

On a recursion formula and some Tauberian theorems

Citation for published version (APA):

Bruijn, de, N. G., & Erdős, P. (1953). On a recursion formula and some Tauberian theorems. *Journal of Research of the National Institute of Standards and Technology*, 50(3), 161-164.
<https://doi.org/10.6028/jres.050.025>

DOI:

[10.6028/jres.050.025](https://doi.org/10.6028/jres.050.025)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/1953

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

On a Recursion Formula and on Some Tauberian Theorems¹

N. G. de Bruijn² and P. Erdős³

The paper is concerned with two sets of positive numbers, c_k and f_k , connected by a linear recursion formula. Under certain assumptions there exists an asymptotic relation between the partial sums $\sum_1^n c_k$ and $\sum_1^n f_k$.

The assumptions on the c_k are of Tauberian type. The method is based on discussing the associated power series $\sum_1^\infty c_k x^k$ and $\sum_1^\infty f_k x^k$.

Let

$$c_k \geq 0, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k = 1.$$

Define

$$f(1) = 1, \quad f(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_k f(n-k) \quad (n > 1). \quad (1)$$

This recursion formula has various applications in the theory of probability.⁴ In the present note, however, we will investigate (1) independently of its applications. Assume, first, that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k c_k < \infty.$$

Erdős, Feller, and Pollard [2] proved that if the greatest common divisor of the k 's with $c_k > 0$ is 1, then,

$$f(n) \rightarrow A^{-1} \quad (A = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k c_k). \quad (2)$$

It is easy to see that if the greatest common divisor of the k 's with $c_k > 0$ is greater than 1, then $\lim f(n)$ cannot exist.⁵ It was also shown that if

$$\sum_1^{\infty} k c_k = \infty,$$

then (2) always holds, in other words, $f(n) \rightarrow 0$.

Feller in a paper [3] restricted himself to the case when $\sum k c_k < \infty$. In the present paper we will not in general make this assumption.

We prove the following results:

Theorem 1. Assume that for every $k > 1$,

$$c_{k-1} c_{k+1} > c_k^2. \quad (3)$$

Then for every $n > 1$,

$$f(n-1) f(n+1) > f^2(n).$$

¹ Preparation of this paper was sponsored in part by the Office of Naval Research.

² Technische Hogeschool Delft. Present address: University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Holland.

³ National Bureau of Standards, and University of Aberdeen, Scotland.

⁴ See Feller [3]. This paper quotes most of the literature that deals with these questions.

⁵ See [2] and the remarks at the end of the present paper.

Other theorems of the same type as theorem 1 were proved by T. Kaluza [4]. Assuming (1), he showed for instance, that $f(2) > 0$, $f(n-1) f(n+1) > f^2(n)$ ($n=2,3,\dots$) imply that the c 's are positive. Furthermore, he proved that $f(1), f(2), \dots$ is a moment sequence if, and only if, c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots is a moment sequence. (Here c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots is called a moment sequence whenever it is of the form $a_n = \int_0^\infty u^n d\chi(u)$, where $\chi(u)$ is nondecreasing and such that the integral converges for all n).

Theorem 2. Put $r_k = \sum_{i \geq k} c_i$, $s(y) = \sum_{k \leq y} r_k$, $S(y) = \sum_{k \leq y} f(k)$. Assume that for every $p > 0$

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s(py)}{s(y)} = p^\alpha \quad (4)$$

for a fixed α , $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ (α independent of p). Then

$$s(y) S(y) = \frac{y}{\Gamma(2-\alpha) \Gamma(1+\alpha)} + o(y). \quad (5)$$

Theorem 3. Assume that (3) and (4) both hold. Then,

$$f(n) = \frac{1-\alpha}{s_n \Gamma(1+\alpha) \Gamma(2-\alpha)} + o\left(\frac{1}{s_n}\right). \quad (6)$$

In case $\alpha=1$, (6) does not give an asymptotic formula, it only gives $f(n) = o(s_n^{-1})$.

It would be interesting to obtain conditions that imply $f(n+1)/f(n) \rightarrow 1$. We can prove that if $c_{n+1}/c_n \rightarrow 1$, then $f(n+1)/f(n) \rightarrow 1$; also if

$$c_n < B \cdot \min_{1 \leq k \leq n} c_k,$$

then $f(n+1)/f(n) \rightarrow 1$. We suppress the proofs because we believe that very much more general conditions can be obtained. If $f(n+1)/f(n) \rightarrow 1$, then it is not difficult to prove that $c_{n-1} = o\{f(n)\}$. It can be conjectured that the converse is also true, under the additional condition that the g.c.d of the k 's with $c_k > 0$ is 1.

