

## ON CERTAIN PROBLEMS IN THE THEORY OF SEQUENCES

BY  
RADA HIGGINS

1. **Introduction.** We are well-acquainted with the theorem about sequences which states that, the existence of

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^n a_k \tag{1}$$

is sufficient to imply  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k = 0$ . Partially out of a growing interest in the theory of regularly varying sequences ([1]), and probably as an interesting problem, in and of itself, some mathematicians have tried to find conditions weaker than (1) that would guarantee  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k = 0$ . This was the subject of a previous paper (See [3]), in which I proved the following main theorem:

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $(a_k)$  be a sequence of complex numbers, such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=[\lambda n]+1}^n a_k \tag{2}$$

*exists for  $\lambda = \xi$  and  $\lambda = 1 - \xi$ , where  $\xi$  is an irrational number in  $(0, 1)$ . Then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k = 0$ .*

In this paper, we ask under what conditions on a set  $E$  of real numbers will the sequence  $(a_k)$  converge to zero if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=n+1}^{[\lambda n]} a_k \tag{3}$$

is equal to zero, for every fixed  $\lambda \in E$ ?

Interestingly, (3) can hold for every  $\lambda \in Z^+$ , but the sequence  $(a_k)$  need not converge to zero. The counterexample which verifies this assertion is based on a construction of J. Galambos and E. Seneta ([2]). They define a sequence  $(b_n)$  as follows: For each  $n \geq 2$ , let  $b_n = w(n) + (\log \log n)^{1/2}$ , where  $w(n)$  denotes the number of prime divisors of  $n$ .

Using the fact that there exists a subsequence  $(p_{j_n})$  of primes, such that  $w(p_{j_n} - 1) \sim \log \log p_{j_n} (n \rightarrow \infty)$ , it is asserted in [2] that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{p_{j_n}} / b_{p_{j_n} - 1} \tag{4}$$

---

Received by the editors May 7, 1973 and, in revised form, November 5, 1973.

is equal to zero. Moreover, for  $k \geq 1$ , it is shown that

$$(5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{nk}/b_n$$

is equal to 1.

From the above sequence  $(b_n)$ , it is easy to define a sequence  $(a_n)$ , such that (3) holds for every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $\lim a_n \neq 0$ . Define  $(a_n)$  as follows: For each  $n \geq 2$ , let  $a_n = \log(b_n/b_{n-1})$ .

Then, by (5), we see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=n+1}^{nk} a_j = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(b_{nk}/b_n) = 0.$$

On the other hand, by (4), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{p_{j_n}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(b_{p_{j_n}}/b_{p_{j_n}-1}) = -\infty$$

Since  $(a_{p_{j_n}})$  is a subsequence of  $(a_n)$ , we have  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_n \neq 0$ . Therefore, the sequence  $(a_n)$  is a counterexample.

It is true, however, that if (3) holds for every  $\lambda$  in  $E$ , a 2nd category subset of  $(1, \infty)$ , then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_n$  does equal zero.

We can state this result more precisely as the following theorem:

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $(a_k)$  be a sequence of complex numbers, such that*

$$(6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=n+1}^{[\lambda n]} a_k = \phi(\lambda)$$

for every fixed  $\lambda$  in a 2nd category subset  $E$  of  $(1, \infty)$ . If  $\phi$  is continuous on  $E$ , then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k = 0$ .

The proof of Theorem 2 can be modified to deduce the following theorem as well:

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $(a_k)$  be a sequence of complex numbers, such that*

$$(7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=[\lambda n]+1}^n a_k = \phi(\lambda)$$

for every fixed  $\lambda$  in a 2nd category subset  $E$  of  $(0, 1)$ . If  $\phi$  is continuous on  $E$ , then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k = 0$ .

**2. Proof of Theorem 2.** Throughout this argument,  $A_n(\lambda)$  will denote

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^{[\lambda n]} a_k$$

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For every positive integer  $N$ , define the sets  $S_N$  as follows:

$$S_N = \left\{ \lambda: \text{for all } n > N, |A_n(\lambda) - \phi(\lambda)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\}$$

Then, by hypothesis,  $S = \cup_{N \in \mathbb{Z}^+} S_N$  is a 2nd category subset of  $(1, \infty)$ .

By Baire's Category Theorem,  $S$  cannot be the countable union of nowhere dense

sets. Hence, there exists a positive integer  $N'$ , such that  $\text{int}(\overline{S_{N'}}) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\alpha_0$  be an irrational number in  $\text{int}(\overline{S_{N'}})$ . Choose  $\delta > 0$  so small that the interval  $I = (\alpha_0 - \delta, \alpha_0 + \delta)$  is contained in  $\overline{S_{N'}}$ .

We assert that every irrational number  $\alpha \in I$  is also an element of  $S_{N'}$ . To see this, let  $\alpha \in I$  be irrational. Since  $I \subset \overline{S_{N'}}$ , there exists a sequence  $(a_m) \subset S_{N'}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_m = \alpha$ . Let  $n$  be any integer greater than  $N'$ . Clearly,  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_m n = \alpha n$ . Since the greatest integer function  $[ \ ]$  is discontinuous only at integers and  $\alpha n$  is irrational,  $[ \ ]$  is continuous at  $\alpha n$ . Hence, for  $m$  sufficiently large, we have  $[a_m n] = [\alpha n]$ . This implies

$$\begin{aligned} |A_n(\alpha) - \phi(\alpha)| &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |A_n(a_m) - \phi(\alpha)| \\ &\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (|A_n(a_m) - \phi(a_m)| + |\phi(a_m) - \phi(\alpha)|) \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\alpha \in S_{N'}$ .

Choose  $N''$  so large that  $\alpha_0/(N'' - 1)$  is less than  $\delta$ . Let  $\bar{N} = \max(N', N'') + 1$ . For  $n > \bar{N}$ ,  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_0 + \varepsilon_n$  are irrational numbers in  $I$ , where  $\varepsilon_n = \alpha_0/(n - 1)$ . Hence,  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_0 + \varepsilon_n$  are in  $S_{N'}$ . Therefore,

$$|A_n(\alpha_0) - \phi(\alpha_0)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

and

$$|A_{n-1}(\alpha_0 + \varepsilon_n) - \phi(\alpha_0 + \varepsilon_n)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Since

$$|a_n| = |A_{n-1}(\alpha_0 + \varepsilon_n) - A_n(\alpha_0)|.$$

we have, by the triangular inequality,

$$|a_n| \leq |A_{n-1}(\alpha_0 + \varepsilon_n) - \phi(\alpha_0 + \varepsilon_n)| + |A_n(\alpha_0) - \phi(\alpha_0)| + |\phi(\alpha_0 + \varepsilon_n) - \phi(\alpha_0)|.$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n| \leq \varepsilon.$$

which proves our theorem.

REFERENCES

1. R. Bojanic and E. Seneta, *A unified theory of regularly varying sequences*, *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, to appear.
2. J. Galambos and E. Seneta, *Regularly Varying Sequences* (Technical Report 29, Series 2), Princeton University, 1973.
3. R. Higgins, *A note on a problem in the theory of sequences*, *Elemente der Mathematik*, to appear.
4. I. Niven and H. S. Zuckerman, *On certain sequences*, *American Math. Monthly* **76** (1969), 386-389.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY