A NOTE ON LEVI-CIVITA FUNCTIONAL EQUATION

BELFAKH KELTOUMA AND ELQORACHI ELHOUCIEN

Abstract. In this paper we find the solutions of the functional equation

\[ f(xy) = g(x)h(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y), \quad x, y \in M, \]

where \( M \) is a monoid, \( n \geq 2 \), and \( g_j \) (for \( j = 1, \ldots, n \)) are linear combinations of at least 2 distinct nonzero multiplicative functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

A solution of Levi-Civita functional equation on a monoid \( M \) is an ordered set of functions \( f, g_1, \ldots, g_N, h_1, \ldots, h_N: M \to \mathbb{C} \) satisfying Levi-Civita functional equation

\[ f(xy) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} g_j(x)h_j(y), \quad x, y \in M. \]

Shulman [6, Lemma 4] described the measurable solutions of (1.1) on locally compact groups in terms of group representations under the additional assumption that both \( g_1, \ldots, g_N \) and \( h_1, \ldots, h_N \) are linearly independent. A description of the (nondegenerated) solutions on abelian groups can be found in Szskelyhidi [8] for all \( N \). They turn out to be exponential polynomials, that is, sums of products of polynomials of additive functions and of solutions of \( \varphi(x + y) = \varphi(x)\varphi(y) \). That is in general not so for non-abelian groups as Stetkær [3, Exemple 1] reveals. We refer also to [4, Theorem 5.2].

Chung, Kannappan and Ng [5] solved the Levi-Civita functional equation

\[ f(xy) = f(x)g(y) + f(y)g(x) + h(x)h(y), \quad x, y \in G, \]

where \( G \) is a group.

The functional equation (1.1) was for each \( N \leq 4 \) thoroughly worked out on abelian groups with implicit formulas for the solutions by Szskelyhidi [7, Theorem 10.4].

Ebanks [1] studied the functional equation

\[ f(xy) = k(x)L(y) + g(x)h(y), \quad x, y \in S, \]

for four unknown central functions \( f, g, h, k \) on certain non-abelian semigroups \( S \), where \( L \) is a fixed multiplicative function on \( S \). Stetkær [3] removed the restriction that the solutions of (1.3) should be central and solved the functional equation

\[ f(xy) = g_1(x)h_1(y) + \mu(x)h_2(y), \quad x, y \in G, \]
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where $G$ is a group (that need not to be abelian), and $\mu : G \to \mathbb{C}$ is a character of $G$.

The motivation of the present work is the recent paper, by Ebanks and Stetkær [2], in which they derive explicit formulas for the solutions $f, g_1, h_1, h_2 : M \to K$ of the functional equation

$$f(xy) = g_1(x)h_1(y) + g(x)h_2(y), \quad x, y \in M,$$

where $M$ is a monoid (that need not to be abelian), $K$ is a field, $g$ is a linear combination of $n \geq 2$ distinct nonzero multiplicative functions with nonzero coefficients. We wish to see what makes the paper [2] work by analyzing a more general Levi-Civita functional equation

$$f(xy) = g(x)h(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y), \quad x, y \in M,$$

where $M$ is a monoid, $K$ is a field, and $f, g, h, h_j : M \to K$ are the unknown functions, and where for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $g_j$ is defined by

$$g_j = \sum_{i=n_j}^{m_j} b_i \mu_i,$$

where $n_1 = 1$, $m_j = n_{j+1} - 1$ for $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$, $m := m_n$, $m_j - n_j \geq 1$, for $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $b_i \neq 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, and $\{\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_m\}$ are distinct nonzero multiplicative functions on $M$. Thus we have grouped the elements of the sequence $\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_n$ into $n$ consecutive, disjoint intervals by

$$\mu_{n_1} = \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{m_1}; \mu_{n_2}; \mu_{n_2}; \mu_{n_3}; \ldots; \mu_{n_n}; \mu_{n+n} = \mu_n$$

in accordance with the sequence $g_1; g_2; \ldots; g_j; \ldots; g_n$. We note here that $g_j$ has at least 2 terms on the right hand side like in the motivating paper [2]. Equation (1.6) is an extension of the functional equation (1.5) (Take $n = 2$ and $h_2 = 0$ in (1.6)).

In our present paper:

1. We get explicit solution formulas involving multiplicative functions.
2. The solutions are abelian, except when they blatantly need not be abelian, so that non-abelian phenomena essentially do not occur, except for some arbitrary functions. This contrasts the formally simpler functional equation studied in the paper [3] (It is due to $m_j - n_j \geq 1$).
3. The proofs are elementary algebraic manipulations (no homological algebra and the link). No analysis or geometry come into play.

