

## On interpolation functions. II

By J. PEETRE in Lund (Sweden)

The purpose of this note is to indicate a certain simplification of the results of [2]. (We use throughout the terminology of that note.)

If  $h=h(u)$  is a positive Borel measurable function on  $(0, \infty)$  we agree to say that  $h$  is *pseudo-concave* if it is equivalent to a concave function, i.e. if there exist a concave function  $h_0$  and a constant  $C$  such that  $C^{-1}h_0(u) \leq h(u) \leq Ch_0(u)$  for all  $u$ .

Lemma.  $h$  is *pseudo-concave* if and only if for some  $C$  holds

$$(1) \quad h(v) \leq C \max(1, v/u) h(u) \quad \text{for all } u, v.$$

Proof (necessity). It suffices to show that (1) holds for  $h_0$ . But from the concavity it follows that  $h_0(u)$  is increasing [but  $\frac{h_0(u)}{u}$  is decreasing. Therefore (1) follows with  $C=1$ .

Proof (sufficiency). Let  $\alpha_i \geq 0$ ,  $\sum \alpha_i = 1$ ,  $u = \sum \alpha_i u_i$  (finite sums). Using (1) we obtain

$$\sum \alpha_i h(u_i) \leq C \sum \alpha_i \max\left(1, \frac{u_i}{u}\right) h(u) \leq C \left(\sum \alpha_i + \sum \frac{\alpha_i u_i}{u}\right) h(u) \leq 2Ch(u).$$

This establishes the pseudo-concavity because we may now take

$$h_0(u) = \sup \sum \alpha_i h(u_i),$$

which is by the way the least concave majorant of  $h$ .

Corollary. If  $h(u)$  is *pseudo-concave* so is  $k(u) = (h(u))^{\frac{1}{r}}$  where  $r$  is any real number  $\neq 0$ .

Proof. Obvious. — This corollary was obtained in [2] as a by-product of the main result there which we now reformulate as follows.

Theorem. A function  $H = H(z_0, z_1)$  homogeneous of degree 1 and satisfying condition (2) in [2] is an interpolation function (of any power  $p$ ) if and only if it is of the form  $H(z_0, z_1) = z_0 h(z_1/z_0)$  with  $h$  *pseudo-concave*.

Proof (necessity). Consider the space  $X = \{x, y\}$  provided with the measure  $\mu$  such that each of the two points  $x$  and  $y$  carries the mass 1. Take

$$\zeta_0(x) = 1, \zeta_0(y) = 1; \zeta_1(x) = u, \zeta_1(y) = v$$

and define a linear mapping  $\pi$  by  $\pi a(x) = 0, \pi a(y) = a(x)$ . The corresponding operator norms of  $\pi$  (considered as a mapping from  $L_{\zeta_0}^p$  into  $L_{\zeta_1}^p$  etc.) are

$$M_0 = 1, \quad M_1 = \frac{v}{u}, \quad M = \frac{h(v)}{h(u)}.$$

By the inequality (cf. inequality (1) in [2])  $M \leq C \max(M_0, M_1)$  we now get

$$\frac{h(v)}{h(u)} \leq C \max\left(1, \frac{v}{u}\right)$$

which establishes (1).

Proof (sufficiency). By the lemma  $H$  is equivalent to a function of the form (4) in [2]. Therefore we may use the corresponding part of the proof of theorem 1 in [2] (cf. in particular pp. 168—169).

We conclude by illustrating our new result in a concrete case (cf. [1]).

Let  $X = (0, \infty)$ ,  $\mu = \text{Haar measure}$ ,  $\zeta_0(x) = 1, \zeta_1(x) = e^{x^\alpha}$  ( $\alpha > 0$ ). With

$$h(u) = e^{(\log u)^\lambda}, \quad \lambda = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \quad (\alpha > \beta > 0)$$

we then have

$$e^{x^\beta} = h(e^{x^\alpha}) = \zeta_0 h\left(\frac{\zeta_1}{\zeta_0}\right).$$

We claim that  $h$  is pseudo-concave. It is clear that  $h(u)$  is increasing. It suffices therefore to show that  $\frac{h(u)}{u}$  is decreasing if  $u$  is large, since the values  $u < 1$  do not interfere. To this end we consider the corresponding logarithmic derivative; we have

$$\frac{d}{du} \log(h(u)/u) = (\lambda(\log u)^{\lambda-1} - 1)/u$$

which, since  $\lambda < 1$ , eventually becomes  $< 0$ . Applying now our theorem we thus get the following interpolation theorem: *If  $\pi$  is a continuous linear mapping from  $L_0^p$  into  $L_0^p$  and from  $L_\alpha^p$  into  $L_\alpha^p$  it is also a continuous linear mapping from  $L_\beta^p$  into  $L_\beta^p$  ( $\alpha > \beta > 0$ ). Here we have set  $L_\gamma^p = L_{(e^{x^\alpha})^\gamma}^p$  with  $\gamma = 0, \alpha, \beta$ .*

### References

- [1] C. GOULAOUIC, Interpolation entre les espaces  $L^p$  avec poids, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **262** (1966), 333—336.  
 [2] J. PEETRE, On interpolation functions, *Acta Sci. Math.*, **27** (1966), 167—171.

(Received April 5, 1967)