Proof of theorem 1. First we show that for any n

$$c_n \{ f(n+2)f(n) - f^2(n+1) \} \\ = \sum_{k=2}^n (c_{n+1}c_{k-1} - c_n c_k) \{ f(n+1)f(n+1-k) \\ - f(n)f(n+2-k) \}. \quad (7)$$

To prove (7) split the right-hand side into four sums. These are, respectively,

$$c_{n+1}f(n+1) \sum_{k=2}^n c_{k-1}f(n+1-k) = c_{n+1}f(n+1)f(n); \\ -c_{n+1}f(n) \sum_{k=2}^n c_{k-1}f(n+2-k) \\ = -c_{n+1}f(n) \{ f(n+1) - c_n f(1) \}; \\ -c_n f(n+1) \sum_{k=2}^n c_k f(n+1-k) \\ = -c_n f(n+1) \{ f(n+1) - c_1 f(n) \}; \\ c_n f(n) \sum_{k=2}^n c_k f(n+2-k) \\ = c_n f(n) \{ f(n+2) - c_{n+1} f(1) - c_1 f(n+1) \}.$$

Addition gives $c_n \{ f(n+2)f(n) - f^2(n+1) \}$, which proves (7).

To prove theorem 1, observe that

$$f(1)f(3) - f^2(2) = c_1 f(2) + c_2 f(1) - f^2(2) = c_2 f(1) > 0.$$

(3) implies that all the c 's are positive.) Assume now $n > 2$, and suppose that $f(k)f(k+2) > f^2(k+1)$ is already proved for $1 \leq k < n$. Then (3) implies $c_{n+1}c_{k-1} > c_n c_k$, since by (3) $(c_2/c_1) < (c_3/c_2) < \dots$. Thus in (7) all terms on the right side are positive, and we obtain $f(n)f(n+2) > f^2(n+1)$, which proves theorem 1.

Remarks: It is clear from the proof of theorem 1 that if we only assume that $c_{k+1}c_{k-1} \geq c_k^2$ ($k > 1$), we obtain $f(n+1)f(n-1) \geq f^2(n)$ ($n > 1$).

If (3) is true, then, by theorem 1, $f(n+1)/f(n)$ is an increasing function of n . We have $f(n+1)/f(n) < 1$ for all n , for otherwise we would have $f(n+1)/f(n) > a > 1$ for some a and all large n . This would contradict the fact that $f(n) = O(1)$, which easily follows from (1). From $f(n+1) < f(n)$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) it follows that

$$f(n)(c_1 + \dots + c_n) < f(n+1) < f(n), \quad (8)$$

and so (3) implies $f(n+1)/f(n) \rightarrow 1$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$).

To prove theorem 2 we need some lemmas.

*Lemma 1.*⁶ Let d_1, d_2, \dots be an infinite sequence, and let α be a number greater than -1 . Put $g(y) = \sum_{k \leq y} d_k$, and assume that $g(y) > 0$ for all large y , and that,

⁶ As far as the authors know, a complete proof of this lemma was not published before, although it is the Abelian counterpart of the Tauberian lemma 2, which is due to Karamata. K. L. Chung brought to our notice that in Doetsch [1] an incomplete proof is presented for a theorem very similar to our lemma 1. Doetsch claims to use only the inequalities $L(y) = O(y^\epsilon)$, $1/L(y) = O(y^\epsilon)$ ($y \rightarrow \infty$), whereas an inequality of the type (11) seems to be indispensable.

for every $p > 0$,

$$g(py)/g(y) \rightarrow p^\alpha \quad (y \rightarrow \infty). \quad (9)$$

Then the series $D(x) = \sum_1^\infty d_k x^k$ converges for $|x| < 1$, and if $t > 0$, $t \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$D(e^{-t}) = \{1 + o(1)\} g(1/t) \Gamma(1 + \alpha). \quad (10)$$

Proof. The function $L(y) = g(y)y^{-\alpha}$ is positive for y large, and it is measurable and bounded over any finite interval $0 \leq y \leq A$ (for $g(y) = 0$ if $0 \leq y < 1$). Furthermore, $L(y)$ is slowly increasing, that is, $L(py)/L(y) \rightarrow 1$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$, for every $p > 0$.

