Petteri Harjulehto; Peter Hästö

Uniform convexity and associate spaces

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 68 (2018), No. 4, 1011–1020

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/147517

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 68 (143) (2018), 1011–1020

UNIFORM CONVEXITY AND ASSOCIATE SPACES

Petteri Harjulehto, Turku, Peter Hästö, Oulu, Turku

Received February 8, 2017. Published online April 13, 2018.

Abstract. We prove that the associate space of a generalized Orlicz space $L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$ is given by the conjugate modular φ^* even without the assumption that simple functions belong to the space. Second, we show that every weakly doubling Φ-function is equivalent to a doubling Φ-function. As a consequence, we conclude that $L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$ is uniformly convex if φ and φ^* are weakly doubling.

MSC 2010: 46E30, 46A25

Keywords: generalized Orlicz space; Musielak-Orlicz space; nonstandard growth; variable exponent; double phase; uniform convexity; associate space

1. Intorduction

Generalized Orlicz spaces $L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$ have been studied since the 1940s. A major synthesis of functional analysis in these spaces, based on work, e.g. of Hudzik, Kamińska and Musielak, is given in the monograph [16]. Following ideas of Maeda, Mizuta, Ohno and Shimomura (e.g. [15]), we have studied these spaces from a point-of-view which emphasizes the possibility of choosing the Φ-function generating the norm in the space appropriately [5], [9], [10], [12]. From this perspective, some classical concepts, like convexity of the Φ-function, are too rigid.

Renewed interest in the topic has arisen recently from studies of PDE with nonstandard growth, including the variable exponent case $\varphi(x,t) = t^{p(x)}$ and the double phase case $\varphi(x,t) = t^p + a(x)t^q$. Such problems have been studied e.g. in [2], [3], [4], [8], [17]. For a detailed motivation of our context and additional references we refer to the introduction of [11].

In this note, we tie up some loose ends concerning the basic functional analysis of generalized Orlicz spaces in our monograph [6]. In the book we relied on the assumption that all simple functions belong to our space. This excludes for instance

DOI: 10.21136/CMJ.2018.0054-17

the case $\varphi(x,t) := |x|^{-n}t^2$, where n is the dimension. We can now remove this assumption from the following result (cf. [6], Theorem 2.7.4). For simplicity, we consider only the Lebesgue measure on subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. See the next sections for definitions.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be measurable. If $\varphi \in \Phi_w(A)$, then $(L^\varphi)' = L^{\varphi^*}$, i.e. for all measurable $f\colon A \to \mathbb{R}$*

$$\|f\|_{\varphi(\cdot)} \approx \sup_{\|g\|_{\varphi^*(\cdot)} \leqslant 1} \int_A |f(x)g(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The proof relies among other things on upgrading the weak Φ-function to a strong Φ-function based on our earlier work. The next result is of the same type, upgrading weak doubling to strong doubling.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be measurable. If $\varphi \in \Phi_w(A)$ satisfies Δ_2^w and ∇_2^w, then there exists $\psi \in \Phi_w(A)$ with $\varphi \sim \psi$ satisfying Δ_2 and ∇_2.*

Recall that a vector space X is *uniformly convex* if it has a norm $\|\cdot\|$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ with

$$\|x - y\| \geqslant \varepsilon \quad \text{or} \quad \|x + y\| \leqslant 2(1-\delta)$$

for all unit vectors x and y. In the Orlicz case, it is well known that the space L^φ is reflexive and uniformly convex if and only if φ and φ^* are doubling [18], Theorem 2, page 297. Hudzik in [13] showed in 1983 that the same conditions are sufficient for uniform convexity (see also [7], [14]). With the equivalence technique, we are able to give a very simple proof of this result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be measurable and $\varphi \in \Phi_w(A)$. If φ satisfies Δ_2^w and ∇_2^w, then $L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$ is uniformly convex and reflexive.*

2. Φ-functions

By $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote a measurable set. The notation $f \lesssim g$ means that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $f \leqslant Cg$. The notation $f \approx g$ means that $f \lesssim g \lesssim f$. By c we denote a generic constant whose value may change between appearances. A function f is *almost increasing* if there exists a constant $L \geqslant 1$ such that $f(s) \leqslant Lf(t)$ for all $s \leqslant t$ (abbreviated L-almost increasing). *Almost decreasing* is defined analogously.

Definition 2.1. We say that $\varphi\colon A\times[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty]$ is a *weak Φ-function*, and write $\varphi\in\Phi_w(A)$, if the following conditions hold:

▷ For every $t\in[0,\infty)$ the function $x\mapsto\varphi(x,t)$ is measurable and for every $x\in A$ the function $t\mapsto\varphi(x,t)$ is non-decreasing and left-continuous.

▷ $\varphi(x,0)=\lim\limits_{t\to0^+}\varphi(x,t)=0$ and $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty}\varphi(x,t)=\infty$ for every $x\in A$.

▷ The function $t\mapsto\varphi(x,t)/t$ is L-almost increasing for $t>0$ uniformly in A. "Uniformly" means that L is independent of x.

If $\varphi\in\Phi_w(A)$ is convex, then it is called a *Φ-function*, and we write $\varphi\in\Phi(A)$. If $\varphi\in\Phi(A)$ is continuous as a function into the extended real line $[0,\infty]$, then it is a *strong Φ-function*, and we write $\varphi\in\Phi_s(A)$.

We say that $\varphi,\psi\in\Phi_w(A)$ are *weakly equivalent*, $\varphi\sim\psi$, if there exist $D>1$ and $h\in L^1(A)$ such that

$$\varphi(x,t)\leqslant\psi(x,Dt)+h(x)\quad\text{and}\quad\psi(x,t)\leqslant\varphi(x,Dt)+h(x).$$

Two functions φ and ψ are *equivalent*, $\varphi\simeq\psi$, if the previous conditions hold with $h\equiv0$. Note that $\varphi\sim\psi$ if and only if $L^{\varphi(\cdot)}=L^{\psi(\cdot)}$. In the case $\varphi,\psi\in\Phi$, this has been proved in [6], Theorem 2.8.1. For the weak Φ-functions the proof is the same.

We define the *doubling condition* Δ_2 and the *weak doubling condition* Δ_2^w by

$$\varphi(x,2t)\lesssim\varphi(x,t),\quad\varphi(x,2t)\lesssim\varphi(x,t)+h(x),$$

respectively, where $h\in L^1$ and the implicit constant are independent of x. If $\varphi\in\Phi_w(A)$, then we define a conjugate Φ-function by

$$\varphi^*(x,t):=\sup_{s\geqslant0}(st-\varphi(x,s)).$$

We say that φ satisfies ∇_2 or ∇_2^w if φ^* satisfies Δ_2 or Δ_2^w, respectively. All these assumptions are invariant under equivalence, $\simeq$, of Φ-functions.

In some situations, it is useful to have a more quantitative version of the Δ_2 and ∇_2 conditions. It can be shown that (aDec) is equivalent to Δ_2 and (aInc) to ∇_2 (cf. [11], Lemma 2.6, and [5], Proposition 3.6), where (aInc) and (aDec) means the following:

(aInc) There exist $\gamma^->1$ and $L\geqslant1$ such that $t\mapsto\varphi(x,t)/t^{\gamma^-}$ is L-almost increasing in $(0,\infty)$.

(aDec) There exist $\gamma^+>1$ and $L\geqslant1$ such that $t\mapsto\varphi(x,t)/t^{\gamma^+}$ is L-almost decreasing in $(0,\infty)$.

Note that the optimal γ^- and γ^+ correspond to the lower and upper Matuszewska-Orlicz indexes, respectively.

