## INROADS

Hajrudin Fejzić,\* Department of Mathematics, California State University, San Bernardino, CA 92407, U.S.A. email: hfejzic@csusb.edu

## A NOTE ON MONOTONICITY THEOREMS FOR APPROXIMATELY CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS

We say that f(x) is approximately continuous at a if there is a measurable set V such that a is a density point of V and the restriction  $f|_V(x)$  is continuous at a. If in addition  $f|_V(x)$  is differentiable at a then we say that f(x) is approximately differentiable at a, and we denote the derivative by  $f'_{ap}(a)$ . It is well known, Theorem 2.5 [2], that  $f'_{ap}(x) \ge 0$  at every point x of an interval I implies that f is nondecreasing on I. See [2], page 107 for the proof of this result. The first part of this note is to provide a simple proof of Theorem 2.5. Since the conditions used in our proof are much weaker than those of Theorem 2.5, our Theorem 2 can be also regarded as its generalization.

**Definition 1.** Let A be a measurable set and  $\lambda(A)$  its Lebesque measure. The upper and lower right densities of a point x with respect to A are  $d^+(A, x) =$  $\limsup_{h\to 0^+} \lambda(A\cap(x,x+h))/h \text{ and } d_+(A,x) = \liminf_{h\to 0^+} \lambda(A\cap(x,x+h))/h$ respectively. The upper and lower left densities are defined as  $d^{-}(A, x) =$  $\limsup_{h\to 0^+} \lambda(A\cap (x-h,x))/h \text{ and } d_-(A,x) = \liminf_{h\to 0^+} \lambda(A\cap (x-h,x))/h$ respectively. When the two lower densities are 1, we say that x is a density point of A.

Let  $E_y = \{x : f(x) < y\}$ , and  $E^y = \{x : f(x) > y\}$ . The condition that f is approximately continuous at a implies that if  $a \in E_y$  then a is a density point of  $E_y$  and if  $a \in E^y$ , then a is a density point of  $E^y$ . Moreover if f is approximately continuous on an interval I, then it's measurable (See Theorem 5.2 [2]). In proving monotonicity results, the assumption  $f'_{ap}(a) \ge 0$ on an interval can be replaced with the weaker assumption that  $f'_{ap}(a) > 0$ , for

Mathematical Reviews subject classification: Primary: 26A24

Key words: approximately continuous functions, monotonicity theorems

Received by the editors January 25, 2017 Communicated by: Brian S. Thomson

<sup>\*</sup>The research for this paper was supported by CSUSB 2016 Mini-grant.

the weaker assumption is true for  $f_n(x) = f(x) + \frac{1}{n}x$ . Now the monotonicity of  $f_n(x)$  for every *n* implies the monotonicity of *f*. The assumption  $f'_{ap}(a) > 0$ , implies that  $d_+(\{x > a : f(x) \ge f(a)\}, a) = 1$ .

**Theorem 2.** Let f be a measurable function defined on an open interval I, such that for  $x \in E_y$  we have  $d^-(E_y, x) > 1/2$  while for  $x \in E^y$  we have  $d^+(E^y, x) > 1/2$ . In addition suppose that for all but countably many  $x \in I$ ,  $d^+(\{z > x : f(z) \ge f(x)\}, x) > 1/2$ . Then f is nondecreasing on I.

PROOF. Suppose to the contrary that there is a < b such that f(a) > f(b). Let f(a) > y > f(b). We will show that there is a < r < b such that f(r) = y and  $d^+(\{z > r : f(z) \ge f(r)\}, r) \le 1/2$ . Since the last inequality can hold for only countably many r, and we have uncountably many choices for y, we have a contradiction.

Let  $A = \{x : f(x) \ge y\}$ . Consider a continuous function g on [a, b] defined by

$$g(x) = \lambda(A \cap (a, x)) - \frac{1}{2}(x - a).$$

Then g(a) = 0 and since  $a \in E^y \subset A$ , by assumption we have that  $d^+(A, a) \ge d^+(E^y, a) > 1/2$  which implies that  $\limsup_{x \to a^+} \frac{g(x) - g(a)}{x - a} > 0$ . Thus if r denotes the point where g(x) attains its maximum, then  $a < r \le b$ . Hence for every  $a \le z < r$ ,  $g(z) \le g(r)$ . This implies that  $\frac{\lambda(A \cap (z, r))}{r - z} \ge 1/2$ . Taking  $\liminf_{z \to r^-}$  we see that

$$d_{-}(A, r) \ge 1/2.$$

If  $r \in E_y$ , then by assumption we would have  $d^-(E_y, r) > 1/2$ , but  $E_y$  is disjoint from A so this is impossible. Hence  $r \notin E_y$  and thus r < b.

