Proyecciones Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 34, N^o 1, pp. 85-105, March 2015.
Universidad Católica del Norte
Antofagasta - Chile
DOI: 10.4067/S0716-09172015000100007

Orlicz-Lorentz Spaces and their Composition Operators

René Erlin Castillo
Universidad Nacional de Colombial, Colombia
Héctor Camilo Chaparro
Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia
and
Julio César Ramos Fernández
Universidad de Oriente, Venezuela
Received : November 2012. Accepted : March 2014

Abstract

In a self-contained presentation, we discuss the Orlicz-Lorentz space. Also the boundedness of composition operators on Orlicz-Lorentz spaces are characterized in this paper.

2010 Mathematics Subject Clasification : *Primary 47B33, 47B38, secondary 46E30.*

1. Introduction

Let f a complex-valued measurable function defined on a σ-finite measure space $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$. For $\lambda \geq 0$, define $D_f(\lambda)$ the distribution function of f as

$$D_f(\lambda) = \mu\left(\{x \in X : |f(x)| > \lambda\}\right). \tag{1.1}$$

Observe that D_f depends only on the absolute value $|f|$ of the function f and D_f may assume the value $+\infty$.

The distribution function D_f provides information about the size of f but not about the behavior of f itself near any given point. For instance, a function on $\mathbf{R^n}$ and each of its translates have the same distribution function. It follows from (1.1) that D_f is a decreasing function of λ (not necessarily strictly) and continuous from the right.

Let (X, μ) be a measurable space and f and g be a measurable functions on (X, μ) then D_f enjoy the following properties for all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$:

1. $|g| \leq |f|$ μ-a.e. implies that $D_g \leq D_f$;
2. $D_{cf}(\lambda) = D_f\left(\frac{\lambda}{|c|}\right)$ for all $c \in \mathbf{C}\{0\}$;
3. $D_{f+g}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \leq D_f(\lambda_1) + D_g(\lambda_2)$;
4. $D_{fg}(\lambda_1\lambda_2) \leq D_f(\lambda_1) + D_g(\lambda_2)$.

For more details on distribution function see [5].
By f^* we mean the non-increasing rearrangement of f given as

$$f^*(t) = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : D_f(\lambda) \leq t\}, \quad t \geq 0$$

where we use the convention that $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. f^* is decreasing and right-continuous. Notice

$$f^*(0) = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : D_f(\lambda) \leq 0\} = \|f\|_\infty,$$

since

$$\|f\|_\infty = \inf\{\alpha \geq 0 : \mu(\{x \in X : |f(x)| > \alpha\}) = 0\}.$$

Also observe that if D_f is strictly decreasing, then

$$f^*(D_f(t)) = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : D_f(\lambda) \leq D_(f)t\} = t.$$

This fact demonstrates that f^* is the inverse function of the distribution function D_f. Let $\mathcal{F}(X, \mathcal{A})$ denote the set of all $\mathcal{A}$-measurable functions on X. Let $(X, \mathcal{A}_0, \mu)$ and $(Y, \mathcal{A}_1, \nu)$ be two measure spaces.

Two functions $f \in F(X, \mathcal{A}_0)$ and $g \in F(X, \mathcal{A}_1)$ are said to be equimeasurable if they have the same distribution function, that is, if

$$\mu\left(\{x \in X : |f(x)| > \lambda\}\right) = \nu\left(\{y \in Y : |g(y)| > \lambda\}\right), \quad \text{for all } \lambda \geq 0.$$

(1.2)

So then there exists only one right-continuous decreasing function f^* equimeasurable with f. Hence the decreasing rearrangement is unique.

In what follows, we gather some useful properties of the decreasing rearrangement function:

a) f^* is decreasing.

b) $f^*(t) > \lambda$ if and only if $D_f(\lambda) > t$.

c) f and f^* are equimeasurables, that is $\mathrm{D}_f(\lambda) = D_{f^*}(\lambda) \quad$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$.

d) If $|f| \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} |f_n|$ then $f^* \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} f_n^*$.

e) If $E \in \mathcal{A}$, then $(\chi_E)^*(t) = \chi_{[0,\mu(E))}(t)$.

f) If $E \in \mathcal{A}$, then $(f\chi_E)^*(t) \leq f^*(t)\chi_{[0,\mu(E))}(t)$.

A weight is a nonnegative locally integrable function on $\mathbf{R^n}$ that takes values in $(0, \infty)$ almost everywhere. Therefore, weights are allowed to be zero or infinite only on a set of Lebesgue measure zero.

Let $\varphi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ be a convex function such that

1. $\varphi(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$;
2. $\lim_{x\to\infty} \varphi(x) = \infty$.

