



Title	ON A DIFFERENTIAL-DIFFERENCE EQUATION
Author(s)	Uchiyama, Saburô
Citation	Journal of the Faculty of Science Hokkaido University. Ser. 1 Mathematics, 19(2), 059-065
Issue Date	1966
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/56070
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	JFSHIU_19_N2_059-065.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

ON A DIFFERENTIAL-DIFFERENCE EQUATION

By

Saburô UCHIYAMA

In connexion with the study of certain incomplete sums of multiplicative functions, N. G. de Bruijn and J. H. van Lint [3] have introduced the function $f_s(x)$ ($s \geq 0$) satisfying the set of conditions:

- (i) $f_s(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$,
- (ii) $f_s(x)$ is continuous for $x > 0$,
- (iii) $f_s(x) = x^{s-1}$ for $0 < x \leq 1$,
- (iv) $xf'_s(x) = (s-1)f_s(x) - sf_s(x-1)$ for $x > 1$.

(The function $f_s(x)$ is originally defined in [3; II, §2] only for $x > 0$; it will be convenient, however, to define $f_s(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$ for our purpose.)

On the other hand, N. G. de Bruijn [1 and 2] has investigated in detail the property and behaviour of $f_s(x)$ for $s = 1$. In particular, there he obtained an explicit formula for $f_1(x)$:

$$f_1(x) = \frac{e^C}{2\pi i} \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \exp\left(-xt + \int_0^t \frac{e^z - 1}{z} dz\right) dt \quad (x > 0),$$

where C is Euler's constant,

$$C = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{m=1}^n \frac{1}{m} - \log n \right).$$

In the present note we shall prove an analogous formula for $f_s(x)$ with general $s > 0$.

Remark. For $s = 0$ it is easy to see that $f_s(x) = f_0(x) = x^{-1}$ ($x > 0$). We may suppose, therefore, that $s > 0$ throughout in the following.

1. Lemmata. We require two lemmas independent of one another.

Lemma 1. *If $\phi(s)$ is a (complex valued) continuous function defined for $s > 0$ and satisfying the functional equation*

$$\phi(s+r) = \phi(s)\phi(r) \quad (s > 0, r > 0),$$

then there is an integer A independent of s such that

$$\phi(s) = e^{2\pi i A s} (\phi(1))^s \quad (s > 0).$$

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that $\phi(s)$ does not vanish for $s > 0$ and hence that $\phi(1) \neq 0$. Consider the continuous function

$$\psi(s) = \frac{\phi(s)}{(\phi(1))^s} \quad (s > 0),$$

where $z^s = \exp(s \log z)$ and the branch of $\log z$ is taken in such a way that $\log z$ is real for real $z > 0$. We have for any $s > 0$

$$\psi(s+1) = \frac{\phi(s+1)}{(\phi(1))^{s+1}} = \frac{\phi(s)}{(\phi(1))^s} = \psi(s).$$

Thus, if we put

$$\alpha(s) = \frac{1}{1 + |\log |\psi(s)||},$$

then

$$(1) \quad \int_0^1 \alpha(s) ds = \int_0^1 \alpha(2s) ds.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \alpha(s) ds &= \int_0^1 \alpha(s+1) ds = \int_1^2 \alpha(s) ds \\ &= 2 \int_{1/2}^1 \alpha(2s) ds = 2 \int_0^1 \alpha(2s) ds - \int_0^1 \alpha(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to (1). Since $\psi(2s) = (\psi(s))^2$, we deduce from (1) that

$$\int_0^1 \frac{|\log |\psi(s)||}{(1 + |\log |\psi(s)||)(1 + 2|\log |\psi(s)||)} ds = 0,$$

and this implies that $\log |\psi(s)| = 0$ almost everywhere on $(0, 1)$. It follows that $|\psi(s)| = 1$ *everywhere* on $(0, \infty)$. This means that, if we set

$$(2) \quad \frac{\phi(s)}{(\phi(1))^s} = e^{2\pi i \theta(s)},$$

then $\theta(s)$ is a real valued continuous function of $s > 0$ satisfying the congruence

$$\theta(s+r) \equiv \theta(s) + \theta(r) \pmod{1} \quad (s > 0, r > 0).$$

Hence, there is a constant $c \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$ such that

$$\theta(s+r) = \theta(s) + \theta(r) + c \quad (s > 0, r > 0),$$

and it follows from this that the limit

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +0} \theta(s) = -c$$

exists. Thus, if we put

$$\theta^*(s) = \theta(s) + c,$$

then $\theta^*(s)$ satisfies the equation

$$\theta^*(s+r) = \theta^*(s) + \theta^*(r) \quad (s>0, r>0).$$

Since $\theta^*(s)$ is continuous for $s>0$, we find by a well-known theorem (which is in fact easy to prove) that $\theta^*(s) = As$ ($s>0$) for some real constant A , so that $\theta(s) = \theta^*(s) - c = As - c$. But, in view of (2), we may take $c=0$. Finally, the constant A must be integral, since $e^{2\pi i A} = 1$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 2. *We have*

$$f_{s+r}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(s+r)}{\Gamma(s)\Gamma(r)} \int_0^x f_s(y)f_r(x-y)dy \quad (s>0, r>0).$$

