

# DISJOINTLY STRICTLY SINGULAR INCLUSIONS BETWEEN VARIABLE LEBESGUE SPACES

FRANCISCO L. HERNÁNDEZ\*, CÉSAR RUIZ\* AND MAURO SANCHIZ\*\*

ABSTRACT. Disjointly strictly singular inclusions between variable Lebesgue spaces  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  on finite measure are characterized. Suitable criteria in terms of the (bounded or unbounded) exponents are given. It is proved the equivalence of  $L$ -weak compactness (also called almost compactness) and disjoint strict singularity for variable Lebesgue space inclusions. For infinite measure any inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^q(\mu)$  is not disjointly strictly singular. No restrictions on the exponent are imposed.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A linear operator  $T$  between two Banach spaces  $E$  and  $F$  is *strictly singular* (or Kato) if  $T$  fails to be an isomorphism on any infinite-dimensional (closed) subspace of  $E$ , i.e. given  $\epsilon > 0$  and an infinite dimensional subspace  $E_0$  of  $E$  there exists a unitary vector  $x \in E_0$  such that  $\|Tx\| \leq \epsilon$ . In the context of Banach lattices  $E$  a useful weaker notion is that an operator  $T$  from  $E$  to  $F$  is said to be *disjointly strictly singular* (DSS in short) if there is no disjoint sequence of non-null vectors  $(x_n)$  in  $E$  such that the restriction of  $T$  to the (closed) subspace  $[x_n]$  spanned by  $(x_n)$  is an isomorphism.

The study of strictly and disjointly strictly singular inclusions have been quite extensive for symmetric (or rearrangement invariant) function spaces. Recall that for symmetric function spaces  $E(\mu)$  on finite measures the left canonic inclusions of  $L^\infty(\mu)$  in  $E(\mu)$  is always strictly singular, while the right inclusion of  $E(\mu)$  in  $L^1(\mu)$  is disjointly strictly singular. And this inclusion  $E(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mu)$  is strictly singular if and only if the Orlicz space  $L_0^{\exp x^2}$  cannot be included in  $E(\mu)$ . When considering two symmetric function spaces with  $E(\mu) \hookrightarrow F(\mu)$  this inclusion  $i$  is strictly singular if and only if  $i$  is disjointly strictly singular and the norms of  $E(\mu)$  and  $F(\mu)$  are not equivalent on  $[r_n]_{E(\mu)}$  and  $[r_n]_{F(\mu)}$ , the subspaces spanned by the Rademacher functions  $(r_n)$  ([4, 12, 18]). This strengthens the interest in knowing characterizations of disjointly strictly singular inclusions for distinguished classes of function spaces (see [5, 15, 19] and references within).

One of the goals of this paper is to study the disjoint strict singularity of inclusion operators between variable Lebesgue spaces (or Nakano spaces)  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  for finite and infinite measures. These non-symmetric classical function spaces  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  have seen a strong renewed relevance in the last decades due to their applications (cf. [8, 7]).

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46E30, 47B60.

\* Partially supported by grant PID2019-107701G-I00.

\*\* Partially supported by grant PID2019-107701G-I00 and scholarship CT42/18-CT43/18.

In this context of variable spaces the inclusion behavior is more diverse than in the symmetric case. Compact and weakly compact inclusions have been considered in [17, 11, 9, 22]. The study of  $L$ -weak compactness of variable space inclusions is motivated by its applications to the compactness of associated Sobolev embeddings (see [9, 11]). Recall that an operator  $T$  between two Banach function lattices  $E$  and  $F$  on a measure space  $(\Omega, \mu)$  is said to be  $L$ -weakly compact (or *almost compact*) whenever  $T(B_E)$  is a equi-integrable subset in  $F$  for  $B_E$  denoting the unit ball of  $E$ , i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in B_E} \{ \|Tf \chi_{A_n}\|_F \} = 0,$$

for every sequence  $(A_n)$  of measurable sets in  $\Omega$  with  $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow 0$   $\mu$ -a.e.. In [9] (Thm. 3.4) Edmunds, Gogathisvili and Nekvinda have given the following  $L$ -weak compactness criterion for bounded exponents defined on bounded open subsets  $\Omega$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with Lebesgue measure  $|\cdot|$ : an inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\Omega)$  is  $L$ -weakly compact if and only if for every  $a > 1$ ,

$$\int_0^{|\Omega|} a \left( \frac{1}{p-q} \right)^*(x) dx < \infty,$$

where  $\left( \frac{1}{p-q} \right)^*(x)$  denotes the decreasing rearrangement of  $\left( \frac{1}{p-q} \right)(t)$ . Another  $L$ -weak compactness criterion in  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  (of De la Vallée-Pousin type) has been given in [22] (Prop. 3.3).

The study of disjointly strictly singular inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  was initiated in [13]. In the present paper we continue this research line obtaining now complete characterizations of disjointly strictly singular inclusions and  $L$ -weakly compact inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$ , giving suitable conditions on the exponents. It comes out the equivalence of these two concepts in this setting of variable Lebesgue space inclusions (a fact rather unexpected according with the Orlicz space behavior, see Section 2). The strict singularity of inclusions  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is also studied giving suitable criteria for it.

The paper is divided in 6 sections. Section 2 recall some definitions and basic results. Section 3 contains some useful preliminary results on  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  spaces and decreasing rearrangement functions. Thus Proposition 3.3 states, by an analysis of disjoint function sequences  $\left( \frac{\chi_{E_n}}{\mu(E_n)^{\frac{1}{p(t)}}} \right)$ , that if an inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is disjointly strictly singular, then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{\left( \frac{p-q}{p} \right)^*(x)} = 0.$$

In Section 4, disjointly strictly singular inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  for *finite* measures are studied, looking for suitable criteria on the exponents. First we do under the hypothesis of the exponent  $q(\cdot)$  be bounded (Theorem 4.1). After that we consider the general case, thus Theorem 4.8 claims the equivalence of the following statements for exponents  $q(\cdot) < p(\cdot)$   $\mu$ -a.e. on a finite measure space:

- (1) The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is  $L$ -weakly compact.
- (2) The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is disjointly strictly singular.
- (3)  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{\left( \frac{p-q}{p} \right)^*(x)} = 0$ .

$$(4) \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\left(\frac{p}{p-q}\right)^*(x)} dx < \infty \quad \text{for every } a > 1.$$

Thus the above  $L$ -weak compactness inclusion criteria for bounded exponents in [9] is extended to the general case. The useful limit condition (3) has not been considered earlier. In particular a new weak compactness criterion for inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mu)$  is given (Corollary 4.2). The strict singularity of inclusions  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is also studied obtaining the following criterion

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)^*(x)} = 0,$$

which is equivalent to  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{p^*(x)} dx < \infty$  for every  $a > 1$ . In other words, the exponent  $p(\cdot)$  must belong to the Orlicz space  $L_0^{exp x}(\mu)$  (Theorem 4.6). Several illustrative examples are included at the end of this section (Examples at 4.9).

In Section 5, the special exponent class of log-Holder continuous functions is considered, giving a simpler disjoint strict singularity criterion, namely

$$ess \inf(p(\cdot) - q(\cdot)) > 0.$$

Finally, Section 6 is devoted to the *infinite* measure case. Inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  for infinite measures forces that the exponents have a very close asymptotic behavior. This allows to find suitable subspaces generated by disjoint functions with equivalence of norms. Thus for infinite measures all the inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  are no disjointly strictly singular (Theorem 6.3).

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We recall here some basic definitions and fix the notation used in the following sections.

An operator  $T : E \rightarrow Y$  between a Banach lattice  $E$  and a Banach space  $F$  is *disjointly strictly singular* (DSS in short) if the restriction  $T|_{[f_n]}$  is not an isomorphism for any (closed) subspace  $[f_n]$  spanned by a normalized pairwise disjoint sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $E$ . This DSS notion is useful in comparing the lattice structure of Banach lattices and studying strictly singular operators between Banach lattices (cf. [20, 12]). Recall that an operator  $T$  between two Banach spaces  $E$  and  $F$  is *strictly singular* (or Kato) if there is no infinite-dimensional subspace  $E_1$  of  $E$  such that the restriction  $T|_{E_1}$  is an isomorphism. Obviously every strictly singular operator is DSS but the converse is not true. (f.i. the inclusions  $L^p[0, 1] \hookrightarrow L^q[0, 1]$ ,  $q < p < \infty$ ).

An operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  between a Banach function lattice  $E$  and a Banach space  $F$  is said to be  *$M$ -weakly compact* whenever  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T(f_n)\|_F = 0$ , where  $(f_n)$  is any norm bounded disjoint sequence in  $E$ . It is clear that every  $M$ -weakly compact operator is a DSS operator. An operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  between two Banach function lattices  $E$  and  $F$  on a measure space  $(\Omega, \mu)$  is  *$L$ -weakly compact (or almost compact or strict)* whenever  $T(B_E)$  is a equi-integrable subset in  $F$  for  $B_E$  the unit ball of  $E$  i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in B_E} \{ \|T(f)\chi_{A_n}\|_F \} = 0$$

for every sequence  $(A_n)$  of measurable sets in  $\Omega$  such that  $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow 0$   $\mu$ -a.e. (cf. [2, 6]).

Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be a measure space. Given an *exponent* function  $p(\cdot)$  on  $\Omega$  (i.e. a real measurable function  $p$  on  $\Omega$  with  $1 \leq p(t) < \infty$ ) the *variable Lebesgue space (or Nakano space)*  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is the space of all real measurable function classes  $f$  on  $\Omega$  such that the modular  $\rho_{p(\cdot)}(f/r) < \infty$  for some  $r > 0$ , where

$$\rho_{p(\cdot)}(f) = \int_{\Omega} |f(t)|^{p(t)} d\mu.$$

The associated Luxemburg norm is defined by

$$\|f\|_{p(\cdot)} = \inf\{r > 0 : \rho_{p(\cdot)}\left(\frac{f}{r}\right) \leq 1\}.$$

We denote  $p^- := \text{ess inf}\{p(t) : t \in \Omega\}$  and  $p^+ := \text{ess sup}\{p(t) : t \in \Omega\}$ . Equally,  $p_A^+$  and  $p_A^-$  denote the essential supremum and infimum of  $p(\cdot)$  over a measurable subset  $A$  of  $\Omega$ . When  $\Omega = \mathbb{N}$  with the counting measure and  $(p_n)$  is a real sequence with  $1 \leq p_n < \infty$ , we get the *Nakano sequence space*  $\ell_{(p_n)}$  i.e. the Banach space

$$\ell_{(p_n)} = \left\{ (x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} : \rho_{(p_n)}((x_n)) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{x_n}{r} \right|^{p_n} < \infty \text{ for some } r > 0 \right\}$$

equipped with the corresponding Luxemburg norm.

The *conjugate exponent* function  $p'(\cdot)$  of  $p(\cdot)$  is defined by the equation  $\frac{1}{p(t)} + \frac{1}{p'(t)} = 1$  almost everywhere  $t \in \Omega$ . When  $p^+ < \infty$ , the topological dual of the space  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is the variable Lebesgue space  $L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ . An space  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is separable if and only if the measure space  $(\Omega, \mu)$  is separable and  $p^+ < \infty$ . Moreover,  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is reflexive if and only if  $1 < p^- \leq p^+ < \infty$ .

Recall that the *associated space*  $(L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu))'$  is the space of all scalar measurable functions  $g$  on  $\Omega$  such that  $\int_{\Omega} fg d\mu < \infty$  for every  $f \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ . If  $1 < p(\cdot) < \infty$  a.e. then  $(L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu))' = L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mu)$  (cf. [7, 28]).

A sequence  $(f_n) \subset L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  verifies that  $\|f_n\|_{p(\cdot)} \rightarrow 0$  if and only if  $\rho_{p(\cdot)}(\lambda f_n) \rightarrow 0$  for every  $\lambda > 0$ . If  $p^+ < \infty$ , then  $\rho_{p(\cdot)}(f_n) \rightarrow 0$  if and only if  $\|f_n\|_{p(\cdot)} \rightarrow 0$ . Furthermore,  $\rho_{p(\cdot)}(f) \leq 1$  if and only if  $\|f\|_{p(\cdot)} \leq 1$ . Also, if  $\|f\|_{p(\cdot)} > 1$ , then  $1 \leq \|f\|_{p(\cdot)} \leq \rho_{p(\cdot)}(f)$  ([8] p.75, [7]). The *Hölder inequality* ([7] Thm 2.26, [8] Lemma 3.2.20) states that there exists a constant  $1 < K \leq 4$  such that for every two measurable functions  $f, g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} |f(t)g(t)| d\mu \leq K \|f\|_{p(\cdot)} \|g\|_{p'(\cdot)}.$$

A criterion for the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  to hold is the following:

**Proposition 2.1.** ([7] Thm 2.45, [8] Thm 3.3.1) *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless infinite measure space and exponents  $p(\cdot)$  and  $q(\cdot)$ . The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  holds if and only if  $q(\cdot) \leq p(\cdot)$   $\mu$ -a.e. and there exists  $\lambda > 1$  such that*

$$\int_{\Omega_d} \lambda^{-\left(\frac{pq}{p-q}\right)(t)} d\mu < \infty,$$

where  $\Omega_d = \{t \in \Omega : p(t) > q(t)\}$ .

Note that, in contrast with classical Lebesgue spaces  $L^p$ , inclusions between variable Lebesgue spaces on infinite measures  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  can hold. Also, for a finite measure space  $(\Omega, \mu)$ , the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  holds if and only if  $q(\cdot) \leq p(\cdot)$   $\mu$ -a.e..

If  $(f_n)$  is a disjoint sequence in  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  and  $(g_n)$  is another sequence such that  $\sum \|f_n - g_n\|_{p(\cdot)} < \infty$  then  $(f_n)$  and  $(g_n)$  are equivalent (unconditional) basic sequences, i.e.  $\sum_n x_n f_n \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  if and only if  $\sum_n x_n g_n \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** ([30]) *Let  $1 \leq p_n, q_n < \infty$ . Then  $\ell_{(p_n)} = \ell_{(q_n)}$  if and only if there exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \alpha \frac{p_n q_n}{|p_n - q_n|} < \infty$ .*

Recall that the *decreasing rearrangement* (cf. [6, 25, 27]) of a measurable function  $f$  is the real function  $f^*$  on  $[0, \mu(\Omega))$  defined by

$$f^*(x) := \inf\{s \in [0, \mu(\Omega)] : \mu_f(s) \leq x\},$$

where  $\mu_f$  is the distribution function of  $f$ ,  $\mu_f(s) := \mu(\{t \in \Omega : |f(t)| > s\})$ . For a measurable  $f \geq 0$  on  $\Omega$ , the functions  $f$  and  $f^*$  are equi-distributed and

$$\int_\Omega f(t) d\mu = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} f^*(x) dx.$$

A Banach function lattice is said to be *rearrangement invariant* if every two equi-distributed functions have the same norm. Orlicz spaces (cf. [24, 29]) are examples of rearrangement invariant spaces while variable Lebesgue spaces are not. If  $\varphi$  is a non-decreasing unbounded positive convex function on  $[0, \infty)$  with  $\varphi(0) = 0$ , the *Orlicz space*  $L^\varphi(\mu)$  consists of all measurable functions classes  $f$  on  $(\Omega, \mu)$  such that for some  $r > 0$

$$\int_\Omega \varphi(r|f|) d\mu < \infty.$$

In the class of Orlicz spaces there are examples of inclusions  $L^\varphi(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^\psi(\mu)$  for a finite measure which are DSS but not  $L$ -weakly compact. Let us recall the DSS criterion and the  $L$ -weak compactness criterion for inclusions between Orlicz spaces:

**Proposition 2.3.** ([20] Prop. 3.2). *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and  $\psi \leq \varphi$  Orlicz functions with the  $\Delta_2$ -condition. An inclusion  $L^\varphi(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^\psi(\mu)$  is DSS if and only if for every natural  $n$  and any constant  $A > 0$  there exist  $1 \leq x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n$  and  $c_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  such that for  $t \geq 1$*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \psi(tx_i) \leq A \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \varphi(tx_i)$$

**Proposition 2.4.** ([24], [5] p.1369) *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and Orlicz functions  $\psi \leq \varphi$ . An inclusion  $L^\varphi(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^\psi(\mu)$  is  $L$ -weakly compact if and only if*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi^{-1}(t)}{\psi^{-1}(t)} = 0.$$

In particular this condition implies that  $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(s)}{\varphi(s)} = 0$ . Indeed, given  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  there exists  $s_0 > 0$  such that  $\varphi^{-1}(s) \leq \epsilon \psi^{-1}(s)$  for  $s > s_0$ . So, for  $s = \psi(t) > s_0$ , we have  $\varphi^{-1}(\psi(t)) \leq \epsilon \psi^{-1}(\psi(t)) = \epsilon t$ , hence  $\psi(t) \leq \varphi(\epsilon t) \leq \epsilon \varphi(t)$  for  $t > \varphi^{-1}(s_0)$ .

Consider now the Orlicz function  $\psi$  defined in ([21] Thm. A) which verifies the inclusion  $L^p[0, 1] \hookrightarrow L^\psi[0, 1]$ , for a fixed  $p > 1$ . Using the above criterion, it is proved that the inclusion  $L^p[0, 1] \hookrightarrow L^\psi[0, 1]$  is DSS and that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(t)}{t^p} \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(2^n)}{2^{np}} > 0$$

(see [21] p.184). So we deduce, by above  $L$ -weak compactness criterion, that the inclusion  $L^p[0, 1] \hookrightarrow L^\psi[0, 1]$  is not  $L$ -weakly compact.

In the setting of variable Lebesgue spaces  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ , a  $L$ -weakly compact inclusion criterion has been given by Edmunds, Gogathisvili and Nekvinda in ([9] Thm 3.4):

**Proposition 2.5.** ([9]) *Let a bounded open subset  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and bounded exponents  $q(\cdot) \leq p(\cdot) \leq p^+ < \infty$ . The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\Omega)$  is  $L$ -weakly compact if and only if for every  $a > 1$*

$$\int_0^{|\Omega|} a^{\left(\frac{1}{p-q}\right)^*(x)} dx < \infty.$$

Other  $L$ -weak compactness inclusion characterization of  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  (De la Vallée-Poussin type) is given in [22] (Prop. 3.3), [31].

### 3. PREVIOUS RESULTS

We will study inclusion operators between variable Lebesgue spaces on a finite measure space  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$ , looking for suitable DSS characterizations in terms of the exponents. In this section we collect some preliminary results. We will assume  $q(\cdot) \leq p(\cdot)$   $\mu$ -a.e. with  $\mu\{t \in \Omega : q(t) = p(t)\} = 0$  (otherwise the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  would be trivially non-DSS). No restrictions on the exponents will be assumed.