Such as function is known as a Young function. A Young function is strictly increasing, in fact, let $0 < x < y$ then $0 < \frac{x}{y} < 1$ and hence, we might write

$$x = \left(1 - \frac{x}{y}\right) 0 + \frac{x}{y} y.$$

Since φ is convex, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x) &= \varphi\left(\left(1 - \frac{x}{y}\right) 0 + \frac{x}{y} y\right) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{x}{y}\right) \varphi(0) + \frac{x}{y} \varphi(y) \\ &< \varphi(y). \end{aligned}$$

A Young function is said to satisfy the Δ_2-condition if there exists a nonnegative constant x_0 and k such that

$$\varphi(2x) \leq k\varphi(x) \quad \text{for } x \geq x_0. \tag{1.3}$$

If $x_0 = 0$, we say that φ satisfy globally the Δ_2-condition. The smaller constant k which satisfy (1.3) is denoted by k_Δ.

Claim 1.1. *If φ is a Young function such that satisfy the Δ_2-condition, then for each $r \geq 0$ there exists a constant $k_\Delta(r)$ such that*

$$\varphi(rx) \leq k_\Delta(r)\varphi(x) \tag{1.4}$$

for $x > 0$ large enough.

Proof. [Proof of the claim.] If $r > 0$, we can choose $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $r \leq 2^n$. Then we can applied (1.3) n-times and use the fact that φ is increasing to obtain

$$\varphi(rx) \leq \varphi(2^n x) \leq k^n \varphi(x),$$

and hence we have (1.4). $\square$

Example 1.2. *The function $\varphi_1(x) = \frac{x^p}{p}$ with $p > 1$ is a Young function which satisfy globally the Δ_2-condition with $k_\Delta = \frac{2^p}{p}$.*

Example 1.3. *The function $\varphi_2(t) = t^p \log(1+t)$ with $p \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$ is a Young function which satisfy the Δ_2-condition, indeed, since*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\varphi_2(2t)}{\varphi_2(t)} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{2^p t^p \log(1+2t)}{t^p \log(1+t)} = 2^{p-1}.$$

Also, φ_2 satisfy globally the Δ_2-condition.

In fact, since for each $t \geq 0$ we have $(1+t)^2 \geq 1+2t$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_2(2t) &= 2^p t^p \log(1+2t) \\ &\leq 2^{p+1} t^p \log(1+2t) \\ &\leq 2^{p+1} \varphi_2(2t). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1.4. *A Young function φ satisfy the Δ_2-condition if and only if there exist constants $\lambda > 1$ and $t_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{tp(t)}{\varphi(t)} < \lambda$$

for all $t \geq t_0$, where p is the right derivate of φ.

Proof. Suppose that φ satisfy the Δ_2-condition, then there exists a constant $k > 0$ such that

$$k\varphi(t) \geq \varphi(2t) = \int_0^{2t} p(s)\,ds > \int_t^{2t} p(s)\,ds$$

for t large enough, since p is increasing, then we have

$$\int_t^{2t} p(s)\,ds > tp(t);$$

hence, for t large enough, we obtain

$$\frac{tp(t)}{\varphi(t)} \leq k.$$

Conversely, if

$$\frac{tp(t)}{\varphi(t)} < \lambda$$

for all $t \geq t_0$, then

$$\int_t^{2t} \frac{p(s)}{\varphi(s)}\,ds < \lambda \int_t^{2t} \frac{ds}{s} = \lambda \log 2.$$

Since $p(s) = \varphi'(s)$, we have

$$\log\left(\frac{\varphi(2t)}{\varphi(t)}\right) < \lambda \log 2,$$

which implies that

$$\varphi(2t) < 2^{\lambda}\varphi(t).$$

$\square$ The following result show us that the Young functions which satisfy the Δ_2-condition have a cross rate less than the function t^p for some $p > 1$.

Theorem 1.5. *If φ is a Young function which satisfy the Δ_2-condition, then there exists constants $\lambda > 1$ and $C > 0$ such that*

$$\varphi(t) \leq Ct^{\lambda}$$

for t large enough.

Proof. By (1.4) we can write

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{p(s)}{\varphi(s)}\, ds < \lambda \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{ds}{s}$$

where $t \geq t_0$. Then

$$\log\left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{\varphi(t_0)}\right) < \lambda \log\left(\frac{t}{t_0}\right),$$

therefore

$$\varphi(t) < \frac{\varphi(t_0)}{t_0^{\lambda}} t^{\lambda}.$$

And the proof is complete. $\square$

Example 1.6. *The following are Young functions:*

1. $\varphi(x) = \frac{|x|^p}{p}$ *with* $p > 1$.
2. $\varphi(x) = e^{|x|} - |x| - 1$.
3. $\varphi(x) = e^{|x|^{\delta}} - 1$ *with* $\delta > 1$.

