arXiv:1806.07310v1 [math.FA] 19 Jun 2018

# On Musielak $N$-functions

Abdulhameed Qahtan Abbood Altai
Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Maryland, Baltimore County
1000 Hilltop Circle
Baltimore, MD 21250,
altai1@umbc.edu

March 3, 2022

**Abstract.** In this paper, the concept of Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them well be introduced. Facts and results of the measure theory will be applied to consider properties, calculus and basic approximation of Musielak $N$-functions and their Musielak-Orlicz spaces. Finally, the relationship between Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz functions and thier Musielak-Orlicz spaces will be considered using facts and results of the measure theory too.

**Keywords:** $\mu-$almost everywhere property, supremum, infimum, limit, convergence, basic convergence, Musielak $N$-function, Musielak-Orlicz function, Musielak-Orlicz spaces, Luxemburg norm

## 1 Introduction

$N$-functions, Orlicz functions and Orlicz classes and Orlicz spaces generated by $N$-functions and Orlicz functions have been studied by many mathematicians as in [24],[17],[28],[18],[25],[3],[4],[5],[26],[11],[20],[9]. Musielak-Orlicz functions and Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by Musielak-Orlicz functions have been originated and developed by [23],[22],[21] where $f \in L_{MO}(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ if and only if $\int_\Omega MO(t, f(t))d\mu < \infty$. Their properties have been studied by [13],[16],[8],[14],[15],[16],[33] and their applications can be found in differential equations [7],[10], fluid dynamics [29],[31], statistical physics[1],integral equations [17], image processing [2],[6],[12] and many other applications [27]. So, because such increasingly importance to these concepts in the modeling of modern materials, we want to investigate properties, calculus and basic approximations of Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz functions and their Musielak-Orlicz spaces using the measure theory where this will help us to consider $\mu-$almost everywhere property, supremum, infimum, limit, convergence and basic convergence of Musielak $N$-functions, Musielak-Orlicz functions and Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them by functioning facts and results of the measure theory and getting advantages from that to consider these concepts. The concept of Musielak $N$-function $M(t, u)$ is a generalization to the concept of $N$-function $M(u)$, where $M(t, u)$ may vary with location in space, whereas the Musielak-Orlicz function $MO(t, u)$ is a generalization to the concept of Orlicz functions $O(u)$, where $MO(t, u)$ may vary with location in space. The Musielak-Orlicz function $MO(t, u)$ is defined on $\Omega \times [0, \infty)$ into $[0, \infty)$ where for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, MO(t, .)$ is Orlicz function of $u$ on $[0, \infty)$ and for each $u \in [0, \infty), MO(., u)$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$ and $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ is a measure space [3],[15]. So, we are going to define the Musielak $N$-function $M(t, u)$ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ into $\mathbb{R}$ in similar way, that is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M(t, .)$ is $N$-function of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, M(., u)$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$ and $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ is a measure space. The novelty to define the Musielak $N$-function $M(t, u)$ by this way is to get benefits from the results of the measure theory and use them to consider properties, calculus, and basic convergence of Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them and the relationship between Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz functions and their Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them where this will give us more flexibility to pick a suitable measurable set $\Omega$ and then the functional $\int_\Omega M(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})d\mu$ defined on it as we will see in section 3. So, the paper is organized as follows. Definition of Musielak $N$-function, developing preliminaries results about the equivalent definition of Musielak $N$-function and studying continuity of Musielak $N$-function are

introduced in section 2. Definition of Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak $N$-function, and using facts and results of the measure theory to study properties, calculus and basic approximation of Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them in section 3. The relationship between Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz functions and Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them respectively using facts and results of the measure theory are introduced also in section 4. Examples of Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz functions that are not Musielak $N$-functions will be in section 5. The conclusion will be in section 6.

# 2 Preliminary Results

In this section, we introduce the concept of the Musielak $N$-function and some results about the equivalent definition and the continuity of the Musielak $N$-functions.

**Defination 2.1 (Musielak $N$-function).** Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a measure space. A function $M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a Musielak $N$-function if:

1. for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M(t,u)$ is even convex of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$
2. for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M(t,u) > 0$ for any $u > 0$
3. for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \lim\limits_{u\to 0} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = 0$
4. for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \lim\limits_{u\to +\infty} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = +\infty$
5. for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, M(t,u)$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$.

The conditions $(1-4)$ guarantee that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M(t,.)$ is $N$-function of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and the condition (5) guarantees the measurability of $M(.,u)$ of $t$ on $\Omega$.

The following theorem is a generalization to theorem 1.1[17] which is necessary to proof the next theorem where it gives us the equivalent definition of Musielak $N$-function.

**Theorem 2.1.** For $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, every convex function $M(t,u) : \Omega \times [a,b] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of $u$ on $[a,b]$ which satisfies the condition $M(t,a) = 0$ can be represented in the form

$$M(t,u) = \int_a^u p(t,s)ds, \tag{2.1}$$

where $p(t,u) : \Omega \times [a,b] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, a non-decreasing, right-continuous function of $u$ on $[a,b], (\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ is a measure space and $[a,b]$ is any interval.

**Proof.** We have for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, for $u_1, u_2 \in [a,b]$, $u_1 < u_2$ that

$$p_-(t,u_1) \leq p_+(t,u_1) \leq p_-(t,u_2), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$p_-(t,u) = \lim_{u\uparrow u_o} \frac{M(t,u) - M(t,u_o)}{u - u_o}$$

and

$$p_+(t,u) = \lim_{u\downarrow u_o} \frac{M(t,u) - M(t,u_o)}{u - u_o},$$

that is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, p_-(t,u)$ is monotonic and hence it is continuous almost everywhere of $u$ on $[a,b]$ (see theorem 4.19 [30]). For $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, let $u_1$ be a continuity point of $p_-(t,u)$ and by taking the limit in (2.1) as $u_2 \to u_1$, we get by the Squeeze theorem for functions that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$p_-(t,u_1) \leq p_+(t,u_1) \leq p_-(t,u_1)$$

which means that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, p_-(t,u_1) = p_+(t,u_1)$. Moreover, from (2.1) we have by the fundamental theorem of calculus that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \frac{\partial M(t,u)}{\partial u} = p(t,u) = p_+(t,u)$. Since for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, the function $M(t,u)$ is convex of $u$ on $[a,b]$, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M(t,u)$ is absolutely continuous of $u$ on $[a,b]$ (see lemma 1.3 [17]) and that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M(t,u)$ is indefinite integral of its derivative $\frac{\partial M(t,u)}{\partial u}$ (see theorem 13.17 [32]), that is

$$M(t,u) = M(t,a) + \int_a^u \frac{\partial M(t,s)}{\partial s} ds = \int_a^u p(t,s) ds$$

for $u \in [a,b]$.

□

**Theorem 2.2.** The function $M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Musielak $N$-function if and only if it can be written as follows: for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$M(t,u) = \int_0^{|u|} p(t,s) ds, \tag{2.3}$$

where $p : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, a non-decreasing, right-continuous function of 0 on $[0,\infty)$ satisfies $p(t,0) = 0, p(t,u) > 0$ when $u > 0$ and $\lim_{u\to\infty} p(t,u) = \infty$ and for each $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $p(t,u)$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$.

