

## PARAMETRIC DIFFERENTIATION

BY

M. J. EVANS AND P. D. HUMKE (MACOMB, ILLINOIS)

**1. Introduction.** By a *parameter*  $\varphi$  we mean a continuous real-valued function defined on  $[0, 1]$  with  $\varphi(0) = 0$  and having the property that there is a positive number  $\delta_\varphi$  such that both of the functions  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  ( $\psi(h) \equiv \varphi(h) + h$ ) are strictly monotone on  $[0, \delta_\varphi)$ . Let  $P$  be the collection of all parameters. If  $f$  is a real-valued function defined on  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $x \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $\varphi \in P$ , define the *lower  $\varphi$ -derivative* of  $f$  at  $x$  by

$$D_\varphi f(x) = \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+} [f(x - \varphi(h)) - f(x - \varphi(h) - h)]/h.$$

The *upper  $\varphi$ -derivative*,  $D^\varphi f(x)$ , is defined analogously; and if  $D_\varphi f(x) = D^\varphi f(x)$ , denote the common value by  $f^\varphi(x)$  and call this the  *$\varphi$ -derivative* of  $f$  at  $x$ . This notion was introduced by Sindalovskii [6]. He, however, did not require  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  to be monotone and continuous.

The parameter class  $P$  naturally splits into three sets,  $S$ ,  $R$ , and  $L$ , according to whether for  $0 < h < \delta_\varphi$  we have  $-h < \varphi(h) < 0$ ,  $\varphi(h) < -h$ , or  $\varphi(h) > 0$ , respectively. From the viewpoint of a generalized type of differentiation we found  $R$  and  $L$  to be not very interesting, since, for example, it is an elementary matter to see that if  $\varphi \in R$  [ $L$ ] and a continuous function  $f$  has a  $\varphi$ -derivative at  $x$ , then  $f$  has a right [left] derivative at  $x$ . Consequently, most of the results in this paper concern parameters  $\varphi$  in  $S$ .

Following Sindalovskii, we say that a parameter  $\varphi$  has *property  $S'_a$*  if, for every set  $P$  which has zero as a point of density, either  $\varphi^{-1}(P)$  or  $\psi^{-1}(P)$  has positive lower density at zero; and  $\varphi$  has *property  $S''_a$*  if there are a  $\varrho$  ( $0 < \varrho < 1$ ) and a  $\delta$  ( $0 < \delta < \delta_\varphi$ ) such that for every  $x \in (0, \delta)$  and every closed set  $P \subseteq [0, x]$  with  $|P| > (1 - \varrho)x$  we have either

$$|\varphi(P)| > \varrho |\varphi(x)| \quad \text{and} \quad |\varphi(x)| > \varrho x$$

or

$$|\psi(P)| > \varrho |\psi(x)| \quad \text{and} \quad |\psi(x)| > \varrho x,$$

where  $\varrho$  depends only on  $\varphi$ . We then let  $S^*$  denote the class of all parameters in  $S$  which have properties  $S'_a$  and  $S''_a$ . Examples of such parameters are those of the form  $\varphi(h) = ch^a$ , where  $c < 0$ ,  $a \geq 1$ , and  $c \neq -1$  if  $a = 1$ . In particular, the familiar notion of symmetric differentiation is obtained by taking  $c = -1/2$  and  $a = 1$ .

The following result is a special case of a more general theorem in [6]:

**THEOREM S.** *Let  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be measurable and let  $\varphi \in S^*$ . If  $D^\varphi f(x) < +\infty$  for almost every  $x \in \mathbf{R}$ , then  $f$  is differentiable almost everywhere.*

In particular, this theorem entails that if  $f$  is  $\varphi$ -differentiable almost everywhere, then it is differentiable almost everywhere. In Section 2 of this paper we further show that  $f$  must be differentiable except on a first category set. (If a property holds for every  $x$  except for those in a first category set, we adopt the notation of saying that the property holds for *nearly every*  $x$ .)

In Section 3 we prove a monotonicity theorem involving the  $\varphi$ -derivative and examine some consequences. One consequence is that if a measurable function  $f$  has a finite  $\varphi$ -derivative on  $\mathbf{R}$ , where  $\varphi \in S^*$ , and if  $f^\varphi$  is bounded from above or from below, then  $f^\varphi$  must belong to the Baire class one.

**2. Parametric and ordinary differentiation.** From Theorem S it follows that if  $\varphi \in S^*$  and a function  $f$  is  $\varphi$ -differentiable almost everywhere on  $\mathbf{R}$ , then  $f$  is actually differentiable almost everywhere on  $\mathbf{R}$ . In this section we augment this result by showing that such an  $f$  will be differentiable nearly everywhere. We begin by establishing a relation between the  $\varphi$ -derivatives and the so-called strong derivatives of a function. The *lower strong derivative* of  $f$  at  $x$  is defined by

$$D_* f(x) = \liminf_{\substack{(\xi, \eta) \rightarrow (x, x) \\ \xi \neq \eta}} [f(\xi) - f(\eta)] / (\xi - \eta),$$

and the *upper strong derivative* is defined analogously (cf. [1]).

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  has the Baire property, then for any  $\varphi \in P$  both of the following equalities hold nearly everywhere:*

- (i)  $D_\varphi f(x) = D_* f(x)$ ,
- (ii)  $D^\varphi f(x) = D^* f(x)$ .

**Proof.** Sentence (ii) follows from (i) by considering the function  $-f$ ; consequently, we need only to prove (i).

Clearly,  $D_\varphi f(x) \geq D_* f(x)$  for every  $x \in \mathbf{R}$ , and hence it suffices to show that the set  $A(f) = \{x: D_\varphi f(x) > D_* f(x)\}$  is of the first category. Furthermore,  $A(f)$  is the countable union of all the sets

$$A(f, a) \equiv \{x: D_\varphi f(x) > a > D_* f(x)\} \quad (a \text{ rational}),$$

and as for each  $A(f, a)$  we have  $A(f, a) = A(g_a, 0)$ , where  $g_a(x) = f(x) - ax$ , we need only to show that  $A(f, 0)$  is of the first category. For each positive integer  $n$ , set

$$\Phi_n = \{x: f(x - \varphi(h)) \leq f(x - \varphi(h) - h) \text{ for } 0 < h < 1/n\}.$$

Then  $A(f, 0)$  clearly equals the countable union of all the sets  $A_n(f, 0) \equiv \Phi_n \cap A(f, 0)$ .

Now, suppose that  $A_n(f, 0)$  is of the second category. Then  $A_n(f, 0)$  is of the second category in every open subinterval of some open interval  $I$ . But, according to the following lemma, this implies that  $D_+ f(x) \geq 0$  for each  $x$  in some subinterval  $J$  of  $I$ ; that is,  $A_n(f, 0) \cap J = \emptyset$ , a contradiction. Hence, by proving the following lemma, we complete the proof of the theorem.

**LEMMA.** *Let  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  have the Baire property and let  $\varphi \in P$ . If  $\Phi_n$  is of the second category on every open subinterval of the open interval  $I$ , then  $f$  is nondecreasing on some open subinterval  $J$  of  $I$ .*

**Proof.** Without loss of generality we assume  $|I| < 1/n$  and choose a  $\delta'$  such that  $0 < \delta' < \delta$  and

$$(1) \quad |\varphi(\delta')| + \delta' < |I|/3.$$

Let  $J$  be the open interval with the same center as  $I$ , but having length  $\delta'$ . It is this interval  $J$  on which  $f$  is nondecreasing. To see this, let  $a$  and  $b$  belong to  $J$  with  $a < b$ , let  $\Sigma$  be a residual subset of  $\mathbf{R}$  such that  $f|_{\Sigma}$  is continuous, let  $c \in \Sigma \cap (a, b)$ , and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We will show that  $f(a) \leq f(c) \leq f(b)$ . Suppose  $L$  is an open interval in  $(a, b)$  with  $c \in L$  such that

$$|f(x) - f(c)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in \Sigma \cap L.$$

