Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.
Vol. 6 No. 3 (1983) 409-418

DOT PRODUCT REARRANGEMENTS

PAUL ERDOS and GARY WEISS

Mathematics Institute, Budapest; University of Cincinnati
(Received September 18, 1980)

ABSTRACT. Let $a = (a_n)$, $x = (x_n)$ denote nonnegative sequences; $x = (x_{\pi(n)})$ denotes the rearranged sequence determined by the permutation π, $a \cdot x$ denotes the dot product $\Sigma a_n x_n$; and $S(a,x)$ denotes $\{a \cdot x_\pi : \pi$ is a permuation of the positive integers$\}$. We examine $S(a,x)$ as a subset of the nonnegative real line in certain special circumstances. The main result is that if $a_n \uparrow \infty$, then $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$ for every $x_n \downarrow \neq 0$ if and only if a_{n+1}/a_n is uniformly bounded.
KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. Dot product, series rearrangements, conditional convergence.
1982 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODE. 40A05.

An elementary classical result of Riemann on infinite series states that a conditionally convergent series that is not absolutely convergent can be rearranged to sum to any extended real number. A slightly similar group of questions arose in connection with certain formulas in operator theory [1, p. 181]. Namely, if we let $a = (a_n)$, $x = (x_n)$ denote any two non-negative sequences and x_π denote the sequence $(x_{\pi(n)})$ where π is any permutation of the positive integers, then what can be said about the set of non-negative real numbers $S(a,x) = \{a \cdot x : \pi$ is a permutation of the positive integers$\}$. More specifically, which subsets of the non-negative real line can be realized as the form $S(a,x)$ for some such a and x?

Various facts about $S(a,x)$ are obvious

(1) $S(a,x) \subset [0,\infty]$. The values 0 and ∞ may be obtained.

(2) If a and x are strictly positive sequences or are at most finitely zero, then $S(a,x) \subset (0,\infty]$.

(3) Not all subsets of $[0,\infty]$ are realizable as an $S(a,x)$ set. This follows by a cardinality argument. If c denotes the cardinality of $[0,\infty]$, then the cardinality of the class of subsets of $[0,\infty]$ is 2^c, but the cardinality of the class of sequences a and x is c and thus the cardinality of the subsets $S(a,x)$ is less than or equal to $c \cdot c = c$.

(4) If either a or x is finitely non-zero then $S(a,x)$ is countable.

(5) An example: if $a = (0,2,0,2,\ldots)$ and $x = (3^{-n})$, then $S(a,x)$ is precisely the Cantor set except for those non-negative real numbers whose ternary expansion consists of a tail of 0's or a tail of 2's (i.e., a subset of the rational numbers.),

It seems too ambitious to consider the general question at this time. For this reason we shall restrict our attention to the cases when a is a non-decreasing sequence and x is a non-increasing sequence,

If $a \equiv 0$ or $x \equiv 0$, the problem is trivial and $S(a,x) = \{0\}$. If $a_1 \neq 0$ and $x_n \not\to 0$, the problem is trivial and $S(a,x) = \{\infty\}$. If a_n is bounded by M, then $S(a,x) \subset [0, M\sum x_n]$. In any case, hereafter we shall assume $a_n \uparrow \infty$ and $x_n \downarrow 0$, unless otherwise specified.

The Lemma that follows is a well-known fact, but we give a proof for completeness and because the proof contains some of the ideas used in the main result.

LEMMA. If $a_n \uparrow$ and $x_n \downarrow$ then $S(a,x) \subset [a \cdot x,\infty]$. In addition, $a \cdot x \in S(a,x)$, and if $a_n \uparrow \infty$ and $x_n \neq 0$ for all n or if $a_n \uparrow$ and $a_n > 0$ for some n and $x_n \neq 0$, then $\infty \in S(a,x)$.

PROOF. It suffices to show that for every permutation π of the positive integers, we have $a \cdot x \leq \sum a_n x_{\pi(n)}$ or, equivalently, $a \cdot x \leq \sum a_{\pi(n)} x_n$ for every π. The rest of the lemma is clear.