**Proof.** Given that $M(t,u)$ is a Musielak $N$-function, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $M(t,u)$ is convex of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and $M(t,0) = 0$. By theorem 2.1 that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$M(t,u) = \int_0^{|u|} p_+(t,s) ds \leq p_+(t,u) \int_0^u ds = u p_+(t,u),$$

i.e,

$$\frac{M(t,u)}{u} \leq p_+(t,u),$$

where $p_+(t,u) : \Omega \times [0,\infty)$ is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, a non-decreasing, right-continuous function of 0 on $[0,\infty)$. From (2) and (4) of the definition 2.1, we have for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ that $p_+(t,u) > 0$ whenever $u > 0$ and $\lim_{u\to\infty} p_+(t,u) = \infty$ respectively. Moreover, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ and for any $u > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} M(t,2u) = \int_0^{2u} p_+(t,s) ds &> \int_u^{2u} p_+(t,s) ds \\ &> p_+(t,u) \int_u^{2u} ds = u p_+(t,u), \end{aligned}$$

i.e,

$$p_+(t,u) \leq \frac{M(t,2u)}{u}.$$

Again from (3) of definition of Musielak $N$-function for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ that

$$\begin{aligned} p_+(t,0) &= \lim_{u\to+0} p_+(t,u) \leq \lim_{u\to+0} \frac{M(t,2u)}{u} \\ &= 2\lim_{u\to+0} \frac{M(t,2u)}{2u} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$0 = \lim_{u\to+0} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} \leq \lim_{u\to+0} p_+(t,u) = p_+(t,0).$$

Thus by the Squeeze theorem of functions that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, p_+(t,0) = 0$. Since for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ that

$$p_+(t,u) = \lim_{u\downarrow u_o} \frac{M(t,u) - M(t,u_o)}{u - u_o}$$

and for each $u \in \mathbb{R}$ that $M(t,u)$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$, then for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, p_+(t,u)$ is measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$.

Now given that $M(t,u)$ satisfies (2.3). So, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $M(t,u)$ is even and positive for any $u > 0$. By theorem 2.1, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $M(t,u)$ is convex of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and by (2.3) for $\mu-$a.e $t \in \Omega$,

$$0 < \frac{M(t,u)}{u} \leq p_+(t,u) < \frac{M(t,2u)}{u}$$

for any $u > 0$. Then

$$0 < \lim_{u\to+0} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} \leq \lim_{u\to0} p_+(t,u) = 0.$$

By the Squeeze theorem for functions that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to0} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = 0$$

and

$$2\lim_{2u\to+\infty} \frac{M(t,2u)}{2u} > \lim_{u\to+\infty} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = +\infty,$$

i.e,

$$\lim_{u\to+\infty} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = +\infty.$$

Since for each $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $p_+(t,u)$ is measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$ and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $M(t,u)$ satisfies (2.3), then for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, M(t,u)$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$. Therefore, $M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Musielak $N$-function.

□

**Theorem 2.3.** Any Musielak $N$-function $M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous from the right of 0 on $\mathbb{R}$ for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$.

**Proof.** Given that $M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Musielak $N$-function. By theorem 2.2, we have for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \lim_{u \to +0} M(t,u) &= \lim_{u \to +0} \int_0^{|u|} p(t,s)ds = \int_0^0 p(t,s)ds \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(t,u_i)\Delta u = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(t,u_i)0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $u_i = 0 + i\Delta u$ and $\Delta u = \frac{0}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the Squeeze theorem for functions that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $\lim_{u \to +0} M(t,u) = 0$.

□

# 3 Properties, calculus and basic approximation of Musielak $N$-functions

In this section, we are going to define the Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak $N$-function which is similar to the one that generated by a Musielak-Orlicz function [21] and investigate properties, calculus and basic approximation of Musielak $N$-functions and the Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them using the facts and results of the measure theory.

**Definition 3.1.** Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a measure space and $M$ be a Musielak $N$-function. The Musielak-Orlicz space $L_M(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ generated by $M$ is defined by

$$L_M(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu) = \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega M(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})d\mu < \infty \right\}$$

where $BS_\Omega$ is the set of all $\mu-$measurable functions from $\Omega$ to $BS$ and $(BS, \|\cdot\|_{BS})$ is a Banach space, with Luxemburg norm

$$\|f\|_M = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega M(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda})d\mu \leq 1 \right\}$$

**Remark 3.1.** The Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak $N$-function $M$ on a measure space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ is the Orlicz space generated by an $N$-function $\varphi$ on a measure space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ whenever the Musielak $N$-function $M$ is the $N$-function $\varphi$. That is, $L_M(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu) = L_\varphi(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ whenever for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ that $M(t,u) = \varphi(u)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$.

**Remark 3.2.** Every Musielak $N$-function $M$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function $MO$ with two additional conditions: for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u \to 0} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = 0, \lim_{u \to \infty} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = \infty;$$

so, the set of all Musielak $N$-functions

$$\mathbf{F}_M = \{M | M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \text{ is a Musielak } N - \text{function}\}$$

is contained in the set of all Musielak-Orlicz functions

$$\mathbf{F}_{MO} = \{MO | MO : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty) \text{ is a Musielak} - \text{Orlicz function}\}.$$

**Remark 3.3.** The Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak $N$-function $M$ with the luxemburg norm $(L_M(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu), \|\cdot\|_M)$ is a Banach space, since the Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak-Orlicz function with the luxemburg norm is a Banach space (see theorem 7.7[21]) and by remark 3.2 the Musielak $N$-function is a Musielak-Orlicz function with two additional conditions.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be two Musielak $N$-functions such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_2(t,u) \leq rM_1(t,u)$ for some number $r > 0$ and all $u \geq u_0 > 0$. Then $L_{M_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \subseteq L_{M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$.

**Proof.** Take $f \in L_{M_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\int_\Omega M_1(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})d\mu < \infty.$$

From the assumption that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, there exist $r > 0$ and $u_0 > 0$,

$$M_2(t,u) \leq rM_1(t,u),\ u \geq u_0,$$

then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, there exist $r > 0$ and $u_0 > 0$ such that,

$$\int_\Omega M_2(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})d\mu \leq r\int_\Omega M_1(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})d\mu < \infty,\ f \neq 0$$

i.e, $f \in L_{M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$.

□

**Corollary 3.1** Let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be two Musielak $N$-functions such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, r_1M_1(t,u) \leq M_2(t,u) \leq r_2M_1(t,u)$ for some numbers $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and all $u \geq u_0 > 0$. Then $L_{M_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) = L_{M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$.

**Proof.** From the assumption there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and $u_0 > 0$ such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $M_2(t,u) \leq r_2M_1(t,u)$ and $M_1(t,u) \leq r_3M_2(t,u), r_3 = 1/r_1$. From theorem 3.1 we have $L_{M_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \subseteq L_{M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ and $L_{M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \subseteq L_{M_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$.

□

**Theorem 3.2.** If $M_1 : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Musielak $N$-function and $M_2 : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_1(t,u) = M_2(t,u)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, then $M_2$ is a Musielak $N$-function

**Proof.** It is given that $M_1$ is a Musielak $N$-function and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_1(t,u) = M_2(t,u)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_2(t,u) = M_1(t,u)$ is even convex function of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_2(t,u) = M_1(t,u) > 0$ for any $u > 0$ and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to 0}\frac{M_2(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0}\frac{M_1(t,u)}{u} = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{u\to \infty}\frac{M_2(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to \infty}\frac{M_1(t,u)}{u} = \infty.$$

Moreover, for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, M_2(t,u)$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$. Then, $M_2$ is a Musielak $N$-function on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ according to definition 2.1.