Let us start by showing that weak doubling can be upgraded to strong doubling via weak equivalence of Φ-functions. For this we will use the *left-inverse* of a weak Φ-function, defined by the formula

$$\varphi^{-1}(x,\tau) := \inf\{t > 0\colon \varphi(x,t) \geqslant \tau\}.$$

We point out that if $\varphi \in \Phi_s(\Omega)$, then by [9], page 4, we have for every t that

$$\varphi(x, \varphi^{-1}(x,t)) = t. \tag{2.1}$$

P r o o f of Theorem 1.2. By [10], Proposition 2.3, we may assume without loss of generality that $\varphi \in \Phi_s(A)$. By assumption,

$$\varphi(x,2t) \leqslant D\varphi(x,t) + h(x), \quad \varphi^*(x,2t) \leqslant D\varphi^*(x,t) + h(x)$$

for some $D > 2$, $h \in L^1$ and all $x \in A$ and $t \geqslant 0$. Using $\varphi = \varphi^{**}$ (see [6], Corollary 2.6.3), and the definition of the conjugate Φ-function, we obtain from the second inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(x,2t) &= \sup_{u\geqslant 0}(2tu - \varphi^*(x,u)) \leqslant \sup_{u\geqslant 0}\Big(2tu - \frac{1}{D}(\varphi^*(x,2u) - h(x))\Big)\\ &= \sup_{u\geqslant 0}\Big(2tu - \frac{1}{D}\varphi^*(x,2u)\Big) + \frac{1}{D}h(x) = \frac{1}{D}\sup_{u\geqslant 0}(Dt2u - \varphi^*(x,2u)) + \frac{1}{D}h(x)\\ &= \frac{1}{D}\varphi(x,Dt) + \frac{1}{D}h(x).\end{aligned}$$

Define $t_x := \varphi^{-1}(x,h(x))$ and suppose that $t \geqslant t_x$ so that $h(x) \leqslant \varphi(x,t)$. By convexity, we conclude that $Dh(x) \leqslant D\varphi(x,t) \leqslant \varphi(x,Dt)$. Hence in the case $t \geqslant t_x$ we have

$$\varphi(x,2t) \leqslant (D+1)\varphi(x,t), \quad \varphi(x,2t) \leqslant \frac{D+1}{D^2}\varphi(x,Dt).$$

Let $p := \log_2(D+1)$ and

$$q := \frac{\log(D^2/(D+1))}{\log(D/2)}.$$

Note that $q > 1$ since $D^2/(D+1) > D/2$. Divide the first inequality by $(2t)^p$ and the second one by $(2t)^q$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\varphi(x,2t)}{(2t)^p} &\leqslant \frac{D+1}{2^p}\frac{\varphi(x,t)}{t^p} = \frac{\varphi(x,t)}{t^p},\\ \frac{\varphi(x,2t)}{(2t)^q} &\leqslant \frac{(D+1)D^q}{D^2 2^q}\frac{\varphi(x,Dt)}{(Dt)^q} = \frac{\varphi(x,Dt)}{(Dt)^q}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $s > t \geqslant t_x$. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^k t < s \leqslant 2^{k+1} t$. Hence

$$\frac{\varphi(x,s)}{s^p} \leqslant \frac{\varphi(x,2^{k+1}t)}{(2^k t)^p} = 2^p \frac{\varphi(x,2^{k+1}t)}{(2^{k+1}t)^p} \leqslant 2^p \frac{\varphi(x,2^k t)}{(2^k t)^p} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant 2^p \frac{\varphi(x,t)}{t^p},$$

so φ satisfies (aDec) with $\gamma^+ = p$ for $t \geqslant t_x$. Similarly, we find that φ satisfies (aInc) with $\gamma^- = q$ for $t \geqslant t_x$.

Define

$$\psi(x,t) := \begin{cases} \varphi(x,t) & \text{for } t \geqslant t_x, \\ c_x t^2 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where c_x is chosen so that ψ is continuous at t_x. Then ψ satisfies (aDec) on $[0, t_x]$ and $[t_x, \infty)$, hence on the whole real axis with $\gamma^+ = \max\{p, 2\}$, similarly for (aInc) with $\gamma^- = \min\{q, 2\}$.

Furthermore, $\varphi(x,t) = \psi(x,t)$ when $t \geqslant t_x$, and so it follows that $|\varphi(x,t) - \psi(x,t)| \leqslant \varphi(x,t_x) = h(x)$, where (2.1) is used for the last step. Since $h \in L^1$, this means that $\varphi \sim \psi$, so ψ is the required function. □

Remark 2.2. From the proof of the previous theorem, we see that the two conditions are not interdependent, i.e. if $\varphi \in \Phi_w(A)$ satisfies Δ_2^w, then there exists $\psi \in \Phi_w(A)$ with $\varphi \sim \psi$ satisfying Δ_2; similarly for only ∇_2^w and ∇_2.

