

Remarks on the Multiplicative Products of Distributions

Mitsuyuki ITANO

(Received January 20, 1976)

Many attempts have been made for defining the multiplication between distributions. Y. Hirata and H. Ogata [3] have defined a product of distributions and J. Mikusiński [9] has also defined the same product in a different fashion. In [5], we have considered the multiplication invariant under diffeomorphism which covers the multiplication in the above sense. If $S, T \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$ and if $\alpha S * \check{T}$ has the value $(\alpha S * \check{T})(0)$ at 0 in the sense of S. Łojasiewicz [8] for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(R^N)$, then there exists a unique distribution W such that $\langle W, \alpha \rangle = (\alpha S * \check{T})(0)$. In [10], R. Shiraishi has defined a restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ as a sequence of non-negative functions $\rho_n \in \mathcal{D}(R^N)$ such that

- (i) $\text{supp } \rho_n$ converges to $\{0\}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$
- (ii) $\int \rho_n(x) dx$ converges to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (iii) $\int |x|^{|\alpha|} |D^\alpha \rho_n(x)| dx \leq M_\alpha (M_\alpha \text{ being independent of } n)$,

where the integral is extended over the whole N -dimensional space, and he has shown that the existence of the product $W = S \circ T$ of S and T is equivalent to each of the following conditions:

- (1) The distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S * \rho_n)(T * \tilde{\rho}_n)$ exists for every restricted δ -sequences $\{\rho_n\}$ and $\{\tilde{\rho}_n\}$;
- (2) The distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S * \rho_n)T$ exists for every restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$;
- (3) The distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(T * \rho_n)$ exists for every restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$;

And if one of these conditions is satisfied, the limit equals W .

On the other hand, we may define the multiplicative product $S \Delta T$ as the distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S * \rho_n)(T * \rho_n)$, if it exists for every restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ ([10, p. 97]). The purpose of this paper is to investigate this multiplication Δ by making a comparison with the multiplication \circ .

By the definition stated above we see that if $S \circ T$ exists, then $S \Delta T$ exists and is equal to $S \circ T$. However the converse does not hold ([10, p. 97]).

LEMMA 1. $\delta \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x} = -\frac{1}{2} \delta'$ but $\delta \circ \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ does not exist.

PROOF. Since the distribution $\text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ has not a value at 0, the product $\delta \circ \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ does not exist. For any restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ and any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ we can write

$$\langle \rho_n \left(\frac{1}{x} * \rho \right) \phi \rangle = \langle \frac{1}{x}, \check{\rho}_n * \phi \rho_n \rangle$$

If we write $\phi(x) = \phi(0) + \phi'(0)x + x^2\psi(x)$, then $\psi(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \psi(x) = 2^{-1}\phi''(0)$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x^{-1}(\psi(x) - \psi(0)) = (3!)^{-1}\phi'''(0)$ and so on. Since $\rho_n * \rho_n$ is an even function, $\langle \frac{1}{x}, \rho_n * \rho_n \rangle$ vanishes. Put $\alpha_n = \rho_n * x \rho_n$. Then $\alpha_n = \rho_n * (-x)\check{\rho}_n = (-x)(\rho_n * \check{\rho}_n) + (x\rho_n) * \check{\rho}_n$, $\alpha_n - \check{\alpha}_n = x(\rho_n * \check{\rho}_n)$ and therefore

$$\langle \frac{1}{x}, \alpha_n \rangle = \int_0^\infty (\rho_n * \check{\rho}_n) dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty (\rho_n * \check{\rho}_n) dx = \frac{1}{2}.$$

On the other hand, if we put $\beta_n = \check{\rho}_n * x^2 \psi \rho_n$, then

$$\beta_n'' = \check{\rho}_n * x^2 \psi \rho_n'' + 2\check{\rho}_n * x(2\psi + x\psi')\rho_n' + \check{\rho}_n * (x^2\psi)''\rho_n.$$

