

Derivatives of flat functions

Hiroki KODAMA, Kazuo MASUDA, and Yoshihiko MITSUMATSU

Abstract

We remark that there is no smooth function $f(x)$ on $[0, 1]$ which is flat at 0 such that the derivative $f^{(n)}$ of any order $n \geq 0$ is positive on $(0, 1]$. Moreover, the number of zeros of the n -th derivative $f^{(n)}$ grows to the infinity and the zeros accumulate to 0 when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We consider smooth functions on the interval $[0, 1]$ which are flat at the origin, namely of class C^∞ and any derivative $f^{(n)}(x)$ converges to 0 when $x \rightarrow 0 + 0$. Eventually it is equivalent to say that f extends to the whole real line as a smooth function by defining $f(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$. In this short note we make a couple of remarks on the asymptotics of higher derivatives around the origin. The notion of higher derivatives was initiated in [N]. For flat functions see, *e.g.*, [GO].

Among non-trivial flat functions the most well-known might be the one which is defined as follows.

$$f(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{x}} \quad \text{for } x > 0$$

If we imagine its graph, of course it seems smooth enough, and it can be extended as constantly 0 on $(-\infty, 0]$ as a smooth function on the real line \mathbb{R} . Its first derivative is positive on $(0, \infty)$, but the second derivative vanishes at $x = \frac{1}{2} = x_2$ and the third vanishes at $x_3 = \frac{1-1/\sqrt{3}}{2} < x_2$, and so on. That is, setting $x_n = \min\{x; f^{(n)}(x) = 0, x > 0\}$ for $n = 2, 3, 4, \dots$, it is clear that $\{x_n\}_n$ is strictly decreasing, and in fact $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$. Moreover, if we fix any interval $[0, \alpha)$ ($\alpha > 0$), $f^{(n)}(x)$ tends to behave more and more wildly when $n \rightarrow \infty$ on the interval.

Also, if we take $g_0(x) = f(x)(\sin(\frac{1}{x}) + 1)$ and

$$g_n(x) = \int_0^x \int_0^{t_{n-1}} \cdots \int_0^{t_1} g_0(t_0) dt_0 \cdots dt_{n-2} dt_{n-1},$$

then for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, $g_n(x)$ is positive on $(0, \infty)$ and is flat at $x = 0$, and apparently $g_n^{(k)}(x) > 0$ when $x > 0$ for $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ but there is no interval $(0, \alpha)$ on which $g_n^{(n)}(x)$ is positive.

They seem to exhibit not particular for these examples but rather common or inevitable phenomena of higher derivatives of flat functions.

Theorem 1 There exists no smooth function $f(x)$ on $[0, 1]$ which is flat at $x = 0$ and satisfies $f^{(n)}(x) > 0$ on $(0, 1]$ for any $n \geq 0$.

This fact is refined as follows.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 26A24 (primary) and 26A06 (secondary).

Theorem 2 For a smooth function $f(x)$ on $[0, 1]$ which is flat at $x = 0$, put $Z(n) = \{x \in (0, 1) \mid f^{(n)}(x) = 0\}$ and $z(n) = \#Z(n)$ for $n \geq 0$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z(n) = \infty$$

holds, where ∞ might be \aleph_c .

Corollary 3 1) In general, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z(n) = 0$.

2) More strongly, for any $k > 0$ there exist $N > 0$ and $y^{(n)}(l) \in Z(n)$ for $n \geq N$ and $l = 1, \dots, k$ which are strictly increasing in l and strictly decreasing in n , namely, satisfying

$$\text{for each fixed } n, \quad y^{(n)}(l) < y^{(n)}(l+1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq k-1,$$

$$\text{for each fixed } l, \quad y^{(n)}(l) > y^{(n+1)}(l).$$

Moreover it satisfies for any l $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y^{(n)}(l) = 0$.

The accumulation of $Z(n)$ to 0 ($n \rightarrow 0$) must be formulated in many more stronger statements. The above corollary is one of them.

These results imply that the set of germs of flat homeomorphisms of the half line $[0, 1)$ at 0 is stable under the integration, while any element goes out of the set by a finite times of differentiation.

Proof of Corollary 3. There is a zero of $f^{(n+1)}$ between two zeros of $f^{(n)}$. This simple argument, which will be used repeatedly, tells that once $Z(n)$ accumulates to 0 for some n , so does $Z(k)$ for any $k \geq n$. Therefore in this case the proof is done. Otherwise, 0 is always isolated from $Z(n)$ and then we can pick up the least element $y^{(n)}(1) \in Z(n)$. Now it is clear that $y^{(n+1)}(1) < y^{(n)}(1)$ for any n . Then, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y^{(n)}(1) = c > 0$, $f|_{[0,c]}$ contradicts to Theorem 1. This proves 1).

