

A NOTE ON S -ASYMPTOTICALLY PERIODIC FUNCTIONS

SELMA H. J. NICOLA AND MICHELLE PIERRI[†]

ABSTRACT. In [1, Lemma 2.1] is established that an scalar S -asymptotically ω -periodic function (that is, a continuous and bounded function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (f(t + \omega) - f(t)) = 0$) is asymptotically ω -periodic. In this note we give two examples to show that this assertion is false.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [1, Lemma 2.1] is established that every scalar continuous and bounded function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (f(t + \omega) - f(t)) = 0$, for some real number $\omega > 0$, is asymptotically ω -periodic. In this note, we provide two examples which shows that this assertion is false. For completeness, we recall some concepts and definitions.

In this note, $C_b([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ is the space of all continuous and bounded functions from $[0, \infty)$ into \mathbb{R} endowed with the norm of the uniform convergence norm denoted by $|\cdot|_\infty$. Its subspaces, $C_0([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ and $C_\omega([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$, $\omega > 0$, are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} C_0([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) &= \left\{ x \in C_b([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) : \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |x(t)| = 0 \right\}, \\ C_\omega([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) &= \left\{ x \in C_b([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) : x \text{ is } \omega\text{-periodic} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 1.1. A function $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ is called *almost periodic* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a relatively dense subset $\mathcal{H}(\varepsilon, f)$ of \mathbb{R} such that $|f(t + \xi) - f(t)| < \varepsilon$, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}(\varepsilon, f)$.

Definition 1.2. A function $f \in C_b([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ is called *asymptotically almost periodic* if there exists an almost periodic function g and $\varphi \in C_0([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ such that $f = g + \varphi$. If g is periodic (resp. ω -periodic) f is said *asymptotically periodic* (resp. *asymptotically ω -periodic*).

For additional facts on almost periodic and asymptotically almost periodic functions, we refer the reader to [2, 3].

Definition 1.3. A function $f \in C_b([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ is called *S -asymptotically periodic* if there exists $\omega > 0$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (f(t + \omega) - f(t)) = 0$. In this case, we say that ω is an *asymptotic period* of f and that f is *S -asymptotically ω -periodic*.

2. EXAMPLES

The following examples are contrary to [1, Lemma 2.1].

[†] Corresponding author. This author thanks the financial support by CNPq, Brasil.

Example 2.1. Let $(b_n)_n$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $b_n \neq 0$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, $b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the sequence $(a_n)_n = (\sum_{i=0}^n b_i)_n$ is bounded and non-convergent. We note that under these conditions, $a_n - a_{n-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined by $f(n) = a_n$ and

$$f(t) = a_{n+1} + (a_{n+1} - a_n)(t - n - 1), \quad t \in [n, n+1], \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

That is, the graph of f consists of the line segments joining the points (n, a_n) , $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore, f is bounded. Moreover, since $|f(t) - f(s)| \leq \max_{k \geq n} |a_{k+1} - a_k| |t - s|$, for every $t, s \in [n, \infty)$, it following that f is uniformly continuous and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |f(t + \omega) - f(t)| = 0,$$

for every $\omega > 0$. Therefore, f is an S -asymptotically ω -periodic function, for any $\omega > 0$. In particular, f is S -asymptotically 1-periodic.

However, f is not asymptotically 1-periodic. In fact, let us assume $f = g + \alpha$, where $g \in C_1([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ and $\alpha \in C_0([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$. In such case, $a_n = f(n) = g(n) + \alpha(n) = g(0) + \alpha(n) \rightarrow g(0)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which is contrary to the construction of $(a_n)_n$.

From the above remarks, we have that f is S -asymptotically 1-periodic but not asymptotically 1-periodic.

The following elementary lemma is immediate and plays a role in the example below.

Lemma 2.1. *If $g \in C_\omega([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$, then $g([t, t + \omega]) = \mathcal{R}(g)$, the range of g , for any $t \in [0, \infty)$*

Example 2.2. Define $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f(t) = \sin \ln(t + 1)$, $t \in [0, \infty)$. Since $f'(t) = (\cos \ln(t + 1))/(t + 1)$ we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f'(t) = 0$.

For any $\omega > 0$, $f(t + \omega) - f(t) = f'(t + \sigma\omega)\omega$, where $0 < \sigma < 1$, which implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |f(t + \omega) - f(t)| = 0$. That is, f is S -asymptotically ω -periodic, for any $\omega > 0$.

But f is not asymptotically ω -periodic. In fact, given $\omega > 0$, let k be sufficiently large such that $e^{2k\pi} + \omega < e^{2k\pi + \frac{\pi}{2}}$. Note that f is increasing in $[e^{2k\pi} - 1, e^{2k\pi + \frac{\pi}{2}} - 1]$, with let $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, and take k larger if necessary in such a way that $t \geq e^{2k\pi} - 1$ implies $|\varphi(t)| < \varepsilon$. Therefore, if $g = f - \varphi$, one sees that $g([e^{2k\pi} - 1, e^{2k\pi + \frac{\pi}{2}} - 1]) \subset (-\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)$. Since $g(e^{(2k + \frac{3}{2})\pi} - 1) < -1 + \varepsilon < -\varepsilon$ we have $g(e^{(2k + \frac{3}{2})\pi} - 1) < -1 + \varepsilon < -\varepsilon$ we have

$$g(e^{(2k + \frac{3}{2})\pi} - 1) \notin (-\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon) \supset g([e^{2k\pi} - 1, e^{2k\pi + \frac{\pi}{2}} - 1]) \supset g([e^{2k\pi} - 1, e^{2k\pi} - 1 + \omega]).$$

This means that for $t = e^{2k\pi} - 1$, $\mathcal{R}(g) \setminus g([t, t + \omega]) \neq \emptyset$ and, according to Lemma 2.1, there is not $\omega > 0$ such that g can be ω -periodic. Consequently, f cannot be asymptotically ω -periodic.

Remark 2.1. The examples above exploit the fact that the functions f under consideration are Lipschitz continuous, with the possibility of choosing the Lipschitz constant arbitrarily small by restricting f to an interval $[T, \infty)$, with $T > 0$ sufficiently large. By consequence, the S -asymptotic period $\omega > 0$ of f is arbitrary. This fact suggests the following question: *Does lemma 2.1 of [1] hold if restricted to scalar S -asymptotically ω -periodic functions that have a minimum S -asymptotic period $\omega > 0$?* The answer is

negative, as one can see by taking for instance the function F given by $F(t) = f(t) + \cos t$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where f is the function given in example 2.2. Straightforward arguments show that F is S -asymptotically 2π -periodic, being 2π its minimum S -asymptotic period, but it is not asymptotically 2π -periodic.

REFERENCES

- [1] Gao Haiyin, Wang Ke, Wei Fengying and Ding Xiaohua, Massera-type theorem and asymptotically periodic Logistic equations. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 7 (2006), 1268-1283.
- [2] Corduneanu, C., *Almost Periodic Functions*, Second Edition, Chelsea, New York, 1989.
- [3] Zaidman, S., *Almost-Periodic Functions in Abstract Spaces*. Res. Notes in Math. 126. Pitman, Boston, MA, 1985.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SÃO CARLOS, CAIXA POSTAL 676, 13560-970 SÃO CARLOS-SP, BRAZIL. E-MAIL ADDRESS: SELMAJ@DM.UFSCAR.BR

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, I.C.M.C. UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO, CAIXA POSTAL 668, 13560-970, SÃO CARLOS-SP, BRAZIL. E-MAIL ADDRESS: MICHELLEPIERRI@YAHOO.COM.BR