By the property (iii) of $\{\rho_n\}$ we see that $\beta_n'(x) = -\int_x^\infty \beta_n''(x) dx$ is bounded and therefore $x^{-1}(\beta_n - \check{\beta}_n) = x^{-1}(\beta_n(x) - \beta_n(0)) + x^{-1}(\beta_n(0) - \check{\beta}_n(x))$ is bounded. Since $\text{supp} \{x^{-1}(\beta_n - \check{\beta}_n)\}$ tends to $\{0\}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we see that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-\infty}^\infty x^{-1}(\beta_n - \check{\beta}_n) dx = 0$. Thus the product $\delta \circ \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ exists and is equal to $-2^{-1}\delta'$.

PROPOSITION 1. For any non-negative integer k , the product $\delta^{(k)} \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^{k+1}}$ exists and

$$\delta^{(k)} \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^{k+1}} = \frac{(-1)^{k+1} k!}{2(2k+1)!} \delta^{(2k+1)}$$

but the product $\delta^{(k)} \circ \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^{k+1}}$ does not exist.

PROOF. Given $S, T \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$, the existence of the product $S \circ T'$ implies the existence of $S' \circ T$ and $S \circ T$ ([5, p. 162]). Thus it follows from Lemma 1 that the product $\delta^{(k)} \circ \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^{k+1}}$ does not exist.

For any restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ and any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\langle (\delta^{(k)} * \rho_n) \left(\frac{1}{x^{k+1}} * \rho_n \right), \phi \rangle = \frac{1}{\kappa!} \left(-\frac{1}{x^k}, (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * \phi \rho_n^{(k)} \right),$$

where we write

$$\phi(x) = \phi(0) + \phi'(0)x + \dots + \frac{1}{(2k+1)!} \phi^{(2k+1)}(0)x^{2k+1} + x^{2k+2}\psi(x).$$

$(\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * \rho_n^{(k)}$ is an even function and

$$(\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x \rho_n^{(k)} = x((\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * \rho_n^{(k)}) - x(\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * \rho_n^{(k)}$$

and therefore we have

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{x}, (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * \rho_n^{(k)} \right\rangle = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{1}{x}, (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x \rho_n^{(k)} \right\rangle &= \int_0^\infty (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * \rho_n^{(k)} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * \rho_n^{(k)} dx = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & (k=0), \\ 0 & (k \geq 1). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Let $f \in \mathcal{L}'$ and put $\beta_{l,n}(x) = (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^l \rho_n^{(k)}$ for $0 \leq l \leq 2k+1$. For $l=2p+1$, $p=1, 2, \dots$, $f \in \mathcal{L}'$, we can write

$$\beta_{l,n}(x) = x \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{2p} (-x)^i (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^{2p-i} \rho_n^{(k)} \right\} - x^{2p+1} (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * \rho_n^{(k)}$$

and hence

$$\beta_{l,n}(x) - \rho_{l,n}^{\mathcal{L}'}(-x) = x \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{2p} (-x)^i (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^{2p-i} \rho_n^{(k)} \right\}$$

If $p < k$, then $i + (2p - i) = 2p < 2k$ and therefore either i or $2p - i$ is less than k . Moreover the function $\sum_{i=0}^{2p} (-x)^i (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^{2p-i} \rho_n^{(k)}$ is an even function with compact support. Thus we have

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{x}, \beta_{l,n} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{2p} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \{ (-x)^i (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^{2p-i} \rho_n^{(k)} \} dx = 0.$$

In the case where $p = k$, we have

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{x}, \beta_{2k+1,n} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \{ (-x)^i (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^{2k-i} \rho_n^{(k)} \} dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \{(-x)^k (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^k \rho_n^{(k)}\} dx \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x^k \rho_n^{(k)}) dx \right\}^2 = \frac{1}{2} (k!)^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

For $l=2p, p=1, 2, \dots$, fe, we can write

$$\beta_{l,n}(x) - \beta_{l,n}(-x) = x \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{2p-1} (-x)^i (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^{2p-i-1} \rho_n^{(k)} \right\},$$

where $\sum_{i=0}^{2p-1} (-x)^i (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^{2p-i-1} \rho_n^{(k)}$ is an even function and either i or $2p-i-1$ is less than fc. Thus we have

