

CHUO MATH NO.123(2018)

# Derivatives of flat functions

by

**Hiroki KODAMA, Kazuo MASUDA,  
and Yoshihiko MITSUMATSU**

*DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS*



*CHUO UNIVERSITY*

*BUNKYOKU TOKYO JAPAN*

*Apr. 28 , 2018*

# Derivatives of flat functions

Hiroki KODAMA, Kazuo MASUDA, and Yoshihiko MITSUMATSU

## Abstract

We remark that there is no smooth function  $f(x)$  on  $[0, 1]$  which is flat at 0 such that the derivative  $f^{(n)}$  of any order  $n \geq 0$  is positive on  $(0, 1]$ . Moreover, the number of zeros of the  $n$ -th derivative  $f^{(n)}$  grows to the infinity and the zeros accumulate to 0 when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We consider smooth functions on the interval  $[0, 1]$  which are flat at the origin, namely of class  $C^\infty$  and any derivative  $f^{(n)}(x)$  converges to 0 when  $x \rightarrow 0 + 0$ . Eventually it is equivalent to say that  $f$  extends to the whole real line as a smooth function by defining  $f(x) = 0$  for  $x < 0$ . In this short note we make a couple of remarks on the asymptotics of higher derivatives around the origin.

Among non-trivial flat functions the most well-known might be the one which is defined as follows.

$$f(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{x}} \quad \text{for } x > 0$$

If we imagine its graph, of course it seems smooth enough, and it can be extended as constantly 0 on  $(-\infty, 0]$  as a smooth function on the real line  $\mathbb{R}$ . Its first derivative is positive on  $(0, \infty)$ , but the second derivative vanishes at  $x = \frac{1}{2} = x_2$  and the third vanishes at  $x_3 = \frac{1-1/\sqrt{3}}{2} < x_2$ , and so on. That is, setting  $x_n = \min\{x; f^{(n)}(x) = 0, x > 0\}$  for  $n = 2, 3, 4, \dots$ , it is clear that  $\{x_n\}_n$  is strictly decreasing, and in fact  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$ . Moreover, if we fix any interval  $[0, \alpha)$  ( $\alpha > 0$ ),  $f^{(n)}(x)$  tends to behave more and more wildly when  $n \rightarrow \infty$  on the interval.

Also, if we take  $g_0(x) = f(x)(\sin(\frac{1}{x}) + 1)$  and

$$g_n(x) = \int_0^x \int_0^{t_{n-1}} \cdots \int_0^{t_1} g_0(t_0) dt_0 \cdots dt_{n-2} dt_{n-1},$$

then for  $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ ,  $g_n(x)$  is positive on  $(0, \infty)$  and is flat at  $x = 0$ , and apparently  $g_n^{(k)}(x) > 0$  when  $x > 0$  for  $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$  but there is no interval  $(0, \alpha)$  on which  $g_n^{(n)}(x)$  is positive.

They seem to exhibit not particular for these examples but rather common or inevitable phenomena of higher derivatives of flat functions.

**Theorem 1** There exists no smooth function  $f(x)$  on  $[0, 1]$  which is flat at  $x = 0$  and satisfies  $f^{(n)}(x) > 0$  on  $(0, 1]$  for any  $n \geq 0$ .

This fact is refined as follows.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 26A24 (primary) and 26A06 (secondary).

**Theorem 2** For a smooth function  $f(x)$  on  $[0, 1]$  which is flat at  $x = 0$ , put  $Z(n) = \{x \in (0, 1) \mid f^{(n)}(x) = 0\}$  and  $z(n) = \#Z(n)$  for  $n \geq 0$ . Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z(n) = \infty$$

holds, where  $\infty$  might be  $\aleph_c$ .

**Corollary 3** 1) In general,  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z(n) = 0$ .

2) More strongly, for any  $k > 0$  there exist  $N > 0$  and  $y^{(n)}(l) \in Z(n)$  for  $n \geq N$  and  $l = 1, \dots, k$  which are strictly increasing in  $l$  and strictly decreasing in  $n$ , namely, satisfying

$$\text{for each fixed } n, y^{(n)}(l) < y^{(n)}(l+1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq k-1,$$

$$\text{for each fixed } l, y^{(n)}(l) > y^{(n+1)}(l).$$

Moreover it satisfies for any  $l$   $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y^{(n)}(l) = 0$ .