Define π_1 in terms of π as follows. Set

$$\pi_1(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 1 \\ \pi(1) & n = \pi^{-1}(1) \\ \pi(n) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is straightforward to verify that π_1 is also a permutation of the positive integers (one-to-one and onto) which fixes 1. We assert that $a_{\pi_1} \cdot x \leq a_\pi \cdot x$ To see this, note that $\pi(1) \geq 1$ and $\pi^{-1}(1) \geq 1$. Hence $a_{\pi(1)} - a_1 \geq 0$ and $x_1 - x_{\pi^{-1}(1)} \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\sum (a_{\pi(n)} - a_{\pi_1(n)})x_n = (a_{\pi(1)} - a_{\pi_1(1)})x_1 + (a_{\pi(\pi^{-1}(1))} - a_{\pi_1(\pi^{-1}(1))})x_{\pi^{-1}(1)}$$

$$= (a_{\pi(1)} - a_1)(x_1 - x_{\pi^{-1}(1)})$$

$$\geq 0 .$$

Proceeding inductively, we obtain a sequence of permutations π_k that fix $1,2,\ldots,k$ for which $a_{\pi_k} \cdot x \leq a_{\pi_{k-1}} \cdot x$. Hence, for every k ,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x_n = \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_{\pi_k(n)} x_n \leq a_{\pi_k} \cdot x \leq a_\pi \cdot x .$$

Letting $k \to \infty$, we obtain $a \cdot x \leq a_\pi \cdot x$.

The main question of this paper is: for which a, x with $a_n \uparrow \infty$ and $x_n \downarrow 0$ is $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$?

The main result of this paper gives a partial answer. Namely, we can characterize which $a_n \uparrow \infty$ have the property that $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$ for every x such that $x_n \underset{\neq}{\downarrow} 0$.

On first sight, it might appear that $S(a,x)$ can never be $[a \cdot x, \infty]$ or that it is quite rare. The first result in this direction was that if $a_n = n$ for every n, then $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$ for every x such that $x_n \neq 0$. That $S(a,x)$ may not be $[a \cdot x, \infty]$ was first decided by an example due to Robert Young. Namely, let $a_n = 2^{2^n}$ and $x_n = 2^{-2^{n+1}}$. Both results are unpublished. The succeeding results and techniques are due to the work of the authors in collaboration with Hugh Montgomery.

THEOREM 1. (The Main Theorem) Let $a = (a_n)$ where $a_n > 0$ for every n and $a_n \to \infty$. Consider the following conditions:

(1) a_{n+1}/a_n is bounded.

(2) For the non-negative sequence $x = (x_n)$, there exist subsequences (a_{n_k}) and (x_{m_k}) of a and x respectively such that

(a) $a_{n_k} x_{m_k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, and

(b) $\sum_k a_{n_k} x_{m_k} = \infty$.

(3) $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$.

Then (1) implies (2) for every strictly positive sequence $x = (x_n)$ that tends to 0. Also if $a_n \uparrow \infty$ and $x_n \downarrow 0$ where $a_n, x_n \neq 0$ for all n, then (2) implies (3).

PROOF. To prove that (1) implies that (2) holds for every strictly positive sequence $x = (x_n)$ that tends to 0, suppose $a_{n+1}/a_n \leq M$ for all n. We assert that for every positive integer k, there exist arbitrarily large positive integers n_k and m_k for which $(k+1)^{-1} \leq a_{n_k} x_{m_k} \leq Mk^{-1}$. If this assertion were true, then clearly we could choose two strictly increasing subsequences of positive integers (n_k) and (m_k) such that $a_{n_k} x_{m_k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ to prove the assertion.

For each fixed positive integer k, $(k+1)^{-1} \leq a_n x_m \leq Mk^{-1}$ if and only if $x_m \in [(a_n(k+1))^{-1}, M(a_n k)^{-1}]$. All we need show is that there exist arbitrarily large n,m for which $x_m \in [(a_n(k+1))^{-1}, M(a_n k)^{-1}]$.

Suppose to the contrary that there exists a positive integer N for which $x_m \notin [(a_n(k+1))^{-1}, M(a_n k)^{-1}]$ for every $n,m \geq N$. In other words, for every $m \geq N$, $x_m \notin \bigcup_{n \geq N} [(a_n(k+1))^{-1}, M(a_n k)^{-1}]$. (Note: This would imply that $\bigcup_{n \geq N} [(a_n(k+1))^{-1}, M(a_n k)-1]$ cannot contain any interval of the form $(0,\varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, since $x_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. However, this is not the case. Indeed, the proof below can be used to show that for every N, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(0,\varepsilon) \subset \bigcup_{n \geq N} [(a_n(k+1))^{-1}, M(a_n k)^{-1}]$.).