Set  $H = \{h: a + h \in L\}$  and  $K = \{x: x = a + \varphi(h) + h, h \in H\}$ . Clearly,  $K$  is an interval and  $K \subseteq I$  because of (1). Now,  $\{x: x = a + \varphi(h) + h, a + h \in L \cap \Sigma\}$  is residual in  $K$ , and  $\Phi_n$  is of the second category in  $K$ . Hence, there are an  $x_0 \in K \cap \Phi_n$  and an  $h_0 \in H$  such that  $x_0 = a + \varphi(h_0) + h_0$  and  $a + h_0 \in L \cap \Sigma$ . Then

$$0 \leq f(x_0 - \varphi(h_0)) - f(x_0 - \varphi(h_0) - h_0) = f(a + h_0) - f(a) \leq f(c) + \varepsilon - f(a),$$

and since this holds for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have  $f(a) \leq f(c)$ . Next, let  $H' = \{h: b - h \in L\}$  and  $K' = \{x: x = b + \varphi(h), h \in H'\}$ . As before,  $K'$  is an interval and  $K' \subseteq I$ . Also  $\{x: x = b + \varphi(h), b - h \in L\}$  is residual in  $K'$  and  $\Phi_n$  is of the second category in  $K'$ . Hence, there are an  $x_1 \in K' \cap \Phi_n$  and an  $h_1 \in H'$  such that  $x_1 = b + \varphi(h_1)$  and  $b - h_1 \in L \cap \Sigma$ . Then

$$0 \leq f(x_1 - \varphi(h_1)) - f(x_1 - \varphi(h_1) - h_1) = f(b) - f(b - h_1) \leq f(b) - f(c) + \varepsilon.$$

Consequently,  $f(c) \leq f(b)$  and the lemma is proved.

We are now in a position to state the main result of this section.

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be measurable and let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^*$ . If  $f$  is  $\varphi$ -differentiable almost everywhere, then  $f$  is differentiable (almost everywhere and) nearly everywhere.*

**Proof.** As Sindalovskii [6] points out,  $f^\varphi(x)$  can be infinite only on a set of measure zero and, as a consequence, Theorem S guarantees that  $f$  is differentiable almost everywhere. Thus,  $f$  must have the Baire property, and Theorem 1 shows that  $f$  is differentiable nearly everywhere.

**3. Monotonicity and related results.** If we let  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be the characteristic function of a point, and let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^*$ , we see that  $f^\varphi \equiv 0$ . So, the fact that  $f^\varphi$  is nonnegative need not imply that  $f$  is monotone unless something in addition to measurability is assumed for  $f$ . The Darboux property is a sufficient condition; indeed, membership in the class  $M_{-1}$ , introduced in [2], is necessary and sufficient as the next theorem shows.

**Definition.** A function  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  belongs to the class  $M_{-1}$  if  $f$  is measurable and if for each  $x \in \mathbf{R}$  we have

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow x} f(t) \leq f(x) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow x} f(t).$$

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $f \in M_{-1}$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^*$ . If  $f$  has a nonnegative  $\varphi$ -derivative at each point in  $\mathbf{R}$ , then  $f$  is nondecreasing on  $\mathbf{R}$ .*

**Proof.** Assume that  $f^\varphi(x) > 0$  for each  $x$ . The general case then follows by considering the function  $f(x) + \varepsilon x$  for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

Suppose there are two numbers  $a$  and  $b$  with  $a < b$  and  $f(a) > f(b)$ . From Theorem S we see that  $f$  is continuous almost everywhere. Let  $x_0$  be a point of continuity of  $f$  in  $(a, b)$  and let  $\alpha$  be a number in  $(f(b), f(a))$  different from  $f(x_0)$ . Then we are assured that one of the two sets  $E^\alpha = \{x \in [a, b]: f(x) \leq \alpha\}$  or  $E_\alpha = \{x \in [a, b]: f(x) \geq \alpha\}$  must contain a subinterval of  $(a, b)$ . For definiteness, suppose  $E^\alpha$  contains such a subinterval. (The other situation is handled analogously.) Let  $(c, d)$  be an interval in  $E^\alpha$  such that

$$(2) \quad c = \inf \{x: (x, d) \subseteq E^\alpha\}.$$

Since  $f^\varphi(c) > 0$ , there is a number  $\delta$  such that  $0 < \delta < \delta_\varphi$  and

$$(3) \quad f(c - \varphi(h) - h) < f(c - \varphi(h)) \quad \text{for all } 0 < h < \delta.$$

Hence,  $f(x) \leq \alpha$  for all  $x \in (c - \varphi(\delta) - \delta, d) - \{c\}$ . But since  $f \in M_{-1}$ , it follows that  $f(c) \leq \alpha$ ; that is,

$$(4) \quad c \in E^\alpha.$$

Since  $f(a) > \alpha$ , we see that  $c > a$  and that (2) conflicts with (3) and (4). This contradiction completes the proof.