3. Associate spaces

We denote by $L^0(A)$ the set of measurable functions in A.

Definition 3.1. Let $\varphi \in \Phi_w(A)$ and define the *modular* $\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)}$ for $f \in L^0(A)$ by

$$\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)}(f) := \int_A \varphi(x, |f(x)|)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The *generalized Orlicz space*, also called Musielak-Orlicz space, is defined as the set

$$L^{\varphi(\cdot)}(A) := \{f \in L^0(A)\colon \lim_{\lambda \to 0^+} \varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)}(\lambda f) = 0\}$$

equipped with the (Luxemburg) quasinorm

$$\|f\|_{\varphi(\cdot)} := \inf\Big\{\lambda > 0\colon \varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)}\Big(\frac{f}{\lambda}\Big) \leqslant 1\Big\}.$$

Let us start with a lemma which shows that we can approximate the function 1 with a monotonically increasing sequence of functions in the generalized Orlicz space. Note that the next lemma is trivial if $L^\infty \subset L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$, as was assumed in [6] when dealing with associate spaces.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\varphi \in \Phi_w(A)$. There exists positive $h_k \in L^{\varphi(\cdot)}(A)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $h_k \nearrow 1$ and $\{h_k = 1\} \nearrow A$.*

P r o o f. For $k \geqslant 1$ we define

$$E_k := \{x\colon\ \varphi(x, 2^{-k}) \leqslant 1\}.$$

Since $\varphi(\cdot, t)$ is assumed to be measurable, E_k is a measurable set. Since $\lim_{t\to 0^+} \varphi(x,t) = 0$, there exists for every $x \in A$ an index k_x such that $x \in E_{k_x}$. And since φ is non-decreasing, it follows that $E_k \nearrow A$ as $k \to \infty$. We define

$$h(x) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{-i-1} \chi_{E_i}(x).$$

Then $h(x) \in (0,1]$ for every x, and h is measurable. Suppose that $x \in E_{k+1} \setminus E_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$h(x) = \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} 2^{-i-1} = 2^{-(k+1)}.$$

Hence, by the definition of E_{k+1}, we find that $\varphi(x, h(x)) \leqslant 1$. Since $A = \bigcup_k E_k$, we have $\varphi(x, h(x)) \leqslant 1$ in A. (The function h can alternatively be constructed using the left-inverse of φ, as in the previous section.)

Let us define $h_k := \min\{kh\chi_{B(0,k)\cap A}, 1\}$. Then

$$\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)}(k^{-1}h_k) \leqslant \int_{B(0,k)\cap A} \varphi(x,h)\,\mathrm{d}x \leqslant |B(0,k)| < \infty,$$

so that $h_k \in L^{\varphi(\cdot)}(A)$. Since $h > 0$, it follows that $kh\chi_{B(0,k)\cap A} \nearrow \infty$ for every x, and so $h_k \nearrow 1$, as required. $\square$

We define the *associate space* by $(L^{\varphi(\cdot)})'(A) := \{f \in L^0(A)\colon\ \|f\|_{(L^{\varphi(\cdot)})'} < \infty\}$, where

$$\|f\|_{(L^{\varphi})'} := \sup_{\|g\|_{\varphi(\cdot)} \leqslant 1} \int_A fg\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

If $g \in (L^{\varphi})'$ and $f \in L^{\varphi}$, then $fg \in L^1$ by the definition of the associate space. In particular, the integral $\int_A fg\,\mathrm{d}x$ is well defined and

$$\left|\int_A fg\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leqslant \|g\|_{(L^{\varphi})'}\|f\|_{\varphi(\cdot)}.$$

Hölder's inequality holds in generalized Orlicz spaces with constant 2, without restrictions on the Φ_w-function ([6], Lemma 2.6.5):

$$\int_A |f|\,|g|\,\mathrm{d}x \leqslant 2\|f\|_{\varphi(\cdot)}\|g\|_{\varphi^*(\cdot)}. \tag{3.1}$$