For each $m \geq N$, let n_m denote the least positive integer n such that $M(a_{n+1}k)^{-1} < x_m$, which exists since $a_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ and hence $M(a_{n+1}k)^{-1} \to 0$

as $n \to \infty$. For m sufficiently large, we have $M(a_{n_m+1}k)^{-1} \le x_m \le M(a_{n_k}k)^{-1}$. Also, since $M(a_{n_m+1}k)^{-1} < x_m$ and $x_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, we have $m \to \infty$ implies $a_{n_m+1} \to \infty$ and hence $n_m \to \infty$. Therefore $n_m \ge N$ for all m sufficiently large, and for these m, $x_m \notin [(a_{n_m}(k+1))^{-1}, M(a_{n_m}k)^{-1}]$. Hence, for infinitely many m, we have $x_m \le M(a_{n_k}k)^{-1}$ and $x_m \notin [(a_{n_m}(k+1))^{-1}, M(a_{n_m}k)^{-1}]$. Therefore, for infinitely many m, we have $M(a_{n_m+1}k)^{-1} < x_m < (a_{n_m}(k+1))^{-1}$. This implies that $M(a_{n_m+1}k)^{-1} < (a_{n_m}(k+1))^{-1}$ for infinitely many m, or equivalently, $a_{n_m+1}/a_{n_m} > M(k+1)/k > M$ for infinitely many m, which contradicts our assumption that $a_{n+1}/a_n \le M$ for all n. Hence (2) is proved.

To prove (2) → (3) whenever $a_n \uparrow \infty$ and $x_n \overset{\downarrow}{\neq} 0$, suppose (2) holds for a and x, so that there exist subsequences (a_{n_k}) and (x_{m_k}) such $a_{n_k}x_{m_k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, and $\sum_k a_{n_k}x_{m_k} = \infty$. We first assert that without loss of generality we may assume that $a \cdot x = \sum a_n x_n < \infty$. To see this suppose $a \cdot x = \sum a_n x_n = \infty$. Then by the lemma we have that $S(a,x) = \{\infty\}$, and hence (3) holds.

Assuming that $\sum a_n x_n < \infty$, we next assert that without loss of generality we can assume that $n_k > m_k$ for every k. To see this, let Z_1 denote the set $\{k : n_k > m_k\}$ and let Z_2 denote the set $\{k : n_k \le m_k\}$. Then

$$\infty = \sum_k a_{n_k}x_{m_k} = \sum_{k \in Z_1} a_{n_k}x_{m_k} + \sum_{k \in Z_2} a_{n_k}x_{m_k}$$

But $\sum_{k \in Z_2} a_{n_k}x_{m_k} \le \sum_{k \in Z_2} a_{n_k}x_{n_k} \le \sum_n a_n x_n < \infty$. Therefore $\sum_{k \in Z_1} a_{n_k}x_{m_k} = \infty$. Let Z_1 determine subsequences of (n_k) and (m_k), which for simplicity we again call (n_k) and (m_k), respectively, by taking only those entries n_k, m_k (in increasing order) for which $k \in Z_1$. This gives us subsequences (a_{n_k}) and (x_{m_k}) of a and x which satisfy conditions a and b in the 2^{nd} condition of the theorem, and in addition satisfy $n_k > m_k$ for all k.