The key elements of our set up are

1. The functions are defined on a monoid $M$ with an identity element $e$, and map into a field $K$.
2. Whenever we refer to the functional equation (1.6) then the functions $g_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ have the forms (1.7).
3. The multiplicative functions $\mu_i$, appearing in (1.6) are nonzero and distinct and their coefficients $b_i$ are nonzero.

Our results are organized as follows. We discuss two cases according to whether $f \neq 0$ and the set $\{g_1, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_n\}$ is linearly independent (Proposition 2.4) or not (Proposition 2.5). The main results are given in Theorem 2.6. Throughout this paper $M$ denotes a monoid: A semigroup $S$ with a neutral element.
Let $K^* = K \setminus \{0\}$ denote the subset of nonzero elements. A multiplicative function $\mu : M \to K$ is a function such that $\mu(xy) = \mu(x)\mu(y)$ for all $x, y \in M$. Let $M(n, \mathbb{C})$ denote the algebra of all complex $n \times n$ matrices, and let $A^T$ denote the transpose matrix of a matrix $A \in M(n, \mathbb{C})$, and $A^{-1}$ its inverse. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq 2$, and let $q \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we introduce the following notation 

$\{1, 2, \ldots, q, \ldots, n\} := \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{q\}$.

The fact that distinct multiplicative functions are independent is frequently used in the present paper. The following result is taken from Proposition 1 (a) in [2].

**Proposition 1.1.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_n : S \to K$ be $n$ distinct multiplicative functions, and let $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \in K$.

If $a_1\mu_1 + a_2\mu_2 + \ldots + a_n\mu_n = 0$, then $a_1\mu_1 = a_2\mu_2 = \ldots = a_n\mu_n = 0$. Thus any set of distinct nonzero multiplicative functions is linearly independent.

**Remark 1.2.** Any $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ in the form (1.7), belongs to exactly one of the $n$ disjoint sub intervals $[n_j, m_j]$ of $[1, m]$, and so the number $j \in [1, n]$ of that subinterval is uniquely determined by $i$. Let $J(i) := j \in [1, n]$, when $j$ is the number of the subinterval containing $i$. So $i \to J(i)$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, is a function of $i$. Note that $J : [1, m] \to [1, n]$ is surjective, that $i \in [n_{J(i)}, m_{J(i)}]$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, and that $J^{-1}\{\{k\}\} = [n_k, m_k]$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$.

Hence, we have

(1.8) \[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=n_j}^{m_j} b_i \mu_i(x)h_j(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \mu_i(x)h_{J(i)}(y).
\]

Thus, the functional equation (1.6) has another form

(1.9) \[
f(xy) = g(x)h(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \mu_i(x)h_{J(i)}(y), \quad x, y \in G.
\]

2. General solution of the functional equation (1.6)

The following proposition gives a partial solution of the functional equation (1.6).

**Proposition 2.1.** Let $(f, g, h, h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_n)$ be a solution of the functional equation (1.6) such that $f \neq 0$, $h_1(e) \neq 0$, and such that the set $\{g, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_m\}$ is linearly independent. Then there exist a nonzero multiplicative function $\chi : M \to K$ such that $\chi \neq \mu_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, and $a, b \in K^*$, and $c_j \in K$ with $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that

\[
f = ab\chi, \quad g = b\chi - \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_k g_k, \quad h = a\chi, \quad h_j = ac_j\chi,
\]

where $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$.

**Proof.** Taking $y = e$ in (1.6) we get

(2.1) \[
f = h(e)g + \sum_{j=1}^{n} h_j(e)g_j.
\]

Substituting (2.1) in equation (1.6) we get

\[
h(e)g(xy) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} h_j(e)g_j(xy) = g(x)h(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y),
\]
from which we deduce that

\[(2.2) \quad g(xy) = \frac{1}{h(e)} [g(x)h(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} h_j(e)g_j(xy)]. \]

Let \( x, y, z \) be in \( M \), using (2.6) we have

\[ f((xy)z) = g(xy)h(z) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(xy)h_j(z), \]
\[ f(x(yz)) = g(x)h(yz) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(yz). \]

Using the associativity of the monoid operation, we deduce that

\[ g(xy)h(z) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(xy)h_j(z) = g(x)h(yz) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(yz). \]