□

**Theorem 3.3.** If $(L_{M_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_1})$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak $N$-function $M_1$ with the luxemburg norm and $M_2 : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_1(t,u) = M_2(t,u)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \left(L_{M_1(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_1(t,u)}\right) = \left(L_{M_2(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_2(t,u)}\right)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and hence $(L_{M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_2})$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by $M_2$ with the luxemburg norm.

**Proof.** Since for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_1(t,u) = M_2(t,u)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, from theorem 3.2 we have that $M_2$ is a Musielak $N$-function and

$$\begin{aligned} L_{M_2(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega M_2(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\ &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega M_1(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\ &= L_{M_1(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \end{aligned}$$

and for $f \in L_{M_1(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \left(= L_{M_2(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)\right)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{M_1(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega M_1\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega M_2\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \|f\|_{M_2(t,u)}; \end{aligned}$$

that is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \|f\|_{M_2(t,u)}$ can satisfies the norm's properties on $L_{M_2(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Then, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, the equality hold in the assumption of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and $(L_{M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_2})$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by $M_2$ with the luxemburg norm.

□

**Theorem 3.4.** If $\{M_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of Musielak $N$-functions $M_n : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n, \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n, \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup M_n, \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf M_n$$

are Musielak $N$-functions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ into $\mathbb{R}$.

**Proof.** Since for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $M_n$ is a Musielak $N$-function, we have for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u)$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u)$ are even convex of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$; for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u) > 0$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u) > 0$ for any $u > 0$ and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u)}{u} = 0 \quad , \quad \lim_{u\to+\infty} \frac{\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u)}{u} = +\infty$$

and

$$\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u)}{u} = 0 \quad , \quad \lim_{u\to+\infty} \frac{\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u)}{u} = +\infty.$$

Moreover, that for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, \sup M_n(t,u)$ and $\inf M_n(t,u)$ are $\mu-$measurable functions of $t$ on $\Omega$. So $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n$ are Musielak $N$-function on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ . Also, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u) &= \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{k\geq n} M_k(t,u), \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u) &= \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \inf_{k\geq n} M_k(t,u) \end{aligned}$$

of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, it follows that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup M_n$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \inf M_n$ are Musielak $N$-functions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$.

□

**Theorem 3.5.** Let $\{M_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of Musielak $N$-functions $M_n : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, M_n(t,u) \leq M_{n+1}(t,u)$ on $\Omega$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . If $\{(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by $\{M_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with the luxemburg norm respectively, then $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) = (L_S(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_S)$, $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) = (L_I(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_I)$, $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\sup(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) = (L_{LS}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{LS})$ and $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\inf(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) = (L_{LI}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{LI})$ via $\{M_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and hence $(L_S(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_S)$, $(L_I(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_I)$, $(L_{LS}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{LS})$ and $(L_{LI}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{LI})$ are Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by

$$S = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n, I = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n, LS = \lim_{n\to\infty}\sup M_n \text{ and } LI = \lim_{n\to\infty}\inf M_n$$

with the luxemburg norm respectively.

**Proof.** We have from theorem 3.4 that $S, I, LS$ and $LI$ are Musielak $N$-functions; so by the monotone convergence theorem that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{M_S(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega M_S(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})\, d\mu < \infty\right\} \\
&= \left\{f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})\, d\mu < \infty\right\} \\
&= \left\{f \in BS_\Omega : \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})\, d\mu < \infty\right\} \\
&= \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L_{M_n(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \\
L_{M_I(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega M_I(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})\, d\mu < \infty\right\} \\
&= \left\{f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})\, d\mu < \infty\right\} \\
&= \left\{f \in BS_\Omega : \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS})\, d\mu < \infty\right\} \\
&= \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L_{M_n(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu);
\end{aligned}$$

and for $f, g \in L_{M_S(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) (f, g \in L_{M_I(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{M_S(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{\lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega M_S\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1\right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{\lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1\right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{\lambda > 0 : \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1\right\} \\
&= \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)}, \\
\|f\|_{M_I(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{\lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega M_I\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1\right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{\lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1\right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{\lambda > 0 : \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1\right\} \\
&= \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)};
\end{aligned}$$

so for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, that $\|f\|_{M_S(t,u)} = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)} \geq 0$ and $\|f\|_{M_I(t,u)} = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)} \geq 0$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. For $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $\|f\|_{M_S(t,u)} = 0 \Rightarrow \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)} = 0$ if and only if $f(t) = 0$ and

$\|f\|_{M_I(t,u)} = 0 \Rightarrow \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)} = 0$ if and only if $f(t) = 0$ for an arbitrary $\lambda$. For $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, for any scalar $\alpha, \|\alpha f\|_{M_S(t,u)} = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|\alpha f\|_{M_n(t,u)} = |\alpha| \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)} = |\alpha|\|f\|_{M_S(t,u)}$ and $\|\alpha f\|_{M_I(t,u)} = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|\alpha f\|_{M_n(t,u)} = |\alpha| \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)} = |\alpha|\|f\|_{M_I(t,u)}$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. And since for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_n(t,u)$ are convex functions of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega M_S\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu &= \int_\Omega \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu \\
&= \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu \\
&\leq \frac{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu \\
&+ \frac{\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu \\
&\leq \frac{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu \\
&+ \frac{\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}+\|g(t)\|_{M_S}} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu \\
&\leq 1,
\end{aligned}$$

because $\int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu \leq 1$ and $\int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|g(t)\|_{M_S}}\right)d\mu \leq 1$, so for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \|f(t)+g(t)\|_{M_S(t,u)} \leq \|f(t)\|_{M_S(t,u)} + \|g(t)\|_{M_S(t,u)}$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$; and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega M_I\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu &= \int_\Omega \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu \\
&= \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu \\
&\leq \frac{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu \\
&+ \frac{\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu \\
&\leq \frac{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu \\
&+ \frac{\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}+\|g(t)\|_{M_I}} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu \\
&\leq 1,
\end{aligned}$$

because $\int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu \leq 1$ and $\int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|g(t)\|_{M_I}}\right)d\mu \leq 1$, so for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \|f(t)+g(t)\|_{M_I(t,u)} \leq \|f(t)\|_{M_I(t,u)} + \|g(t)\|_{M_I(t,u)}$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$; that is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \|f(t)\|_{M_S(t,u)}$ and $\|f(t)\|_{M_I(t,u)}$ are norms on $L_{M_S(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ and $L_{M_I(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ respectively. So, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, the equality hold in the assumption of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and $(L_{M_S}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_S})$ and $(L_{M_I}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_I})$ are Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by $M_S$ and $M_I$ with the luxemburg norm respectively.

Now, again by the monotone convergence theorem that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{M_{LS}(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega M_{LS}(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\
&= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\
&= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L_{M_k(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \\
L_{M_{LI}(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega M_{LI}(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\
&= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\
&= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L_{M_k(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu);
\end{aligned}$$

and for $f \in L_{M_{LS}(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ $\left(f \in L_{M_{LI}(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)\right)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{M_{LS}(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega M_{LS}\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \le 1 \right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \le 1 \right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \le 1 \right\} \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)}, \\
\|f\|_{M_{LI}(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega M_{LI}\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \le 1 \right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \le 1 \right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \le 1 \right\} \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)};
\end{aligned}$$

that is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $\|f\|_{M_{LS}(t,u)}$ and $\|f\|_{M_{LI}(t,u)}$ can satisfy the norm's properties on $\left(L_{M_{LS}(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)\right)$ and $\left(L_{M_{LI}(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)\right)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ respectively. Therefore, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, we get the equality in the assumption of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and $(L_{M_{LS}}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_{LS}})$ and $(L_{M_{LI}}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_{LI}})$ are Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by $M_{LS}$ and $M_{LI}$ with the luxemburg norm respectively.

