

Héctor H. Cuenya\*, Departamento de Matemática, Fac. de Cs. Exactas F. Q. y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto, Campus Universitario, 5800 Río Cuarto, Argentina. e-mail: [hcuenya@unrccc.edu.ar](mailto:hcuenya@unrccc.edu.ar)

Felipe Zó, Instituto de Matemática Aplicada San Luis, Universidad Nacional de San Luis, Conicet, 5700 San Luis, Argentina. e-mail: [fzo@uns1.edu.ar](mailto:fzo@uns1.edu.ar)

## MONOTONE NORMS ON $C(\Omega)$ AND MULTIPLICATIVE FACTORS

### Abstract

Let  $C(\Omega)$  be the algebra of continuous complex-valued functions on a topological space  $\Omega$  and let  $\rho$  be a function norm on  $C(\Omega)$ . We give necessary and sufficient conditions on the set  $A_\rho = \{f \in C(\Omega) : \rho(f) < \infty\}$  to be an algebra. Also, we prove that every complete function norm is quasi-submultiplicative provided  $A_\rho$  is an algebra and we give a characterization of the best multiplicative factor of  $\rho$ . Finally we characterize the infinity norm and we prove that every quasi-submultiplicative function norm on  $C(\Omega)$  is equivalent to the infinity norm.

### 1 Introduction

Let  $\Omega$  be a topological space and let  $C(\Omega)$  be the algebra of continuous complex-valued functions. In a similar way as it was introduced in [3] we are going to consider a *function norm*  $\rho$  on  $C(\Omega)$ , i.e., a function  $\rho : C(\Omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  which satisfies the usual properties of a norm, including the monotonicity condition

$$f, g \in C(\Omega), |f| \leq |g| \Rightarrow \rho(f) \leq \rho(g).$$

It follows immediately from the definition that  $\rho(|f|) = \rho(f)$  for all  $f \in C(\Omega)$ .

---

Key Words: monotone norms, submultiplicative norms, multiplicative factors, algebra of continuous functions.

Mathematical Reviews subject classification: Primary 46H05, 46J10

Received by the editors June 19, 1997

\*This work, was supported by CONICET, CONICOR, Univ. Nac. de Río Cuarto and Univ. Nac. de San Luis.

Throughout this paper  $A_\rho$  will denote the following subspace of  $C(\Omega)$ ,

$$A_\rho = \{f \in C(\Omega) : \rho(f) < \infty\},$$

and  $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$  will denote the space of bounded complex-valued functions on  $\Omega$ . We are interested in giving necessary and sufficient conditions on  $C(\Omega)$  for existence of a function norm such that  $A_\rho$  is an algebra. This problem was studied for other spaces in [1], and later in [2] and it is related to the existence of *submultiplicative norms*, see [4], [5] and [6].

A norm  $\rho : C(\Omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  will be called  $\sigma$ -subadditive if for all sequences of functions  $f_n \in C(\Omega)$ ,  $f_n \geq 0$  and  $\sum_1^\infty f_n \in C(\Omega)$  it follows that

$$\rho\left(\sum_1^\infty f_n\right) \leq \sum_1^\infty \rho(f_n).$$

We will say that a norm  $\rho$  on  $C(\Omega)$  is *complete* if  $(A_\rho, \rho)$  is complete. It is not difficult to see that every complete function norm on  $C(\Omega)$  is  $\sigma$ -subadditive. See for example [3]. We will say that a norm  $\rho$  is *quasi-submultiplicative* if there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that

$$\rho(fg) \leq K\rho(f)\rho(g), \tag{1}$$

for all  $f, g \in C(\Omega)$ . In this case we will say that  $K$  is a *multiplicative factor* of  $\rho$ . The infimum of all multiplicative factors of  $\rho$  it is called the *best multiplicative factor* of  $\rho$ . Obviously given a quasi-submultiplicative function norm  $\rho$ , with  $A_\rho \neq \{0\}$ , its best multiplicative factor  $M$  is again a multiplicative factor of  $\rho$ , in particular  $M > 0$ .

One of our main results states that if  $\rho$  is a  $\sigma$ -subadditive function norm on  $C(\Omega)$  and  $A_\rho$  is an algebra,  $A_\rho$  can not contains an unbounded function. The following example shows that there exist  $\sigma$ -subadditive function norms on  $C(\Omega)$  where the subspace  $A_\rho$  admits unbounded functions. Let  $\Omega$  be the interval  $(0, 1)$  and

$$\rho(f) = \left(\int_\Omega f^2 dx\right)^{1/2} = \|f\|_2,$$

where  $dx$  stands for Lebesgue measure. Clearly,  $\rho$  is a  $\sigma$ -subadditive function norm on  $C((0, 1))$ . However there exist unbounded square integrable continuous functions on  $(0, 1)$ .

