

A CAUCHY CRITERION FOR THE SUMMABILITY OF AN INFINITE INTEGRAL

by B. THORPE*

(Received 31st July 1978, revised 26th February 1979)

1.

If $a \in L(1, T)$ for every finite $T > 1$, then we say that the infinite integral $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ is convergent with sum s if $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_1^T a(u) du = s$. It is well known that a necessary and sufficient condition for $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ to be convergent (with some finite sum s) is that Cauchy's criterion,

$$\sup_{x > y} \left| \int_y^x a(u) du \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } y \rightarrow \infty,$$

holds. The object of this note is to obtain a similar result for summability (C, α) of $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ which reduces to Cauchy's criterion in the case of convergence. The corresponding problem for summable series has been treated by A. F. Andersen in (1).

2.

In this section we give the notation and some basic properties.

When $\alpha \geq 0$, we say that $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ is summable (C, α) with sum s , and write

$$\int_1^\infty a(u) du = s(C, \alpha),$$

if

(i) $a \in L(1, T)$ for every finite $T > 1$, and

(ii) $t(x) = \int_1^x (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du \rightarrow s$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

We want to extend the definition to the case $-1 < \alpha < 0$ and this means altering either (i) or (ii). If we assume that (i) holds, then in the case $-1 < \alpha < 0$, it does not follow that

* This paper was originally written at the University of Western Ontario, Canada where the author was a research associate of Professor D. Borwein; I would like to thank Professor Borwein and his colleagues in the Mathematics Department for their hospitality during my stay.

$(x - u)^\alpha a(u)$ is Lebesgue integrable in $(1, x)$; however it is well known that $t(x)$, defined as in (ii), exists and is finite for almost all x . (See, for example, (4), p. 146). Thus the limit in (ii) would have to be replaced by an essential limit, so that the condition would be that there exists a function t_1 such that $t(x) = t_1(x)$ p.p. and $t_1(x) \rightarrow s$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. This definition is perfectly reasonable and, if it is used, the theorem below holds provided that, in its statement, the supremum is replaced by an essential supremum. However, we prefer a definition which is slightly simpler, though not so general. When $-1 < \alpha < 0$ we say that

$$\int_1^\infty a(u) du = s(C, \alpha)$$

if

(i)' $a \in L^\infty(1, T)$ for every finite $T > 1$,

and

(ii) holds.

It is clear that, under the hypothesis (i)', $t(x)$ exists everywhere. Moreover t is continuous, as is shown in (2, Lemma 5).

We shall need the following Abelian property of summability (C, α) : if $-1 < \alpha < \beta$ and

$$\int_1^\infty a(u) du = s(C, \alpha)$$

then

$$\int_1^\infty a(u) du = s(C, \beta).$$

This is proved in (6), p. 27, for the case $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$ and the proof extends to the case $-1 < \alpha < \beta$. We also need the observation that, if $-1 < \alpha < \beta$, then there is an integral which is summable (C, β) but which is not summable (C, α) . (See (3), p. 131.)

3.

We are now ready for the main result.

Theorem. Let $-1 < \alpha < 0$ and $a \in L^\infty(1, T)$ for every finite $T > 1$. Then $\int_1^\infty a(u) du = s(C, \alpha)$ if and only if, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $y_0(\epsilon)$ such that if $y \geq y_0$,

$$\sup_{x > y} \left| \int_y^x (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du \right| < \epsilon. \tag{1}$$

Proof. Suppose that (1) holds and let $x > y_2 > y_1 > y_0$ so that

$$\left| \int_{y_1}^x (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du \right| < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \int_{y_2}^x (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du \right| < \epsilon,$$

and hence

$$\left| \int_{y_1}^{y_2} (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du \right| < 2\epsilon.$$