□

**Theorem 3.6.** If $\{M_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of Musielak $N$-functions that satisfy the $\triangle_2$-condition $M_n : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, and $M_n \to M, M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ pointwisely as $n \to \infty$, then $M$ is a Musielak $N$-function and satisfy the $\triangle_2$-condition.

**Proof.** Since the convergence of $M_n$ to $M$ is pointwisely, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ that

$$M(t,u) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u)$$

of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, and the $\triangle_2$-condition is clear to satisfy.

□

**Theorem 3.7.** Let $\{M_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of Musielak $N$-functions $M_n : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, M_n(t,u) \to M(t,u)$ on $\Omega$ as $n \to \infty$ and $|M_n(t,u)| \leq G(t,u)$, where for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, G$ is absolutely integrable on $\Omega$. If $\{(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by $\{M_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with the luxemburg norm, then $(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) \to (L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_M)$ via $\{M_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ as $n \to \infty$ and hence $(L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_M)$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by $M$ with the luxemburg norm.

**Proof.** From the assumptions and from theorem 3.6 that $M$ is a Musielak $N$-function and so by the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{M(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega M(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\ &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty} M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\ &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega M_n(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} L_{M_n(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu); \end{aligned}$$

and for $f, g \in L_{M(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{M(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega M\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty} M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)}; \end{aligned}$$

that is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, that $\|f\|_{M(t,u)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)} \geq 0$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. For $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, $\|f\|_{M(t,u)} = 0 \Rightarrow \lim_{n\to\infty} \|f\|_{M_n(t,u)} = 0$ if and only if $f(t) = 0$ for an arbitrary $\lambda$. For $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$, for any scalar $\alpha, \|\alpha f\|_M = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|\alpha f\|_{M_n} = |\alpha| \lim_{n\to\infty} \|f\|_{M_n} = |\alpha| \|f\|_M$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. And since for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_n(t,u)$ are convex of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, then for $f, g \in L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega M\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M}\right) d\mu &= \int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty} M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M}\right) d\mu \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M}\right) d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{\|f(t)\|_M}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M} \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M}\right) d\mu \\ &+ \frac{\|g(t)\|_M}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M} \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M}\right) d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{\|f(t)\|_M}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M} \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_M}\right) d\mu \\ &+ \frac{\|g(t)\|_M}{\|f(t)\|_M + \|g(t)\|_M} \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|g(t)\|_M}\right) d\mu \\ &\leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

because $\int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_M}\right) \leq 1$ and $\int_\Omega M_n\left(t, \frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|g(t)\|_M}\right) \leq 1$, so for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \|f(t)+g(t)\|_{M(t,u)} \leq \|f(t)\|_{M(t,u)} + \|g(t)\|_{M(t,u)}$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$; that is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \|f(t)\|_{M(t,u)}$ is norm on $L_{M(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ of

$u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. So, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ the convergence holds in the assumption of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and $(L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_M)$ is a Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by $M$ with the luxemburg norm.

□

**Corollary 3.2.** Under theorem 3.7's assumptions with $|M_n(t,u)| \leq M(t,u)$ and $M_n$ satisfies the $\triangle_2$-condition for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $f \in (L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_M)$ then there exists a sequence of functions $\{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $f_n \in (L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} f$ under the luxemburg norm $\|\cdot\|_M$.

**Proof.** From above assumptions and according to theorem 3.1 we have $L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \subseteq L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$; that is $L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$. So, if $f \in L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$, then $f \in L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, since $\left(L_{M_{n_0}}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_{n_0}}\right)$ is separable, because $M_{n_0}$ satisfies the $\triangle_2$-condition[18], there exists $f_{n_0} \in \left(L_{M_{n_0}}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_{n_0}}\right)$ such that $\|f_{n_0} - f\|_{M_{n_0}} < \frac{1}{n_0}$. Then,

$$0 \leq \|f_{n_0} - f\|_M = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|f_{n_0} - f\|_{M_n} < \frac{1}{n_0} \lim_{n|n_0\to\infty} \|f_{n_0} - f\|_{M_n}.$$

Letting $n_0 \to \infty$, we get $\lim_{n_0\to\infty} \|f_{n_0} - f\|_M = 0$ by the Squeeze theorem of functions.

□

**Theorem 3.8.** If $M_i : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, i = 1,2$ are Musielak $N$-functions, then for r $\in \mathbb{R}_+$ that $rM_1$ and $M_1 + M_2$ are Musielak $N$-functions.

**Proof.** Since $M_i, i = 1,2$ are Musielak $N$-functions, then for $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, rM_1(t,u)$ and $(M_1 + M_2)(t,u)$ are even convex of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$; for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, rM_1(t,u) > 0$ and $(M_1 + M_2)(t,u) > 0$ for any $u > 0$ and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{rM_1(t,u)}{u} = 0, \qquad \lim_{u\to+\infty} \frac{rM_1(t,u)}{u} = +\infty$$
$$\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}{u} = 0, \quad \lim_{u\to+\infty} \frac{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}{u} = +\infty$$

Moreover, that for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, rM_1(t,u)$ and $(M_1 + M_2)(t,u)$ are $\mu-$measurable functions of $t$ on $\Omega$. So, $\Omega, rM_1$ and $M_1 + M_2$ are Musielak $N$-functions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$.

□

**Theorem 3.9.** If $(L_{M_i}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_i}) : i = 1,2$ are Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by Musielak $N$-functions $M_i : i = 1,2$ with the luxemburg norm respectively, then $(L_{rM_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{rM_1}), r \geq 1$ and $(L_{M_1+M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_1+M_2})$ are Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by Musielak $N$-functions $rM_1$ and $M_1 + M_2$ with the luxemburg norm respectively.

**Proof.** We have from theorem 3.8 for $r \geq 1$ that $rM_1$ and $M_1 + M_2$ are Musielak $N$-functions, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{rM_1(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega rM_1\left(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}\right) d\mu < \infty \right\}, \\ &= L_{M_1(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \\ L_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{ f \in BS_\Omega : \int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}\right) d\mu < \infty \right\}; \end{aligned}$$