Related with the Young function φ, we define, for $t \geq 0$ the complementary function of Young function as

$$\psi(t) = \sup\{ts - \varphi(s) : s \geq 0\}.$$

Example 1.7. *If $\varphi(t) = \frac{1}{p}t^p$ with $p > 1$ and $t \geq 0$, then its complementary function is $\psi(t) = \frac{1}{q}t^q$ where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$.*

Indeed, by definition we have

$$\psi(t) = \sup\left\{ts - \frac{1}{p}s^p : s \geq 0\right\},$$

next, for $t > 0$ fixed, we can consider the function

$$g(s) = ts - \frac{1}{p}s^p, \quad \text{with } s \geq 0.$$

It is not hard to check that g achieves its maximum at $s = t^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$ which is given by

$$g\left(t^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\right) = \frac{1}{q}t^q.$$

Hence

$$\psi(t) = \sup\left\{ts - \frac{1}{p}s^p : s \geq 0\right\} = \frac{1}{q}t^q.$$

Proposition 1.8. *If φ is a Young function, then its complementary function ψ is also a Young function.*

Proof. It is clear that $\psi(0) = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$. Now, we just need to show that ψ is a convex function. To this end, let us choose $t_1, t_2 \in [0, +\infty)$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Then, by definition of ψ we have

$$\psi(\lambda t_1 + (1-\lambda)t_2) = \sup\{s(\lambda t_1 + (1-\lambda)t_2) - \varphi(s) : s \geq 0\}.$$

On the other hand

$$\lambda\psi(t_1) = \lambda \sup\{st_1 - \varphi(s) : s \geq 0\} \geq \lambda(st_1 - \varphi(s)) \ \forall \ s \geq 0$$

and

$$(1-\lambda)\psi(t_2) = (1-\lambda)\sup\{st_2 - \varphi(s) : s \geq 0\} \geq (1-\lambda)(st_2 - \varphi(s)) \ \forall \ s \geq 0.$$

From the last two inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s(\lambda t_1 + (1-\lambda)t_2) - \varphi(s) &= \lambda(st_1 - \varphi(s)) + (1-\lambda)(st_2 - \varphi(s)) \\ &\leq \lambda\psi(t_1) + (1-\lambda)\psi(t_2) \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \geq 0$. Which means that $\lambda\psi(t_1) + (1-\lambda)\psi(t_2)$ is an upper bound of the set

$$\{s(\lambda t_1 + (1-\lambda)t_2) - \varphi(s) : s \geq 0\},$$

then

$$\psi(\lambda t_1 + (1-\lambda)t_2)) \leq \psi(t_1) + (1-\lambda)\psi(t_2),$$

and so ψ is convex. □

Theorem 1.9 (Young's Inequality). *Let ψ be the complementary function of φ. Then*

$$ts \leq \varphi(s) + \psi(t)$$

where $t, s \in [0, +\infty)$.

Proof. Let $t, s \in [0, +\infty)$. Then $\psi(t) = \sup\{st - \varphi(s) : s \geq 0\}$ $\geq st - \varphi(s) \quad \forall\, s \geq 0$, then

$$\psi(t) + \varphi(s) \geq st,$$

and the proof is complete. □ For more details on Young functions see [13].

2. Weighted Lorentz-Orlicz Spaces

The aim of this section is to present basic results about Lorentz-Orlicz spaces. We have tried to make the proofs as self-contained and synthetic as possible.

Definition 2.1 (Luxemburg norm). *Let φ be a Young function. For any measurable function f on X,*

$$\|f\|_{\varphi,w} = \inf\left\{\varepsilon > 0 : \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{\varepsilon}\right) w(t)\, dt \leq 1\right\} \in [0, \infty),$$

where it is understood that $\inf(\emptyset) = +\infty$.

Remark 2.2. *In this article, we will not always require that the Luxemburg norm actually be a norm. $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi,w}$ is indeed a quasinorm. A quasinorm is a functional that is like a norm except that it does only satisfy the triangle inequality with a constant $C \geq 1$, that is, $\|f+g\| \leq C(\|f\| + \|g\|)$ where $C \geq 1$.*

Lemma 2.3. *For any measurable function f on X, $\|f\|_{\varphi,w} = 0$ if and only if $f = 0$ μ-almost everywhere.*