Let  $r : \Omega \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  be an *exponent* and consider the function  $a^{r(\cdot)}$  on  $\Omega$  for some  $a > 1$ . It holds that  $(a^{r(\cdot)})^*(x) = a^{r^*(x)}$  for all  $x > 0$  (cf. [9] Lemma 2.10), hence

$$\int_{\Omega} a^{r(t)} d\mu = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} (a^{r(\cdot)})^*(x) dx = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{r^*(x)} dx.$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and  $r(\cdot)$  be an exponent. If there exists  $a > 1$  such that  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{r^*(x)} dx = \infty$ , then there exist  $\beta > 0$  and a disjoint measurable sequence  $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  such that, for every natural  $n$ ,*

$$\|\chi_{E_n}\|_{r(\cdot)} \geq \beta.$$

*Proof.* Let  $0 < \beta < 1$  with  $1/\beta > a$ . Since the rearrangement  $r^*(\cdot)$  is decreasing and  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{r^*(x)} dx = \infty$ , there exists a positive sequence  $(t_n)$ , with  $t_n \searrow 0$  and  $t_1 = \mu(\Omega)$ , such that

$$\int_{t_{n+1}}^{t_n} a^{r^*(x)} dx > 1.$$

Now, for each  $t_n > 0$  we can find a measurable set  $F_n \subset \Omega$  with  $\mu(F_n) = t_n$  such that

$$\int_{F_n} a^{r(t)} d\mu = \int_0^{t_n} (a^{r(\cdot)})^*(x) dx = \int_0^{t_n} a^{r^*(x)} dx.$$

Moreover, the sets  $(F_n)$  can be defined so that  $F_{n+1} \subset F_n$  since  $t_{n+1} < t_n$  (cf. [6] Lemma 2.2.5).

Consider now the disjoint measurable sequence  $(E_n)$  where  $E_n := F_n \setminus F_{n+1}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\chi_{E_n}}{\beta}\right)^{r(t)} d\mu &\geq \int_{E_n} (a\chi_{E_n})^{r(t)} d\mu = \int_{F_n} (a\chi_{F_n})^{r(t)} d\mu - \int_{F_{n+1}} (a\chi_{F_{n+1}})^{r(t)} d\mu \\ &= \int_0^{t_n} a^{r^*(x)} dx - \int_0^{t_{n+1}} a^{r^*(x)} dx = \int_{t_{n+1}}^{t_n} a^{r^*(x)} dx > 1 \end{aligned}$$

for every natural  $n$ . Hence,  $\|\chi_{E_n}\|_{r(\cdot)} \geq \beta$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and an exponent  $r(\cdot)$ . Then every sequence  $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  in  $\Omega$  with  $\chi_{E_n} \rightarrow 0$   $\mu$ -a.e. satisfies  $\|\chi_{E_n}\|_{r(\cdot)} \rightarrow 0$  if and only if for every  $a > 1$ ,*

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{r^*(x)} dx < \infty.$$

*Proof.* The direct implication is above Lemma 3.1. Let us show the converse. Assume there exist a measurable sequence  $(E_n)$  with  $\chi_{E_n} \rightarrow 0$   $\mu$ -a.e. (thus  $\mu(E_n) \rightarrow 0$ ) and  $0 < \delta < 1$  such that  $\|\chi_{E_n}\|_{r(\cdot)} \geq \delta$  for every  $n$ . Taking  $0 < \beta < \delta$ , it follows from the norm definition that

$$1 < \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\chi_{E_n}}{\beta}\right)^{r(t)} d\mu.$$

Now, by the hypotheses,

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\chi_{\Omega}}{\beta}\right)^{r(t)} d\mu = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} \left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right)^{r^*(x)} dx < \infty$$

and, as  $\frac{\chi_{E_n}}{\beta} \rightarrow 0$   $\mu$ -a.e., we conclude using the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\chi_{E_n}}{\beta}\right)^{r(t)} d\mu \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \mapsto \infty$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

The above equivalence, for bounded exponents, was crucial for proving Theorem 3.4 in [9] (see also [10]).

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and exponents  $q(\cdot) \leq p(\cdot)$ . If the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is DSS, then*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(x)} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Since the inclusion is DSS we have  $\mu(\{t : p(t) = q(t)\}) = 0$ . First note that if  $\text{ess inf}(\frac{p-q}{pq})^* > 0$ , then  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{(\frac{p-q}{pq})^*(x)} = 0$ . Hence (since the rearrangement is decreasing), we can suppose

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} \left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(x) = 0.$$

Let us assume that  $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{(\frac{p-q}{pq})^*(x)} > 0$ . Then there exist  $r > 0$  and a scalar sequence  $(x_n) \nearrow \mu(\Omega)$  such that

$$(\diamond) \quad (\mu(\Omega) - x_n)^{(\frac{p-q}{pq})^*(x_n)} \geq r$$

for every natural  $n$ . Furthermore it can be assumed w.l.o.g. that  $\frac{x_n + \mu(\Omega)}{2} < x_{n+1}$  and

$$\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*\left(\frac{x_n + \mu(\Omega)}{2}\right) > \left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(x_{n+1})$$

for every natural  $n$ . Consider the sets

$$A_n = \left(\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*\right)^{-1} \left( \left[ \left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*\left(\frac{x_n + \mu(\Omega)}{2}\right), \left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(x_n) \right] \right) \cong \left[ x_n, \frac{x_n + \mu(\Omega)}{2} \right].$$

Thus  $(A_n)$  is a disjoint measurable sequence with Lebesgue measure

$$(\diamond\diamond) \quad |A_n| \geq \frac{\mu(\Omega) - x_n}{2}.$$

Let us define the sets

$$B_n = \{t \in \Omega : \left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*\left(\frac{x_n + \mu(\Omega)}{2}\right) \leq \frac{p-q}{pq}(t) \leq \left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(x_n)\}.$$

Since the functions  $\frac{p-q}{pq}$  and  $(\frac{p-q}{pq})^*$  are equi-distributed we have  $\mu(B_n) = |A_n|$ . The sets  $(B_n)$  are disjoint and it can be assumed  $0 < \mu(B_n) < 1$  for every  $n$ . Consider the disjoint normalized sequence  $(s_n)$  in  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$

$$s_n(t) := \frac{\chi_{B_n}}{\mu(B_n)^{\frac{1}{p(t)}}}$$

and the (closed) subspace  $[s_n]_{p(\cdot)}$ . Note that  $\sum_n a_n s_n \in [s_n]_{p(\cdot)}$  if and only if

$$\rho_{p(\cdot)}(\lambda \sum_{n>N} a_n s_n) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{for every } \lambda > 0.$$

Let us prove that  $i|_{[s_n]_{p(\cdot)}}$  is an isomorphism showing that  $(s_n)$  and  $(is_n)$  are equivalent basic sequences. Since  $i$  is continuous, we only need to show that  $\sum y_n s_n \in [s_n]_{q(\cdot)}$  implies  $\sum y_n s_n \in [s_n]_{p(\cdot)}$ . First notice that

$$\rho_{p(\cdot)}\left(\sum \lambda y_n s_n\right) = \sum \int_{B_n} |\lambda y_n|^{p(t)} \frac{\chi_{B_n}}{\mu(B_n)} d\mu = \sum \int_{B_n} |\lambda y_n|^{q(t)} |\lambda y_n|^{p-q(t)} \frac{\chi_{B_n}}{|A_n|^{\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}} |A_n|^{1-\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}}} d\mu.$$

Also,  $|\lambda y_n| < 1$  up to a finite amount of terms for every  $\lambda > 0$ . Otherwise, since for large enough  $N$  we have  $\rho_{q(\cdot)}(\lambda \sum_{n>N} y_n s_n) < \infty$ , taking  $\lambda_0 > \frac{2}{r}$  we get



$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{q(\cdot)}\left(\sum_{n>N} \lambda_0 \lambda y_n s_n\right) &\geq \sum_{n>N} \int_{B_n} \lambda_0^{q(t)} \frac{1}{|A_n|^{\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}}} d\mu = \sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \int_{B_n} \lambda_0^{q(t)} |A_n|^{1-\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}} d\mu \\
&= \sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \int_{B_n} \left[ \lambda_0 |A_n|^{\frac{p(t)-q(t)}{q(t)p(t)}} \right]^{q(t)} d\mu
\end{aligned}$$