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x} (\beta_n(x) - \beta_n(-x)) dx = 0.$$

For $\beta_n(x) = (\rho_n^{(k)})^\vee * x^{2k+2} \psi \rho_n^{(k)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta_n'' &= (-1)^k \check{\rho}_n * (x^{2k+2} \psi \rho_n^{(k)})^{(k+2)} \\
 &= (-1)^k \sum_{j=0}^{k+2} \binom{k+2}{j} (\check{\rho}_n * (x^{2k+2} \psi)^{(j)} \rho_n^{(2k+2-j)}).
 \end{aligned}$$

By the property (iii) of $\{\rho_n\}$ we see that $\beta_n' = -\int_x^\infty \beta_n''(x) dx$ is bounded and so is $x^{-1}(\beta_n(x) - \beta_n(-x))$. Moreover $\text{supp} \{x^{-1}(\beta_n(x) - \beta_n(-x))\}$ tends to $\{0\}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1}(\beta_n(x) - \beta_n(-x)) = 0$.

Consequently the product $\delta^{(k)} \Delta \text{Pf. } x^{\frac{1}{k+1}}$ exists and is equal to $\frac{(-1)^{k+1} k!}{2 (2k+1)!} \delta^{(2k+1)}$.

In [1], B. Fisher has introduced the product of two distributions on the open interval (a, b) , $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$, as the distributional limit of $(S * \delta_n)(T * \delta_n)$, where $\delta_n(x) = n\rho(nx)$ and p is a fixed C^∞ function having the following properties: (1) $\rho(x) = 0$ for $|x| \geq 1$, (2) $\rho(x) \geq 0$, (3) $p(x) = \rho(-x)$, (4) $\int_{-1}^1 \rho(x) dx = 1$ and (5) $\rho^{(r)}(x)$ has only r changes of sign for $r = 1, 2, \dots$. And he has shown that the product of the distributions $\delta^{(k)}$ and $\text{Pf. } x^{\frac{1}{k+1}}$ in his sense exists and equals $\frac{(-1)^{k+1} k!}{2 (2k+1)!} \delta^{(2k+1)}$ for any non-negative integer fc.

In our previous paper [6] with collaboration of S. Hatano, we have shown that the product of the distributions $\delta^{(k)}$ and $\text{Pf. } x^{\frac{1}{k+1}}$ in the sense of H. G. Tillmann exists and the same result as above holds true.

In the proof of Proposition 2 below we shall need the following lemma, which we have shown in [4, p. 71].

LEMMA 2. Let E and F be spaces of type (F). Let G be a locally convex space. If a family of separately continuous bilinear maps u_α , $\alpha \in A$, of $E \times F$ into G is bounded at each point of $E \times F$, then $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ is equicontinuous.

PROPOSITION 2. Let $S, T \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^N)$. If the multiplicative product $(S^*(\alpha T)^\vee)^\Delta \delta$ exists for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then the product $S_\Delta T$ exists.

PROOF. Let K be any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^N and let $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_K$. There exist two compact subsets K' and K'' of \mathbb{R}^N such that $K \subset K''$ and $K'' \subset \overset{\circ}{K}'$. Let $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\alpha_1 = 1$ on K' and

$$\alpha_1 S^*(\psi T)^\vee = S^*(\psi T)^\vee$$

in a 0-neighbourhood for any $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{K''}$. Then we have

$$(\alpha_1 S^*(\psi T)^\vee)^\Delta \delta = (S^*(\psi T)^\vee)^\Delta \delta, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{K''}.$$

For $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{K''}$ such that $\alpha_2 = 1$ in a small neighbourhood of K we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (S^* \rho_n)(T^* \rho_n), \phi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\alpha_1 S^* \rho_n)(\alpha_2 T^* \rho_n), \phi \rangle,$$

where $\{\rho_n\}$ is any restricted δ -sequence.