Here φ^* is the conjugate Φ-function defined in the previous section. Furthermore, we can define a conjugate modular on the dual space by the formula

$$(\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)})^*(J) := \sup_{f \in L^{\varphi(\cdot)}} (J(f) - \varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)}(f))$$

for $J \in (L^{\varphi(\cdot)})^*$, i.e. $J\colon L^{\varphi(\cdot)} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded linear functional. By J_f we denote the functional $g \mapsto \int fg \, \mathrm{d}x$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We follow the outlines of [6], Theorem 2.7.4, but use Lemma 3.2 to get rid of the extraneous assumption that simple functions belong to the space. The inequality $\|f\|_{(L^{\varphi})'} \leqslant 2\|f\|_{\varphi^*(\cdot)}$ follows from (3.1).

Let then $f \in (L^{\varphi})'$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ be an enumeration of non-negative rational numbers with $q_1 = 0$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in A$ define

$$r_k(x) := \max_{j=1,\ldots,k} q_j|f(x)| - \varphi(x, q_j).$$

The special choice $q_1 = 0$ implies $r_k(x) \geqslant 0$ for all $x \geqslant 0$. Since $\mathbb{Q}$ is dense in $[0, \infty)$ and $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is left-continuous, $r_k(x) \nearrow \varphi^*(x, |f(x)|)$ for every $x \in A$ as $k \to \infty$.

Since f and $\varphi(\cdot, t)$ are measurable functions, the sets

$$E_{i,k} := \{x \in A\colon \ q_i|f(x)| - \varphi(x, q_i) = \max_{j=1,\ldots,k} (q_j|f(x)| - \varphi(x, q_j))\}$$

are measurable. Let $F_{i,k} := E_{i,k} \setminus (E_{1,k} \cup \ldots \cup E_{i-1,k})$. Define

$$g_k := \sum_{i=1}^{k} q_i \chi_{F_{i,k}}.$$

Then g_k is measurable and bounded and

$$r_k(x) = g_k(x)|f(x)| - \varphi(x, g_k(x))$$

for all $x \in A$.

Let $h_k \in L^{\varphi(\cdot)}(A)$ be as in Lemma 3.2, i.e. $\{h_k = 1\} \nearrow A$ and $0 < h_k \leqslant 1$. Since g_k is bounded, it follows that $w := \operatorname{sgn} f \, h_k g_k \in L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$. Denote $E := \{fw \geqslant \varphi(x, w)\}$.

Since the conjugate modular is defined as a supremum over functions in $L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$, we get a lower bound by using the particular function $w\chi_E$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)})^*(J_f) &\geqslant J_f(w\chi_E) - \varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)}(w\chi_E) = \int_E fw - \varphi(x, w) \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &\geqslant \int_{\{h_k=1\}} g_k|f| - \varphi(x, g_k) \, \mathrm{d}x = \int_A r_k \chi_{\{h_k=1\}} \, \mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

Since $r_k \chi_{\{h_k=1\}} \nearrow \varphi^*(x,|f|)$, it follows by monotone convergence that $(\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)})^*(J_f) \geqslant \varrho_{\varphi^*(\cdot)}(f)$. From the definitions of $(\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)})^*$ and $\varrho_{\varphi^*(\cdot)}$,

$$(\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)})^*(J_f) = \sup_{g\in L^{\varphi(\cdot)}} \int_A fg - \varphi(x,g)\,\mathrm{d}x \leqslant \int_A \varphi^*(x,f)\,\mathrm{d}x = \varrho_{\varphi^*(\cdot)}(f).$$

Hence $(\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)})^*(J_f) = \varrho_{\varphi^*(\cdot)}(f)$.

Since $f \mapsto J_f$ is linear, it follows that $(\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)})^*(\lambda J_f) = \varrho_{\varphi^*(\cdot)}(\lambda f)$ for every $\lambda > 0$ and therefore $\|f\|_{\varphi^*(\cdot)} = \|J_f\|_{(\varrho_{\varphi(\cdot)})^*} \leqslant \|J_f\|_{(L^{\varphi(\cdot)})^*} = \|f\|_{(L^{\varphi(\cdot)})'}$, where the second step follows from [6], Theorem 2.2.10.