We shall prove that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist positive constants $C(\epsilon)$, $C_1(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\left| \frac{L(py)}{L(y)} \right| < C_1(\epsilon) \{ p^\epsilon + p^{-\epsilon} \} \quad (p > 0, y > C(\epsilon)). \quad (11)$$

It is known⁷ that $L(py)/L(y) \rightarrow 1$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly for $a \leq p \leq b$, where a and b are arbitrary positive. Therefore, $C(\epsilon)$ can be determined such that $L(y) > 0$ for $y \geq C(\epsilon)$ and such that

$$\log \{ L(py)/L(y) \} < \epsilon \quad (e^{-1} \leq p \leq e, y \geq C(\epsilon)).$$

It follows by induction that

$$\log \{ L(py)/L(y) \} < \epsilon(1 + \log p) \quad (p \geq 1, y \geq C(\epsilon)), \quad (12)$$

and

$$\log \{ L(py)/L(y) \} < \epsilon(1 + \log p^{-1}) \\ (C(\epsilon)y^{-1} \leq p \leq 1, y \geq C(\epsilon)). \quad (13)$$

Put

$$M(\epsilon) = \sup_{0 \leq y \leq C(\epsilon)} L(y).$$

Then we have, for $0 < p < C(\epsilon)y^{-1}$, $y \geq C(\epsilon)$ by (13),

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \log \{ L(py)/L(y) \} \\ = \log \{ L(C(\epsilon))/L(y) \} + \log \{ L(py)/L(C(\epsilon)) \} \\ < \epsilon \left\{ 1 + \log \frac{y}{C(\epsilon)} \right\} + \log \frac{M(\epsilon)}{L(C(\epsilon))} \\ < \epsilon(1 + \log p^{-1}) + C_2(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (14)$$

Now (12), (13) and (14) prove (11).

In the first place, we obtain from (11) that $L(x) = O(x^\epsilon)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, and therefore $d_k = O(k^{\alpha+\epsilon})$. Hence the power series for $D(x)$ converges if $|x| < 1$.

We have, for $t > 0$,

$$D(e^{-t}) = \int_0^\infty e^{-yt} dg(y) = \int_0^\infty te^{-yt} g(y) dy,$$

⁷ See [5] (where $L(y)$ is assumed to be continuous), and [7].

and so,

$$D(e^{-t}) = t^{-\alpha} L(t^{-1}) \int_0^{\infty} \phi(y, t) dy,$$

where

$$\phi(y, t) = e^{-y} y^{\alpha} \frac{L(y/t)}{L(1/t)}.$$

For any fixed $y > 0$, $\phi(y, t)$ tends to $e^{-y} y^{\alpha}$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, by (11), $\phi(y, t)$ can be majorized by a positive function of y only, whose integral over $(0, \infty)$ converges. Therefore, by the Arzela-Lebesgue theorem, we have

$$\int_0^{\infty} \phi(y, t) dy \rightarrow \int_0^{\infty} e^{-y} y^{\alpha} dy = \Gamma(1 + \alpha) \quad (t > 0, t \rightarrow 0).$$

This proves the lemma.

Lemma 2. Assume that

$$D(x) = \sum_1^{\infty} d_k x^k$$

is convergent for $|x| < 1$, and that $d_k \geq 0$ but not all $d_k = 0$. Let $\alpha \geq 0$ be fixed. Assume that for any fixed $p > 0$

$$D(e^{-p^t})/D(e^{-t}) \rightarrow p^{-\alpha} \quad (t > 0, t \rightarrow 0). \quad (15)$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{k \leq t^{-1}} d_k = \{1 + o(1)\} D(e^{-t})/\Gamma(1 + \alpha) \quad (t > 0, t \rightarrow 0).$$

This result is due to Karamata [6].

Theorem 2 can be derived from lemmas 1 and 2. Following a suggestion of Karamata, we first prove a more general theorem:

Theorem 4. Let $a_k \geq 0$ (but not all = 0), $b_k \geq 0$ (but not all = 0), $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$;

$$d_n = \sum_1^{n-1} a_k b_{n-k} \quad (n = 2, 3, \dots).$$

Put

$$s(y) = \sum_{k \leq y} a_k, \quad S(y) = \sum_{k \leq y} b_k, \quad T(y) = \sum_{k \leq y} d_k.$$

Assume that for every $p > 0$, we have

$$s(py)/s(y) \rightarrow p^{\alpha}, \quad T(py)/T(y) \rightarrow p^{\gamma} \quad (y \rightarrow \infty),$$

where $\gamma \geq \alpha \geq 0$, γ and α independent of p . Then we have

$$S(y) = \left\{1 + o(1)\right\} \frac{T(y)}{s(y)} \frac{\Gamma(1 + \gamma)}{\Gamma(1 + \gamma - \alpha)\Gamma(1 + \alpha)}.$$

Proof. Put $A(x) = \sum_1^{\infty} a_k x^k$, $B(x) = \sum_1^{\infty} b_k x^k$,

$D(x) = \sum_2^{\infty} d_k x^k$, then we have formally $A(x)B(x) = D(x)$.