To estimate the right hand side of the equation we may assume that φ is a periodic function with period $2l$ for each coordinate where l is taken large enough. Thus we can write

$$\phi = \sum c_m e^{i\frac{\pi}{l} \langle m, x \rangle},$$

where $\sum |c_m| (1 + |m|)^k < \infty$ for any positive integer k . Writing $e(m) = e^{i\frac{\pi}{l} \langle m, x \rangle}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\alpha_1 S^* \rho_n)(\alpha_2 T^* \rho_n), \varphi \rangle &= \sum c_m \langle (\alpha_1 S^* \rho_n)(\alpha_2 T^* \rho_n), e(m) \rangle \\ &= \sum c_m \langle \alpha_1 S^* \rho_n, e(m) \alpha_2 T^* \rho_n e(m) \rangle \\ &= \sum c_m \langle \alpha_1 S^*(e(m) \alpha_2 T)^\vee, \check{\rho}_n * \rho_n e(m) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since the product $(\alpha_1 S^*(\psi T)^\vee)^\Delta \delta$ exists for any $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{K''}$, we can write for any $\chi \in \mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\alpha_1 S^*(\psi T)^\vee)^\Delta \delta, \chi \rangle &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\alpha_1 S^*(\psi T)^\vee * \rho_n) \rho_n, \chi \rangle \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \alpha_1 S^*(\psi T)^\vee, \check{\rho}_n * \rho_n \chi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here the map

$$(\psi, \chi) \longrightarrow \langle \alpha_1 S^*(\psi T)^\vee, \check{\rho}_n * \rho_n \chi \rangle$$

of $\mathcal{D}_{K''} \times \mathcal{B}$ into the complex number field is separately continuous for any ρ_n and the family of maps is bounded at each point of $\mathcal{D}_{K''} \times \mathcal{B}$. By virtue of Lemma 2 this family of maps is equicontinuous. Thus there exist a constant M and a positive constant k such that

$$| \langle \alpha_1 S^*(\psi T)^\vee, \check{\rho}_n * \rho_n \chi \rangle | \leq M \sup_{|p| \leq k} |D^p \psi| \sup_{|p| \leq k} |D^p \chi|$$

and consequently there exists a constant M' such that

$$| \langle \alpha_1 S^*(e(m)\alpha_2 T)^\vee, \check{\rho}_n * \rho_n e(m) \rangle | \leq M'(1 + |m|)^{2k}.$$

From $\sum |c_m|(1 + |m|)^{2k} < \infty$ it follows that $\sum c_m \langle \alpha_1 S^*(e(m)\alpha_2 T)^\vee, \check{\rho}_n * \rho_n e(m) \rangle$ is normally convergent. Furthermore each term has a limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the multiplicative product $S_\Delta T$ exists.

PROPOSITION 3. *Let $S, T \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$. If the multiplicative product $S_\Delta \beta T$ exists for any $\beta \in \mathcal{E}(R^N)$, then the product $(S^*(\alpha T)^\vee)_\Delta \delta$ exists for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(R^N)$.*

PROOF. Let K be any compact subset of R^N and take a compact subset K_1 with $K \subset \overset{\circ}{K}_1$. If we take $\beta \in \mathcal{D}(R^N)$ such that $\beta = 1$ on K_1 , then $\beta S^*(\alpha T)^\vee = S^*(\alpha T)^\vee$ in a 0-neighbourhood for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_K$. From the fact that

$$(1 - \beta) S_\Delta (\alpha T)^\vee = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ((1 - \beta) S * \rho_n) ((\alpha T)^\vee * \rho_n) = 0,$$

it follows that the multiplicative product $\beta S_\Delta \alpha T$ exists for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_K$ and equals $S_\Delta \alpha T$. Thus we have for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(R^N)$

$$\langle (S^*(\alpha T)^\vee)_\Delta \delta, \varphi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\beta S^*(\alpha T)^\vee * \rho_n) \rho_n, \varphi \rangle$$

if the right hand side exists. In the same way as in the proof of Proposition 2 we can write