Proof. Clearly $\|f\|_{\varphi,w} = 0$ if and only if $\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{\varepsilon}\right) w(t)\,dt \le 1\;\forall\,\varepsilon > 0$. It follows that

$$\|f\|_{\varphi,w} = 0 \text{ if and only if } \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\alpha f^*(t)\right) w(t)\,dt = 0\;\forall\;\alpha > 0$$

$$\text{if and only if } \varphi\left(\alpha f^*(t)\right) w(t) = 0\;\mu - \text{a.e.}\;\forall\;\alpha > 0$$

$$\text{if and only if } f^*(t) = 0\;\mu - \text{a.e.}$$

$$\text{if and only if } D_f(\lambda) = 0\;\mu - \text{a.e.}$$

$$\text{if and only if } f = 0\;\mu - \text{a.e.}$$

□

Identification of almost everywhere equal functions. As with L_p spaces, one identifies the function which are μ-almost everywhere equal. This means that one works with the equivalence classes of the equivalence relation defined by the μ-almost everywhere equality. From now on, this will be done without further mention. Consequently, one write:

$$\|f\|_{\varphi,w} = 0 \text{ if and only if } f = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Lemma 2.4. *If* $0 < \|f\|_{\varphi,w} < \infty$ *then* $\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt \le 1$. *In particular,* $\|f\|_{\varphi,w} \le 1$ *is equivalent to* $\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(f^*(t)\right) w(t)\,dt \le 1$.

Proof. For all $b > \|f\|_{\varphi,w}$, we have

$$\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{b}\right) w(t)\,dt \le 1.$$

Letting b decrease to $\|f\|_{\varphi,w}$, one obtains the first result by monotone convergence. The second statement follows from this and lemma 2.8. □

Proposition 2.5. *The gauge* $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi,w}$ *is a quasinorm on the vector space of all the measurable functions* f *such that* $\|f\|_{\varphi,w} < \infty$.

Proof. It is already seen that (2.1) holds under identification of a.e. equal functions.

It is clear that for all real λ, $\|\lambda f\|_{\varphi,w} = |\lambda|\|f\|_{\varphi,w}$.

It remains to prove the triangle inequality. Let f and g be two measurable functions such that $0 < \|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w} < \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{(f+g)^*(t)}{2(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w})}\right) w(t)\,dt \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t/2) + g^*(t/2)}{2(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w})}\right) w(t)\,dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}{2(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w})}\frac{f^*(t/2)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}} + \frac{\|g\|_{\varphi,w}}{2(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w})}\frac{g^*(t/2)}{\|g\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt \\
&\leq \frac{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}{2(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w})}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t/2)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt \\
&\quad + \frac{\|g\|_{\varphi,w}}{2(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w})}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{g^*(t/2)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt \\
&= \frac{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}{2(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w})}2\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(2t)\,dt \\
&\quad + \frac{\|g\|_{\varphi,w}}{2(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w})}2\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{g^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(2t)\,dt \\
&\leq \frac{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w}}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt \\
&\quad + \frac{\|g\|_{\varphi,w}}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w}}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{g^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt \\
&\leq 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last but one inequality follows from the convexity of φ and the fact that w is nonincreasing and the last inequality from lemma 2.4. Therefore

$$\|f+g\|_{\varphi,w} \leq 2\left(\|f\|_{\varphi,w} + \|g\|_{\varphi,w}\right).$$

As a consequence, the set of all measurable functions f such that $\|f\|_{\varphi,w} < \infty$ is a vector space. $\square$

Definition 2.6. *Let φ be a Young function. We define the weighted Lorenz-Orlicz spaces*

$$L_{\varphi,w} = \left\{ f : X \to \mathbf{C} \text{ measurable} : \int_0^\infty \varphi(\alpha f^*(t)) w(t)\, dt < \infty, \text{ for some } \alpha > 0 \right\}.$$

It follows from proposition 1.8 that if $L_{\varphi,w}$ is a weighted Lorentz-Orlicz space, then $L_{\psi,w}$ is also a weighted Lorenz-Orlicz space.

Proposition 2.7 (Hölder's type inequality). *For $f \in L_{\varphi,1}$ and $g \in L_{\psi,1}$*

$$\int_X |fg|\, d\mu \le 2\|f\|_{\varphi,1}\|g\|_{\psi,1}.$$

In particular, $fg \in L_1$.

Proof. If $\|f\|_{\varphi,1} = 0$ or $\|g\|_{\psi,1} = 0$, one concludes with lemma 2.3.

Assume now that $0 < \|f\|_{\varphi,1}, \|g\|_{\psi,1}$. Because of Young's inequality: $st \le \varphi(s) + \varphi(t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \frac{|fg|}{\|f\|_{\varphi,1}\|g\|_{\psi,1}}\, d\mu &\le \int_0^\infty \frac{f^*(t)g^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,1}\|g\|_{\psi,1}}\, dt \\ &\le \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,1}}\right) dt + \int_0^\infty \psi\left(\frac{g^*(t)}{\|g\|_{\psi,1}}\right) dt \\ &\le 2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\int_X |fg|\, d\mu \le 2\|f\|_{\varphi,1}\|g\|_{\psi,1}.$$

□

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ be a sequence in $L_{\varphi,w}$. Then, the following assertions are equivalent:*

a) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|f_n\|_{\varphi,w} = 0$;

b) *For all* $\alpha > 0$, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_0^\infty \varphi(\alpha f_n^*(t)) w(t)\, dt \le 1$;

c) *For all* $\alpha > 0$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^\infty \varphi(\alpha f_n^*(t)) w(t)\, dt = 0$.