Replacing \( g(xy) \) in this equation by its form in (2.2) we obtain after computations

\[
g(x) \left[ h(y) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} - h(yz) \right] = \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x) \left[ h_j(yz) - h_j(y) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} \right] + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(xy) \left[ h_j(e) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} - h_j(z) \right]
\]
\[
= \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i=n_j}^{m_j} b_i \mu_i(x) \left[ h_j(yz) - h_j(y) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} + \sum_{i=n_j}^{m_j} b_i \mu_i(xy) \left[ h_j(e) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} - h_j(z) \right] \right]
\]
\[
= \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i=n_j}^{m_j} b_i \mu_i(x) \left[ h_j(yz) - h_j(y) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} + \mu_i(y) \left( h_j(e) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} - h_j(z) \right) \right].
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \mu_i(x) \left[ h_{J(i)}(yz) - h_{J(i)}(y) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} + \mu_i(y) \left( h_{J(i)}(e) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} - h_{J(i)}(z) \right) \right].
\]

Since by hypothesis, \( \{g, \mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m\} \) is linearly independent and all \( b_i \) are nonzero we deduce that

\[(2.3) \quad h(yz) - h(y)h(z)h(e) = 0, \]

and

\[(2.4) \quad h_{J(i)}(yz) - h_{J(i)}(y)h(z)h(e) + \mu_i(y)h_{J(i)}(e)h(e) - h_{J(i)}(z) = 0, \]

for all \( i = 1, 2, ..., m \).

Equation (2.3) implies that \( h = a\chi \), where \( \chi := h/h(e) : M \rightarrow K \) is a nonzero multiplicative function and \( a = h(e) \neq 0 \). Using the facts that \( J^{-1}([j]) = [n_j, m_j] \), \( \mu_{n_j}, ..., \mu_{m_j} \) are distinct, and \( m_j - n_j \geq 1 \) for all \( j \in \{1, 2, ..., n\} \), we get from (2.2)

that

\[ h_{J(i)}(z) = h_{J(i)}(e) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} = ac_{J(i)}\chi(z), \]

where \( c_{J(i)} := \frac{h_{J(i)}(e)}{a} \).

Since the function \( J \) is surjective we deduce that for all \( j \in \{1, 2, ..., n\} \)

\[ h_j(z) = h_j(e) \frac{h(z)}{h(e)} = ac_j\chi(z), \]

where \( c_j := \frac{h_j(e)}{a} \).
Taking \(x = e\) in \((2.2)\) we find that
\[
g = b\chi - \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_k g_k, \quad \text{where } b := g(e) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_k g_k(e) \in K.
\]
If \(b = 0\) we get that
\[
g = -\sum_{k=1}^{n} c_k g_k = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} c_J(i) b_i \mu_i.
\]
This means that \(\{g, \mu_1, ..., \mu_m\}\) is a linear dependent set, which is not true by hypothesis. Thus, \(b \neq 0\). Using the same argument we prove that \(\chi\) is distinct from \(\mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m\).

To find \(f\) we replace the functions \(g, h, h_1, ..., h_n\) by their forms in \((2.1)\) and we obtain that \(f = ab\chi\).

The following lemmas will be useful in the proofs of our main results.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \((f, h_1, h_2, ..., h_n)\) be a solution of the functional equation
\[
f(xy) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x) h_j(y), \quad x, y \in M.
\]
Then \(f = h_j = 0\) for all \(j \in \{1, ..., n\}\).

**Proof.** Assume for contradiction that \(f \neq 0\). Taking \(y = e\) in \((2.6)\) we get that
\[
f = \sum_{j=1}^{n} h_j(e) g_j.
\]
If \(h_j(e) = 0\) for all \(j \in \{1, ..., n\}\) then we get from \((2.7)\) that \(f = 0\) which contradicts the hypothesis that \(f \neq 0\). Thus, there exists \(k \in \{1, ..., n\}\) such that \(h_k(e) \neq 0\).