If y_2, y_1 are fixed and x tends to infinity, then, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\left| \int_{y_1}^{y_2} a(u) du \right| \leq 2\varepsilon;$$

i.e. Cauchy's criterion is satisfied and so $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ is convergent. Furthermore, if $1 < y < x$, we can write

$$t(x) - \int_1^\infty a(u) du = I_1 + I_2 + I_3$$

where

$$I_1 = t(x) - \int_1^y (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du,$$

$$I_2 = \int_1^y (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du - \int_1^y a(u) du,$$

and

$$I_3 = \int_1^y a(u) du - \int_1^\infty a(u) du.$$

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, by (1), there exists $y_0(\varepsilon)$ such that, if $x > y \geq y_0$, $|I_1| < \varepsilon$. Also, since $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ is convergent, there exists $y_1(\varepsilon)$ such that if $y \geq y_1$, $|I_3| < \varepsilon$. To deal with I_2 , fix $y \geq \max(y_0, y_1)$; then, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, there exists $x_0(\varepsilon)$ such that, if $x \geq x_0$, $|I_2| < \varepsilon$. Putting these together we see that $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ is summable (C, α) .

To prove that (1) is necessary we first show that we can assume $t(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. If $t(x) \rightarrow s$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, then define $\hat{a}(u) = a(u) - s$ for $1 \leq u \leq 2$ and $\hat{a}(u) = a(u)$ if $u > 2$. For $x > 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^x (1 - u/x)^\alpha \hat{a}(u) du &= \int_1^x (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du - s \int_1^2 (1 - u/x)^\alpha du \\ &\rightarrow s - s \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

and we only have to observe that (1) remains unchanged if we replace a by \hat{a} (for $y > 2$). Thus we can assume that $t(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Since, for $1 < y < x$,

$$\int_y^x (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du = t(x) - \int_1^y (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du,$$

we see that a necessary and sufficient condition for (1) to hold is that, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $y_0(\varepsilon)$ such that, if $y \geq y_0$, then

$$\sup_{x > y} \left| \int_1^y (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du \right| < \varepsilon.$$

We now use the following identity due to M. Riesz: if $-1 < \alpha < 0$ and $1 < y < x$, then

$$\Gamma(\alpha + 1)\Gamma(-\alpha) \int_1^y (1 - u/x)^\alpha a(u) du = (1 - y/x)^{\alpha+1} \int_1^y (1 - u/x)^{-1} (y - u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha t(u) du.$$

A proof of this is given in (2). (See equations (1.1), (3.1) and (5.18).) It is worthwhile to point out that there is an elementary proof of equation (5.18) of (2) using the following identity†; if $y < v < x$, $-1 < \alpha < 0$, then

$$\int_v^x (x-u)^\alpha (u-y)^{-\alpha-2} du = \int_v^x \left(\frac{x-y}{u-y} - 1\right)^\alpha (u-y)^{-2} du$$

$$= \frac{1}{\alpha+1} (x-y)^{-1} (x-v)^{\alpha+1} (v-y)^{-\alpha-1}.$$

Thus we wish to show that, if $t(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sup_{x>y} \left| (1-y/x)^{\alpha+1} \int_1^y (1-u/x)^{-1} (y-u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha t(u) du \right| \rightarrow 0 \tag{2}$$

as $y \rightarrow \infty$. We first prove that

$$\sup_{x>3y/2} \left| (1-y/x)^{\alpha+1} \int_1^y (1-u/x)^{-1} (y-u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha t(u) du \right| \rightarrow 0 \tag{3}$$

as $y \rightarrow \infty$.

For $x > 3y/2$, $(x-u)^{-1} \leq (x-y)^{-1}$, and so

$$\left| (1-y/x)^{\alpha+1} \int_1^y (1-u/x)^{-1} (y-u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha t(u) du \right| \leq (1-y/x)^\alpha \int_1^y (y-u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha |t(u)| du.$$

Now $\sup_{x>3y/2} (1-y/x)^\alpha = 3^{-\alpha}$ and, by using Theorem 6 of (5) or giving an easy direct proof,

$$\int_1^y (y-u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha |t(u)| du \rightarrow 0$$

as $y \rightarrow \infty$, and this proves (3).

Next we show that

$$\sup_{y<x \leq 3y/2} \left| (1-y/x)^{\alpha+1} \int_1^y (1-u/x)^{-1} (y-u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha t(u) du \right| \rightarrow 0 \tag{4}$$

as $y \rightarrow \infty$. To do this we split the integral in (4) into three parts as follows:

$$\int_1^y = \int_1^{y/2} + \int_{y/2}^{2y-x} + \int_{2y-x}^y.$$

We consider each integral separately, and during the course of the argument we shall employ the letter M to denote constants which need not be the same at different occurrences.