Next we assert that without loss of generality we may assume $n_k \neq m_j$ for all k,j. To see this, note that we have $n_k > m_k$ for all k and that $\langle n_k \rangle$ and $\langle m_k \rangle$ are strictly increasing (a property of subsequences). Therefore if $n_k = m_j$ for some k,j, then $k < j$ and $n_k \neq m_i$ for all $i \neq j$. That is, n_k can occur at most once among the m_j's. Put $(n_1,m_1),\ldots,(n_{k_1},m_{k_1}) \varepsilon S_1$ where k_1+1 is the least positive integer such that $m_{k_1+1} = n_k$ for some $k < k_1 + 1$. Put $(n_{k_1+1}, m_{k_1+1}),\ldots,(n_{k_2},m_{k_2}) \varepsilon S_2$ where k_2+1 is the least positive integer, if it exists, such that $m_{k_2+1} = n_k$ for some $k_1+1 \leq k < k_2+1$. Put $(n_{k_2+1}, m_{k_2+1}),\ldots,$ $(n_{k_3}, m_{k_3}) \varepsilon S_1$ such that k_3+1 is the least positive integer, if it exists, such that $m_{k_3+1} = n_k$ for some $k \leq k_1$ or $k_2 \leq k < k_3+1$. Continuing in this way, if no such least positive integer exists, then either S_1 or S_2 is finite. Otherwise both S_1,S_2 are infinite. For either case, no $n_k = m_j$ when both $(n_k,m_k),(n_j,m_j)$ εS_1 or S_2. Then clearly S_1,S_2 is a disjoint partition of the set of all (n_k,m_k) and in each set, no n_k appears as an m_j. Therefore $\infty = \sum a_{n_k} x_{m_k} = \sum_{S_1} a_{n_k} x_{m_k} + \sum_{S_2} a_{n_k} x_{m_k}$, and so either $\sum_{S_1} a_{n_k} x_{m_k} = \infty$ or $\sum_{S_2} a_{n_k} x_{m_k} = \infty$. Choosing S_1 or S_2 accordingly we produce the sequence (n_k,m_k) with the desired properties, (i.e., satisfying a) and b) in Theorem 1 and also satisfying $n_k \neq m_j$ for all k,j and $n_k > m_k$ for every k.).

Now consider the series $\sum_k (a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k})$. Since $n_k > m_k$, we have $0 \leq a_{n_k} - a_{m_k} \leq a_{n_k}$ and $0 \leq x_{m_k} - x_{n_k} \leq x_{m_k}$, and so $0 \leq (a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k})$ $\leq a_{n_k} x_{m_k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Furthermore, since $\sum_k a_{n_k} x_{m_k} = \infty$, $a_{m_k} x_{n_k} \geq 0$, $\sum_k a_{n_k} x_{n_k}$ $\leq a \cdot x < \infty$, $\sum_k a_{m_k} x_{m_k} \leq a \cdot x < \infty$, and $\sum a_{m_k} x_{n_k} \leq \sum a_{n_k} x_{n_k} < \infty$, we have

$$\sum_k (a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k}) = \sum_k (a_{n_k} x_{m_k} + a_{m_k} x_{n_k} - a_{n_k} x_{n_k} - a_{m_k} x_{m_k})$$

$$= \infty .$$

We shall now show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a subsequence (k_n) of positive integers such that $\varepsilon = \sum_{k \varepsilon \{k_n\}} (a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k})$. This follows from the following more general fact.

Suppose $(d(k))$ is a non-negative sequence for which $d(k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and $\sum d(k) = \infty$. We assert that very every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a subsequence (k_n) such that $\varepsilon = \sum d(k_n)$. The proof of this fact proceeds along the same lines as the proof of Riemann's theorem on rearrangments of conditionally convergent series. Fix

$\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $n_1 \geq N_1$ so that $d(k) < \varepsilon$ for every $k \geq N_1$, and so that n_1 is the greatest integer greater than N_1 such that $\sum_{k=N_1}^{n_1} d(k) < \varepsilon$. Hence $\sum_{k=N_1}^{n_1} d(k) < \varepsilon \leq \sum_{k=N_1}^{n_1+1} d(k)$. This can be done since $d(k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and $d(k) = \infty$. Choose $N_2 > n_1$ so that $d(k) < (\varepsilon - \sum_{k=N_1}^{n_1} d(k))/2$ for every $k \geq N_2$ and then choose n_2 to be the largest integer greater than N_2 such that $\sum_{k=N_2}^{n_2} d(k) < \varepsilon - \sum_{k=N_1}^{n_1} d(k)$. Hence $\sum_{k=N_2}^{n_2} d(k) < \varepsilon - \sum_{k=N_1}^{n_1} d(k) \leq \sum_{k=N_2}^{n_2+1} d(k)$. Proceeding inductively in this way, we obtain sequences (N_p) and (n_p) of positive integers for which $n_p \geq N_p > n_{p-1}$, $0 \leq d(k) \leq (\varepsilon - \sum_{q=1}^{p-1} \sum_{k=N_q}^{n_q} d(k))/2^{p-1}$ for every p and every $k \geq N_p$, and

$$\sum_{k=N_p}^{n_p} d(k) < \varepsilon - \sum_{q=1}^{p-1} \sum_{k=N_q}^{n_q} d(k) \leq \sum_{k=N_p}^{n_p+1} d(k) .$$