Proof. Put

$$f(x) = \int_0^x f_s(y)f_r(x-y)dy.$$

Apparently, $f(x)=0$ for $x<0$ and $f(x)$ is continuous for $x>0$. For $0<x\leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= x^{s+r-1} \int_0^1 z^{s-1}(1-z)^{r-1} dz \\ &= f_{s+r}(x) \frac{\Gamma(s)\Gamma(r)}{\Gamma(s+r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that $x>1$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} xf(x) &= \int_0^x yf_s(y)f_r(x-y)dy + \int_0^x f_s(y)(x-y)f_r(x-y)dy \\ &= \int_0^x (x-y)f_s(x-y)f_r(y)dy + \int_0^x f_s(y)(x-y)f_r(x-y)dy \\ &= I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned}$$

say. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI_1}{dx} &= \int_0^x ((x-y)f'_s(x-y) + f_s(x-y))f_r(y)dy \\ &= \int_0^x (x-y)f'_s(x-y)f_r(y)dy + \int_0^x f_s(x-y)f_r(y)dy \\ &= (s-1)f(x) - sf(x-1) + f(x) \\ &= sf(x) - sf(x-1), \end{aligned}$$

and, by symmetry,

$$\frac{dI_2}{dx} = rf(x) - rf(x-1).$$

Since $(xf(x))' = xf'(x) + f(x)$, we thus obtain

$$xf'(x) = (s+r-1)f(x) - (s+r)f(x-1).$$

Hence the function $\frac{\Gamma(s+r)}{\Gamma(s)\Gamma(r)}f(x)$ satisfies all the conditions (i)–(iv) with $s+r$ in place of s , and, since these conditions uniquely determine the function $f_{s+r}(x)$, it follows that

$$f_{s+r}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(s+r)}{\Gamma(s)\Gamma(r)}f(x),$$

which is the required result.

Remark. The substance of Lemma 2 is a particular case of a slightly more general result. Thus, let $h(x) = h(x; c)$ be a function defined by the following conditions, $c = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n)$ being an $(n+1)$ -tuple of constants ($n \geq 0$ fixed):

- (i) $h(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$,
- (ii) $h(x)$ is continuous for $x > 0$,
- (iii) $\lim_{x \rightarrow +0} xh(x) = 0$,
- (iv) $xh'(x) = (c_0 - 1)h(x) + \sum_{j=1}^n c_j h(x-j)$ for all $x > 0$,
 $x \neq m$ ($1 \leq m \leq n$).

(Obviously the above conditions for $h(x) = h(x; c)$ imply that $c_0 > 0$ and $h(x) = Bx^{c_0-1}$ for $0 < x \leq 1$ with B a constant and, for $x > 1$, $h(x)$ is uniquely determined once B is fixed. We shall be concerned with those functions $h(x)$ only which are not identically zero.) Then we have

$$h(x; a+b) = K \int_0^x h(y; a)h(x-y; b) dy \quad (x \neq 0),$$

where K is a constant and where we set

$$a+b = (a_0+b_0, a_1+b_1, \dots, a_n+b_n)$$

if

$$a = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n) \quad \text{and} \quad b = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n).$$

2. The Explicit Formula. We now consider the Laplace transform of $f_s(x)$,

$$F_s(\xi) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\xi x} f_s(x) dx,$$

where ξ is a complex variable. The integral defining $F_s(\xi)$ is absolutely convergent on the line $\operatorname{Re} \xi = 0$ (cf. §3 below). Also, $F_s(\xi)$ is, as a function of s , continuous for $s > 0$, ξ ($\operatorname{Re} \xi \geq 0$) being fixed.