$$\varphi = \sum c_m e^{i\frac{\pi}{l} \langle x, m \rangle} = \sum c_m e(m),$$

where $\sum |c_m|(1 + |m|)^k < \infty$ for any positive integer k and l is taken sufficiently large. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\beta S^*(\alpha T)^\vee * \rho_n) \rho_n, \phi \rangle &= \sum c_m \langle \beta S^*(\alpha T)^\vee, \check{\rho}_n * \rho_n e(m) \rangle \\ &= \sum c_m \langle \beta S, (\alpha T) * \check{\rho}_n * \rho_n e(m) \rangle \\ &= \sum c_m \langle (\beta S * \rho_n)(e(-m)\alpha T * \rho_n), e(m) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By the existence of the product $\beta S_\Delta \chi T$ for any $\chi \in \mathcal{D}_K$ there exist a constant M and a positive integer k such that

$$| \langle (\beta S * \rho_n)(\chi T * \rho_n) \psi \rangle | \leq M \sup_{|p| \leq k} |D^p \chi| \sup_{|p| \leq k} |D^p \psi|$$

for any $\psi \in \mathcal{E}$ and therefore we have the inequality

$$| \langle (\beta S * \rho_n)(e(-m)\alpha T * \rho_n), e(m) \rangle | \leq M_1(1 + |m|)^{2k}$$

with a constant M_1 . Thus the sequence $\Sigma c_m \langle (\beta S * \rho_n)(e(-m)\alpha T * \rho_n), e(m) \rangle$ is normally convergent and we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\beta S * \rho_n)(e(-m)\alpha T * \rho_n), e(m) \rangle = \langle \beta S * e(-m)\alpha T, e(m) \rangle.$$

Consequently we see that the limit of $\langle (\beta S * (\alpha T)^\vee * \rho_n) \rho_n \phi \rangle$ exists as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which means that the product $(\beta S * (\alpha T)^\vee) \Delta \delta = (S * (\alpha T)^\vee) \Delta \delta$ exists.

Now recall the definition of the multiplicative product ST of $S \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $T \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in the sense of Y. Hirata-H. Ogata and J. Mikusiński. The product ST is defined as one of the limits of the sequences in the following equivalent conditions ([11]):

- (1) The distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S * \rho_n)(T * \tilde{\rho}_n)$ exists for every δ -sequences $\{\rho_n\}$ and $\{\tilde{\rho}_n\}$;
- (2) The distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S * \rho_n)T$ exists for every δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$;
- (3) The distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(T * \rho_n)$ exists for every δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$.

Here a δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ is a sequence of non-negative functions $\rho_n \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with the following properties:

- (i) $\text{supp } \rho_n$ converges to $\{0\}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) $\int \rho_n(x) dx = 1$, the integral being extended to the whole N -dimensional space.

In [11, p. 229] we showed that ST exists if and only if, for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there exists a 0-neighbourhood in which $\alpha S * \check{T}$ is a bounded function continuous at 0 and that $\langle ST, \alpha \rangle = (\alpha S * \check{T})(0)$ in this case.

We may define the multiplicative product $S \cdot T$ as the distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S * \rho_n)(T * \rho_n)$, if it exists for every δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$. Since the property (iii) of a restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ does not play any role in the proofs of the above two propositions, we have the analogues of Propositions 2 and 3 for such multiplication.

PROPOSITION 4. *Let $S, T \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^N)$. If the product $(S * (\alpha T)^\vee) \delta$ exists for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then the product $S \cdot T$ exists.*

PROPOSITION 5. *Let $S, T \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^N)$. If the product $S \beta T$ exists for any $\beta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then the product $(S * (\alpha T)^\vee) \delta$ exists for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

REMARK. Let $\{\rho_n\}$ be any fixed δ -sequence. We may define another multiplicative product of $SE \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$ and $T \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$ as the distributional limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S^* \rho_n)(T * \rho_n)$, if it exists. For such multiplication we have also the analogues of Propositions 4 and 5.