This implies that

$$0 < \varepsilon - \sum_{q=1}^{p} \sum_{k=N_q}^{n_q} d(k) \leq d(n_p + 1) \leq (\varepsilon - \sum_{q=1}^{p-1} \sum_{k=N_q}^{n_q} d(k))/2^{p-1}$$

$$\leq \varepsilon/2^{p-1} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad p \to \infty.$$

Therefore $\varepsilon = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=N_q}^{n_q} d(k)$. Hence, if we choose (k_n) to be the strictly increasing sequence of positive integers k, where k is taken to range over the set $\bigcup_{p=1}^{\infty} \{k : N_p \leq k \leq n_p\}$, we have $\varepsilon = \sum d(k_n)$.

Applying this result to the sequence $(a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k})$, since it is non-negative, tends to 0, and sums to ∞, we obtain that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist subsequences of (n_k) and (m_k), which we shall again denote by (n_k) and (m_k), for which $\varepsilon = \sum_k (a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k})$.

Now recall that we wish to show that $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$. We already know $a \cdot x$ and $\infty \in S(a,x)$. Suppose $a \cdot x < r < \infty$. It suffices to show $r \in S(a,x)$. Let $\varepsilon = r - a \cdot x$ and choose subsequences which we again call (n_k) and (m_k) so that

$$\varepsilon = \sum_k (a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k}) .$$

We now choose π, the requisite permutation on Z^+, as follows. Let $\pi(n_k) = m_k$ and $\pi(m_k) = n_k$ for each k, and let π fix all other integers n (i.e., those n for which $n \neq n_k, m_k$ for every k). The permutation π is well-defined since $n_i \neq m_j$ for every i,j. Let Z_π denote the set $\{n : n = n_k$ or $n = m_k$ for some $k\}$. Hence $\pi(n) = n$ for all $n \notin Z$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_n a_n x_{\pi(n)} &= \sum_{n\notin Z} a_n x_n + \sum_k (a_{n_k} x_{m_k} + a_{m_k} x_{n_k}) \\ &= \sum_{n\notin Z} a_n x_n + \sum_k (a_{n_k} x_{n_k} + a_{m_k} x_{m_k}) + (a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k})) \\ &= \sum a_n x_n + \sum_k (a_{n_k} - a_{m_k})(x_{m_k} - x_{n_k}) \\ &= a \cdot x + \varepsilon = r ,\end{aligned}$$

and so $r \in S(a,x)$, which proves (3). Q.E.D.

THEOREM 2. Let $a = (a_n)$ where $a_1 > 0$ and $a_n \uparrow \infty$. Then a_{n+1}/a_n is bounded if and only if, for every $x = (x_n)$ for which $x_n \overset{\downarrow}{\neq} 0$, $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$.

PROOF. If a_{n+1}/a_n is bounded, then by Theorem 1, if $x_n \overset{\downarrow}{\neq} 0$, then $x = (x_n)$ satisfies condition (2) of the theorem. Also by Theorem 1, since $a_n \uparrow \infty$ and $a_1 > 0$, condition (3) of the theorem is satisfied by x. That is, $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$.

Conversely, if $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$ for every $x = (x_n)$ for which $x_n \overset{\downarrow}{\neq} 0$, we claim that a_{n+1}/a_n must remain bounded.

Suppose to the contrary that a_{n+1}/a_n is not bounded. Let $h(n)$ denote the least positive integer k for which $k \geq n$ and $a_{k+1}/a_k \geq 4^n$. Clearly $h(n)$ is a non-decreasing function of n. Define $x_n = (a_{h(n)} 3^n)^{-1}$. Then $x_n \overset{\downarrow}{\neq} 0$. Letting $x = (x_n)$, we claim that $S(a,x) \neq [a \cdot x, \infty]$. In fact, we claim that $a \cdot x < 1$ but $1 \notin S(a,x)$. Indeed, $a \cdot x = \sum a_n x_n = \sum a_n (a_{h(n)} 3^n)^{-1} \leq \sum 3^{-n} = 1/2 < 1$. Furthermore, letting π be any permuation of Z^+, if $\pi^{-1}(k) > h(k)$ for some k, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum a_n x_{\pi(n)} \geq a_{\pi^{-1}(k)} x_k &\geq a_{h(k)+1} x_k = a_{h(k)+1} (a_{h(k)} 3^k)^{-1} \\ &\geq 4^k 3^{-k} > 1 .\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\pi^{-1}(k) \leq h(k)$ for every k, then

$$\sum a_n x_{\pi(n)} = \sum a_{\pi^{-1}(n)} x_n \leq a_{h(n)} x_n = \sum 3^{-n} = 1/2 < 1 .$$