and for $f,g \in L_{rM_1(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)\left(f,g \in L_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{rM_1(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{\lambda>0 : \int_\Omega rM_1\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right)d\mu \le 1\right\} \\
&= \|f\|_{M_1(t,u)}, \\
\|f\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{\lambda>0 : \int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right)d\mu \le 1\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\|f\|_{rM_1(t,u)}$ is a norm on $L_{rM_1(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$. Now, for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega, \|f\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)} \ge 0$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. For $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega, \|f\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}=0$ if and only if $f(t)=0$ for an arbitrary $\lambda$. For $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega$, for any scalar $\alpha, \|\alpha f\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)} = |\alpha|\|f\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$; and since for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega, (M_1+M_2)(t,u)$ is a convex function of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, let $Sn_{(M_1+M_2)} = \|f(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)} + \|g(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)+g(t)\|_{BS}}{Sn_{(M_1+M_2)}}\right)d\mu &\le \frac{\|f(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}}{Sn_{(M_1+M_2)}}\int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{Sn_{(M_1+M_2)}}\right)d\mu \\
&+ \frac{\|g(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}}{Sn_{(M_1+M_2)}}\int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t,\frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{Sn_{(M_1+M_2)}}\right)d\mu \\
&\le \frac{\|f(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}}{Sn_{(M_1+M_2)}}\int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}}\right)d\mu \\
&+ \frac{\|g(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}}{Sn_{(M_1+M_2)}}\int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t,\frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|g(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}}\right)d\mu \\
&\le 1,
\end{aligned}$$

because $\int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\|f(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}}\right)d\mu \le 1$ and $\int_\Omega (M_1+M_2)\left(t,\frac{\|g(t)\|_{BS}}{\|g(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)}}\right)d\mu \le 1$, so for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega, \|f(t)+g(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)} \le \|f(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)} + \|g(t)\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$; that is, for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega, \|f\|_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}$ is norm on $L_{(M_1+M_2)(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Thus, for $r\ge 1$ that $(L_{rM}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_{rM})$ and $(L_{M_1+M_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_{M_1+M_2})$ are Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by $rM$ and $M_1+M_2$ with the luxemburg norm respectively.

□

**Remark 3.4** If $M_i : \Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}, i=1,2$ are Musielak $N$-functions, then the subtraction in $M_1-M_2$ does not preserve the positivity and the convexity of the Musielak $N$-functions, so $M_1-M_2$ is not necessary to be a Musielak $N$-function and if so, it would be as $M_1+M_2$ and the $(L_{M_1-M_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_{M_1-M_1})$ would be as $(L_{M_1+M_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_{M_1+M_1})$. Moreover, $M_1+k, k\in\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}, M_1M_2, M_1^n, n\in\mathbb{N}$ and $M_1/M_2$ are not Musielak $N$-functions by theorem 2.2, where for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega$ that $(M_1+k)(t,0)\neq 0, (M_1M_2)(t,0)\neq 0, M_1^n(t,0)\neq 0$ and $\frac{M_1(t,0)}{M_2(t,0)}\neq 0$ .

**Theorem 3.10.** If $M:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is a bounded Musielak $N$-function, then there exists a sequence of Musielak $N$-function $\{\varphi_n : n\in\mathbb{N}\}, \varphi_n:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi_n\to M$ on $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$.

**Proof.** It is given that $M$ is a bounded Musielak $N$-function, so for each $u\in\mathbb{R}, M(t,u)$ is bounded and $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$; so, there exists a sequence of simple functions $\{\varphi_n : n\in\mathbb{N}\}, \varphi_n:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that for each $u\in\mathbb{R}$, for all $\varepsilon>0, \exists N\in\mathbb{N}, |M(t,u)-\varphi_n(t,u)|<\varepsilon$ for all $n\ge N$, for all $t\in\Omega$ by the basic approximation, then such convergence is uniform on $\Omega$ and pointwise on $\mathbb{R}$. Then, for all $n\in\mathbb{N}, \exists N\in\mathbb{N}$ such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega, \varphi_n(t,u)$ can satisfy the conditions $(1-4)$ of definition 2.1, and for each $u\in\mathbb{R}, \varphi_n(t,u)$ is $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$ for all $n\ge N$, that is, these simple functions $\varphi_n, n\ge N$ are Musielak $N$-functions converge to $M$ on $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$ as $n\to\infty$.

□

**Theorem 3.11.** If $(L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_M)$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a bounded Musielak $N$-function $M:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$, then there exists a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz spaces $\{(L_{\varphi_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_n}),n\in\mathbb{N}\}$, generated by a sequence of Musielak $N$-function $\{\varphi_n:n\in\mathbb{N}\},\varphi_n:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ respectively, such that $(L_{\varphi_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_n})\to(L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_M)$ via $\{\varphi_n:n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ as $n\to\infty$.

**Proof.** It is given that $M:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is a bounded Musielak $N$-function. By theorem 3.10, there exists a sequence of Musielak $N$-functions $\{\varphi_n:n\in\mathbb{N}\},\varphi_n:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi_n$ converge to $M$ uniformly on $\Omega$ and pointwisely on $\mathbb{R}$ as $n\to\infty$; so $\{\varphi_n:n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is uniformly bounded on $\Omega$. By the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{M(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) &= \left\{f\in BS_\Omega:\int_\Omega M(t,\|f(t)\|_{BS})d\mu<\infty\right\}\\
&= \left\{f\in BS_\Omega:\int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty}\varphi_n\left(t,\|f(t)\|_{BS}\right)d\mu<\infty\right\}\\
&= \left\{f\in BS_\Omega:\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \varphi_n\left(t,\|f(t)\|_{BS}\right)d\mu<\infty\right\}\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} L_{\varphi_n(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),
\end{aligned}$$

and for $f\in L_{M(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\ f\ \|_{M(t,u)} &= \inf\left\{\lambda>0:\int_\Omega M\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right)d\mu\le 1\right\}\\
&= \inf\left\{\lambda>0:\int_\Omega \lim_{n\to\infty}\varphi_n\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right)d\mu<1\right\}\\
&= \inf\left\{\lambda>0:\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \varphi_n\left(t,\frac{\|f(t)\|_{BS}}{\lambda}\right)d\mu<1\right\}\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\|\ f\ \|_{\varphi_n(t,u)};
\end{aligned}$$

that is, for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega,\|f\|_{\varphi_n(t,u)}$ can satisfy the norm's properties on $L_{\varphi_n(t,u)}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Therefore, for all $n\in\mathbb{N},\exists N\in\mathbb{N},(L_{\varphi_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_n})$ is a Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by a simple function $\varphi_n$ with the luxemburg norm for all $n\ge N$ respectively and $(L_{\varphi_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_n})\to(L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu),\|\cdot\|_M)$ as $n\to\infty$.

□

# 4 Properties, calculus and basic approximation of Musielak-Orlicz functions

In this section we going to study properties, calculus and basic approximation of Musielak-Orlicz functions and the Musielak-Orlicz space generated by them and the relation between the Musielak $N$-function and the Musielak-Orlicz function and their Musielak-Orlicz spaces. Some theorems will be left without proof because they are a generalization to the ones that we did in section 3, so we can follow the similar way to proof them by consider the conditions of the Musielak-Orlicz function.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $M$ be a Musielak $N$-function and $MO$ be a Musielak-Orlicz function such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t\in\Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to 0}\frac{MO(t,u)}{u}\neq 0,$$

then $L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)\neq L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$.

**Proof.** Assume $L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) = L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$, this means $L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \subseteq L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$ and $L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \subseteq L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$, so there exist two positive constants $r_1$ and $r_2$ and $u_0 > 0$ such that for $f \in L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)\,(= L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu))$, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$r_1 \int_\Omega MO(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu \leq \int_\Omega M(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty,\ f \neq 0$$

and

$$r_2 \int_\Omega M(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu \leq \int_\Omega MO(t, \|f(t)\|_{BS}) d\mu < \infty,\ f \neq 0.$$

So for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$r_1 MO(t,u) \leq M(t,u),\ u \geq u_0$$

and

$$r_2 M(t,u) \leq MO(t,u),\ u \geq u_0.$$

Taking the limit $u \to 0$ we get for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$r_1 \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} \leq \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = 0$$

and

$$0 = r_2 \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} \leq \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u}.$$

By the Squeez theorem for functions, we get for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} = 0$$

which contradicts the assumption.