We have shown in [5, p. 162] that if the products $S \circ \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_j}$ exist for $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, then the products $S \circ T$ and $\frac{\partial S}{\partial x_j} \circ T$ exist for $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} (S \circ T) = \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_j} \circ T + S \circ \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_j}$ holds. The same property holds also true of the multiplicative product ST . But the statement is not true in general for the multiplication Δ . Let $N = 1$. The product $\delta' \circ \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^2}$ exists but the product $\delta' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ does not exist. In fact, let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(R)$ such that $\rho \geq 0$ and $\int \rho(x) dx = 1$, and put $\rho_n(x) = n\rho(nx)$. Then $\{\rho_n\}$ is a restricted δ -sequence and we have

$$\left\langle \left(\frac{1}{x} * \rho_n \right) \rho'_n, \varphi \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{1}{x}, \rho'_n \phi * \check{\rho}_n \right\rangle$$

for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(R)$. If we take $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(R)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ in a 0-neighbourhood, then for a sufficiently large n we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{1}{x}, \rho'_n * \check{\rho}_n \right\rangle &= n^2 \left\langle \frac{1}{x}, \rho' * \check{\rho} \right\rangle \\ &= 2n^2 \int_0^\infty x^{-2} (\rho * \check{\rho}(x) - \rho * \check{\rho}(0)) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho * \check{\rho} \geq 0$ and $\rho * \check{\rho}(0) = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \rho^2(x) dx$. In the relations

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho * \check{\rho})^2 &= \left(\int \rho(x-t) \rho(-t) dt \right)^2 \\ &\cong \left(\int \rho^2(x-t) dt \right) \left(\int \rho^2(-t) dt \right) = (\rho * \check{\rho}(0))^2, \end{aligned}$$

the equality does not hold and therefore

$$\int_0^\infty x^{-2} (\rho * \check{\rho}(x) - \rho * \check{\rho}(0)) dx < 0.$$

Thus $\left\langle \left(\frac{1}{x} * \rho_n \right) \rho'_n, \Phi \right\rangle$ does not converge. This means the product $\delta' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ does not exist.

Moreover the product $\delta'' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ does not exist. In fact, for any restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ and any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(R)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho_n'' \left(\frac{1}{x} * \rho_n \right), \phi \rangle &= \langle \frac{1}{x}, \rho_n'' \phi * \check{\rho}_n \rangle \\ &= \langle \frac{1}{x}, (\rho_n' \phi)' * \check{\rho}_n - \rho_n' \phi' * \check{\rho}_n \rangle \\ &= \langle \frac{1}{x^2}, \rho_n' \phi * \check{\rho}_n \rangle - \langle \rho_n'' \left(\frac{1}{x} * \rho_n \right), \phi' \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

From the facts that the product $\delta' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^2}$ exists but the product $\delta' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ does not exist it follows that $\langle \frac{1}{x^2}, \rho_n' \phi * \check{\rho}_n \rangle$ converges to $\langle \delta' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^2}, \phi \rangle$ but $\langle \rho_n'' \left(\frac{1}{x} * \rho_n \right), \phi' \rangle$ does not converge as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and therefore $\langle \rho_n'' \left(\frac{1}{x} * \rho_n \right), \phi \rangle$ does not converge.

It is easily shown that if the products $S \Delta T$ and $S \Delta \frac{\hat{\cdot} T}{\cup \alpha_j}$ exist for $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, then the product $\frac{\partial S}{\partial x_j} \Delta T$ exists and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} (S \Delta T) = \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_j} \Delta T + S \Delta \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_j}$ holds. From the facts that $\delta \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ exists but $\delta' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ does not exist it follows that $\delta \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^2}$ does not exist.