and using  $(\diamond\diamond)$  and  $(\diamond)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \int_{B_n} \left[ \lambda_0 \left( \frac{\mu(\Omega) - x_n}{2} \right)^{\frac{p(t)-q(t)}{q(t)p(t)}} \right]^{q(t)} d\mu \\
&\geq \sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \int_{B_n} \left[ \lambda_0 \left( \frac{\mu(\Omega) - x_n}{2} \right)^{\frac{p(t)-q(t)}{q(t)p(t)}+} \right]^{q(t)} d\mu \\
&\geq \sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \int_{B_n} \left[ \lambda_0 \left( \frac{\mu(\Omega) - x_n}{2} \right)^{\frac{p-q}{pq}*(x_n)} \right]^{q(t)} d\mu \\
&\geq \sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \int_{B_n} [\lambda_0 r \frac{1}{2}]^{q(t)} d\mu = \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Now, using this fact and writing  $\lambda = \frac{\lambda'}{\lambda_0}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{p(\cdot)}\left(\sum_{n>N} \lambda y_n s_n\right) &= \sum_{n>N} \int_{B_n} \left| \frac{\lambda'}{\lambda_0} y_n \right|^{q(t)} \frac{\lambda'}{\lambda_0} y_n |^{p-q(t)} \frac{\chi_{B_n}}{|A_n|^{\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}} |A_n|^{1-\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}}} d\mu \\
&\leq \sum_{n>N} \int_{B_n} |\lambda' y_n|^{q(t)} \frac{\chi_{B_n}}{|A_n|^{\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}}} \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda_0 (|A_n|)^{\frac{p(t)-q(t)}{p(t)q(t)}}} \right]^{q(t)} d\mu \\
&\leq \sum_{n>N} \int_{B_n} |\lambda' y_n|^{q(t)} \frac{\chi_{B_n}}{|A_n|^{\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}}} \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda_0 (|A_n|)^{\frac{p(t)-q(t)}{p(t)q(t)}+}} \right]^{q(t)} d\mu \\
&\leq \sum_{n>N} \int_{B_n} |\lambda' y_n|^{q(t)} \frac{\chi_{B_n}}{|A_n|^{\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}}} \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda_0 \left( \frac{\mu(\Omega) - x_n}{2} \right)^{\frac{p-q}{pq}*(x_n)}} \right]^{q(t)} d\mu \\
&\leq \sum_{n>N} \int_{B_n} |\lambda' y_n|^{q(t)} \frac{\chi_{B_n}}{|A_n|^{\frac{q(t)}{p(t)}}} \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda_0 r \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{p-q}{pq}*(x_n)}} \right]^{q(t)} d\mu \\
&\leq \rho_{q(\cdot)}\left(\sum_{n>N} \lambda' y_n s_n\right) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and exponents  $q(\cdot) < p(\cdot)$   $\mu$ -a.e. If the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is DSS, then*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{\frac{p-q}{p}*(x)} = 0.$$

Moreover, if  $p^+ < \infty$ , then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{(p-q)^*(x)} = 0.$$

*Proof.* It follows from above proposition and when  $p^+ < \infty$  using that  $(\frac{p-q}{p^+})(\cdot) \leq (\frac{p-q}{p})(\cdot) \leq (\frac{p-q}{p^-})(\cdot)$ .  $\square$

The converse of the above proposition will be proved later. We will need some basic Lemmas:

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be a finite measure space and  $f : \Omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  be a measurable function. Then the functions  $1/f$  and  $1/f^*$  are equi-distributed. Hence  $(1/f)^* = (1/f^*)^*$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda > 0$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{1/f}(\lambda) &= \mu(\{t \in \Omega : 1/f(t) > \lambda\}) = \mu(\{t \in \Omega : 1/\lambda > f(t)\}) \\ &= \mu(\Omega) - \mu(\{t \in \Omega : f(t) \geq 1/\lambda\}) = \mu(\Omega) - |\{t \in [0, \mu(\Omega)] : f^*(t) \geq 1/\lambda\}| \\ &= |\{t \in [0, \mu(\Omega)] : f^*(t) < 1/\lambda\}| = |\{t \in [0, \mu(\Omega)] : 1/f^*(t) > \lambda\}| = |\mu_{1/f^*}(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

the functions  $1/f$  and  $1/f^*$  are equi-distributed.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** *If  $f : [0, \mu(\Omega)] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  is an increasing measurable function then  $f^*(t) = f(\mu(\Omega) - t)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda > 0$  and consider  $s_\lambda := \inf\{t \in [0, \mu(\Omega)] : f(t) > \lambda\}$ . Since  $f$  is increasing we have  $\mu_f(\lambda) = \mu(\Omega) - s_\lambda$ . On the other hand, the function  $h(t) := f(\mu(\Omega) - t)$  is decreasing and

$$\{t \in [0, \mu(\Omega)] : h(t) > \lambda\} = (0, \mu(\Omega) - s_\lambda).$$

$\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $f : [0, b) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  be a decreasing measurable function with  $f(0) > 0$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow b^-} f(x) = 0$ . If  $\lim_{x \rightarrow b^-} (b-x)^{f(x)} = 0$ , then, for every  $a > 1$ ,*

$$\int_0^b a^{\frac{1}{f(x)}} dx < \infty.$$

*Proof.* Given  $a > 1$ , consider a natural  $N$  such that  $a < e^N$ . Let us see  $\int_0^b e^{N/f(x)} dx < \infty$ .

From the hypothesis it follows that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow b^-} -f(x) \ln(b-x) = \infty$ . Hence there exists  $0 < \delta_N < 1$  such that  $-f(x) \ln(b-x) \geq 2N$  for every  $x \in (b - \delta_N, b)$ , i.e.  $\frac{1}{2N} \geq \frac{1}{-f(x) \ln(b-x)}$ .

Thus

$$\int_0^b a^{1/f(x)} dx \leq \int_0^{b-\delta_N} a^{1/f(x)} dx + \int_{b-\delta_N}^b (e^N)^{1/f(x)} dx < \infty,$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{b-\delta_N}^b (e^N)^{1/f(x)} dx &= \int_{b-\delta_N}^b (e^N)^{\frac{-\ln(b-x)}{-f(x) \ln(b-x)}} dx \leq \int_{b-\delta_N}^b (e)^{-\ln(b-x)N(\frac{1}{2N})} dx \\ &= \int_{b-\delta_N}^b \left( \frac{1}{(b-x)^N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2N}} dx = \int_{b-\delta_N}^b \frac{1}{\sqrt{b-x}} dx < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

## 4. THE FINITE MEASURE CASE

In this section we give suitable criteria in terms of the exponents for the inclusions between variable exponent Lebesgue spaces over finite measure spaces be DSS. First we consider the case of inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  when  $q(\cdot)$  is a bounded exponent. After that, we will do the general case.

In particular we get the equivalence of the  $L$ -weak compactness and the DSS property for inclusions between variable Lebesgue spaces (recall that this equivalence does not happen in Orlicz spaces, see Section 2).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and exponents  $q(\cdot) < p(\cdot)$   $\mu$ -a.e. with  $q^+ < \infty$ . Denote  $i$  the inclusion  $i : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$ . TFAE:*

- (1)  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{(\frac{p}{p-q})^*(x)} dx < \infty$  for every  $a > 1$ .
- (2)  $i$  is  $L$ -weakly compact.
- (3)  $i$  is  $M$ -weakly compact.
- (4)  $i$  is DSS.
- (5) The restriction of the inclusion  $i$  on any subspace spanned by a disjoint sequence  $(\frac{\chi_{E_n}}{\mu(E_n)^{\frac{1}{p(t)}}})$  is not an isomorphism.
- (6)  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{(\frac{p-q}{p})^*(x)} = 0$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) It is similar to Lemma 3.3 in [9]. Suppose that (1) is true and (2) is not. Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in B_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)}} \{ \|f \chi_{A_n}\|_{q(\cdot)} \} \neq 0$$

for certain sequence  $(A_n)$  in  $\Omega$  such that  $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow 0$   $\mu$ -a.e.. Then there exist  $0 < \delta < 1$ , a sequence  $(f_k)_k \subset B_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)}$  and a subsequence  $(A_{n_k})_k$  such that

$$\|f_k \chi_{A_{n_k}}\|_{q(\cdot)} > \delta$$

for every natural  $k$ . This implies

$$1 < \left\| \frac{f_k \chi_{A_{n_k}}}{\delta} \right\|_{q(\cdot)} \leq \rho_{q(\cdot)} \left( \frac{f_k \chi_{A_{n_k}}}{\delta} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\delta^{q^+}} \rho_{q(\cdot)}(f_k \chi_{A_{n_k}}).$$

Hence,

$$\delta^{q^+} < \rho_{q(\cdot)}(f_k \chi_{A_{n_k}}) = \int_{\Omega} |f_k \chi_{A_{n_k}}(t)|^{q(t)} d\mu$$

for every  $k$ . Now considering the exponent  $r(t) := \frac{p(t)}{q(t)} > 1$   $\mu$ -a.e. and its conjugate  $r'(t) = \frac{p(t)}{p(t)-q(t)}$  we have, by Hölder inequality, that

$$\rho_{q(\cdot)}(f_k \chi_{A_{n_k}}) \leq K \| \chi_{A_{n_k}} \|_{r'(\cdot)} \| f_k^{q(\cdot)} \|_{r(\cdot)}.$$

And, since  $\|f_k\|_{p(\cdot)} \leq 1$ , we have  $\|f_k^{q(\cdot)}\|_{r(\cdot)} \leq 1$ . Indeed, if  $\rho_{p(\cdot)}(\frac{f}{\lambda}) \leq 1$  for every  $\lambda > 1$ , then

$$\rho_{r(\cdot)} \left( \frac{f^q}{\lambda} \right) \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(t)|^{p(t)}}{(\lambda^{1/q^+})^{p(t)}} d\mu \leq 1.$$

Thus,

$$\delta^{q^+} \leq K \|\chi_{A_n k}\|_{r'(\cdot)}.$$

But by hypotheses (1) and Proposition 3.2 we get  $\|\chi_{A_n k}\|_{r'(\cdot)} \rightarrow 0$ , which is a contradiction.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) Let  $(f_n)$  be a pairwise disjoint normalized sequence in  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ . As  $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$  we have  $\mu(\text{supp}(f_n)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{q(\cdot)} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_k \|f_k \chi_{\text{supp}(f_n)}\|_{q(\cdot)} \leq \lim_{\mu(A) \rightarrow 0} \sup_k \|f_k \chi_A\|_{q(\cdot)} = 0.$$

It is clear that (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (5).