The accumulation of  $Z(n)$  to 0 ( $n \rightarrow 0$ ) must be formulated in many more stronger statements. The above corollary is one of them.

*Proof of Corollary 3.* There is a zero of  $f^{(n+1)}$  between two zeros of  $f^{(n)}$ . This simple argument, which will be used repeatedly, tells that once  $Z(n)$  accumulates to 0 for some  $n$ , so does  $Z(k)$  for any  $k \geq n$ . Therefore in this case the proof is done. Otherwise, 0 is always isolated from  $Z(n)$  and then we can pick up the least element  $y^{(n)}(1) \in Z(n)$ . Now it is clear that  $y^{(n+1)}(1) < y^{(n)}(1)$  for any  $n$ . Then, if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y^{(n)}(1) = c > 0$ ,  $f|_{[0,c]}$  contradicts to Theorem 1. This proves 1).

Now let us prove 2). Theorem 2 implies for any  $k$  there is  $N'$ ,  $\#Z(n) \geq k$  for  $n \geq N'$ . Like in 1), once 0 is accumulated by  $Z(N)$ , take any decreasing sequence  $y^{(n)}(k) \in Z(n)$  for  $n \geq N$ , and then it is fairly easy to take  $\{y^{(n)}(l)\}$  for other  $l$ 's so as to satisfy the conditions. Therefore we assume that 0 is isolated from  $Z(n)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Next, take  $A(n) \subset Z(n)$  to be the set of points which is accumulated from above by points in  $Z(n)$ . Clearly this set has  $\eta(n) = \min A(n)$  whenever  $A(n) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $A(n) = \emptyset$ , put  $\eta(n) = 1$ . If  $\eta(n) < 1$ ,  $f^{(n)}$  is flat at  $\eta(n)$  and  $\eta(n) \in A(n')$  for  $n' \geq n$ . Therefore the sequence  $\{\eta(n)\}_n$  is weakly decreasing.

In the case where  $c = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta(n) > 0$ , applying Theorem 2 to  $f|_{[0,c]}$ , we can find  $N$  such that  $\#(Z(N) \cap (0, c)) \geq k$ . Moreover, in this case, for any  $n \geq N$  we can take the  $k$  least zeros  $0 < y^{(n)}(1) < y^{(n)}(2) < \dots < y^{(n)}(k)$  because there is no accumulation from above. Automatically  $\{y^{(n)}(l)\}_n$  is strictly decreasing for each  $l$ . If  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y^{(n)}(k) = c' > 0$ , then again  $f|_{[0,c']}$  contradicts to Theorem 2. Therefore this case is done.

In the case where  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta(n) = 0$ , a similar argument in the case where 0 is accumulated by some  $Z(n)$  enable us to arrange  $\{y^{(n)}(l)\}$  so as to satisfy the conditions.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* The theorem is easily deduced from Lemma 4 by contradiction. Assume for some  $\alpha > 0$  that  $f(x)$  is smooth on  $[0, \alpha]$ , is flat at  $x = 0$ , and that its  $n$ -th derivative is positive on  $(0, \alpha]$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We adjust the function  $f$  into  $g(x) = f(\alpha)^{-1}f(\alpha x)$ . Then  $g(x)$  satisfies the condition of the lemma for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore  $g(x) \equiv 0$  on  $[0, 1)$ , and we obtain a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 4** Let  $n$  be an integer and  $g(x)$  be a function on  $[0, 1]$  of class  $C^{n+1}$  with the following properties.

- (1)  $g^{(k)}(0) = 0$  for  $k = 0, \dots, n$ , and  $g(1) = 1$ ,
- (2)  $g^{(n+1)}(x) > 0$  for  $x > 0$ .