Proof. The equivalence $(a) \Leftrightarrow (b)$ is a direct consequence of the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi,w}$. Off course $(c) \Rightarrow (b)$ is obvious. As φ is convex and $\varphi(0)=0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, we have

$$\varphi(t) = \varphi\left((1-\varepsilon)0 + \varepsilon\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) \leq (1-\varepsilon)\varphi(0) + \varepsilon\varphi\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

that is

$$\varphi(t) \leq \varepsilon\varphi\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) \quad t \geq 0, 0 < \varepsilon \leq 1.$$

From which $(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ follows easily. □

Theorem 2.9. *The space $L_{\varphi,w}$ is a quasi-Banach space.*

Proof. Let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ be a Cauchy sequence in $L_{\varphi,w}$. Let us choose $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that $\tilde{\varepsilon}\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}\right) < \frac{1}{n+m}$ for $n, m \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0, k_0 > 0$. For such $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that

$$\|f_n - f_m\|_{\varphi,w} < \tilde{\varepsilon}.$$

If $n, m \geq n_0$. By the definition of the Luxemburg quasi-norm we can use $k_0 > 0$ in such a way that $k_0 < \tilde{\varepsilon}$ and

$$\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{(f_n - f_m)^*(t)}{k_0}\right) w(t)\,dt \leq 1.$$

Let $E = \{x \in X : |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| > \varepsilon\}$, then

$$\varepsilon\chi_E(x) \leq |f_n(x) - f_m(x)|.$$

Hence

$$\varepsilon\chi_E^*(t) \leq (f_n - f_m)^*(t),$$

$$\varepsilon\chi_{(0,\mu(E))}(t) \leq (f_n - f_m)^*(t).$$

Therefore

$$\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}\chi_{(0,\mu(E))}(t)\right) w(t)\,dt \leq \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{(f_n - f_m)^*(t)}{k_0}\right) w(t)\,dt.$$

Then

$$\int_0^{\mu(E)} \varphi\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}\right) w(t)\,dt \leq \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{(f_n - f_m)^*(t)}{k_0}\right) w(t)\,dt$$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{\varepsilon} \int_0^{D_{f_n - f_m(\varepsilon)}} w(t)\,dt \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}\right) \int_0^{\infty} \varphi\left(\frac{(f_n - f_m)^*(t)}{k_0}\right) w(t)\,dt$$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{\varepsilon} \int_0^{D_{f_n - f_m(\varepsilon)}} w(t)\,dt \leq \frac{1}{n+m}$$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{\varepsilon} \lim_{n,m\to\infty} \int_0^{D_{f_n - f_m(\varepsilon)}} w(t) = 0.$$

Since $w > 0$, we must have $\lim_{n,m\to\infty} D_{f_n - f_m}(\varepsilon) = 0$ which means that $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in measure. Then some subsequence $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$ converges almost everywhere to a measurable function f, that is, $f_{n_k} \to f$ μ-a.e.

Let $\alpha > 0$. By lemma 2.8 there exists a large enough integer $n(\alpha)$ such that

$$\int_0^{\infty} \varphi\left(\alpha(f_n - f_m)^*(t)\right) w(t)\,dt \leq 1, \quad \forall\ m, n \geq n(\alpha).$$

With Fatou's lemma this gives

$$\int_0^{\infty} \varphi\left(\alpha(f_n - f)^*(t)\right) w(t)\,dt \leq \liminf \int_0^{\infty} \varphi\left(\alpha(f_n - f_m)^*(t)\right) w(t)\,dt \leq 1$$

$\forall\ m \geq n(\alpha)$. Therefore $f_n - f$ belongs to $L_{\varphi,w}$, but $f_n \in L_{\varphi,w}$, so that $f \in L_{\varphi,w}$.

Moreover, as $\limsup_{m\to\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \varphi\left(\alpha(f_m - f)^*(t)\right) w(t)\,dt \leq 1$ for all $\alpha > 0$, we have $\lim_{m\to\infty} \|f_m - f\|_{\varphi,w} = 0$. This proves that $L_{\varphi,w}$ is complete. □

Theorem 2.10. *Simple functions are dense in* $L_{\varphi,w}$.

Proof. Suppose $f \in L_{\varphi,w}$. We may assume that $f \geq 0$. Note that if $D_f(\lambda) = \infty$, then $\lim_{t\to\infty} f^*(t) = 0$. It follows that $D_f(\lambda) < \infty$.