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6) It is the proof of Proposition 3.3 (and Corollary 3.4)

(6)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Consider the function  $f(t) = \left(\frac{p-q}{p}\right)(t)$ . From Lemma 3.5, we have that the functions  $\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{p}\right)^*(x)}$  and  $\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{p}\right)(t)} = \left(\frac{p}{p-q}\right)(t)$  are equi-distributed. Thus  $\left(\frac{p}{p-q}\right)^* = (1/f^*)^*$  and

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\left(\frac{p}{p-q}\right)^*(x)} dx = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\left(\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{p}\right)^*}\right)^*(x)} dx,$$

Now, as  $1/f^*$  is an increasing function, it follows by Lemma 3.6 that  $(1/f)^*(x) = (1/f^*)^*(x) = (1/f^*)(\mu(\Omega) - x)$  so we have

$$= \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{p}\right)^*(\mu(\Omega)-x)}} dx = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{p}\right)^*(y)}} dy.$$

Finally the boundedness of this integral follows from Lemma 3.7 for  $\mu(\Omega) = b$ , since  $\left(\frac{p-q}{p}\right)^*(\cdot)$  is decreasing and the hypothesis.  $\square$

It is clear that under the hypotheses of  $\text{ess inf}(p-q) > 0$  and  $p^+ < \infty$  we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{\left(\frac{p-q}{p}\right)^*(x)} = 0,$$

so the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is DSS (theses hypotheses are not necessary conditions, see Example 4.9).

For variable Lebesgue spaces on finite measures  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  we have the canonical extreme inclusions  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mu)$  (cf. [8, 7]).

It follows from the above a DSS criterion for the right extreme case of  $L^1(\mu) \equiv L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  (recall that weakly compact subsets in  $L^1(\mu)$  are the same as equi-integrable sets by Dunford-Pettis Theorem, cf. [1]):

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and an exponent  $p(\cdot)$ . TFAE:*

- (1)  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^*(x)} dx < \infty$  for every  $a > 1$ .
- (2) The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mu)$  is weakly compact.
- (3) The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mu)$  is DSS.
- (4)  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{\left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^*(x)} = 0$ .

*Remark 4.3.* Notice that the above inclusions  $i : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mu)$ , are not strictly singular.

Indeed, in the constant exponent case  $p_- = p_+$  it is well-known (Khinchine inequality, cf. [26] p.66). Assume now  $p_- \leq r < p_+ \leq \infty$  and consider the set  $\Omega_r = \{t \in \Omega : p(t) < r\}$ , which have  $\mu(\Omega_r) > 0$ . The restricted variable Lebesgue space  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega_r)$  can be canonically identified with a closed band-subspace of  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ . Now as  $p|_{\Omega_r}^+ \leq r < \infty$  it follows easily from Khinchine inequalities in  $L^p$ -spaces (cf. [3, 26]) that the Rademacher function system  $(r_n)$  in  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega_r)$  and in  $L^1(\mu)$  are equivalent to the canonical basis of  $\ell_2$ . Hence the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mu)$  is not strictly singular.

A similar argument shows also that all the inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  (for  $q(\cdot) \leq p(\cdot)$ ) are not strictly singular.

We consider now the left extreme inclusions  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ . In this case the DSS property is equivalent to the strict singularity:

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and an exponent  $p(\cdot)$ . Denote  $i$  the inclusion  $i : L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ . TFAE:*

- (1)  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{p^*(x)} dx < \infty$  for every  $a > 1$ .
- (2) Every measurable set sequence  $(E_n)_n$  with  $\chi_{E_n} \rightarrow 0$  a.e. satisfies  $\|\chi_{E_n}\|_{p(\cdot)} \rightarrow 0$ .
- (3)  $i$  is  $L$ -weakly compact.
- (4)  $i$  is  $M$ -weakly compact.
- (5)  $i$  is weakly compact.
- (6)  $i$  is strictly singular.
- (7)  $i$  is DSS.

*Proof.* (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2). It is Proposition 3.2.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3). If  $f \in L^\infty(\mu)$ , as  $\|f\|_{p(\cdot)} \leq \|(\|f\|_\infty)\chi_\Omega\|_{p(\cdot)} = \|f\|_\infty \|\chi_\Omega\|_{p(\cdot)}$ , we have

$$\lim_{\mu(A) \rightarrow 0} \sup\{\|f\chi_A\|_{p(\cdot)} : \|f\|_\infty \leq 1\} \leq \lim_{\mu(A) \rightarrow 0} \|\chi_A\|_{p(\cdot)} = 0.$$

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4). It is clear.

(4)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (5). Since  $L^\infty(\mu)$  is an  $AM$ -space (cf. [2] Thm. 18.11),

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6). Since  $L^\infty(\mu)$  has the Dunford-Pettis property and the inclusion  $i$  is weakly compact (cf. [16] Thm. 3.3.5).

(6)  $\Rightarrow$  (7). It is obvious.

(7)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Assume that there exists  $a > 1$  such that  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{p^*(x)} dx = \infty$ . Then, by Lemma 3.1, there exists  $\beta > 0$  and a sequence of disjoint measurable sets  $(E_n)_n$  verifying  $\|\chi_{E_n}\|_{p(\cdot)} \geq \beta$  for every  $n$ . Now the basic sequence  $(\chi_{E_n})_n$  in  $L^\infty(\mu)$  and in  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  are equivalent. Indeed, since the inclusion  $i : L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is continuous, we have  $\|\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n \chi_{E_n}\|_{p(\cdot)} \leq C \|\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n \chi_{E_n}\|_\infty$  for some  $C > 0$ . And for every natural  $k$  we have

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^k a_n \chi_{E_n} \right\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq n \leq k} |a_n| \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^k a_n \chi_{E_n} \right\|_{p(\cdot)}.$$

This contradicts the DSS property. □

A direct consequence, by factorization, is the following:

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and exponents  $q(t) \leq p(t)$   $\mu$ -a.e.. If*

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{q^*(x)} dx = \infty \quad \text{for some } a > 1,$$

*then the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is not DSS.*

Let us give another strictly singular criteria for inclusions  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ . Recall that the exponential Orlicz space  $L_0^{exp}(\mu)$  defined by the function  $\varphi(x) = e^x - 1$  and a finite measure is the space of all measurable functions  $f$  such that

$$\int_\Omega e^{|rf(t)|} d\mu < \infty \quad \text{for every } r > 0.$$

Then, we have:

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and an exponent  $p(t)$ . TFAE:*

- (1) *The inclusion  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is strictly singular.*
- (2)  *$p(\cdot) \in L_0^{exp}(\mu)$ .*
- (3)  *$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_0^x p^*(s) ds}{x \ln(\frac{e}{x})} = 0$ .*
- (4)  *$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{(\frac{1}{p})^*(x)} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2). Assume that the inclusion  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is strictly singular. Then, by the above characterization,

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{p^*(x)} dx = \int_\Omega a^{p(t)} d\mu = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} (a^{p(\cdot)})^*(x) dx < \infty$$

for every  $a > 1$ . Since  $1 < a = e^{\frac{1}{s}}$  for some  $0 < s < \infty$ , we have

$$\int_\Omega a^{p(t)} d\mu = \int_\Omega e^{\frac{p(t)}{s}} d\mu < \infty$$

for every  $s > 0$ . Therefore  $p(\cdot) \in L_0^{exp}(\mu)$ . The converse is equal.

The equivalence (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) follows from the following known fact: the order continuous exponential Orlicz space  $L_0^{exp}(\Omega)$  coincides with the order-continuous Marcinkiewicz space  $M_0(\varphi)$  defined by the function  $\varphi(x) = x \ln(\frac{e}{x})$  (cf. [25] p.116). Hence the exponent  $p(\cdot) \in L_0^{exp}(\Omega)$  satisfies the condition

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_0^x p^*(s) ds}{x \ln(\frac{e}{x})} = 0.$$

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4). First assume  $1 < p(t)$   $\mu$ -a.e.. Then, since  $1 < p'(t) = \frac{p(t)}{p(t)-1} < \infty$ , (1) says that  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{(\frac{p'}{p'-1})^*(x)} dx < \infty$  for every  $a > 1$ . And Corollary 4.2 allows to get

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{(\frac{p'-1}{p'})^*(x)} = 0.$$

Assume now that  $\Omega_1 = \{t \in \Omega : p(t) = 1\}$  has positive measure, take then the exponent  $r(t) = 2\chi_{\Omega_1} + p(t)\chi_{\Omega_1^c}$ . Thus

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{r^*(x)} dx = \int_{\Omega} a^{r(t)} d\mu \leq \int_{\Omega_1} a^2 d\mu + \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_1} a^{p(t)} d\mu < \infty.$$

Now, since  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{(\frac{1}{r})^*(x)} = 0$  and  $(\frac{1}{r})^*(\cdot) \leq (\frac{1}{p})^*(\cdot)$ , we conclude that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{(\frac{1}{p})^*(x)} = 0.$$

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) The case  $p^+ < \infty$  is trivial. Assume now that  $p^+ = \infty$ . Since  $(\frac{1}{p})^*$  is decreasing and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)} (\frac{1}{p})^*(x) = 0$ , it follows from Lemma 3.7 that