Taking into account that $\varphi^{**} \simeq \varphi$, we have shown that $L^{\varphi(\cdot)} = (L^{\varphi^*(\cdot)})'$. By the definition of the associate space norm, this means that

$$\|f\|_{\varphi(\cdot)} \approx \sup_{\|g\|_{\varphi^*(\cdot)}\leqslant 1} \int |f|\,|g|\,\mathrm{d}x$$

for $f \in L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$. In the case $f \in L^0 \setminus L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$, we can approximate $h_k \min\{|f|,k\} \nearrow |f|$ with h_k as before. Since $h_k \min\{|f|,k\} \in L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$, the previous result implies that the formula holds, in the form $\infty = \infty$, when $f \in L^0 \setminus L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$. □

4. Uniform convexity

The function $\varphi \in \Phi_w(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is *uniformly convex* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\varphi\Big(x, \frac{s+t}{2}\Big) \leqslant (1-\delta)\frac{\varphi(x,s)+\varphi(x,t)}{2}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ whenever $|s-t| \geqslant \varepsilon \max\{|s|,|t|\}$.

Theorem 4.1. *The function $\varphi \in \Phi_w(A)$ is equivalent to a uniformly convex Φ-function if and only if it satisfies* (aInc).

P r o o f. Assume first that φ satisfies (aInc) with $\gamma^- = p > 1$. By [10], Lemma 2.2, there exists $\psi \in \Phi(A)$ such that $\varphi \simeq \psi$ and $\psi^{1/p}$ is convex for some $p > 1$. The claim follows once we show that ψ is uniformly convex. Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $s - t \geqslant \varepsilon s$ with $s > t > 0$. Since $\psi^{1/p}$ is convex,

$$\psi\Big(x, \frac{s+t}{2}\Big)^{1/p} \leqslant \frac{\psi(x,s)^{1/p} + \psi(x,t)^{1/p}}{2}.$$

Since $t \leqslant (1-\varepsilon)s$ and ψ is convex, we find that $\psi(x,t) \leqslant \psi(x,(1-\varepsilon)s) \leqslant (1-\varepsilon)\psi(x,s)$. Therefore $\psi(x,t)^{1/p} \leqslant (1-\varepsilon')\psi(x,s)^{1/p}$ for some $\varepsilon' > 0$. Since t^p is uniformly convex, we obtain that

$$\Big(\frac{\psi(x,s)^{1/p}+\psi(x,t)^{1/p}}{2}\Big)^p \leqslant (1-\delta)\frac{\psi(x,s)+\psi(x,t)}{2}.$$

Combined with the previous estimate, this shows that ψ is uniformly convex.

Assume now conversely that $\varphi \simeq \psi$ and ψ is uniformly convex. Choose $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ and $t = 0$ in the definition of uniform convexity:

$$\psi(x,s/2) \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}(1-\delta)\psi(x,s).$$

Divide this equation by $(s/2)^p$, where p is chosen so that $2^{p-1}(1-\delta) = 1$:

$$\frac{\psi(x,s/2)}{(s/2)^p} \leqslant 2^{p-1}(1-\delta)\frac{\psi(x,s)}{s^p} = \frac{\psi(x,s)}{s^p}.$$

The previous inequality holds for every $s > 0$. If $0 < t < s$, then we can choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^k t \leqslant s < 2^{k+1}t$. Then by the previous inequality and monotonicity of ψ,

$$\frac{\psi(x,t)}{t^p} \leqslant \frac{\psi(x,2t)}{(2t)^p} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \frac{\psi(x,2^k t)}{(2^k t)^p} \leqslant 2^p\frac{\psi(x,s)}{s^p}.$$

Hence, ψ satisfies (aInc) with $\gamma^- = p$. Since this property is invariant under equivalence, it holds for φ as well. □

We can now prove the uniform convexity of the space.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By Theorem 1.2, Δ_2^w and ∇_2^w imply Δ_2 and ∇_2. If φ satisfies (aInc), then it follows from Theorem 4.1 that it is equivalent to a uniformly convex Φ-function ψ. By (aDec), also ψ is doubling. Hence by [16], Theorem 11.6 (see also [6], Theorem 2.4.14), $L^{\psi(\cdot)}$ is uniformly convex. Since $\varphi \simeq \psi$, $L^{\varphi(\cdot)} = L^{\psi(\cdot)}$, and hence we have proved $L^{\varphi(\cdot)}$ is uniformly convex. Furthermore, every uniformly convex Banach space is reflexive [1], Chapter 1. □

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank the referees for their valuable comments.