Hence, given $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, we can find a simple function $s_n \geq 0$ such that $s_n(x) = 0$ when $f(x) \leq \varepsilon$ and $f(x) - \varepsilon \leq s_n(x) \leq f(x)$ when $f(x) > \varepsilon$ except on a set of measure less than δ. It follows that

$$\mu\left(\{x \in X : |f(x) - s_n(x)| > \varepsilon\}\right) < \delta.$$

Next, choose $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, then

$$(f - s_n)^*(t) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : D_{f-s_n}(\varepsilon) < \delta \leq t\}.$$

Thus

$$(f - s_n)^*(t) \leq \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{for } t \geq \delta,$$

since $s_n \leq f$, then $s_n^*(t) \leq f^*(t)$, for each $t > 0$. Since $n > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, we have

$$(f - s_n)^*(t) \leq \frac{1}{n} < \varepsilon,$$

next,

$$\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{(f-s_n)^*(t)}{k}\right) w(t)\,dt \leq \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{1}{nk}\right) w(t)\,dt.$$

Let $a = \int_0^\infty w(t)\,dt$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|f - s_n\|_{\varphi,w} &= \inf\left\{k > 0 : \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{(f-s_n)^*(t)}{k}\right) w(t)\,dt \leq 1\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.\end{aligned}$$

□

3. Composition Operator

Let $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a σ-finite complete measure space and let $T : X \to X$ be a measurable transformation, that is, $T^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{A}$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

If $\mu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right) = 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(A) = 0$, then T is said to be nonsingular. This condition means that the measure $\mu \circ T^{-1}$, defined by $\mu \circ T^{-1}(A) = \mu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right)$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ (it is usually denoted $\mu \circ T^{-1} \ll \mu$). Then the Radon-Nikodym theorem ensure the existence of a non-negative locally integrable function f_T on X such that

$$\mu \circ T^{-1}(A) = \int_A f_T\,d\mu \quad \text{for } A \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Any measurable nonsingular transformation T induces a linear operator (composition operator) C_T from $F(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ into itself defined by

$$C_T(f)(x) = f\left(T(x)\right), x \in X, f \in F(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu),$$

where $F(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ denotes the linear space of all equivalence classes of $\mathcal{A}$-measurable functions on X, where we identify any two functions that are equal μ-almost everywhere on X.

Here the nonsingularty of T guarantees that the operator C_T is well defined as a mapping of equivalence classes of functions into itself since $f = g$ μ-a.e. implies $C_T(f) = C_T(g)$ μ-a.e.

Example 3.1. *Let* $([0,1],\mathcal{B},m)$ *be a Lebesgue measure space,* $\mathcal{B}$ *stand for the Borel's* σ*-algebra and* $T:[0,1]\to[0,1]$ *a transformation defined by*

$$T(x)=\begin{cases} 2x, & \text{if } 0\le x\le \frac{1}{2} \\ 1, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2}<x\le 1. \end{cases}$$

It is not hard to see that T *is* $\mathcal{B}$*-measurable, also, observe that* T *is not nonsigular, indeed*

$$T^{-1}(\{1\})=\left(\frac{1}{2},1\right],$$

hence $m(T^{-1}(\{1\}))=\frac{1}{2}$ *but* $m(\{1\})=0$.

Now, let us consider $f=\chi_{[0,1)}$ *and* $g=\chi_{[0,1]}$ *note* $f=g$ μ-a.e., *but*

$$\begin{aligned} C_T(f) &= C_T\left(\chi_{[0,1)}\right) \\ &= \chi_{[0,1)}\circ T \\ &= \chi_{[0,\frac{1}{2})} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C_T(g) &= C_T\left(\chi_{[0,1]}\right) \\ &= \chi_{[0,1]}\circ T \\ &= \chi_{[0,1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $C_T(f)\neq C_T(g)$, *which means that* C_T *is not well defined.*

In other words, the nonsingularity of T *is a necessary condition in order to* T *induces a composition operator on* $F(X,\mathcal{A},\mu)$.

Composition operators are relatively simple operators with a wide range of applications in areas such a partial differential equations, group representation theory, ergodic theory or dynamical systems, etc. For details on composition operator see [7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15] and the references given therein.

In what follows, we will consider the transformation C_T from $L_{\varphi,w}$ into the space of all complex-valued measurable functions on X as

$$\left(C_T f\right)(x) == \begin{cases} f\left(T(x)\right), \text{if } x\in Y \\ 0, \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where Y is a measurable subset of X.

Next, a necessary and sufficient condition for the boundedness of composition mapping C_T is given.