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{(\frac{1}{p})^*(x)} dx < \infty \quad \text{for every } a > 1.$$

Now, using Lemma 3.5, the functions  $p = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{p}}$  and  $\frac{1}{(\frac{1}{p})^*}$  are equi-distributed, thus

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{p^*(x)} dx = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{(\frac{1}{(\frac{1}{p})^*})^*(x)} dx = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{(\frac{1}{p})^*(x)} dx < \infty.$$

□

We pass now to study the general case of DSS inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  for unbounded exponents. First notice that now the condition (6) in above Theorem 4.1 is no enough for getting disjoint strict singularity, as the following example shows:

**Example 4.7.** Let  $q(x) = \frac{1}{x}$  with  $x \in (0, 1)$  and  $p(x) = (1 + \epsilon)q(x)$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $\int_0^1 a^{\frac{1}{x}} dx = \infty$  for every  $a > 1$ , we have by Corollary 4.4 that the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)} \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}$  is not DSS, in spite of

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - x)^{(p-q/p)^*(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - x)^{\epsilon/1+\epsilon} = 0.$$

We wonder now what happens with the inclusions  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  whether  $q^+ = \infty$  and  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{q^*(x)} dx < \infty$  for every  $a > 1$ . Notice that, if for  $a > 1$

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{(\frac{pq}{p-q})^*(x)} dx < \infty,$$

then also  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{q^*(x)} dx < \infty$ . Indeed, for  $1 < f(t) = \frac{p}{q}(t)$  we have

$$\frac{pq}{p-q}(t) = \frac{f(t)}{f(t) - 1} q(t) > q(t),$$

so  $(\frac{pq}{p-q})^*(x) \geq q^*(x)$ . This leads to the following:

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless finite measure space and exponents  $q(\cdot) < p(\cdot)$   $\mu$ -a.e.. TFAE:*

- (1)  $\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{(\frac{pq}{p-q})^*(x)} dx < \infty$  for every  $a > 1$ .
- (2) The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is  $L$ -weakly compact.
- (3) The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is  $M$ -weakly compact.

- (4) The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is DSS.
- (5) The restriction of the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  on any subspace spanned by a disjoint sequence  $\left(\frac{\chi_{E_n}}{\mu(E_n)^{\frac{1}{p(t)}}}\right)$  is not an isomorphism.
- (6)  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \mu(\Omega)^-} (\mu(\Omega) - x)^{\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(x)} = 0$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Let us define the exponent  $s(t) := \frac{p(t)q(t)}{p(t)-q(t)}$ . Then  $1/q(t) = 1/p(t) + 1/s(t)$  and using Hölder norm inequality we have

$$\|f \chi_A\|_{q(\cdot)} \leq 2 \|f\|_{p(\cdot)} \|\chi_A\|_{\frac{pq}{p-q}(\cdot)}$$

Hence by the hypothesis and Proposition 3.2 we get

$$\lim_{\mu(A_n) \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in B_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)}} \|f \chi_{A_n}\|_{q(\cdot)} \leq 2 \lim_{\mu(A_n) \rightarrow 0} \|\chi_{A_n}\|_{\frac{pq}{p-q}(\cdot)} = 0,$$

so the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is  $L$ -weakly compact.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (5) are clear (see Theorem 4.1).

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6) is Proposition 3.3.

(6)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Consider the function  $f(t) = \frac{p-q}{pq}(t)$ . From Lemma 3.5 we have that the functions  $\frac{1}{\frac{p-q}{pq}(t)} = \frac{pq}{p-q}(t)$  and  $\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(x)}$  are equi-distributed. Thus  $\left(\frac{pq}{p-q}\right)^* = (1/f^*)^*$  and

$$\int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\left(\frac{pq}{p-q}\right)^*(x)} dx = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\left(\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*}\right)^*(x)} dx$$

Now, as  $1/f^*$  is an increasing function it follows, by Lemma 3.6, that  $(1/f)^*(x) = (1/f^*)^*(x) = (1/f^*)(\mu(\Omega) - x)$ . Hence

$$= \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(\mu(\Omega)-x)}} dx = \int_0^{\mu(\Omega)} a^{\frac{1}{\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(y)}} dy.$$

Finally, the boundedness of this integral follows now from the hypothesis and Lemma 3.7 for  $\mu(\Omega) = b$ , since  $\left(\frac{pq}{p-q}\right)^*(\cdot)$  is decreasing.  $\square$

Notice that above extends the  $L$ -weak compactness criterion in [9] (Thm 3.4) including now unbounded exponents.

**Example 4.9.** (1) Let  $p(t) = 1 + \ln(1 - \ln t)$  on  $(0, 1)$ . The inclusion  $L^\infty(0, 1) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(0, 1)$  is strictly singular, since for every  $a > 1$

$$\int_0^1 a^{1 + \ln(1 - \ln t)} dt < \infty.$$

(2) Let  $p_\alpha(t) = \frac{1}{t^\alpha}$  for  $\alpha > 0$  on  $(0, 1)$ . The inclusions  $L^\infty(0, 1) \hookrightarrow L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1)$  and  $L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1) \hookrightarrow L^1(0, 1)$  are not DSS.

The inclusions  $L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1) \hookrightarrow L^{p_\beta(\cdot)}(0, 1)$ , for  $0 < \alpha < \beta \leq 1$  or  $1 \leq \beta < \alpha < \infty$ , are not DSS.

(3) Let  $p_\alpha(t) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^\alpha}$  on  $(0, 1)$  and  $\alpha > 0$ . The inclusions  $L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1) \hookrightarrow L^1(0, 1)$  and  $L^\infty(0, 1) \hookrightarrow L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1)$  are not weakly compact.



- (4) Let  $p_\alpha(t) = \ln^\alpha(\frac{1}{t})$  for  $t \in (0, 1/e)$  and  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ . The inclusion  $L^\infty(0, 1/e) \hookrightarrow L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1/e)$  is strictly singular if and only if  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Indeed, this follows from Theorem 4.6, since

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 1/e} \left( \frac{1}{e} - x \right)^{\frac{1}{\ln^\alpha((\frac{1}{e}-x)^{-1})}} = 0$$

if and only if  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . On the other side the inclusions  $L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1/e) \hookrightarrow L^1(0, 1/e)$ , for  $\alpha > 0$ , are not DSS.

The inclusions  $L^{p_\beta(\cdot)}(0, 1/e) \hookrightarrow L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1/e)$  for  $0 < \alpha < \beta < \infty$  are not DSS.

- (5) Let  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $t \in (0, 1/e)$  and

$$p_\alpha(t) := \frac{\ln^\alpha(\frac{1}{t})}{\ln^\alpha(\frac{1}{t}) - 1}.$$

The inclusion  $L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}(0, 1/e) \hookrightarrow L^1(0, 1/e)$  is weakly compact if and only if  $0 < \alpha < 1$ .

- (6) Let  $q(t) := \sqrt{\ln(\frac{1}{t})}$  for  $t \in (0, \frac{1}{e})$  and  $p(t) := (1 + \epsilon)q(t)$ , for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(0, \frac{1}{e}) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(0, \frac{1}{e})$  is DSS. Indeed,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \frac{1}{e}} \left( \frac{1}{e} - x \right)^{\left(\frac{p-q}{pq}\right)^*(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow \frac{1}{e}} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{e} - x \right)^{\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)^*(x)} \right]^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} = 0.$$

In case of  $p^+ < \infty$ , the condition  $\text{ess inf}(p-q)(\cdot) > 0$  is a sufficient condition for the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  be DSS ([13] Prop.3.3) or  $L$ -weakly compact ([9] Thm. 3.4). However this fails when  $p^+ = \infty$ , see Example 4.7 (and compare it with Example 4.9 (6)).

## 5. REGULAR EXPONENTS

In this section we assume some regularity for the exponents, getting then a simpler DSS criterion. Recall that a scalar function  $f$  over a metric measure space  $(\Omega, \mu, d)$  is said to be (locally) *log-Hölder continuous* if there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that, for all  $x \neq y \in \Omega$ ,

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \frac{C}{\ln \left( e + \frac{1}{d(x,y)} \right)}.$$

The class of log-Hölder continuous exponents is very useful in applications of variable exponent spaces (cf. [8, 7]).