Both $A(x)$ and $D(x)$ are analytic for $|x| < 1$ (see

lemma 1); it follows that $B(x)$ is analytic in some circle $|x| < \delta$. The coefficients of $B(x)$ are non-negative, and for $0 \leq x < 1$, $B(x)$ is analytic (since $A(x) > 0$ for $0 < x < 1$). Thus by a theorem of Pringsheim (see [8], sec. 17) $B(x)$ is analytic for $|x| < 1$.

By lemma 1 we have, as $t > 0$, $t \rightarrow 0$,

$$A(e^{-t}) \sim s(t^{-1})\Gamma(1 + \alpha); \quad D(e^{-t}) \sim T(t^{-1})\Gamma(1 + \gamma).$$

Hence for any $p > 0$,

$$B(e^{-p^t})/B(e^{-t}) \rightarrow p^{-\alpha - \gamma}.$$

But then by lemma 2

$$S(t^{-1}) \sim B(e^{-t})/\Gamma(1 + \gamma - \alpha).$$

Now theorem 4 follows immediately from $D(x) = A(x)B(x)$.

Proof of theorem 2. Theorem 2 is an easy consequence of theorem 4. If

$$F(x) = f(1)x + f(2)x^2 + \dots, \quad R(x) = r_1x + r_2x^2 + \dots,$$

then it follows from (1) that $F(x)R(x) = x^2/(1-x)$, and so

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} r_k f(n-k) = 1 \quad (n = 2, 3, \dots). \quad (16)$$

Therefore, taking

$$a_k = r_k, \quad b_k = f(k) \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots), \\ d_n = 1 \quad (n = 2, 3, \dots), \quad \gamma = 1,$$

we obtain from theorem 4

$$S(n) \sim \frac{n}{s(n)} \frac{\Gamma(2)}{\Gamma(2 - \alpha)\Gamma(1 + \alpha)},$$

which proves theorem 2.

Proof of theorem 3. Let ϵ be a number greater than 0. From (8) we infer

$$f(n) > \{S_{n(1+\epsilon)} - S_n\}/(\epsilon n + 1). \quad (17)$$

It follows from (4) and (5) that

$$s_n S_n \sim Cn, \quad s_n S_{n(1+\epsilon)} \sim Cn(1+\epsilon)^{1-\alpha},$$

where $C = 1/\{\Gamma(2 - \alpha)\Gamma(1 + \alpha)\}$. Therefore, (17) implies

$$\liminf f(n)s_n \geq C\{(1 + \epsilon)^{1-\alpha} - 1\}/\epsilon \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

This holds for every $\epsilon > 0$. Making $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\liminf f(n)s_n \geq (1 - \alpha)C.$$

Applying the same argument to $n(1-\epsilon)$ instead of $n(1+\epsilon)$ we obtain $\liminf f(n)s_n \leq (1-\alpha)C$. This proves theorem 3.

Some final remarks: Feller [3] proved the following theorem: Assume that the g.c.d. of the k 's with $c_k > 0$ is 1, and that

$$\sum_1^\infty k^2 c_k < \infty, \quad (18)$$

then

$$\sum_{l=1}^n f(l) = A^{-1}n + d + o(1), \quad (19)$$

where $A = \sum_1^\infty c_k$, and, in fact, $\sum_1^\infty \{f(l) - A^{-1}\} < \infty$.

Now we show the converse, namely, if (19) holds, then (18) holds too.

Theorem 5. Assume that the g.c.d. of the k 's with $c_k > 0$ is 1, and that $\sum_1^\infty k^2 c_k = \infty$. Then we have

$$\sum_1^\infty \{f(l) - A^{-1}\} = \infty.$$

Proof. If $A = \infty$, then (19) expresses that $\sum_1^\infty f(l) < \infty$.