Now let us prove 2). Theorem 2 implies for any k there is N' , $\#Z(n) \geq k$ for $n \geq N'$. Like in 1), once 0 is accumulated by $Z(N)$, take any decreasing sequence $y^{(n)}(k) \in Z(n)$ for $n \geq N$, and then it is fairly easy to take $\{y^{(n)}(l)\}$ for other l 's so as to satisfy the conditions. Therefore we assume that 0 is isolated from $Z(n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Next, take $A(n) \subset Z(n)$ to be the set of points which is accumulated from above by points in $Z(n)$. Clearly this set has $\eta(n) = \min A(n)$ whenever $A(n) \neq \emptyset$. If $A(n) = \emptyset$, put $\eta(n) = 1$. If $\eta(n) < 1$, $f^{(n)}$ is flat at $\eta(n)$ and $\eta(n) \in A(n')$ for $n' \geq n$. Therefore the sequence $\{\eta(n)\}_n$ is weakly decreasing.

In the case where $c = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta(n) > 0$, applying Theorem 2 to $f|_{[0,c]}$, we can find N such that $\#(Z(N) \cap (0, c)) \geq k$. Moreover, in this case, for any $n \geq N$ we can take the k least zeros $0 < y^{(n)}(1) < y^{(n)}(2) < \dots < y^{(n)}(k)$ because there is no accumulation from above. Automatically $\{y^{(n)}(l)\}_n$ is strictly decreasing for each l . If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y^{(n)}(k) = c' > 0$, then again $f|_{[0,c']}$ contradicts to Theorem 2. Therefore this case is done.

In the case where $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta(n) = 0$, a similar argument in the case where 0 is accumulated by some $Z(n)$ enable us to arrange $\{y^{(n)}(l)\}$ so as to satisfy the conditions. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. The theorem is easily deduced from Lemma 4 by contradiction. Assume for some $\alpha > 0$ that $f(x)$ is smooth on $[0, \alpha]$, is flat at $x = 0$, and that its n -th derivative is positive on $(0, \alpha]$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We adjust the function f into $g(x) = f(\alpha)^{-1}f(\alpha x)$. Then $g(x)$ satisfies the condition of the lemma for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore $g(x) \equiv 0$ on $[0, 1)$, and we obtain a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4 Let n be an integer and $g(x)$ be a function on $[0, 1]$ of class C^{n+1} with the following properties.

$$(1) \quad g^{(k)}(0) = 0 \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, n, \text{ and } g(1) = 1,$$

$$(2) \quad g^{(n+1)}(x) > 0 \text{ for } x > 0.$$

Then $g(x) < x^n$ holds on $(0, 1)$.

Proof of Lemma 4. It is enough to show that $g(x)/x^n$ is increasing on $[0, 1]$. As $\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{g(x)}{x^n} \right) = \frac{xg'(x) - ng(x)}{x^{n+1}}$, it is also sufficient to show that the numerator $xg'(x) - ng(x)$ is positive on $(0, 1)$.

Then because $(xg'(x) - ng(x))^{(n)} = xg^{(n+1)}(x)$ is positive on $(0, 1]$ from our condition, we see successively that each k -th derivative $(xg'(x) - ng(x))^{(k)} = xg^{(k+1)} - (n-k)g^{(k)}(x)$ vanishes at $x = 0$ and therefore is positive on $(0, 1]$ for $k = n-1, n-2, \dots, 0$. This completes the proof. \square

A variant of this lemma is used to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. The key idea is not to look at $z(n)$ but at the number $s(n)$ of the quasi-positive and quasi-negative intervals of $f^{(n)}$. For a smooth (continuous) function g on $[0, 1]$ a connected component of the closure of $g^{-1}(0, \infty)$ [resp. $g^{-1}(-\infty, 0)$] is called a *quasi-positive* [resp. *quasi-negative*] interval. Such intervals are exactly maximal ones on which the primitive $\int g(x)dx$ of g is strictly monotone. Let us define $s(g) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ to be the number of all the quasi-positive and quasi-negative intervals of g . Then we put $s(n) = s(f^{(n)})$.

If we have $s(n) = \infty$ for some n , $s(k) = \infty$ for $k \geq n$ as follows. If $Z(n)$ has interior points for some n , so does $Z(k)$ for $k \geq n$. If for some n we have $z(n) = \infty$ and $\text{int } Z(n) = \emptyset$, the complement $[0, 1] \setminus Z(n)$ consists of infinitely many intervals and possibly of one half open interval. Each open interval contains an element in $Z(n+1)$.

Therefore, eliminating such cases, we can assume $z(n) < \infty$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently $s(n) < \infty$ ($\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$) holds as well. We want to prove $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s(n) = \infty$ under this assumption.

Let $x^{(n)}(l)$ ($l = 1, 2, \dots, s(n) - 1$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) denotes the bigger end point of the l -th of quasi-positive/negative intervals for $f^{(n)}$, namely

$[0, x^{(n)}(1)], [x^{(n)}(1), x^{(n)}(2)], \dots, [x^{(n)}(l-1), x^{(n)}(l)], \dots, [x^{(n)}(s(n)-1), 1]$ are the maximal intervals. Except for the final one, any quasi-positive [*resp.* quasi-negative] interval contains a maximal [*resp.* minimal] point in its interior. From this observation it is easy to see the following, among which 1) is a conclusion of Theorem 1, because it implies $z(n) \geq 1$ for some n and then we have $s(n+1) \geq 2$.