□

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $M$ be a Musielak $N$-function and $MO$ be a Musielak-Orlicz function such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} \neq \infty,$$

then $L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu) \neq L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$.

**Proof.** Following the similar way of theorem 4.1's proof and letting $u$ go to $\infty$, we get for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$r_1 \lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} \leq \lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} = \infty$$

and

$$\infty = r_2 \lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} \leq \lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u}.$$

By the Squeez theorem for functions, we get for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} = \infty$$

which contradicts the assumption.

□

**Theorem 4.3.** If $MO_1 : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function such that $\lim\limits_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_1(t,u)}{u} \neq 0$ or $\lim\limits_{u\to\infty} \frac{MO_1(t,u)}{u} \neq \infty$ and $MO_2 : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a function such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, MO_1(t,u) = MO_2(t,u)$ of $u$ on $[0,\infty)$, then $MO_2$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function not Musielak $N-$function.

**Proof.** Since $MO_1$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, MO_1(t,u) = MO_2(t,u)$ of $u$ on $[0,\infty)$, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, MO_2(t,u)$ is convex function of $u$ on $[0,\infty)$; $MO_2(t,0) = MO_1(t,0) = 0$ and $MO_2(t,u) = MO_1(t,u) > 0$ for $u \neq 0$. Moreover, for each $u \in [0,\infty), MO_2(t,u)$ is $\mu-$ measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$. So, $MO_2$ is a Musilak-Orlicz function on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$. Now, assume that $MO_2$ is a Musielak $N-$function, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$0 \neq \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_1(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_2(t,u)}{u} = 0,$$

or

$$\infty \neq \lim_{u\to \infty} \frac{MO_1(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to \infty} \frac{MO_2(t,u)}{u} = \infty,$$

which is a contradiction.

□

**Theorem 4.4.** If $(L_{MO_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_1})$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak-Orlicz function $M_1$ with the luxemburg norm and $MO_2 : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a function such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, M_1(t,u) = M_2(t,u)$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, (L_{MO_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_1}) = (L_{MO_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_2})$ of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and hence $(L_{MO_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_2})$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by $MO_2$ with the luxemburg norm.

**Theorem 4.5.** If $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz functions $MO_n : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, \lim\limits_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} \neq 0$ or $\lim\limits_{u\to\infty} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} \neq \infty$, then

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n, \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n, \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup MO_n, \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf MO_n$$

are Musielak-Orlicz functions not Musielak $N-$ functions on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$.

**Proof.** Since for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, MO_n$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)$ are convex of $u$ on $[0,\infty)$; for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,0) = 0$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,0) = 0$; and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u) > 0$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u) > 0$ for $u \neq 0$. Moreover, for each $u \in [0,\infty), \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)$ are $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$. So, $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n$ are Musielak-Orlicz functions on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$. Now, assume that $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n$ and $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n$ are Musielak $N$-functions, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)}{u} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} = 0,$$
$$\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)}{u} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} = 0,$$

or

$$\lim_{u\to \infty} \frac{\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)}{u} = \infty \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \lim_{u\to \infty} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} = \infty,$$
$$\lim_{u\to \infty} \frac{\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)}{u} = \infty \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \lim_{u\to \infty} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} = \infty,$$

which is a contradiction to the assumptions. Also, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{k\geq n} MO_k(t,u)$$
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} M_n(t,u) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \inf_{k\geq n} M_k(t,u),$$

of $u$ on $[0,\infty)$, it follows that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup MO_n$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \inf MO_n$ are Musielak-Orlicz functions not Musielak $N$-functions on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$.

□

**Theorem 4.6.** Let $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz functions $MO_n : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that for each $u \in [0,\infty), MO_n(t,u) \leq MO_{n+1}(t,u)$ on $\Omega$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . If $\{(L_{MO_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_n}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with the luxemburg norm respectively, then $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) = (L_S(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_S)$, $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(L_{MO_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_n}) = (L_I(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_I)$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup(L_{MO_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_n}) = (L_{LS}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{LS})$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \inf(L_{MO_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_n}) = (L_{LI}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{LI})$ via $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and hence $(L_S(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_S)$, $(L_I(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_I)$, $(L_{LS}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{LS})$ and $(L_{LI}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{LI})$ are Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by

$$S = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n, I = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n, LS = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup MO_n \text{ and } LI = \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf MO_n$$

with the luxemburg norm respectively.

**Theorem 4.7.** If $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a seqence of Musielak-Orlicz functions $MO_n : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that $\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} \neq 0$ or $\lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} \neq \infty$ and $MO_n \to MO, MO : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ pointwisely as $n \to \infty$, then $MO$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function not Musielak $N$-function and satisfy the $\triangle_2$-condition.

**Proof.** Since the convergence of $MO_n$ to $MO$ is pointwisely, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$ that

$$MO(t,u) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} MO_n(t,u)$$

of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Now, assume that $MO$ is a Musielak $N$-function, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$0 \neq \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} = 0,$$

or

$$\infty \neq \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{MO_n(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} = \infty,$$

which is a contradiction. So, $MO$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function not Musielak $N$-function on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$ according to theorem 4.5; and the $\triangle_2$-condition is clear to satisfy.

□

**Theorem 4.8.** Let $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz functions $MO_n : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that for each $u \in [0,\infty), MO_n(t,u) \to MO(t,u)$ on $\Omega$ as $n \to \infty$ and $|MO_n(t,u)| \leq G(t,u)$, where for each $u \in [0,\infty), G$ is absolutely integrable on $\Omega$. If $\{(L_{M_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M_n}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with the luxemburg norm, then $(L_{MO_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_n}) \to (L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO})$ via $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ as $n \to \infty$ and $(L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO})$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by $MO$ with the luxemburg norm.

**Corollary 4.1.** Under theorem 4.8's assumptions with $|MO_n(t,u)| \leq MO(t,u)$ and $MO_n$ satisfies the $\triangle_2$-condition for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $f \in (L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO})$ then there exists a sequence of functions $\{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $f_n \in (L_{MO_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_n})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} f$ under the luxemburg norm $\|\cdot\|_{MO}$.

**Theorem 4.9.** If $MO : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function such that $\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} \neq 0$ and $M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Musielak $N$-function, then for $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ that $rMO$ and $MO + M$ are Musielak-Orlicz functions not Musielak $N$-functions.

**Proof.** It is given that $MO$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function and $M$ is a Musielak $N$-function, then both $MO$ and $M$ are non-negative convex functions on $[0,\infty)$. So, for $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, rMO(t,u)$ and $(MO + M)(t,u)$ are convex of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}$; for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, rMO(t,0) = 0$ and $(MO + M)(t,0) = 0$; and for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, rMO(t,u) > 0$ and $(MO + M)(t,u) > 0$ for $u \neq 0$. Moreover, for each $u \in [0,\infty), rMO(t,u)$ and $(MO + M)(t,u)$ are $\mu-$measurable functions of $t$ on $\Omega$. So, $rMO$ and $MO + M$ are Musielak-Orlicz functions on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$. Now, assume that $rMO$ and $MO + M$ are Musielak $N$-functions, then for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega$,

$$0 = \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{rMO(t,u)}{u} = r \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} \neq 0$$

and

$$0 = \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{(MO + M)(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO(t,u)}{u} + \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{M(t,u)}{u} \neq 0;$$

so, both make a contradiction.