Next we prove a slight generalization of this theorem which will be used later in this section.

**COROLLARY 1.** *Let  $f \in M_{-1}$  and  $\varphi \in S^*$ . Suppose that  $f$  has a finite  $\varphi$ -derivative everywhere in  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $f^\varphi(x) \geq 0$  for almost every  $x$  in  $\mathbf{R}$ . Then  $f$  is nondecreasing.*

*Proof.* Let  $E = \{x: f^\varphi(x) < 0\}$  and let  $g$  be a continuous nondecreasing function on  $\mathbf{R}$  such that  $g'(x) = +\infty$  for each  $x \in E$ . (Such a function  $g$  exists according to Theorem 6 in [5]). Let  $\varepsilon$  be a positive number and set  $F(x) = f(x) + \varepsilon g(x)$ . Theorem 3 indicates that  $F$  is nondecreasing, and since this holds for each positive  $\varepsilon$ , the result follows.

In the example given in the first paragraph of this section we saw an instance of a measurable function  $f$  for which  $f^\varphi(x) \geq 0$  for every  $x$  and yet  $f$  was not monotone. However, there is clearly a continuous function  $g$  which agrees with  $f$  at "most" places, which is monotone, and which has the same  $\varphi$ -derivative as  $f$ . The next theorem shows that this situation is typical.

**THEOREM 4.** *Let  $\varphi \in S^*$  and let  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be a measurable  $\varphi$ -differentiable function with  $f^\varphi(x) \geq 0$  for each  $x \in \mathbf{R}$ . Then there are a set  $T$ , whose complement is nowhere dense of measure zero, and a nondecreasing function  $g: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  for which*

- (i)  $f(x) = g(x)$  for each  $x \in T$ ,
- (ii)  $f^\varphi(x) = g^\varphi(x)$  for each  $x \in \mathbf{R}$ .

*Furthermore, if  $f^\varphi(x)$  is finite for all  $x$ , then  $g$  is continuous on  $\mathbf{R}$ .*

*Proof.* From Theorem 2 we know that  $f$  is differentiable almost everywhere and nearly everywhere. Since  $f$  is differentiable nearly everywhere, the theorem in [4] assures us that  $f$  is continuous except at a nowhere dense set of points. Let  $T$  be the set of points of continuity of  $f$ . Then the complement of  $T$  is nowhere dense of measure zero.

Let  $G$  denote the interior of  $T$ . We first prove that  $f|G$ , the restriction of  $f$  to  $G$ , is nondecreasing, from which it readily follows that  $f|T$  is nondecreasing since the complement of  $G$  is nowhere dense and  $f$  is continuous at each point of  $T$ . In order to show that  $f|G$  is nondecreasing, there is no loss of generality in assuming that  $f^\varphi(x) > 0$  for all  $x$ .

Let  $I$  be any component of  $G$ . Then  $f|I$  is nondecreasing according to Theorem 3. Suppose there are two points  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  in  $G$  such that  $\xi < \eta$  and  $f(\xi) > f(\eta)$ . Let  $(a, b)$  be the component of  $G$  containing  $\xi$ . If  $\alpha = \sup\{f(x): x \in (a, b)\}$ , pick any  $\gamma$  such that  $f(\eta) < \gamma < \alpha$  and note that, since  $f^\varphi(b) > 0$ , we have

$$\{x: f[b, x] \subseteq (\gamma, \infty)\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Now put

$$(5) \quad x_0 = \sup\{x: f[G \cap (b, \infty)] \subseteq (\gamma, \infty)\}.$$

Since  $f^\varphi(x_0) > 0$ , there is a  $\delta$  such that  $0 < \delta < \delta_\varphi$  and  $f(x_0 - \varphi(h) - h) < f(x_0 - \varphi(h))$  for  $0 < h < \delta$ . However,  $(x_0, x_0 - \varphi(\delta)) \cap G \neq \emptyset$ , and hence there is an interval  $I \subseteq (x_0, x_0 - \varphi(\delta))$  such that  $f(I) \subseteq (-\infty, \gamma]$ . Now, let  $J = \{x_0 - \varphi(h) - h : x_0 - \varphi(h) \in I\}$  and note that  $f(J) \subseteq (-\infty, \gamma]$ . But this contradicts (5) since  $J \cap G = \emptyset$ . It follows that  $f|_G$  is nondecreasing.