In view of Lemma 2 we have

$$F_{s+r}(\xi) = \frac{\Gamma(s+r)}{\Gamma(s)\Gamma(r)} F_s(\xi) F_r(\xi) \quad (s > 0, r > 0)$$

or

$$\frac{F_{s+r}(\xi)}{\Gamma(s+r)} = \frac{F_s(\xi)}{\Gamma(s)} \frac{F_r(\xi)}{\Gamma(r)} \quad (s > 0, r > 0).$$

Hence, by applying Lemma 1 to $\phi(s) = F_s(\xi)/\Gamma(s)$, we get for $s > 0$

$$\frac{F_s(\xi)}{\Gamma(s)} = e^{A s} \left(\frac{F_1(\xi)}{\Gamma(1)} \right)^s$$

or

$$F_s(\xi) = \Gamma(s) (F_1(\xi))^s,$$

the constant A being necessarily zero since for any $s > 0$ $F_s(\xi)$ has a positive real value for real $\xi \geq 0$.

We see from the explicit formula for $f_1(x)$ ([2; §1]) that

$$F_1(\xi) = e^C \exp \left(\int_0^{-\xi} \frac{e^z - 1}{z} dz \right).$$

Therefore,

$$(3) \quad F_s(\xi) = \Gamma(s) e^{Cs} \exp \left(s \int_0^{-\xi} \frac{e^z - 1}{z} dz \right) \quad (s > 0).$$

By a standard inversion formula for the Laplace transform, we thus obtain the following result.

Theorem. We have for $s > 0$

$$f_s(x) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma(s) e^{Cs}}{2\pi i} \int_{-iT}^{iT} \exp \left(-xt + s \int_0^t \frac{e^z - 1}{z} dz \right) dt \quad (x \neq 0).$$

3. Notes. 1) We note that for $s = 1$ the right-hand side of the equality in the theorem is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ at $x = 0$ and for $s > 1$ it is equal to 0 at $x = 0$. Also, if $s = 1$ then we have

$$f_1(x) = \frac{e^{\mathcal{C}}}{2\pi i} \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \exp\left(-xt + \int_0^t \frac{e^z - 1}{z} dz\right) dt$$

for all $x \neq 0$, and if $s > 1$ then

$$f_s(x) = \frac{\Gamma(s)e^{\mathcal{C}s}}{2\pi i} \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \exp\left(-xt + s \int_0^t \frac{e^z - 1}{z} dz\right) dt$$

for all x , $-\infty < x < \infty$, $f_s(0)$ being defined to be equal to 0.

2) de Bruijn and van Lint [3; I] have also considered the function $g_s(x)$ ($s \geq 0$) defined by the conditions:

- (i) $g_s(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$,
- (ii) $g_s(x)$ is continuous for $x \geq 0$,
- (iii) $g_s(x) = x^s$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$,
- (iv) $xg'_s(x) = sg_s(x) - sg_s(x-1)$ for $x > 1$.

As is noted in [3; II, §2], we have for $s > 0$

$$g_s(x) = s \int_0^x f_s(y) dy.$$

They showed in [3; I, §2] that if $s=0$ then $g_s(x) = g_0(x) = 1$ for all $x > 0$ and if $s > 0$ then $g_s(x)$ is a positive, monotone increasing function of x for $x > 0$.

It is also proved there that we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g_s(x) = \Gamma(s+1)e^{\mathcal{C}s} \quad (s > 0)$$

and this implies at once that

$$\int_0^{\infty} f_s(x) dx = \Gamma(s)e^{\mathcal{C}s} \quad (s > 0),$$

which clearly agrees with (3). And in the course of its proof they found a formula which is essentially the same as (3). (In fact, using the relation between $f_s(x)$ and $g_s(s)$, we can show that $F_s(\xi)$ ($s > 0$) satisfies as a function of ξ the differential equation

$$\xi F'_s(\xi) = s(e^{-\xi} - 1)F_s(\xi),$$

and, by integrating this equation, we get the formula (3).) Thus, our main interest of this note is in deriving the explicit formula for $f_s(x)$ from a somewhat different point of view, that is, on the basis of Lemma 2 which shows an interesting interrelation existent among the functions $f_s(x)$ ($s > 0$).

References

- [1] N. G. DE BRUIJN: On the number of positive integers $\leq x$ and free of prime factors $> y$. Kon. Nederlandse Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A, vol. 54 (1951), pp. 50-60.
- [2] N. G. DE BRUIJN: The asymptotic behaviour of a function occurring in the theory of primes. Journ. Indian Math. Soc., vol. 15 (1951), pp. 25-32.
- [3] N. G. DE BRUIJN and J. H. VAN LINT: Incomplete sums of multiplicative functions. I, II. Kon. Nederlandse Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A, vol. 67 (1964), pp. 339-347, 348-359.

Department of Mathematics,
Hokkaidô University

(Received August 10, 1965)