We will show that a function norm  $\rho$  is quasi-submultiplicative provided it is a complete norm function and  $A_\rho$  is an algebra. For the function norm  $\rho$  we are interested in obtaining an alternative, expression for the best multiplicative factor of  $\rho$  which is easier to handle. Along the way we will give a

characterization of the best multiplicative factor analogous to the one in [2] in the case of function norms defined on measurable spaces. More explicitly, we prove for any non trivial ( $A_\rho \neq \{0\}$ ) quasi-submultiplicative norm function  $\rho$ , that its best multiplicative factor is given by

$$M_\rho = \sup\{\|f\|_\infty : f \in C(\Omega), \rho(f) \leq 1\}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  denote the infinity norm. Note that  $M_\rho$  is a well defined number in  $[0, \infty]$  for any function norm  $\rho$  and because  $M_\rho$  is a finite number it will characterize quasi-submultiplicative norms.

Finally, we will give a simple characterization of the infinity norm and we will prove that for every finite complete function norm  $\rho$  on  $C(\Omega)$  the multiples  $\lambda\rho$  are submultiplicative norms for  $\lambda \geq M_\rho$ . In general it is easier to decide that a norm is monotone and complete. Then the previous result gives us a method to obtain submultiplicative norms.

## 2 Results and Proofs

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\rho$  be a function norm on  $C(\Omega)$ .*

- (a) *If  $\rho$  is  $\sigma$ -subadditive, then  $A_\rho$  is an algebra if and only if  $A_\rho \subset \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ ,*
- (b) *If  $A_\rho = C(\Omega)$ , then  $C(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ .*
- (c) *If  $\rho$  is quasi-submultiplicative, then  $A_\rho \subset \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ .*

PROOF. (a) We assume that  $A_\rho$  is an algebra. Suppose that there exists an unbounded function  $f \in A_\rho$ . Since  $\rho(|f|) = \rho(f)$  we assume that  $f \geq 0$ . The next argument is similar to the one used in Theorem 1 of [4]. Thus we get a sequence of elements  $t_n \in \Omega$  such that  $f(t_{n+1}) > f(t_n) + 3$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f(t_1) > 2$  and  $\frac{f(t_n)}{n^2}$  tends to infinity. Let  $(I_n)$  be the sequence of pairwise disjoint closed intervals  $I_n = [f(t_n) - 1, f(t_n) + 1]$  and for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we choose a continuous function  $g_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\text{supp}(g_n) \subset I_n$ ,  $g_n \geq 0$  and  $\|g_n\|_\infty = 1$ . Let  $h_n(t) = g_n(f(t))$ . Then  $h_n \in C(\Omega)$ ,  $0 \leq h_n(t) \leq f(t)$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ , so  $h_n \in A_\rho$  and  $(fh_n)(t) \geq (f(t_n) - 1)h_n(t)$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ . Thus  $0 < \rho(h_n) < \infty$ . Let  $g = \sum_1^\infty \frac{h_n}{n^2\rho(h_n)}$ . Clearly  $g \in C(\Omega)$ . Since  $\rho$  is  $\sigma$ -subadditive, we have that  $g \in A_\rho$ . Then  $fg \in A_\rho$ . On the other hand, by the monotonicity we get

$$\rho(fg) \geq \frac{\rho(fh_n)}{n^2\rho(h_n)} \geq \frac{f(t_n) - 1}{n^2},$$

which is a contradiction.

Assume now  $A_\rho \subset \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ ,  $f$  and  $g$  belong to  $A_\rho$ . Thus we have  $\rho(fg) \leq \|f\|_\infty \rho(g) < \infty$ . Therefore  $fg \in A_\rho$ .

(b) Suppose that there exists an unbounded function  $f \in C(\Omega)$ . By defining a function  $g$  as in (a), we obtain as before a contradiction.