In the first integral, $1 \leq u \leq y/2$; and since also $y < x \leq 3y/2$, we have

$$(x-u)^{-1} (y-u)^{-\alpha-1} \leq M y^{-1} y^{-\alpha-1}.$$

Then

$$\sup_{y<x \leq 3y/2} \left| (1-y/x)^{\alpha+1} \int_1^{y/2} (1-u/x)^{-1} (y-u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha t(u) du \right| \leq M y^{-\alpha-1} \int_1^{y/2} u^\alpha |t(u)| du \rightarrow 0$$

as $y \rightarrow \infty$.

† This was pointed out to me by Professor D. Borwein.

When $y/2 \leqq u \leqq 2y - x$ and $y < x \leqq 3y/2$, we have

$$(x - u)^{-1} u^\alpha \leqq M(y - u)^{-1} y^\alpha,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} \left| (1 - y/x)^{\alpha+1} \int_{y/2}^{2y-x} (1 - u/x)^{-1} (y - u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha t(u) du \right| \\ & \leqq M \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} (x - y)^{\alpha+1} \int_{y/2}^{2y-x} (y - u)^{-\alpha-2} |t(u)| du \\ & \leqq M \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} (x - y)^{\alpha+1} \left\{ \sup_{y/2 \leqq u \leqq 2y-x} |t(u)| \int_{y/2}^{2y-x} (y - u)^{-\alpha-2} du \right\} \\ & \leqq M \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} (x - y)^{\alpha+1} \left\{ \sup_{y/2 \leqq u \leqq 2y-x} |t(u)| \cdot (x - y)^{-\alpha-1} \right\} \\ & \leqq M \sup_{y/2 < u \leqq y} |t(u)| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $y \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, when $2y - x \leqq u \leqq y$ and $y < x \leqq 3y/2$, we have

$$(x - u)^{-1} u^\alpha \leqq M(x - y)^{-1} y^\alpha.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} \left| (1 - y/x)^{\alpha+1} \int_{2y-x}^y (1 - u/x)^{-1} (y - u)^{-\alpha-1} u^\alpha t(u) du \right| \\ & \leqq M \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} (x - y)^\alpha \int_{2y-x}^y (y - u)^{-\alpha-1} |t(u)| du \\ & \leqq M \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} (x - y)^\alpha \left\{ \sup_{2y-x \leqq u \leqq y} |t(u)| \int_{2y-x}^y (y - u)^{-\alpha-1} du \right\} \\ & \leqq M \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} (x - y)^\alpha \left\{ \sup_{2y-x \leqq u \leqq y} |t(u)| \cdot (x - y)^{-\alpha} \right\} \\ & \leqq M \sup_{y < x \leqq 3y/2} |t(u)| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $y \rightarrow \infty$. This proves (4), and so (2) holds.

4.

In the case $\alpha > 0$, (1) is a sufficient condition for $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ to be summable (C, α)

since it implies the stronger result that $\int_1^\infty a(u) du$ is convergent (by the first part of the proof of the theorem which only required $\alpha > -1$). However, if $\alpha > 0$, (1) is not a necessary condition for summability (C, α) . This follows from the observation made at the end of Section 2, that there exist integrals summable (C, α) but not convergent.

In conclusion I would like to thank the referee for suggesting improvements in the presentation of this note.

REFERENCES

- (1) A. F. ANDERSEN, A condition for C-summability of negative order, *Math. Scand.* **7** (1959), 337–346.
- (2) L. S. BOSANQUET, Some extensions of M. Riesz's mean value theorem, *Indian J. Math.* **9** (1967), 65–90.
- (3) G. H. HARDY, Theorems connected with Maclaurin's test for the convergence of series, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (2) **9** (1911), 126–144.
- (4) G. H. HARDY, Notes on some points in the integral calculus XLVIII: On some properties of integrals of fractional order, *Math. Messenger* **47** (1918), 145–150.
- (5) G. H. HARDY, *Divergent Series* (Oxford, 1949).
- (6) E. C. TITCHMARSH, *Introduction to the theory of Fourier integrals* (Oxford, 1937).

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS
THE UNIVERSITY
BIRMINGHAM
B15 2TT