□

**Theorem 4.10.** If $(L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO})$ is a Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak-Orlicz function $MO$ and $(L_M(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_M)$ generated by a Musielak $N$-function $M$ with the luxemburg norm, then $(L_{rMO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{rMO}), r \geq 1$ and $(L_{MO+M}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO+M})$ are Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by Musielak-Orlicz functions $rM$ and $MO + M$ with the luxemburg norm respectively.

**Remark 4.1.** If $MO_i : \Omega\times[0,\infty) \to [0,\infty), i = 1,2$ are Musielak-Orlicz functions such that $\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{MO_i(t,u)}{u} \neq 0, i = 1,2$ or $\lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{MO_i(t,u)}{u} \neq \infty, i = 1,2$ and $M : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Musielak $N$-function, then $MO_1 + k, k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}, MO_1MO_2, MO_1^n, n \in \mathbb{N}, \frac{MO_1}{MO_2}, \frac{MO_1}{M}$ and $\frac{M}{MO_1}$ are neither Musielak-Orlicz functions nor Musielak $N$-functions because for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, (MO_1 + k)(t,0) \neq 0, (MO_1MO_2)(t,0) \neq 0, MO_1^n(t,0) \neq 0, \frac{MO_1(t,0)}{MO_2(t,0)} \neq 0, \frac{MO_1(t,0)}{M(t,0)} \neq 0, \frac{M(t,0)}{MO_1(t,0)} \neq 0$. Also, $MO_1 - MO_2, MO_1 - M$ and $M - MO_1$ are not necessary to be Musielak-Orlicz functions because the subtraction in them do not preserve the positivity and the convexity of the Musielak-Orlicz functions and if so, they would be as $MO_1 + MO_2$ and $MO_1 + M$ and $(L_{MO_1-MO_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_1-MO_2}), (L_{MO_1-M}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_1-M})$ and $(L_{M-MO_1}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{M-MO_1})$ would be as $(L_{MO_1+MO_2}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_1+MO_2})$ and $(L_{MO_1+M}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO_1+M})$.

**Theorem 4.11.** If $MO : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a bounded Musielak-Orlicz function, then there exists a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz function $\{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}, \varphi_n : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that $\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{\varphi_n(t,u)}{u} \neq 0, \lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{\varphi_n(t,u)}{u} \neq \infty$ and $\varphi_n \to M$ on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$.

**Proof.** It is given that $MO$ is a bounded Musielak-Orlicz function, so for each $u \in [0,\infty), MO(t,u)$ is bounded and $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$; so there exists a sequence of simple functions $\{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}, \varphi_n : \Omega\times[0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that for each $u \in [0,\infty)$, for all $\varepsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathbb{N}, |MO(t,u) - \varphi_n(t,u)| < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq N$, for all $t \in \Omega$ by the basic approximation, then such convergence is uniform on $\Omega$ and pointwise on $[0,\infty)$. Then, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \Omega, \varphi_n(t,u)$ can satisfy the conditions of Orlicz function on $[0,\infty)$, and for each $u \in [0,\infty), \varphi_n(t,u)$ is $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\Omega$ for all $n \geq N$, then these simple functions $\varphi_n, n \geq N$ are Musielak-Orlicz functions converge to $MO$ on $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$ as $n \to \infty$. Now, assume $\{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are Musielak $N$-functions, then

$$0 = \lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{u\to 0}\frac{\varphi_n(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\varphi_n(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0}\frac{MO(t,u)}{u} \neq 0$$

or

$$\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{u\to\infty}\frac{\varphi_n(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\varphi_n(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to\infty}\frac{MO(t,u)}{u} \neq \infty$$

which is a contradiction.

□

**Theorem 4.12.** If $(L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO})$ is a bounded Musielak-Orlicz space generated by a Musielak-Orlicz function $MO : \Omega\times[0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$, then there exists a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz spaces $\{(L_{\varphi_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{\varphi_n}), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, generated by a sequence of Musielak-Orlicz functions $\varphi_n : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ respectively, such that $(L_{\varphi_n}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{\varphi_n}) \to (L_{MO}(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu), \|\cdot\|_{MO})$ via $\{MO_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ as $n \to \infty$.

# 5 Examples

## 5.1 Examples of Musielak $N$-functions.

1. Every $N$-function is a Musielak $N$-function.
2. $M : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty), M(t,u) = (tu)^2$ is Musielak $N$-function, where
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}, M(t,u)$ is even convex because $M(t,-u) = M(t,u)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 M(t,u)}{\partial u^2} = 2t^2 \geq 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}, M(t,u) = (tu)^2 > 0$ for any $u > 0$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{u\to 0}\frac{M(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0} t^2u = 0$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{u\to\infty}\frac{M(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to\infty} t^2u = \infty$
   - for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, M(t,u) = (tu)^2$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\mathbb{R}$ since it is continuous on measurable set $\mathbb{R}$.
3. $M : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, M(t,u) = exp(|u|+|t|) - |u| - |t|$ is Musielak $N$-function, where
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}, M(t,u)$ is even convex because $M(t,-u) = M(t,u)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 M(t,u)}{\partial u^2} = exp(|u|+|t|) > 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}, M(t,u) = exp(|u|+|t|) - |u| - |t| > 0$ for any $u > 0$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{u\to 0}\frac{M(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to 0}\frac{exp(|u|+|t|)-|u|-|t|}{u} = 0$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{u\to 0}\frac{M(t,u)}{u} = \lim_{u\to\infty}\frac{exp(|u|+|t|)-|u|-|t|}{u} = \infty$
   - for each $u \in \mathbb{R}, M(t,u) = exp(|u|+|t|) - |u| - |t|$ is a $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $\mathbb{R}$ since it is continuous on measurable set $\mathbb{R}$.

## 5.2 Examples of Musielak-Orlicz functions that are not Musielak $N$-functions.

1. $M : [0,\infty)\times[0,\infty) \longrightarrow [0,\infty), M(t,u) = a^{tu} - 1, a > 1$;
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in [0,\infty), a^{tu} - 1 > 0$ on $(0,\infty)$ and $a^{tu} - 1 = 0$ whenever $u = 0$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in [0,\infty), M(t,u) = a^{tu}-1$ is convex function on $[0,\infty)$ since $\frac{\partial^2 M(t,u)}{\partial u^2} = a^{tu}(t\log a)^2 > 0$ for all $u \in [0,\infty)$

- for all $u \geq 0, M(t,u) = a^{tu} - 1$ is $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $[0,\infty)$ since it is continuous on measurable set $[0,\infty)$

then $M(t,u)$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function but not Musielak $N-$ function because for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in [0,\infty)$,

$$\lim_{u \longrightarrow 0} \frac{a^{tu} - 1}{u} = t \log a \neq 0$$

2. $M : (-\infty, 0) \times [0,\infty) \longrightarrow [0,\infty), M(t,u) = u^t$;