If $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is a σ-finite measure space and $T : X \to X$ is a non-singular measurable transformation and w is a weight function, define a measure ν on the σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ as

$$\nu(A) = \int_0^{\mu(A)} w(t)\, dt.$$

Next, for $A \in \mathcal{A}$,
$\|\chi_A\|_{\varphi,w} = \inf\left\{k > 0 : \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{\chi_A^*(t)}{k}\right) w(t)\, dt \leq 1\right\}$

$$= \inf\left\{k > 0 : \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{\chi_{(0,\mu(A))}(t)}{k}\right) w(t)\, dt \leq 1\right\}$$
$$= \inf\left\{k > 0 : \int_0^{\mu(A)} \varphi\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) w(t)\, dt \leq 1\right\}.$$

Now, observe that if $k = \frac{1}{\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(A)}\right)}$, then

$$\varphi\left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\varphi^{-1}(\nu(A))}}\right) = \varphi\left(\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(A)}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{\nu(A)},$$

thus

$$\int_0^{\mu(A)} \varphi\left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\varphi^{-1}(\nu(A))}}\right) w(t)\, dt = \int_0^{\mu(A)} \varphi\left(\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(A)}\right)\right) w(t)\, dt$$

$$= \int_0^{\mu(A)} \frac{w(t)}{\nu(A)}\, dt$$
$$= \frac{1}{\nu(A)} \int_0^{\mu(A)} w(t)\, dt$$
$$= \frac{1}{\nu(A)} \cdot \nu(A)$$
$$= 1.$$

Therefore

$$\|\chi_A\|_{\varphi,w} = \frac{1}{\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(A)}\right)}.$$

Theorem 3.2. *Let $T : X \to X$ be a non-singular measurable transformation. Then C_T induced by T is bounded on $L_{\varphi,w}$ if and only if there exists $M \geq 1$ such that*

$$\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right) \leq M\nu(A) \quad \forall\ A \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{3.1}$$

Moreover

$$\|C_T(f)\| = \sup_{0<\nu(A)<\infty} \left(\frac{\nu(T^{-1}(A))}{\nu(A)}\right). \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Let C_T be a bounded transformation on $L_{\varphi,w}$, then we can find $M \geq 1$ such that

$$\|C_T f\|_{\varphi,w} \leq M\|f\|_{\varphi,w} \quad \forall\ f \in L_{\varphi,w}.$$

If $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is such that $\nu(A) = \infty$, then (3.1) holds. Suppose $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is such that $\nu(A) < \infty$, thus
$\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\alpha\chi_A^*(t)\right) w(t)\, dt = \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\alpha\chi_{0,\mu(A)}(t)\right) w(t)\, dt$

$$= \int_0^{\mu(A)} \varphi(\alpha)w(t)\, dt$$
$$= \varphi(\alpha)\nu(A) < \infty.$$

Hence

$$\|C_T\chi_A\|_{\varphi,w} \leq M\|\chi_A\|_{\varphi,w}. \tag{3.3}$$

Note

$$\begin{aligned}(\chi_A \circ T)(x) = \chi_A(T(x)) &= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathrm{T(x)} \in A \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathrm{T(x)} \notin A \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathrm{x} \in T^{-1}(A) \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathrm{x} \notin T^{-1}(A) \end{cases} \\ &= \chi_{T^{-1}(A)}(x).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|C_T\chi_A\|_{\varphi,w} &= \|\chi_{T^{-1}(A)}\|_{\varphi,w}\\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(T^{-1}(A))}\right)},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\chi_A\|_{\varphi,w} = \frac{1}{\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(A)}\right)}.$$

Hence, we can write (3.3) as follows

$$\frac{1}{\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(T^{-1}(A))}\right)} \leq \frac{M}{\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(A)}\right)}$$

and so

$$\varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(A)}\right) \leq \varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(T^{-1}(A))}\right).$$

Since φ^{-1} is concave and $0 = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(0)) = \varphi^{-1}(0)$ thus φ^{-1} is increasing, then

$$\begin{gathered}\frac{1}{\nu(A)} \leq M\frac{1}{\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right)}\\ \nu(T^{-1}(A)) \leq M\nu(A).\end{gathered}$$