Defining  $g: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  by

$$g(x) = \inf\{f(t) : t \in G \text{ and } t \geq x\}$$

we see that (i) is clearly satisfied. Now, let  $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For each  $h > 0$ , there is an  $h^*$  with  $0 < h^* < \varepsilon h$  such that  $x_0 - \varphi(h + h^*)$  and  $x_0 - \varphi(h + h^*) - h - h^*$  both belong to  $G$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g(x_0 - \varphi(h)) - g(x_0 - \varphi(h) - h)}{h} &\leq \frac{g(x_0 - \varphi(h + h^*)) - g(x_0 - \varphi(h + h^*) - h - h^*)}{h} \\ &= \frac{f(x_0 - \varphi(h + h^*)) - f(x_0 - \varphi(h + h^*) - h - h^*)}{h + h^*} \frac{h + h^*}{h}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $D^\varphi g(x_0) \leq f^\varphi(x_0)(1 + \varepsilon)$ . Since this holds for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have  $D^\varphi g(x_0) \leq f^\varphi(x_0)$ . Similarly, we can show  $D_\varphi g(x_0) \geq f^\varphi(x_0)$ , and so  $g^\varphi(x_0)$  exists and equals  $f^\varphi(x_0)$ .

If  $f^\varphi(x)$  is always finite, then clearly the nondecreasing function  $g$  can have no discontinuities.

In [3] Filipczak showed that if  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is approximately continuous and has a symmetric derivative everywhere, then this symmetric derivative must belong to the Baire class one. Theorem 4 complements this result by yielding the following observation concerning measurable functions:

**COROLLARY 2.** *Let  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be measurable and  $\varphi \in S^*$ . If  $f^\varphi(x)$  exists everywhere and is bounded either from above or from below, then there is a continuous function  $g$  such that  $f(x) = g(x)$  except possibly on a nowhere dense set of measure zero and  $f^\varphi \equiv g^\varphi$ . In particular,  $f^\varphi$  belongs to the Baire class one.*

As another application of Theorem 4 we note that Corollaries 1 and 2 of this paper can be used to prove the following result. We omit the proof here since it is essentially identical to the proof given for the symmetric derivative in [2], Theorem 6.

**THEOREM 5.** *Let  $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be measurable and have a finite  $\varphi$ -derivative for  $\varphi \in S^*$ . If  $f^\varphi$  is bounded from above or from below and is a Darboux function, then  $f^\varphi$  also has the Denjoy property; that is, for each interval  $(\alpha, \beta)$ ,  $\{x: f^\varphi(x) \in (\alpha, \beta)\}$  is either empty or has positive Lebesgue measure.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. L. Belna, M. J. Evans and P. D. Humke, *Symmetric and strong differentiation*, American Mathematical Monthly (to appear).
- [2] M. J. Evans, *A symmetric condition for monotonicity*, Bulletin of the Institute of Mathematics, Academia Sinica (to appear).
- [3] F. M. Filipczak, *Sur les dérivées symétriques des fonctions approximativement continues*, Colloquium Mathematicum 34 (1976), p. 249-256.
- [4] M. K. Fort, Jr., *A theorem concerning functions discontinuous on a dense set*, American Mathematical Monthly 58 (1951), p. 408-410.
- [5] I. P. Natanson, *Theory of functions of a real variable*, Vol. I, New York 1960.
- [6] Г. Х. Синдаловский, *О некотором обобщении производных чисел*, Известия Академии наук СССР, серия математическая, 24 (1960), p. 707-720.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
MACOMB, ILLINOIS

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 31. 8. 1978*

---