   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in (-\infty, 0), u^t > 0$ on $(0,\infty)$ and $u^t = 0$ whenever $u = 0$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in (-\infty, 0), M(t,u) = u^t$ is convex function on $[0,\infty)$ since $\frac{\partial^2 M(t,u)}{\partial u^2} = t(t-1)u^{t-2} > 0$ for all $u \in [0,\infty)$
   - for all $u \geq 0, M(t,u) = u^t$ is $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $(-\infty, 0)$ since it is continuous on measurable set $(-\infty, 0)$

   then $M(t,u)$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function but not Musielak $N-$ function because for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in (-\infty, 0)$,

$$\lim_{u \longrightarrow 0} \frac{u^t}{u} = \infty \neq 0$$

3. $M : R \times [0,\infty) \longrightarrow [0,\infty), M(t,u) = (t+1)^2 u$

   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in R, M(t,u) > 0$ on $(0,\infty)$ and $M(t,u) = 0$ whenever $u = 0$
   - for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in R, M(t,u) = (t+1)^2 u$ is convex function on $(0,\infty)$ since for all $u_1, u_2 \in (0,\infty)$ and for all $\lambda \in (0,1)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} M(t, \lambda u_1 + (1-\lambda)u_2) &= (t+1)^2(\lambda u_1 + (1-\lambda)u_2) \\ &\leq \lambda(t+1)^2 u_1 + (1-\lambda)(t+1)^2 u_2 \\ &= \lambda M(t,u_1) + (1-\lambda) M(t,u_2) \end{aligned}$$

   - for all $u \geq 0, M(t,u) = (t+1)^2 u$ is $\mu-$measurable function of $t$ on $R$ since it is continuous on measurable set $R$

   then $M(t,u)$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function but not Musielak $N-$ function because for $\mu-$a.e. $t \in R$,

$$\lim_{u \longrightarrow 0} \frac{(t+1)^2 u}{u} = (t+1)^2 \neq 0$$

$$\lim_{u \longrightarrow \infty} \frac{(t+1)^2 u}{u} = (t+1)^2 \neq \infty$$

# 6 Conclusion

The concept of $N$-function can be generalized to Musielak $N$-function as the concept of Orlicz function is generalized to Musielak-Orlicz function. $\mu-$almost everywhere property, supremum, infimum, limit, convergence and basic convergence of a sequence of Musielak $N-$functions and Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them can be considered using facts and results of the measure theory . Also, the relationship between Musielak $N$-functions and Musielak-Orlicz functions and Musielak-Orlicz spaces generated by them have been studied according to facts and results of the measure theory.

# References


[1] Adam M.W, Labuschagne L.E. On applications of Orlicz spaces to statistical physics. Springer. 1424-0637/14/061197-25. June 19, 2013. DOI 10.1007/s00023-013-0267-3.

[2] Alaouia M.K, Nabilab T, Altanjia M. On some new non-linear diffusion models for image filtering. Applicable Anal. 93(2014). No.2,269-280.

[3] Battoor A, Benderski O, Yaskolko S. Measurable fields of Orlicz spaces. Thesis reports.XV All-union school on the theory of operators in function spaces.Uljanovsk. 1990.

[4] Battoor A. Orlicz spaces for measurable functions. Lecture notes. 2002.

[5] Chen S. Geometry of Orlicz spaces. Instytut Matematyczny PAN. Warszawa. 1996.

[6] Chen Y, Levine S, Rao M. Variable exponent,linear growth functionals in image restoration. SIAM J.Appl.Math. 66(2006). No.4,1383-1406.

[7] Colombo M, Mingione G. Regularity for Double Phase Variational Problems Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 215(2015), no.2,443-496.

[8] Diening L. Maximal function on Musielak-Orlicz spaces and generalized Lebesgue spaces. ELSEVIER. 129(2005)657-700.

[9] Ferreira R, H*ästö* P, Riberiro A.M. Characterization of Generalized Orlicz Spaces. arXiv:1612.04566v1 [math.FA] 14 Dec 2016.

[10] Giannetti F, Passarelli di Napoli A. Regularity results for a new class of functionals with non-standard growth conditions. J. Differential Equations 254(2013)1280-1305.

[11] Harjulehto P, H*ästö* P, Klén R. Basic properties of Generalized Orlicz Spaces. 2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 46E35, 46E30. April 8, 2015.

[12] Harjulehto P, H*ästö* P, Latvala V, Toivanen O. Critical variable exponent functionals in image restoration. Appl.Math. Letters 26(2013), 56-60.

[13] Hudzik H. Convexity in Musielak-Orlicz spaces. Hokkaido Mathematical Journal, Vol. 14(1985), p.85-96.

[14] Hudzik H, Kurc W. Monotonicity properties of Musielak-Orlicz spaces and dominated best approximation in Banach lattices. Journal of Approximation Theory 95,353-368(1998). Artical No. AT973226.

[15] Kaminska A. Kubiak D. The Daugavet property in the Musielak-Orlicz Spaces. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 427(2)(2015),873-898.

[16] Katirtzoglou E. Normal structure of Musielak-Orlicz spaces. Collect. Math. 48, 4-6(1997), 571-585.

[17] Krasnoselkii M.A and Rutitskii B.Ya. Translated by Leo F. Boron. Convex function and Orlicz spaces. Philadelphia 26, Pennsylvania(English).1961.

[18] Lindenstrauss J, Tzafriri L. Classical Banach Sapces I and II. *Springer* Verlag. 1977.

[19] Maji A, Srivastava P.D. On some geometric properties of generalized Musielak-Orlicz sequence space and corresponding operator ideals. Banach ournal of Mathematical Analysis. Volume 9, Number 4(2015),14-33.

[20] Masta A, Gunawan H, Budhi W.S. Inclusion Properties of Orlicz and Weak Orlicz spaces. J.Math.Fund.Sci.,Vol.48, No.3, 2016, 193-203.

[21] Musielak J. Orlicz Spaces and Modular Spaces. Springer. Berlin. 1983.

[22] Musielak J, Orlicz W. On modular Spaces. Sudia Math. 18(1959)49-65.

[23] Nakano H. Modulared Semi-Ordered Linear Spaces. Maruzen Co. Ltd. Tokyo. 1950.

[24] Orlicz W. Uber eine gewisse Lasse von Raumen vom Typus. BBull. Int. Acad. Polon. Sci. 207-220. 1932.

[25] Pick L, Kufner A, John O, Fučik A. Function Spaces. Volume 1. Second Edition. Berlin/Boston. Walter de Gruyter GmbH. 2013.

[26] Rao M.M, Ren Z.D. Theory of Orlicz spaces. Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York. 1991.

[27] Rao M.M, Ren Z.D. Applications of Orlicz spaces. Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York. 2002.

[28] Roberts A.W, Varberg D.E. convex function. Academic press, Inc. New York. 1973.

[29] *Ś*wierczewska-Gwiazda A. Nonlinear parabolic problems in Musielak-Orlicz spaces. Nonlinear Anal. 98(2014), 48-65.

[30] Wade W.R. "An Introduction to Analysis". Fourth Edition. Pearson Education, Inc. 2010.

[31] Wr*ó*blewska-Kami*ń*ska A. Existence result for the motion of several rigid bodies in an incompressible non-Newtonian fluid with growth conditions in Orlicz spaces. Nonlinearity 27(2014)685-716.

[32] Yeh J. Real Analysis, Theorey of Meausre and Integration. Second Edition. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd. 2006.

[33] Youssfi A, Ahmida Y. Some approximation results in Musielak-Orlicz Spaces. arXiv:1708.02453v3 [math.FA] 23 Oct 2017.