(c) Suppose that there exists an unbounded function  $f \in A_\rho$ . We choose  $g_n$  and  $h_n$  as in (a). Then for some  $K > 0$  we get  $f(t_n - 1)\rho(h_n) \leq \rho(fh_n) \leq K\rho(f)\rho(h_n)$  and we obtain that  $f(t_n - 1) \leq K\rho(f)$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark.** We note that part (c) of Theorem 1, is not a consequence of [4] or [5], because they used that  $A_\rho = C(\Omega)$ . Also, the example given in the introduction allows us to observe that monotonicity does not implies quasi-submultiplicative. In fact,  $\rho$  is not quasi-submultiplicative, otherwise by (c) of Theorem 1, the set  $A_\rho$  should not admit an unbounded function, which is false. On the other hand there exist non-monotone quasi-submultiplicative norms. In order to see this, let  $\rho$  be the Minkowski’s functional associated to a bounded balanced convex absorbing set  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . If in addition  $P$  is a closed set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , it is not difficult to see that  $\rho$  is monotone if and only if  $P$  is symmetric, i.e., if  $(x_1, x_2) \in P$ , then  $(\epsilon_1 x_1, \epsilon_2 x_2) \in P$  where  $\epsilon_i = \pm 1, i = 1, 2$ . Then if we consider a set  $P$  nonsymmetric, the norm  $\rho$  is not monotone. However it is quasi-submultiplicative, since  $\rho$  is equivalent to the submultiplicative norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ .

In the remainder of this section we study existence and characterization of multiplicative factors.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\rho$  be a function norm on  $C(\Omega)$ . If any of the two conditions holds*

- (a)  $\rho$  is a complete norm and  $A_\rho$  is a subalgebra of  $C(\Omega)$ , or
- (b)  $A_\rho = C(\Omega)$  where  $\Omega$  is a  $T_1$ -space with a dense set of isolated points without accumulation points.

*Then there exists a constant  $K$  such that  $\|f\|_\infty \leq K\rho(f)$ , for all  $f \in C(\Omega)$ .*

PROOF. Suppose that (a) holds and the theorem is false. Then there is a non-negative function sequence  $f_n$ , with  $\|f_n\|_\infty = a_n, \rho(f_n) = 1$  and  $\sum_1^\infty \frac{1}{(a_n)^{\frac{1}{2}}} < \infty$ . We can assume without lost of generality that  $a_1 \geq 4$  and  $a_{n+1} > a_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $t_n$  a sequence in  $\Omega$  be such that  $f_n(t_n) > \frac{a_n}{2}$ , and set  $J_n = [f_n(t_n) - 1, f_n(t_n) + 1]$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $g_n$  be a non negative function in  $C(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\text{supp}(g_n) \subset J_n, g_n(f_n(t_n)) = \frac{a_n}{4} = \|g_n\|_\infty$ . We define a function

$h_n \in C(\Omega)$  by  $h_n(t) = g_n(f_n(t))$ . Given  $t \in \Omega$ , if  $f_n(t) \in J_n$ , then

$$f_n(t) \geq f_n(t_n) - 1 > \frac{a_n}{2} - 1 \geq \frac{a_n}{4} = \|g_n\|_\infty \geq g_n(f_n(t)) = h_n(t),$$

while  $f_n(t) \notin J_n$ , implies that  $h_n(t) = 0$ . Therefore  $h_n \leq f_n$  and hence  $\rho(h_n) \leq \rho(f_n) = 1$ .

As  $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\rho(h_n)}{\sqrt{a_n}} \leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_n}} < \infty$ , the function  $s_k := \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{h_n}{\sqrt{a_n}}$  belongs to  $A_\rho$  and  $(s_k)$  is a Cauchy sequence. Since  $A_\rho$  is a complete space, there exists  $s \in A_\rho$  such that  $\rho(s_k - s) \rightarrow 0$ . Moreover, as in part (b) of the proof of theorem 4.8 in [3], we have  $s \geq s_k$ , for every  $k$ . Then

$$\|s\|_\infty \geq \|s_k\|_\infty \geq \frac{\|h_k\|_\infty}{\sqrt{a_k}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{a_k}}{4} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore  $s$  is not bounded, contrary to (a) of Theorem 1.

Now we assume (b) and suppose the theorem is false. Then there exists a sequence of functions  $f_n \in A_\rho, f_n \geq 0$  such that  $\rho(f_n) = 1$  and  $\|f_n\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$  for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus we can get a sequence of isolated points  $t_n$  such that  $f_n(t_n) \rightarrow \infty$  and  $t_n$  has no accumulation points. If  $\delta_n$  is the characteristic function of the unitary set  $\{t_n\}$ , then the function  $\delta_n$  is continuous. We let  $h = \sum_{n=1}^\infty f_n(t_n)\delta_n$ . Since the set  $\{t_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  has no accumulation points, it follows that  $h \in C(\Omega)$ . On the other hand,  $\|h\|_\infty \geq f_n(t_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore  $h \notin B(\Omega)$ , contrary to part (b) of Theorem 1.  $\square$

In particular, the hypothesis (b) of Theorem 2 holds on  $\Omega$  when  $\Omega = \mathbb{Z}$ , the set of integers with the discrete topology.