This is false, since $\sum_1^\infty f(l)x^l = x / \{1 - \sum_1^\infty c_k x^{k^2}\}$, and the right-hand side tends to ∞ if $x \rightarrow 1$.

Now assume $A < \infty$. Since $f(l) \rightarrow A^{-1}$, we have by (16),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_1^n f(l) \cdot \sum_1^n r_k &= \sum_{2 \leq k+l \leq n} f(l)r_k + \sum_{l=1}^n f(l) \sum_{n+1-l}^n r_k \\ &= n-1 + \sum_{l=1}^n (A^{-1} + \epsilon_l) \sum_{n+1-l}^n r_k \\ &= n-1 + A^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n k r_k + \sum_{l=1}^n \epsilon_l \sum_{n+1-l}^n r_k \\ &= n-1 + \sum_1 + \sum_2. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\sum_1 \rightarrow \infty$, since $\sum k r_k$ diverges ($\sum k r_k > \frac{1}{2} \sum k^2 c_k$), and $\sum_2 = o(\sum_1)$, since $\epsilon_l \rightarrow 0$.

Finally, we have $\sum_1^n r_k = \sum_1^n k c_k = A$, and so

$$A \sum_1^n f(l) > n + \sum_1 + o(\sum_1).$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_1^n \{f(l) - A^{-1}\} > \{A^{-1} + o(1)\} \sum_1 \rightarrow \infty,$$

q.e.d.

Let D denote the greatest common factor of the k 's with $c_k > 0$. Erdős, Feller, and Pollard [2] proved that if $D=1$ and $\sum k c_k < \infty$, then

$$\sum_2^\infty |f(k) - f(k-1)| < \infty, \quad (20)$$

which, of course, implies that $f(k)$ tends to a limit. It seems possible that the condition $\sum k c_k < \infty$ is superfluous.

If $D > 1$ and $\sum k c_k < \infty$, then (20) does not hold, since $\lim f(k)$ does not exist. In order to see this, take $c_k^* = c_{kD}$, $f^*(k) = f(kD - D + 1)$; it follows that

$$f^*(k) \rightarrow (\sum k c_k^*)^{-1} = DA^{-1}.$$

Hence,

$$f(kD+1) \rightarrow DA^{-1} \neq 0, \quad f(kD+2) \equiv 0.$$

If $D > 1$ and $\sum k c_k = \infty$, then we have $f(k) \rightarrow 0$. Nevertheless, the series (20) need not converge. Take $c_n = 0$ for n odd, $c_n = 24\pi^{-2}n^{-2}$ for n even. Then we have $f(2n) = 0$, $f(2n-1) = f^*(n)$, where $f^*(n)$ and $c_n^* = c_{2n}$ are related by an equation of the type (1), and $\sum_1^\infty c_n^* = 1$. It follows, by theorem 3, that $f^*(n) \sim \pi^2 / (6 \log n)$.

Therefore,

$$f(2n-1) \sim \pi^2 / (6 \log n), \quad f(2n) = 0,$$

and the series (20) diverges.

- [1] Doetsch, Theorie und Anwendung der Laplace-Transformationen (Springer, Leipzig, 1937).
- [2] P. Erdős, W. Feller and H. Pollard, A property of power series with positive coefficients, *Bul. Am. Math. Soc.* **55**, 201-204 (1949). See also, Kolmogorov *Bul. de l'Université d'État à Moscow, Sec. A.* **1**, 1-15 (1937).
- [3] W. Feller, Fluctuation theory of recurrent events, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **67**, 98-119 (1949).
- [4] T. Kaluza, Ueber die Koeffizienten reziproker Funktionen, *Math. Z.* **28**, 161-170 (1928).
- [5] J. Karamata, Sur un mode de croissance régulière des fonctions, *Mathematica (Cluj)* **4**, 38-53 (1930).
- [6] J. Karamata, Neuer Beweis und Verallgemeinerung der Tauberschen Sätze, welche die Laplacesche und Stieltjessche Transformation betreffen, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **164**, 27-39 (1931).
- [7] J. Korevaar, T. van Aardenne-Ehrenfest and N. G. de Bruijn, A note on slowly oscillating functions, *Nieuw. Arch. Wiskunde (2)* **23**, 77-86 (1949).
- [8] E. Landau, Darstellung und Begründung einiger neuerer Ergebnisse der Funktionentheorie, (Springer, Berlin, 2e Aufl. 1929).

Los Angeles, August 10, 1950.