Then  $g(x) < x^n$  holds on  $(0, 1)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.* It is enough to show that  $g(x)/x^n$  is increasing on  $[0, 1]$ . As  $\frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{g(x)}{x^n} \right) = \frac{xg'(x) - ng(x)}{x^{n+1}}$ , it is also sufficient to show that the numerator  $xg'(x) - ng(x)$  is positive on  $(0, 1)$ .

Then because  $(xg'(x) - ng(x))^{(n)} = xg^{(n+1)}(x)$  is positive on  $(0, 1]$  from our condition, we see successively that each  $k$ -th derivative  $(xg'(x) - ng(x))^{(k)} = xg^{(k+1)} - (n-k)g^{(k)}(x)$  vanishes at  $x = 0$  and therefore is positive on  $(0, 1]$  for  $k = n-1, n-2, \dots, 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

A variant of this lemma is used to prove Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* The key idea is not to look at  $z(n)$  but at the number  $s(n)$  of the quasi-positive and quasi-negative intervals of  $f^{(n)}$ . For a smooth (continuous) function  $g$  on  $[0, 1]$  a connected component of the closure of  $g^{-1}(0, \infty)$  [*resp.*  $g^{-1}(-\infty, 0)$ ] is called a *quasi-positive* [*resp.* *quasi-negative*] interval. Such intervals are exactly maximal ones on which the primitive  $\int g(x)dx$  of  $g$  is strictly monotone. Let us define  $s(g) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  to be the number of all the quasi-positive and quasi-negative intervals of  $g$ . Then we put  $s(n) = s(f^{(n)})$ .

If we have  $s(n) = \infty$  for some  $n$ ,  $s(k) = \infty$  for  $k \geq n$  as follows. If  $Z(n)$  has interior points for some  $n$ , so does  $Z(k)$  for  $k \geq n$ . If for some  $n$  we have  $z(n) = \infty$  and  $\text{int } Z(n) = \emptyset$ , the complement  $[0, 1] \setminus Z(n)$  consists of infinitely many intervals and possibly of one half open interval. Each open interval contains an element in  $Z(n+1)$ .

Therefore, eliminating such cases, we can assume  $z(n) < \infty$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consequently  $s(n) < \infty$  ( $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) holds as well. We want to prove  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s(n) = \infty$  under this assumption.

Let  $x^{(n)}(l)$  ( $l = 1, 2, \dots, s(n) - 1$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) denotes the bigger end point of the  $l$ -th of quasi-positive/negative intervals for  $f^{(n)}$ , namely  $[0, x^{(n)}(1)]$ ,  $[x^{(n)}(1), x^{(n)}(2)]$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $[x^{(n)}(l-1), x^{(n)}(l)]$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $[x^{(n)}(s(n)-1), 1]$  are the maximal intervals. Except for the final one, any quasi-positive [*resp.* quasi-negative] interval contains a maximal [*resp.* minimal] point in its interior. From this observation it is easy to see the following, among which

1) is a conclusion of Theorem 1, because it implies  $z(n) \geq 1$  for some  $n$  and then we have  $s(n+1) \geq 2$ .

**Assertion 5** 1)  $s(n) \geq 2$  for some  $n$ .

- 2)  $\{x^{(k)}(1)\}_k$  is strictly decreasing ( $k = n, n+1, n+2, \dots$ ) for  $n$  in 1).
- 3) Also for any  $m$  and  $0 < l < s(m)$ , the sequence  $\{x^{(k)}(l)\}_k$  is strictly decreasing ( $k = m, m+1, m+2, \dots$ ).
- 4)  $\{s(n)\}_n$  is weakly increasing, namely,  $s(n) \leq s(n+1)$  for any  $n$ .

Now let us proceed by contradiction. We assume that  $s(n)$  does not grow to  $\infty$ , i.e., for some  $N$ ,  $s(n) \equiv s(N) (= S)$  for any  $n \geq N$ . For fixed  $l \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ , the quasi-positivity/negativity of the  $l$ -th interval is independent of  $n \geq N$ . Under the assumption we also see the following.