Conversely, if inequality (3.1) holds for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, then
Therefore

$$(f\circ T)^*(t) \leq Mf^*(t) \quad \text{a.e.}$$

Since $\varphi(\alpha t) \leq \alpha\varphi(t)$ for $\alpha < 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{(f\circ T)^*(t)}{M\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt &\leq \frac{1}{M}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt\\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\frac{f^*(t)}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}}\right) w(t)\,dt \leq 1.\end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$\|f\circ T\|_{\varphi,w} \leq M\|f\|_{\varphi,w},$$

that is

$$\|C_T f\|_{\varphi,w} \le M\|f\|_{\varphi,w}.$$

On the one hand, let us prove (3.2). Indeed, let

$$N = \sup_{0<\nu(A)<\infty} \left(\frac{\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right)}{\nu(A)}\right),$$

then

$$\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right) \le N\nu(A)$$

and thus

$$\|C_T f\|_{\varphi,w} \le N\|f\|_{\varphi,w}, \quad \forall\, f \in L_{\varphi,w}$$

hence

$$\frac{\|C_T f\|_{\varphi,w}}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}} \le N, \quad \text{for all } 0 \ne f \in L_{\varphi,w}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|C_T\| &= \sup_{f\ne 0} \frac{\|C_T(f)\|_{\varphi,w}}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}} \\ &< N = \sup_{0<\nu(A)<\infty} \left(\frac{\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right)}{\nu(A)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\|C_T\| \le \sup_{0<\nu(A)<\infty} \left(\frac{\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right)}{\nu(A)}\right). \tag{3.4}$$

On the other hand, let us consider

$$M = \|C_T\| = \sup_{f\ne 0} \frac{\|C_T(f)\|_{\varphi,w}}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}},$$

then

$$\frac{\|C_T(f)\|_{\varphi,w}}{\|f\|_{\varphi,w}} \le M \quad \forall\, 0 \ne f \in L_{\varphi,w}.$$

In particular, if $f = \chi_A$ such that $0 < \mu(A) < \infty$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$, then

$$\frac{\|C_T(\chi_A)\|_{\varphi,w}}{\|\chi_A\|_{\varphi,w}} = \left(\frac{\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right)}{\nu(A)}\right) \le M,$$

therefore

$$\sup_{0<\nu(A)<\infty} \left(\frac{\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right)}{\nu(A)}\right) \le M = \|C_T\|. \tag{3.5}$$

Combining 3.4 and 3.5 we have

$$\|C_T\| = \sup_{0<\nu(A)<\infty} \left(\frac{\nu\left(T^{-1}(A)\right)}{\nu(A)} \right).$$

□

References

[1] M. B. Abrahamese, Multiplication operators, Lecture notes in Math., Vol. 693, pp. 17-36, Springer Verlag, New York, (1978).

[2] Y. A. Abramovich, C. D. Aliprantis, An Invitation to Operator Theory, American Mathematical Society, (2002).

[3] S.C Arora, Gopal Datt and Satish Verma, Multiplication operators on lorentz spaces, Indian Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 48, (3), pp. 317-329, (2006).

[4] A. Axler, Multiplication operators on Bergman space, J. Peine Angew Math., Vol. 33 (6), pp. 26-44, (1982).

[5] Grafakos, Loukas. Classical Fourier Analysis Second Edition, Springer, (2008).

[6] R. E. Castillo, R. León; E. Trousselot. Multiplication operator on $L(p, q)$ spaces, Panamer. Math Journal Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 37-44, (2009).

[7] Y. Cui, H. Hudzik, Romesh Kumar and L. Maligranda, Composition operators in Orlicz spaces, J. Austral. Math. Soc., Vol. 76 (2), pp. 189-206, (2004).

[8] H. Hudzik, A. Kaminska and M. Mastylo, On the dual of Orlicz-Lorentz space, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 130 (6), pp. 1645-1654, (2003).

[9] B. S. Komal and Shally Gupta, Multiplication operators between Orlicz spaces, Integral Equations and Operator Theory. Vol. 41, pp. 324-330, (2001).

[10] Romesh Kumar, Composition operators on Orlicz spaces, Integral Equations and Operator Theory. Vol. 29, pp. 17-22, (1997).

[11] Rajeev Kumar and Romesh Kumar, Compact composition operators on Lorentz spaces, Math. Vesnik, Vol. 57, pp. 109-112, (2005).

[12] E. Nordgren, Composition operators on Hilbert spaces, Lecture notes in Math., Vol. 693, pp. 37-68, Springer Verlag, New York, (1978).

[13] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, Theory of Orlicz spaces, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, (1993).

[14] R. K. Singh and A. Kumar, Multiplication and composition operators with closed ranges, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. Vol. 16, pp. 247-252, (1977).

[15] R. K. Singh and J. S. Manhas, Composition operators on Function Spaces, North Holland Math. Stud. Vol. 179, Elsevier Science Publications, Amsterdem, New York, (1993).

René Erlin Castillo
Departamento de Matemáticas,
Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Bogotá,
Colombia
e-mail : recastillo@unal.edu.co

Héctor Camilo Chaparro
Departamento de Matemáticas,
Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Bogotá,
Colombia
e-mail : hcchaparrog@unal.edu.co

and

Julio César Ramos Fernández
Departamento de Matemáticas
Universidad de Oriente,
Cumaná, Estado Sucre,
Venezuela
e-mail : jcramos@udo.edu.ve