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a log-Hölder continuous function. Then its decreasing rearrangement  $f^*$  is also log-Hölder continuous.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $f^*$  is not log-Hölder continuous, so there exist two sequences  $(x_n)$  and  $(y_n)$  in  $[0, 1]$  such that, for every natural  $n$ ,

$$|f^*(x_n) - f^*(y_n)| > \frac{n}{\ln \left( e + \frac{1}{|x_n - y_n|} \right)}.$$

We can suppose  $f^*(x_n) > f^*(y_n)$  for every  $n$ . We will look for sequences  $(a_n)$  and  $(b_n)$  such that  $|a_n - b_n| \leq |x_n - y_n|$  and  $|f(a_n) - f(b_n)| \geq |f^*(x_n) - f^*(y_n)|$ , since then

$$|f(a_n) - f(b_n)| \geq |f^*(x_n) - f^*(y_n)| > \frac{n}{\ln\left(e + \frac{1}{|x_n - y_n|}\right)} \geq \frac{n}{\ln\left(e + \frac{1}{|a_n - b_n|}\right)}.$$

We know by the properties of  $f^*$  that

$$\left| \left\{ t \in [0, 1] : f^*(y_n) < f^*(t) < f^*(x_n) \right\} \right| \leq |x_n - y_n|,$$

and

$$(5.1) \quad \left| \left\{ t \in [0, 1] : f^*(y_n) < f(t) < f^*(x_n) \right\} \right| \leq |x_n - y_n|.$$

For every natural  $n$  we define the disjoint compact sets  $A_n := f^{-1}([0, f^*(y_n)])$  and  $B_n := f^{-1}([f^*(x_n), \infty))$ . Thus there exist  $a_n \in A_n$  and  $b_n \in B_n$  such that

$$|a_n - b_n| = \min\{|r - s| : r \in A_n \text{ and } s \in B_n\}.$$

Since  $f$  is continuous we have

$$f(a_n) \leq f^*(y_n) \quad \text{and} \quad f(b_n) \geq f^*(x_n).$$

Now, for  $t = \lambda a_n + (1 - \lambda)b_n$  with  $0 < \lambda < 1$ , it follows from the definition of  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  that

$$f^*(y_n) < f(t) < f^*(x_n).$$

Using (5.1), we conclude that  $|a_n - b_n| \leq |x_n - y_n|$ . □

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $p(\cdot) \geq q(\cdot)$  log-Hölder continuous exponents on  $[0, 1]$ . If*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - x)^{(p-q)^*(x)} = 0,$$

*then  $\text{ess inf}(p - q) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\text{ess inf}(p - q) = 0$  (hence  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} (p - q)^*(x) = 0$ ). Then, given  $x_n \in [0, 1)$ , we can take  $x_{n+1}$  close enough to 1 to get

$$(x_{n+1} - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(x_{n+1})} \simeq (1 - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(1)} = (1 - x_n)^0 = 1.$$

Concretely, we take  $x_{n+1}$  so that  $(x_{n+1} - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(x_{n+1})} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . So, by induction, for every  $x_0 \in [0, 1)$ , we can construct a sequence  $(x_n) \nearrow 1$  satisfying

$$(x_{n+1} - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(x_{n+1})} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

But, on the other side,  $p(\cdot)$  and  $q(\cdot)$  are log-Hölder continuous, so  $(p - q)(\cdot)$  and  $(p - q)^*(\cdot)$  are log-Hölder too by above proposition. If we also suppose that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} (1 - x)^{(p-q)^*(x)} = 0$  we reach a contradiction, as

$$\begin{aligned} (x_{n+1} - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(x_{n+1})} &= (x_{n+1} - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(x_{n+1}) - (p-q)^*(x_n) + (p-q)^*(x_n)} \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{x_{n+1} - x_n} \right)^{(p-q)^*(x_n) - (p-q)^*(x_{n+1})} \cdot (x_{n+1} - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(x_n)} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{x_{n+1} - x_n} \right)^{\frac{M}{\ln\left(e + \frac{1}{x_{n+1} - x_n}\right)}} \cdot (1 - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(x_n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$

because  $(1 - x_n)^{(p-q)^*(x_n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$  and  $\left(\frac{1}{x_{n+1}-x_n}\right)^{\frac{M}{\ln\left(e+\frac{1}{x_{n+1}-x_n}\right)}} \rightarrow e^M$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.3.** *Let  $p(\cdot) \geq q(\cdot)$  be log-Hölder continuous exponents on  $[0, 1]$  with  $p^+ < \infty$ . TFAE:*

- (1)  $\text{ess inf}(p(\cdot) - q(\cdot)) > 0$ .
- (2) The inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}[0, 1] \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}[0, 1]$  is DSS.
- (3)  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - x)^{(p-q)^*(x)} = 0$ .

*Proof.* The above proposition shows that (1) and (3) are equivalent, and the others follows from Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

*Remark 5.4.* Notice that every other statement at Theorem 4.1 is also equivalent.

**Example 5.5.** (i) Inclusions  $L^{p_\alpha(\cdot)}[0, 1] \hookrightarrow L^p[0, 1]$  are not DSS, for  $p_\alpha(x) = p + x^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > 0$  and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ .

In general  $\text{ess inf}(p - q)(\cdot) > 0$  is not an equivalence for an inclusion be DSS but just a sufficient condition (even in the case of be  $p(\cdot)$  continuous and  $q(\cdot)$  log-Hölder continuous):

- (ii) Take a log-Hölder continuous exponent  $q(\cdot)$ , the continuous function

$$r(x) = \frac{\ln\left([\log_2(1-x)]^{2j}\right)}{-\log_2(1-x)},$$

(for  $j$  natural) and the exponent  $p(\cdot) = q(\cdot) + r(1-2^{-e})\chi_{[0, 1-2^{-e}]} + r(\cdot)\chi_{[1-2^{-e}, 1]}$ . Then  $\text{ess inf}(p - q)(\cdot) = 0$  but the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}[0, 1] \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}[0, 1]$  is  $M$ -weakly compact for big enough  $j \geq p^+$  and hence DSS (see [22] p.9).

We do not know whether above criteria can be extended to bounded open subsets in  $R^n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ).

## 6. THE INFINITE MEASURE CASE

In order to study DSS inclusions on an infinite measure, we can always assume that  $\mu(\Omega_d) = \infty$  (in Proposition 2.1), avoiding trivial cases of non-DSS inclusions.

If the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  holds and  $p^+ < \infty$ , then the sets  $D_\varepsilon$  (for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ) has infinite measure, where

$$D_\varepsilon := \{t \in \Omega_d : p(t) < q(t) + \varepsilon\}.$$

Indeed, assume that there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\mu(D_\varepsilon) < \infty$ . Then,  $\mu(\Omega_d \setminus D_\varepsilon) = \infty$  and if  $r(t) := \frac{pq}{p-q}(t)$ , we have  $r^+_{|\Omega_d \setminus D_\varepsilon} \leq \frac{p^+q^+}{\varepsilon} < \infty$ . Hence, for every  $\lambda > 1$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega_d} \lambda^{-r(t)} d\mu \geq \int_{\Omega_d \setminus D_\varepsilon} \lambda^{-r(t)} d\mu \geq \lambda^{-\frac{p^+q^+}{\varepsilon}} \mu(\Omega_d \setminus D_\varepsilon) = \infty$$

which, using Proposition 2.1, gives a contradiction.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless infinite measure space and exponents  $p(\cdot)$  and  $q(\cdot)$ . If the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  holds and  $p^+ < \infty$ , then the inclusion is non-DSS.*

*Proof.* We shall proceed in a similar way as in [23] Thm 3.4. It is enough to find a disjoint sequence  $(f_n)$  generating the same infinite dimensional (closed) subspace in  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  as well as in  $L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$ . To do so, if we could take functions  $f_n := \chi_{A_n}$ , where  $(A_n)$  is a disjoint sequence with  $\mu(A_n) = 1$  verifying that  $p_{|A_n}^+ - q_{|A_n}^- < \frac{1}{n}$ , the proof would be finished.

Indeed, under these hypotheses we have the inclusions

$$\ell_{p_{|A_n}^-} \hookrightarrow [f_n]_{p(\cdot)} \hookrightarrow \ell_{p_{|A_n}^+}$$

and

$$\ell_{q_{|A_n}^-} \hookrightarrow [f_n]_{q(\cdot)} \hookrightarrow \ell_{q_{|A_n}^+}.$$

Using now Proposition 2.2 we have that the Nakano sequence spaces  $\ell_{p_{|A_n}^-} \cong \ell_{p_{|A_n}^+} \cong \ell_{q_{|A_n}^-} \cong \ell_{q_{|A_n}^+}$ . Hence, we deduce that  $[f_n]_{p(\cdot)} \cong [f_n]_{q(\cdot)}$ .

Let us now construct such disjoint sequence  $(A_n)$  with the above properties. We remarked above that for every natural  $n$  we have  $\mu(D_{\frac{1}{2n}}) = \infty$  (or either  $p(\cdot)|_A \equiv q(\cdot)|_A$  over a positive measure subset  $A \subset \Omega$  and then the proof is trivial). Thus, if we make a finite partition  $\{[x_i, x_{i+1})\}$  of the interval  $[1, p^+)$  where  $1 = x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_k = p^+$  and  $x_{i+1} - x_i < \frac{1}{2n}$  for every natural  $i$ , we can assure that, for some  $j$ ,

$$\mu\left(D_{\frac{1}{2n}} \cap p^{-1}([x_j, x_{j+1}))\right) = \infty.$$

Even more, by the definition of  $D_{\frac{1}{2n}}$ , it is also true that

$$\mu\left(D_{\frac{1}{2n}} \cap p^{-1}([x_j, x_{j+1})) \cap q^{-1}\left([x_j - \frac{1}{2n}, x_{j+1})\right)\right) = \infty.$$

Thus, we conclude that there exists a set  $E_n$  (the above set) with infinite measure such that

$$p_{E_n}^+ - q_{E_n}^- \leq x_{j+1} - \left(x_j - \frac{1}{2n}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

Now, since  $\mu(E_n) = \infty$  for each natural  $n$ , we can take  $A_n \subset \left(E_n \cap \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i\right)^c\right)$  with  $\mu(A_n) = 1$  getting so the needed disjoint sequence  $(A_n)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be an atomless infinite measure space and exponents  $p(\cdot)$  and  $q(\cdot)$ . If the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  holds and the distribution function of  $q(\cdot)$  verifies  $\mu_{q(\cdot)}(n) = \infty$  for every natural  $n$ , then the inclusion is not DSS.*

*Proof.* Consider the sets

$$D_n = \{t \in \Omega : q(t) > n\} \subset E_n = \{t \in \Omega : p(t) > n\}.$$

Since  $\mu(D_n) = \infty$ , the increasing sequence  $(D_n \setminus E_m)_m$  verifies  $\mu(D_n \setminus E_m) \nearrow \infty$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

Hence, by the hypotheses, it is possible to find a strictly increasing sequence  $(n_k)_k$  of natural numbers and a disjoint sequence of measurable sets  $(A_k)_k$  with  $\mu(A_k) = 1$  such that

$$n_k \leq q_{|A_k}^- \leq p_{|A_k}^- \quad \text{and} \quad q_{|A_k}^+ \leq p_{|A_k}^+ \leq n_{k+1}.$$

Consider now the (closed) subspace  $[\chi_{A_k}]_{p(\cdot)}$ , formed by all functions of the form  $\sum_k \lambda_k \chi_{A_k} \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  such that  $\rho_{p(\cdot)}(\lambda \sum_{k>N} \lambda_k \chi_{A_k}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0$  for every  $\lambda > 0$ .