- Assertion 5**
- 1) $s(n) \geq 2$ for some n .
 - 2) $\{x^{(k)}(1)\}_k$ is strictly decreasing ($k = n, n+1, n+2, \dots$) for n in 1).
 - 3) Also for any m and $0 < l < s(m)$, the sequence $\{x^{(k)}(l)\}_k$ is strictly decreasing ($k = m, m+1, m+2, \dots$).
 - 4) $\{s(n)\}_n$ is weakly increasing, namely, $s(n) \leq s(n+1)$ for any n .

Now let us proceed by contradiction. We assume that $s(n)$ does not grow to ∞ , *i.e.*, for some N , $s(n) \equiv s(N) (= S)$ for any $n \geq N$. For fixed $l \in \{1, \dots, S\}$, the quasi-positivity/negativity of the l -th interval is independent of $n \geq N$. Under the assumption we also see the following.

- Assertion 6** For $n \geq N$,
- 1) $f^{(n)}$ is strictly monotone on the final interval $[x^{(n)}(S-1), 1]$.
 - 2) In particular $f^{(n)}(1) \neq 0$. More precisely, if the final interval is quasi-positive [*resp.* quasi-negative] we have $f^{(n)}(1) > 0$ [*resp.* $f^{(n)}(1) < 0$].
 - 3) The final intervals are increasing, namely, we have $x^{(N)}(S-1) > x^{(N+1)}(S-1) > \dots > x^{(n)}(S-1) > x^{(n+1)}(S-1) > \dots$.

By multiplying a non-zero constant to f , we assume that for any $n \geq N$ $f^{(n)}$ is weakly increasing on the final interval and that $f^{(N)}(1) = 1$.

Lemma 7 Under these assumptions, the following estimate holds.

$$f^{(N)}(x) \leq x^p \quad \text{on } [x^{(N)}(S-1), 1] \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This lemma apparently implies $f^{(N)}|_{[x^{(N)}(S-1), 1]} \equiv 0$ and contradicts to our assumption. This completes the proof of Theorem 2. \square

Proof of Lemma 7. We adjust the proof of Lemma 4 in order to apply to $f^{(N)}$. Put $a_n = x^{(n)}(S-1)$ to simplify the notation.

It is enough to show that for any $p \geq 0$, $f^{(N)}(x) \cdot x^{-p}$ is strictly increasing on $[a_N, 1]$ because $f^{(N)}(x) \cdot x^{-p}|_{x=1} = 1$. So it suffices to show $(f^{(N)}(x) \cdot x^{-p})' > 0$, namely, $xf^{(N+1)}(x) - pf^{(N)}(x) > 0$ on $(a_N, 1)$.

For this purpose we prove inductively for $k = p, p-1, p-2, \dots, 0$

$$(xf^{(N+1)}(x) - pf^{(N)}(x))^{(k)} > 0 \quad \text{on } (a_{N+k}, 1).$$

For $k = p$, on $(a_{N+p+1}, 1)$ and in particular on $(a_{N+p}, 1)$, we have clearly

$$(xf^{(N+1)}(x) - pf^{(N)}(x))^{(p)} = xf^{(N+p+1)}(x) > 0.$$

Then on each step, as $f^{(N+k+1)}(a_{N+k}) > 0$ and $f^{(N+k)}(a_{N+k}) = 0$,

$$\left(xf^{(N+1)}(x) - pf^{(N)}(x)\right)^{(k)} = xf^{(N+1+k)}(x) - (p-k)f^{(N+k)}(x)$$

is positive at $x = a_{N+k}$. Because the inductive hypothesis implies its derivative is positive on $(a_{N+k}, 1)$ (and even on $(a_{N+k+1}, 1)$), the induction is completed. \square

Problem 8 1) For some smooth functions on $[0, 1]$ which are flat at 0, $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} Z(n)$ seems to be dense in $[0, 1]$. However, we do not see which kind of further properties as flat functions are essential for this phenomena, because it discusses points away from 0. Verify this phenomena for certain f 's and explain the reason.

2) Does there exist a smooth function on $[0, 1]$ which is flat at 0 such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max Z(n) = 0$? Or how about flat at 0 such that the derived set of $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} Z(n)$ coincides with $\{0\}$? It seems plausible that such functions do not exist, while we do not know how to prove it.

References

- [GO] Bernard R. Gelbaum & John M. H. Olmsted; *Counterexamples in analysis*. Corrected reprint of the second (1965) edition. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2003.
- [N] Isaac Newton ; *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica* . (1687).

Hiroki KODAMA

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo,
3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 153-8914, Japan
and
Arithmer Inc.
 kodma@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Kazuo MASUDA

3-40-15 Wakamiya, Nakano-ku, Tokyo 165-0033, Japan
 math21@maple.ocn.ne.jp

Yoshihiko MITSUMATSU

Department of Mathematics, Chuo University
1-13-27 Kasuga Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 112-8551, Japan
 yoshi@math.chuo-u.ac.jp