References

[1] *R. Adams*: Sobolev Spaces. Pure and Applied Mathematics 65, Academic Press, New York, 1975. zbl MR

[2] *M. Avci, A. Pankov*: Multivalued elliptic operators with nonstandard growth. Adv. Nonlinear Anal. *7* (2018), 35–48. zbl MR doi

[3] *P. Baroni, M. Colombo, G. Mingione*: Non-autonomous functionals, borderline cases and related function classes. St. Petersbg. Math. J. *27* (2016), 347–379; translation from Algebra Anal. *27* (2015), 6–50. zbl MR doi

[4] *M. Colombo, G. Mingione*: Regularity for double phase variational problems. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. *215* (2015), 443–496. zbl MR doi

[5] *D. Cruz-Uribe, P. Hästö*: Extrapolation and interpolation in generalized Orlicz spaces. Trans. Am. Math. Soc. *370* (2018), 4323–4349. zbl doi

[6] *L. Diening, P. Harjulehto, P. Hästö, M. Růžička*: Lebesgue and Sobolev Spaces with Variable Exponents. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2017, Springer, Berlin, 2011. zbl MR doi

[7] *X.-L. Fan, C.-X. Guan*: Uniform convexity of Musielak-Orlicz-Sobolev spaces and applications. Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl., Ser. A *73* (2010), 163–175. zbl MR doi

[8] *P. Gwiazda, P. Wittbold, A. Wróblewska-Kamińska, A. Zimmermann*: Renormalized solutions to nonlinear parabolic problems in generalized Musielak-Orlicz spaces. Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl., Ser. A *129* (2015), 1–36. zbl MR doi

[9] *P. Harjulehto, P. Hästö*: Riesz potential in generalized Orlicz spaces. Forum Math. *29* (2017), 229–244. MR doi

[10] *P. Harjulehto, P. Hästö, R. Klén*: Generalized Orlicz spaces and related PDE. Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl., Ser. A *143* (2016), 155–173. zbl MR doi

[11] *P. Harjulehto, P. Hästö, O. Toivanen*: Hölder regularity of quasiminimizers under generalized growth conditions. Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. *56* (2017), Article No. 2, 26 pages. zbl MR doi

[12] *P. Hästö*: The maximal operator on generalized Orlicz spaces. J. Funct. Anal. *269* (2015), 4038–4048. zbl MR doi

[13] *H. Hudzik*: Uniform convexity of Musielak-Orlicz spaces with Luxemburg's norm. Ann. Soc. Math. Pol., Ser. I, Commentat. Math. *23* (1983), 21–32. zbl MR

[14] *H. Hudzik*: A criterion of uniform convexity of Musielak-Orlicz spaces with Luxemburg norm. Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci., Math. *32* (1984), 303–313. zbl MR

[15] *F.-Y. Maeda, Y. Mizuta, T. Ohno, T. Shimomura*: Boundedness of maximal operators and Sobolev's inequality on Musielak-Orlicz-Morrey spaces. Bull. Sci. Math. *137* (2013), 76–96. zbl MR doi

[16] *J. Musielak*: Orlicz Spaces and Modular Spaces. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1034, Springer, Berlin, 1983. zbl MR doi

[17] *J. Ok*: Gradient estimates for elliptic equations with $L^{p(\cdot)}\log L$ growth. Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. *55* (2016), Article No. 26, 30 pages. zbl MR doi

[18] *M. M. Rao, Z. D. Ren*: Theory of Orlicz Spaces. Pure and Applied Mathematics 146, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1991. zbl MR

Authors' addresses: Petteri Harjulehto, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, FI-20014 University of Turku, Finland, e-mail: `petteri.harjulehto@utu.fi`; Peter Hästö, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, FI-20014 University of Turku, Finland, and Department of Mathematical Sciences, FI-90014 University of Oulu, Finland, e-mail: `peter.hasto@oulu.fi`.