So for all  $r < z \leq b$ ,  $g(r) \geq g(z)$  which implies that  $\frac{\lambda(A \cap (r,z))}{z-r} \leq 1/2$ . Taking  $\limsup_{z \to r^+}$  we see that

$$d^+(A, r) \le 1/2.$$

Since  $E^y \subset A$  we also have  $d^+(E^y, r) \leq 1/2$ . If  $r \in E^y$ , then by assumption  $d^+(E^y, r) > 1/2$ , which is a contradiction. Hence  $r \notin E_y \cup E^y$ , that is f(r) = y and  $A \supset \{z > r : f(z) \geq f(r)\}$ .

Another monotonicity theorem for approximately continuous functions was obtained by Ornstein in 1971, [6].

**Ornestein Theorem.** Let f be approximately continuous on an interval I. Suppose that for all ( but countably many )  $x \in I$ ,  $d^+(\{w > x : f(w) \ge f(x)\}, x) > 0$ . Then f is nondecreasing. The Ornestein theorem provides a positive answer to a question from 1937 by A. J. Ward.

Scottish book problem # 157. Let f be approximately continuous on an interval I. Suppose that for all  $x \in I$ , the approximate upper right derivate,  $D_{ap}^+f(x)$  is positive. Is f(x) monotone increasing?

See [1] on problem 157 and [3] for a different proof of Ornestein theorem. In the second part of this note, using similar ideas as in our proof of Theorem 2 we present a shorter proof of Ornestein theorem. Moreover we prove "the parenthetical version" of Ornestein's theorem which is stronger than the original version.

PROOF. Suppose to the contrary that there is a < b such that f(a) > f(b). Let f(b) < y < f(a). We will show that there is a < r < b such that f(r) = y and  $d^+(\{w > r : f(w) \ge f(r)\}, r) = 0$ . Since the last equality can hold for only countable many r, and we have uncountably many choices for y, we have a contradiction.

Let  $A = \{x : f(x) \ge y\}$ , and for any positive integer n let  $C_n = \{t : f(t) > y - \frac{y - f(b)}{n}\}$  so that  $C_n$ 's are nested and  $A = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n$ . Consider a continuous function

$$g(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \lambda(C_n \cap (a, x)) + \lambda(A \cap (a, x)) - (x - a).$$

Since g(a) = 0, and a is a right density point of A we have that  $\lim_{x \to a^+} \frac{g(x) - g(a)}{x - a} \ge \lim_{x \to a^+} \frac{2\lambda(A \cap (a, x))}{x - a} - 1 = 1$ . Therefore if r is the point where g attains its maximum then  $a < r \le b$ . Thus for every  $a \le z < r$ , we have  $g(z) \le g(r)$  which implies that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{\lambda(C_n \cap (z, r))}{r - z} + \frac{\lambda(A \cap (z, r))}{r - z} \ge 1.$$

$$\tag{1}$$

If there is an integer n such that  $r \notin C_n$ , then approximate continuity implies that  $d^-(C_{n+1},r) = 0$ . From (1) we get  $1 - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{\lambda(C_{n+1} \cap (z,r))}{r-z} + \frac{\lambda(C_{n+1} \cap (z,r))}{2} > 1$ . Taking  $\limsup_{z \to z^-}$  we obtain a contradiction  $1 - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} > 1$ .

 $\frac{\lambda(C_{n+1}\cap(z,r))}{r-z} \geq 1. \text{ Taking } \limsup_{z \to r^{-}} \text{ we obtain a contradiction } 1 - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \geq 1.$ Thus  $r \in C_n$  for all n and thus also in  $A = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n$ . Hence r < b and  $g(w) \leq g(r)$  for all  $r < w \leq b$ . This implies that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{\lambda(C_n \cap (r, w))}{w - r} + \frac{\lambda(A \cap (r, w))}{w - r} \le 1.$$

$$\tag{2}$$

Since  $r \in C_n$  for all n, approximate continuity of f implies that  $\lim_{w\to r} \frac{\lambda(C_n \cap (r,w))}{w-r} = 1$ . Taking  $\limsup_{w\to r^+}$ in (2) we obtain  $1+d^+(A,r) \leq 1$ , that is  $d^+(A, r) = 0$ .

If f(r) > y then by the approximate continuity of f we would have  $d_{+}(A, r) = 1$ . Therefore  $f(r) = y, A \supset \{w > r : f(w) \ge f(r)\}.$ 

## References

- [1] K. Beanland, P. Humke and T. Richards, On Scottish Book 157, Real Anal. Exchange, **41(2)** (2016), 331–346.
- [2] A. Bruckner, Differentiation of Real Functions, CRM Monograph Series, American Mathematical Society (1994).
- [3] C. Freiling, P. Humke and R. O'Malley, An Alternate Solution to Scottish Book 157, Real Anal. Exchange, (2016), 403–408.
- [4] C. Freiling, P. Humke and R. O'Malley, Approximetely continuous functions have approximate extrema, a new proof, Real Anal. Exchange, (2016), 409-414.
- [5] R. O'Malley, Approximate maxima, Fund. Math., 1 (1977), 75–81.
- [6] D. Ornstein, A characterization of monotone functions, Illinois J. Math., **15** (1971), 73-76.