In any case, $\sum a_n x_{\pi(n)} \neq 1$, hence $1 \notin S(a,x)$. Q.E.D.

NOTE. In the proof of Theorem 1, each time we constructed a permutation π to solve the equation $\sum a_n x_{\pi(n)} = r$, it sufficed to use only disjoint 2-cycles. That is, each such π that we constructed was the product of disjoint 2-cycles. This seems odd and leads us to ask if there are any circumstances in which the use of infinite-cycles or n-cycles yields more. In other words, is it always true that $S(a,x)$ is the same as $\{ \sum a_n x_{\pi(n)} : \pi$ is a permutation of Z^+ which is a product of disjoint 2-cycles$\}$?

The following question seems likely to have an affirmative answer. If so, this would give a characterization for those sequences a and x where $a_n \uparrow \infty$, $a_1 > 0$, and $x_n \overset{\downarrow}{\neq} 0$, which satisfy $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$. However, it remains unsolved.

QUESTION 1. If a and x are as above, does (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) in Theorem 1?

Finally, we wish to point out that Theorems 1 and 2 imply analogous theorems in which a and x switch roles. Indeed, the proofs of the following two corollaries follow naturally along the same lines as those of Theorems 1 and 2.

COROLLARY 3. Let $x = (x_n)$ where $x_n > 0$ for all n, and $x_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Consider the following conditions.

(1) x_n/x_{n+1} is bounded below.

(2) For the non-negative sequence $a = (a_n)$, there exist subsequences (a_{n_k}) and (x_{m_k}) of a and x, respectively, such that

  a) $a_{n_k} x_{m_k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, and

  b) $\sum_k a_{n_k} x_{m_k} = \infty$.

Then (1) implies that (2) holds for every strictly positive sequence $a = (a_n)$ that tends to ∞ .

COROLLARY 4. Let $x = (x_n)$ be a non-negative sequence. Then x_n/x_{n+1} is bounded below if and only if, for every $a = (a_n)$ for which $a_n \uparrow \infty$ and $a_1 > 0$, $S(a,x) = [a \cdot x, \infty]$.

QUESTION 2. Is there anything to be said about the qualitative nature of $S(a,x)$? Is it always a Borel set, measurable, F_σ, G_σ?

REFERENCE

1. WEISS, GARY "Commutators and operator ideals", dissertation, University of Michigan, 1975.

Advances in Difference Equations

Special Issue on Boundary Value Problems on Time Scales

Call for Papers

The study of dynamic equations on a time scale goes back to its founder Stefan Hilger (1988), and is a new area of still fairly theoretical exploration in mathematics. Motivating the subject is the notion that dynamic equations on time scales can build bridges between continuous and discrete mathematics; moreover, it often revels the reasons for the discrepancies between two theories.

In recent years, the study of dynamic equations has led to several important applications, for example, in the study of insect population models, neural network, heat transfer, and epidemic models. This special issue will contain new researches and survey articles on Boundary Value Problems on Time Scales. In particular, it will focus on the following topics:

- Existence, uniqueness, and multiplicity of solutions
- Comparison principles
- Variational methods
- Mathematical models
- Biological and medical applications
- Numerical and simulation applications

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ade/guidelines.html. Authors should follow the Advances in Difference Equations manuscript format described at the journal site http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ade/. Articles published in this Special Issue shall be subject to a reduced Article Processing Charge of €200 per article. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/ according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	April 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	July 1, 2009
Publication Date	October 1, 2009

Lead Guest Editor

Alberto Cabada, Departamento de Análise Matemática, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain; alberto.cabada@usc.es

Guest Editor

Victoria Otero-Espinar, Departamento de Análise Matemática, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain; mvictoria.otero@usc.es