We have shown in [5, p. 162] that if the product $S \circ T$ exists, then $(\alpha S) \circ T$ and $S \circ (\alpha T)$ exists for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(R^N)$ and $(\alpha S) \circ T = \alpha (S \circ T) = S \circ (\alpha T)$. The same property holds also true of the multiplicative product ST . But the statement is not true in general for $S \Delta T$. In fact, let $N = 1$ and take $S = \delta'$ and $T = \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^2}$. Then the product $\delta' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^2}$ exists but $\delta' \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$ and $\delta \Delta \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x^2}$ do not exist. On the other hand, if we take $S = \delta$ and $T = \text{Pf.} \frac{1}{x}$, then $(\alpha S) \Delta T = -\frac{\alpha(0)}{2} \delta'$ and $\alpha(S \Delta T) = \frac{1}{2} \alpha'(0) \delta - \frac{\alpha(0)}{2} \delta'$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(R)$ and therefore $\alpha(S \Delta T)$ is not equal to $(\alpha S) \Delta T$ in general.

Let S, T be tempered distributions on R^N and suppose S and T are \mathcal{S}' -composable, that is, $(S_x \otimes T_y) \phi(\hat{x} + \hat{y}) \in (\mathcal{D}'_{L,1})$ for any $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(R^N)$. Then the product Sf exists and $(S * T)^\wedge = ST$ ([3, p. 151]). Furthermore $(S * \rho_n) (f * \check{\rho}_n)$ converges in $\mathcal{S}'(R^N)$ to $\hat{S} \hat{T}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any δ -sequences $\{\rho_n\}$ and $\{\check{\rho}_n\}$ ([11, p. 233]). Thus, if S and T are \mathcal{S}' -composable, then $\hat{S} \Delta \hat{T}$ exists, $\hat{S} \Delta \hat{T} = (S * T)^\wedge$ and $(\hat{S} * \rho_n) (\hat{T} * \rho_n)$ converges to $\hat{S} \Delta \hat{T}$ in $\mathcal{S}'(R^N)$ for any restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$

PROPOSITION 6. *Let $S \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent to each other:*

- (1) $S \in \mathcal{E}(R^N)$.
- (2) $S \Delta T$ exists for any $T \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$.

(3) $S_{\Delta}T$ exists for any $T \in \mathcal{E}'(R^N)$.

PROOF. It suffices to prove the implications (1) \Rightarrow (2) and (3) \Rightarrow (1).

(1) \Rightarrow (2). Let $S \in \mathcal{E}'(R^N)$. Then the product ST exists for any $T \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$, and a fortiori $S_{\Delta}T$ exists.

(3) \Rightarrow (1). Suppose $S_{\Delta}T$ exists for any $T \in \mathcal{E}'(R^N)$. For any restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$, the map

$$T \longrightarrow (S*\rho_n)(T*\rho_n)$$

of $\mathcal{E}'(R^N)$ into $\mathcal{D}'(R^N)$ is continuous and $\mathcal{E}'(R^N)$ is a barrelled space. By the Banach-Steinhaus theorem the map $\mathcal{E}'(R^N) \ni T \rightarrow \lim (S*\rho_n)(T*\rho_n) = S_{\Delta}T \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$ is continuous, and therefore for any $\phi \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$ there exists an element $\phi(S) \in \mathcal{E}'(R^N)$ such that

$$\langle S_{\Delta}T, \phi \rangle = \langle \phi(S), T \rangle.$$

If we take $\Gamma = \alpha \in \mathcal{D}'(R^N)$, then $\langle S_{\Delta}\alpha, \phi \rangle = \langle \alpha S, \phi \rangle = \langle \phi S, \alpha \rangle$. Thus $\phi S = \phi(S) \in \mathcal{E}'(R^N)$, which implies $S \in \mathcal{E}'(R^N)$.

Let ξ be a C^∞ map of a non-empty open subset $\Omega \subset R^N$ into another open subset $\Omega' \subset R^n$. If the map $\xi^*: \mathcal{D}'(\Omega') \ni \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \circ \xi \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ is continuously extended to the map of $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ (or equivalently of $\mathcal{E}'(\Omega)$) into $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega')$, then the map ξ is said to be admissible ([7, p. 76]) and ξ^*S is said to be the transposed image of $S \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega')$. Then we see that $n \leq N$ ([7, p. 77]).