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $\rho$  be a function norm on  $C(\Omega)$ .*

- (a) *If  $\rho$  is complete, then  $A_\rho$  is a subalgebra of  $C(\Omega)$  if and only if  $\rho$  is quasi-submultiplicative.*
- (b) *If  $\Omega$  is a  $T_1$  space with a dense set of isolated points without accumulation points, such that  $A_\rho = C(\Omega)$ , then  $\rho$  is quasi-submultiplicative.*

PROOF. We only prove (a) since (b) follows by analogous arguments. Suppose that  $A_\rho$  is a subalgebra of  $C(\Omega)$ . Let  $f, g \in A_\rho$ . By Theorem 2 there exists a constant  $M$  such that  $\|h\|_\infty \leq M\rho(h)$  for all  $h \in C(\Omega)$ . It follows that  $\rho(fg) \leq \|f\|_\infty\rho(g) \leq M\rho(f)\rho(g)$ , i.e.  $\rho$  is quasi-submultiplicative. The remaining of the statement is obvious.  $\square$

The condition that  $\rho$  be complete cannot be substituted by the weaker condition of  $\sigma$ -subadditive, though  $A_\rho = C(\Omega)$ , as the next example shows.

**Example.** Let  $\Omega = [0, 1]$  and define a function norm  $\rho$  on  $C(\Omega)$  by  $\rho(f) = \int_{\Omega} |f| d\mu = \|f\|_1$ . Clearly,  $A_{\rho} = C(\Omega)$  and  $\rho$  is  $\sigma$ -subadditive. We can construct a sequence  $(f_n) \in C(\Omega)$  such that  $\frac{\|f_n\|_2}{\|f_n\|_1}$  is arbitrarily large. Thus there is no constant  $K$  such that  $\rho(f^2) \leq K(\rho(f))^2$  for all  $f \in C(\Omega)$ . Consequently  $\rho$  is not quasi-submultiplicative.

Next we will give a characterization of the best multiplicative factor. If  $f \in C(\Omega)$  and  $K$  is a nonnegative real number, we consider the following subset of  $\Omega$ ,  $A(f, K) = \{t \in \Omega : f(t) > K\rho(f)\}$ .

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\rho$  be a quasi-submultiplicative function norm on  $C(\Omega)$  and let  $f \in C(\Omega)$ . If  $K$  is a multiplicative factor of  $\rho$  and  $A(f, K)$  is nonempty, then there exists a function  $b \in A_{\rho}$ ,  $b \neq 0$  such that  $\rho(bf) = K\rho(b)\rho(f)$ .*

PROOF. We may assume without loss of generality that  $f \geq 0$ . Since  $A(f, K) \neq \emptyset$ , the function  $f \in A_{\rho}$  is by Theorem 1 a bounded function. Now set

$$r = \inf\{f(t) : t \in A(f, K)\}.$$

We have two cases,  $r > K\rho(f)$  or  $r = K\rho(f)$ .

In the first case, we take a nonnegative function  $g \in C(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $g(x) = 0$  for  $x \leq K\rho(f)$  and  $\|g\|_{\infty} = g(r) = r$ . Now, we define  $b(t) = g(f(t))$  for  $t \in \Omega$ . Clearly  $b \in C(\Omega)$  and  $b \neq 0$ . If  $t \in A(f, K)$ , we have  $K\rho(f) \leq (f)(t)$ , otherwise we have  $b(t) = 0$ . Thus  $(bf)(t) \geq K\rho(f)b(t)$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ .

In the second case there is  $t_0 \in \Omega$  such that  $K\rho(f) < f(t_0) \leq \|f\|_{\infty}$ . Here we choose a nonnegative function  $g \in C(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\text{supp}(g) \subset [r, \|f\|_{\infty}]$ ,  $g(f(t_0)) \neq 0$  and  $\|g\|_{\infty} = r$ . We define a function  $b$  in  $C(\Omega)$  by  $b(t) = g(f(t))$ . Then if  $t \in A(f, K)$ , we have  $K\rho(f) < f(t) \leq \|f\|_{\infty}$ , while for  $t \notin A(f, K)$  we have  $b(t) = 0$ . Again we get  $K\rho(f)b(t) \leq (bf)(t)$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ .

Thus, in both cases we obtain a function  $b \in A_{\rho}$ ,  $b \neq 0$  such that  $(bf)(t) \geq K\rho(f)b(t)$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ . Finally, since  $\rho$  is monotone and  $K$  is a multiplicative factor we obtain  $K\rho(f)\rho(b) \leq \rho(bf) \leq K\rho(f)\rho(b)$ , and this concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $\rho$  a quasi-submultiplicative function norm on  $C(\Omega)$  with  $A_{\rho} \neq \{0\}$ . Then the best multiplicative factor is given by (2).*

PROOF. Since  $A_{\rho} \neq \{0\}$ , it is easy to see that there exists a best multiplicative factor and it is given by  $M = \sup\{\rho(fg) : \rho(f) \leq 1, \rho(g) \leq 1\}$  and  $M > 0$ . Now  $\rho(fg) \leq \|f\|_{\infty}\rho(g)$  for all  $f, g \in A_{\rho}$  which implies that  $M \leq M_{\rho}$ . We are going to show that  $M \geq M_{\rho}$ . Let  $f \neq 0$  be a function in  $A_{\rho}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then the set  $A(f, M + \epsilon)$  is empty. In fact if this were not so, by Lemma 4 there exists  $b \in A_{\rho}$ ,  $b \neq 0$  such that  $\rho(bf) = (M + \epsilon)\rho(b)\rho(f)$ , which is contradiction.

Hence, we must have  $A(f, M + \epsilon) = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\|f\|_\infty \leq (M + \epsilon)\rho(f)$ . Thus  $M_\rho \leq M + \epsilon$ , for every  $\epsilon > 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.** *Let  $\rho$  be a function norm on  $C(\Omega)$  with  $A_\rho \neq \{0\}$  and which satisfies the conditions (a) or (b) of Theorem 2. Then  $\rho$  is quasi-submultiplicative and the best multiplicative factor is given by (2).*

PROOF. It follows immediately from Corollary 3 and Theorem 5.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.** *Let  $\rho$  be a norm on  $C(\Omega)$  and  $A_\rho \neq \{0\}$ . Then  $\rho$  is quasi-submultiplicative (submultiplicative) if and only if  $M_\rho < \infty$ , ( $M_\rho \leq 1$ ). Moreover if  $M_\rho < \infty$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , the function norm  $\lambda\rho$  is submultiplicative if and only if  $\lambda \geq M_\rho$ .*

PROOF. If  $M_\rho < \infty$ , ( $M_\rho \leq 1$ ) the monotonicity of  $\rho$  implies that  $\rho$  is quasi-submultiplicative (submultiplicative). The converse statement follows by Theorem 5. Observe that  $\lambda > 0$  and  $A_\rho \neq \{0\}$ . Then  $M_{\lambda\rho} = \frac{1}{\lambda}M_\rho$ . Thus the proof is completed.  $\square$

**Theorem 8.** (a) *Let  $\rho$  be a function norm on  $C(\Omega)$ . If  $1 \in A_\rho$  and  $M_\rho$  satisfies  $\rho(1)M_\rho = 1$ , then  $\|f\|_\infty = M_\rho\rho(f)$ , for all  $f \in C(\Omega)$ .*

(b) *The infinity norm is the unique submultiplicative function norm on  $C(\Omega)$  such that  $\rho(1) = 1$ .*

(c) *Every quasi-submultiplicative function norm  $\rho$  on  $C(\Omega)$  such that  $1 \in A_\rho$ , is equivalent to infinity norm.*

PROOF. Since  $\|f\|_\infty \leq M_\rho\rho(f) \leq M_\rho\rho(1)\|f\|_\infty$ , we have (a).

Now, by Theorem 5 the best multiplicative factor for a quasi-submultiplicative function norm  $\rho$  is given by  $M_\rho$ . As  $\rho$  is submultiplicative  $M_\rho \leq 1$ . On the other hand, since  $\rho(1) \leq M_\rho(\rho(1))^2$  and  $\rho(1) = 1$ , we have  $M_\rho \geq 1$ . Thus, (b) follows from (a). Finally (c) is a direct consequence of Theorem 5 and of the monotonicity of  $\rho$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] R. Arens, M. Goldberg and W. A. Luxemburg, *multiplicative factors for function norms*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **177**, (1993), 368–385.
- [2] H. H. Cuenya, *multiplicative factors for function seminorms*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **195** (1995), 440–448.
- [3] W. A. J. Luxemburg, A. C. Zaanen, *Notes on Banach functions spaces, I*, Indag.Math., **25** (1963), 135–147.

- [4] M. J. Meyer, *Some algebras without submultiplicative norms or positive functionals*, *Studia Math.*, **116(3)** (1995), 299–302.
- [5] A. R. Pruss, *A remark on non existence of an algebra norm for the algebra of continuous functions on a topological space admitting an unbounded continuous function*, *Studia Math.*, **116 (3)** (1995), 295–297.
- [6] B. Yood, *On the non existence of norms for some algebras of functions*, *Studia Math.*, **111(1)** (1994) 97–101.