If  $\sum_k \lambda_k \chi_{A_k} \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ , then, for some  $r > 0$ ,

$$\sum_k \left| \frac{\lambda_k}{r} \right|^{n_{k+1}} \leq \sum_k \left| \frac{\lambda_k}{r} \right|^{p_{|A_k}^+} \leq \rho_{p(\cdot)}\left(\frac{\sum_k \lambda_k \chi_{A_k}}{r}\right) \leq \sum_k \left| \frac{\lambda_k}{r} \right|^{p_{|A_k}^-} \leq \sum_k \left| \frac{\lambda_k}{r} \right|^{n_k}.$$

Hence, since the Nakano sequence spaces  $\ell_{(n_k)} \cong \ell_\infty \cong \ell_{(n_{k+1})}$ , we deduce that the subspace  $[\chi_{A_k}]_{p(\cdot)} \cong c_0$ .

Analogously the corresponding subspace defined similarly  $[\chi_{A_k}]_{q(\cdot)}$  in  $L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  satisfies that  $[\chi_{A_k}]_{q(\cdot)} \cong c_0$ . Therefore we conclude that  $[\chi_{A_k}]_{p(\cdot)} \cong [\chi_{A_k}]_{q(\cdot)} \cong c_0$ . □

Combining now the two above propositions we cover the different cases for the the following statement (notice that the case  $q^+ < p^+ = \infty$  and  $\mu_{p(\cdot)}(n) = \infty$  for every natural  $n$  is not possible according with Proposition 2.1).

**Theorem 6.3.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mu)$  be a non-atomic infinite measure space and exponents  $p(\cdot)$  and  $q(\cdot)$ . If the inclusion  $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{q(\cdot)}(\mu)$  holds, then it is not DSS.*

*Proof.* In the case of the existence of a subset  $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$  with  $\mu(\Omega_0) = \infty$  and  $p_{|\Omega_0}^+ < \infty$ , the above Proposition 6.1 gives the result. For the other possible cases we can use now Proposition 6.2. □

*Remark 6.4.* The non-DSS property of inclusions between variable Lebesgue spaces on infinite measures is not true in the class of Orlicz spaces. For example the inclusions  $L^\varphi(0, \infty) \hookrightarrow L^\psi(0, \infty)$  are DSS for the Orlicz functions  $\varphi(x) = x^r \vee x^s$  and  $\psi(x) = x^p \vee x^q$ , ( $r < p \leq q < s$ ) (cf. [14] Ex. 4.9).

*Remark 6.5.* Note that also for infinite measures if the inclusion  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  holds then it is non-DSS.

Indeed, assume that for an exponent function  $p(\cdot)$  the inclusion  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  holds. Then,  $\chi_\Omega \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$ , so there exists  $\lambda > 1$  such that  $\int_\Omega \frac{d\mu}{\lambda^{p(t)}} < \infty$ . It follows that the sets  $D_n = \{t \in \Omega : p(t) > n\}$  has infinite measure for every natural  $n$  (since  $\mu(D_n^c) < \infty$ ). Now reasoning as in above Proposition 6.2, we can easily deduce that the inclusion  $L^\infty(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mu)$  is non-DSS.

### REFERENCES

1. F. Albiac and N.J. Kalton; *Topics in Banach space theory* (2nd ed.). Springer, 2016.
2. Ch. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw; *Positive operators*. Academic Press, 1985.
3. S.V. Astashkin; *The Rademacher system in function spaces*. Birkhäuser, 2020.
4. S.V. Astashkin, F.L. Hernández and E.M. Semenov; *Strictly singular inclusions of rearrangement invariant spaces and Rademacher spaces*. Studia Math. **193** (2009), 269-283.
5. S.V. Astashkin and E.M. Semenov; *Some properties of embeddings of rearrangement invariant spaces*. Sbornik Math. **210:10** (2019), 1361-1379.
6. C. Bennett and R.C. Sharpley; *Interpolation of operators*. Pure and Applied Mathematics **129**. Academic Press, 1988.

7. D.V. Cruz-Urbe and A. Fiorenza; *Variable Lebesgue spaces: foundations and harmonic analysis*. Birkhäuser/Springer, 2013.
8. L. Diening, P. Harjulehto, P. Hästö and M. Ružička; *Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with variable exponents*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. **2017**. Springer, 2011.
9. D.E. Edmunds, A. Gogatishvili and A. Nekvinda; *Almost compact and compact embeddings of variable exponent spaces*. Studia Math. **268** (2023), no. 2, 187-211.
10. D.E. Edmunds, J. Lang and A. Nekvinda; *On  $L^{p(x)}$  norms*. Proc. R. Soc. London A **255** (1999), 219-225.
11. A. Fiorenza, A. Gogatishvili, A. Nekvinda and J. Rokotoson; *Remarks on compactness results for variable exponent spaces  $L^{p(\cdot)}$* . J. Math. Pures Appl. **157** (2022), 136-144.
12. J. Flores, F.L. Hernández, N.J. Kalton and P. Tradacete; *Characterizations of strictly singular operators on Banach lattices*. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **79** (2009), no. 3, 612-630.
13. J. Flores, F.L. Hernández, C. Ruiz and M. Sanchiz; *On the structure of variable exponent spaces*. Indag. Math. (N.S.) **31** (2020), no. 5, 831-841.
14. A. García del Amo, F.L. Hernández and C. Ruiz; *Disjointly strictly singular operators and interpolation*. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **126** (1996), no. 5, 1011-1026.
15. A. García del Amo, F.L. Hernández, E. Semenov and V. Sánchez; *Disjointly strictly singular inclusions between rearrangement invariant spaces*. J. London Math. Soc. **62** (2000), 239-252.
16. S. Goldberg; *Unbounded linear operators: theory and applications*. Dover, 1966.
17. P. Górká and A. Macios; *Almost everything you need to know about relatively compact sets in variable Lebesgue spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. **269** (2015), 1925-1949.
18. F.L. Hernández, S.Ya. Novikov and E.M. Semenov; *Strictly singular embeddings between rearrangement invariant spaces*. Positivity **7**:1-2 (2003), 119-124.
19. F.L. Hernández, Y. Raynaud and E.M. Semenov; *Bernstein widths and superstrictly singular inclusions*. Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. vol. **218** (2012), 359-376.
20. F.L. Hernández and B. Rodríguez-Salinas; *On  $\ell_p$ -complemented copies in Orlicz spaces II*. Israel J. Math. **68** (1989), 27-55.
21. \_\_\_\_\_; *Lattice embedding  $L^p$  into Orlicz spaces*. Israel J. Math. **90** (1995), 167-188.
22. F.L. Hernández, C. Ruiz and M. Sanchiz; *Weak compactness in variable exponent spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. **281** (2021), 109087.
23. \_\_\_\_\_; *Weak compactness and representation in variable exponent Lebesgue spaces on infinite measure spaces*. Rev. Real Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fis. Nat. Ser. A-Mat, **116**,152 (2022).
24. M. Krasnoselskii and Ya. Rutickii; *Convex functions and Orlicz spaces*. Noordhoff, 1961.
25. S. Krein, J. Petunin and E. Semenov; *Interpolation of linear operators*. Transl. Amer. Math. Soc., 1982.
26. J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri; *Classical Banach spaces I*. Springer-Verlag, 1977.
27. \_\_\_\_\_; *Classical Banach spaces II*. Springer-Verlag, 1979.
28. L. Maligranda and W. Wnuk; *Landau-type theorems for variable Lebesgue spaces*. Commentationes Math. **55** (2015), 119-126.
29. J. Musielak; *Orlicz spaces and modular spaces*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. **1034**. Springer, 1983.
30. H. Nakano; *Modulated sequence spaces*. Proc. Japan Acad. **27** (1951), 411-415.
31. M. Sanchiz; *Structure and operators on variable Lebesgue spaces*. Ph.D. Thesis, Madrid Complutense University, 2023.

IMI AND DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO Y MATEMÁTICA APLICADA, FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS,  
UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE, 28040 MADRID, SPAIN

*Email address:* (F.L. Hernández) [pacoh@ucm.es](mailto:pacoh@ucm.es)

*Email address:* (C. Ruiz) [cruizb@mat.ucm.es](mailto:cruizb@mat.ucm.es)

*Email address:* (M. Sanchiz) [mauro.sanchizalonso@ceu.es](mailto:mauro.sanchizalonso@ceu.es)