Let ξ and η be C^∞ maps of a non-empty open subset $\Omega \subset R^N$ into another open subsets $\Omega_1 \subset R^p$ and $\Omega_2 \subset R^q$ respectively, and assume the map $\chi = (\xi, \eta)$ of Ω into $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ has no critical point. By the facts that the multiplication \circ is invariant under the diffeomorphism and has the local property ([5, pp. 162-165]) we conclude that the multiplicative product $(\xi^*S)_{\Delta}(\eta^*T)$ exists for every $S \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega_1)$ and $T \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega_2)$.

PROPOSITION 7. Let ξ be an admissible map of $\Omega \subset R^N$ into $\Omega_1 \subset R^p$ and η be an admissible map of Ω into $\Omega_2 \subset R^q$. If the multiplicative product $(\xi^*S)_{\Delta}(\eta^*T)$ exists for every $S \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega_1)$ and $T \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega_2)$, then the map $\chi = (\xi, \eta)$ is admissible.

PROOF. Let $\{\rho_n\}$ be any restricted δ -sequence defined in Ω and consider the map

$$(S, T) \longrightarrow ((\xi^*S)*\rho_n)((\eta^*T)*\rho_n)$$

of $\mathcal{E}'(\Omega_1) \times \mathcal{E}'(\Omega_2)$ into $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ for a large n . It is a separately continuous bilinear map for each ρ_n and $((\xi^*S)*\rho_n)((\eta^*T)*\rho_n)$ converges in $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ to $(\xi^*S)_{\Delta}$

(η^*T) as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\mathcal{E}'(\Omega_1)$ and $\mathcal{E}'(\Omega_2)$ are barrelled, the bilinear map

$$(S, T) \longrightarrow (\xi^*S) \wedge (\eta^*T)$$

of $\mathcal{E}'(\Omega_1) \times \mathcal{E}'(\Omega_2)$ into $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ is hypocontinuous. Owing to the theorem of Grothendieck ([2, p. 66]), since $\mathcal{E}'(\Omega_1)$ and $\mathcal{E}'(\Omega_2)$ are (DF)-spaces, the map is continuous and therefore it can be continuously extended to the map of $\mathcal{E}'(\Omega_1) \hat{\otimes}_\pi \mathcal{E}'(\Omega_2) = \mathcal{E}'(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ into $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$; this means that the map $\chi = (\xi, \eta)$ is admissible.

Since the property (iii) of a restricted δ -sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ does not play any role in the proofs of the above two propositions, the analogues of Propositions 6 and 7 remain valid for the multiplication.

References

- [1] B. Fisher, *The product of the distributions x^{-r} and $\delta_{(x)}^{(r-1)}$* , Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 72 (1972), 201-204.
- [2] A. Grothendieck, *Sur les espaces (F) et (DF)*, Summa Brasil Math. 3 (1954), 57-122.
- [3] Y. Hirata and H. Ogata, *On the exchange formula for distributions*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I 22 (1958), 147-152.
- [4] M. Itano, *On the multiplicative products of distributions*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I 29 (1965), 51-74.
- [5] ———, *On the theory of the multiplicative products of distributions*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I 30 (1966), 151-181.
- [6] ——— and s. Hatano, *Note on the multiplicative products of x^r and δ_x^r* , Mem. Fac. Gen. Ed. Hiroshima Univ. III 8 (1974), 159-174.
- [7] ——— and A. Jóichi, *On C^∞ maps which admit transposed image of every distribution*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I 31 (1967), 75-88.
- [8] S. Łojasiewicz, *Sur la valeur et la limite d'une distribution dans un point*, Studia Math. 16 (1957), 1-36.
- [9] J. Mikusiński, *Criteria of the existence and of the associativity of the product of distributions*, Studia Math. 21 (1962), 253-259.
- [10] R. Shiraishi, *On the value of distributions at a point and the multiplicative products*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I 31 (1967), 89-104.
- [11] ——— and M. Itano, *On the multiplicative products of distributions*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I 28 (1964), 223-235.

*Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences,
Hiroshima University*