**Assertion 6** For  $n \geq N$ ,

- 1)  $f^{(n)}$  is strictly monotone on the final interval  $[x^{(n)}(S-1), 1]$ .
- 2) In particular  $f^{(n)}(1) \neq 0$ . More precisely, if the final interval is quasi-positive [resp. quasi-negative] we have  $f^{(n)}(1) > 0$  [resp.  $f^{(n)}(1) < 0$ ].
- 3) The final intervals are increasing, namely, we have  $x^{(N)}(S-1) > x^{(N+1)}(S-1) > \dots > x^{(n)}(S-1) > x^{(n+1)}(S-1) > \dots$ .

By multiplying a non-zero constant to  $f$ , we assume that for any  $n \geq N$   $f^{(n)}$  is weakly increasing on the final interval and that  $f^{(N)}(1) = 1$ .

**Lemma 7** Under these assumptions, the following estimate holds.

$$f^{(N)}(x) \leq x^p \quad \text{on } [x^{(N)}(S-1), 1] \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This lemma apparently implies  $f^{(N)}|_{[x^{(N)}(S-1), 1]} \equiv 0$  and contradicts to our assumption. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 7.* We adjust the proof of Lemma 4 in order to apply to  $f^{(N)}$ . Put  $a_n = x^{(n)}(S-1)$  to simplify the notation.

It is enough to show that for any  $p \geq 0$ ,  $f^{(N)}(x) \cdot x^{-p}$  is strictly increasing on  $[a_N, 1]$  because  $f^{(N)}(x) \cdot x^{-p}|_{x=1} = 1$ . So it suffices to show  $(f^{(N)}(x) \cdot x^{-p})' > 0$ , namely,  $xf^{(N+1)}(x) - pf^{(N)}(x) > 0$  on  $(a_N, 1)$ .

For this purpose we prove inductively for  $k = p, p-1, p-2, \dots, 0$

$$(xf^{(N+1)}(x) - pf^{(N)}(x))^{(k)} > 0 \quad \text{on } (a_{N+k}, 1).$$

For  $k = p$ , on  $(a_{N+p+1}, 1)$  and in particular on  $(a_{N+p}, 1)$ , we have clearly

$$(xf^{(N+1)}(x) - pf^{(N)}(x))^{(p)} = xf^{(N+p+1)}(x) > 0.$$

Then on each step, as  $f^{(N+k+1)}(a_{N+k}) > 0$  and  $f^{(N+k)}(a_{N+k}) = 0$ ,

$$(xf^{(N+1)}(x) - pf^{(N)}(x))^{(k)} = xf^{(N+1+k)}(x) - (p-k)f^{(N+k)}(x)$$

is positive at  $x = a_{N+k}$ . Because the inductive hypothesis implies its derivative is positive on  $(a_{N+k}, 1)$  (and even on  $(a_{N+k+1}, 1)$ ), the induction is completed.  $\square$

**Problem 8** 1) For some smooth functions on  $[0, 1]$  which are flat at 0,  $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} Z(n)$  seems to be dense in  $[0, 1]$ . However, we do not see which kind of further properties as flat functions are essential for this phenomena, because it discusses points away from 0. Verify this phenomena for certain  $f$ 's and explain the reason.

2) Does there exist a smooth function on  $[0, 1]$  which is flat at 0 such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max Z(n) = 0$ ? Or how about flat at 0 such that the derived set of  $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} Z(n)$  coincides with  $\{0\}$ ? It seems plausible that such functions do not exist, while we do not know how to prove it.

## References

[N] Isaac Newton ; *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica* , (1687).

Hiroki KODAMA

*Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo,  
3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 153-8914, Japan*  
and

*Arithmer Inc.*

`kodma@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp`

Kazuo MASUDA

*3-40-15 Wakamiya, Nakano-ku, Tokyo 165-0033, Japan*

`math21@maple.ocn.ne.jp`

Yoshihiko MITSUMATSU

*Department of Mathematics, Chuo University  
1-13-27 Kasuga Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 112-8551, Japan*

`yoshi@math.chuo-u.ac.jp`