We may take \(k = n\), and the equation \((2.6)\) becomes
\[
f(xy) = g_n(x) h_n(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} g_j(x) h_j(y).
\]
The set \(\{g_n, \mu_1, ..., \mu_{m-1}\}\) is linearly independent. In fact, if it is not, we will have
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m(n-1)} c_i \mu_i(x) + c_n g_n = 0
\]
with \((c_1, c_2, ..., c_n) \neq (0, 0, ..., 0)\). Using the form of \(g_n\), equation \((2.8)\) can be written as follows
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m(n-1)} c_i \mu_i(x) + \sum_{i=n}^{m} c_n b_i \mu_i(x) = 0.
\]
Since \(n_n = m_{n-1} + 1\) the last equation is equivalent to \(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \mu_i(x) = 0\), where \(a_i = c_i\) for \(i = 1, 2, ..., m_{n-1}\), and \(a_i = c_n b_i\) for \(i = n_n, ..., m\). The multiplicative functions \(\mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m\) are distinct and nonzero, so according to Proposition \(1.1\) we deduce that \(a_i = 0\) for all \(i \in \{1, 2, ..., m\}\), and hence \(c_i = 0\) for \(i = 1, 2, ..., m_{n-1}\), and \(c_n = 0\). This means that \((c_1, c_2, ..., c_n) = (0, 0, ..., 0)\) and this contradicts the hypothesis that the set \(\{g_n, \mu_1, ..., \mu_{m-1}\}\) is linearly dependent. Thus \(\{g_n, \mu_1, ..., \mu_{m-1}\}\) is a linearly independent set. Now, using the fact that \(f \neq 0\), \(h_n(e) \neq 0\), and that \(\{g_n, \mu_1, ..., \mu_{m-1}\}\) is linearly independent, we get from Proposition \(2.1\) that there
exist a nonzero multiplicative function \( \chi : M \to K \) such that \( \chi \neq \mu_i \) for all \( i \in \{1, 2, ..., m_n-1\} \), and \( a, b \in K^* \), and \( c_j \in K \), for \( j = 1, 2, ..., n \) such that
\[
(2.9) \quad f = ab\chi, \quad g_n = b\chi - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_j g_j, \quad h_n = a\chi, \quad h_j = ac_j \chi
\]
for all \( j = 1, 2, ..., n - 1 \). We get from (2.4) that
\[
b\chi = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_j g_j + g_n = \sum_{i=1}^{m_n-1} c_{J(i)} b_i \mu_i + \sum_{i=n_n}^m b_i \mu_i.
\]
This means that the set \( \{ \chi, \mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m \} \) is linearly dependent which is not possible according to Proposition 1.1 because \( \chi, \mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m \) are distinct multiplicative functions. We deduce that \( f = 0 \). Hence, we get from the functional equation (2.6) that
\[
\sum_{j=1}^n g_j(x)h_j(y) = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i(x)h_{J(i)}(y) = 0.
\]
Since \( \{\mu_1, ..., \mu_m\} \) is linearly independent we deduce that \( b_i h_{J(i)} = 0 \). Using the fact that the coefficients \( b_i \) are nonzero we deduce that \( h_{J(i)} = 0 \). The subjectivity of the function \( J \) implies that \( h_j = h_{J(i)} = 0 \) for all \( j \in \{1, ..., n\} \). This completes the proof.

Lemma 2.3. Let \( (f, g, h, h_1, ..., h_n) \) be a solution of the functional equation (1.6) such that \( f \neq 0 \). If the set \( \{g, \mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m\} \) is linearly independent, then the set \( \{f, \mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m\} \) is also linearly independent.

Proof. If \( h = 0 \) then we have
\[
f(xy) = \sum_{j=1}^n g_j(x)h_j(y).
\]
Applying Lemma 2.2 we deduce that \( f = 0 \), which contradicts the hypothesis that \( f \neq 0 \). Hence \( h \neq 0 \). Now assume that \( \{f, \mu_1, ..., \mu_m\} \) is linearly dependent. This means that \( f \) can be written as follows
\[
f = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \mu_i,
\]
where \( \alpha_i \in K \) for all \( i \in \{1, ..., m\} \). Substituting the last expression of \( f \) in equation (1.9) we get
\[
(2.10) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \mu_i(x) \mu_i(y) = g(x)h(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \mu_i(x)h_{J(i)}(y), \quad x, y \in G.
\]
Since \( h \neq 0 \) there exists \( y_0 \) such that \( h(y_0) \neq 0 \). Thus, we obtain
\[
g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \mu_i(y_0) - \frac{b_i h_{J(i)}(y_0)}{h(y_0)} \mu_i(x).
\]
This means that \( \{g, \mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m\} \) is a linearly dependent set. This completes the proof.

Now, using Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 we can omit the condition \( h(e) \neq 0 \) from Proposition 2.1.
Proposition 2.4. Let \((f, g, h, h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_n)\) be a solution of the functional equation \((1.6)\) such that \(f \neq 0\). If the set \(\{g, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_m\}\) is linearly independent, then there exist a nonzero multiplicative function \(\chi : M \rightarrow K\) such that \(\chi \neq \mu_i\) for all \(i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}\), and \(a, b \in K^*\), and \(c_j \in K\) for \(j = 1, 2, \ldots, n\), such that

\[
(2.11) \quad f = ab\chi, \quad g = b\chi - \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_k g_k, \quad h = a\chi, \quad h_j = ac_j\chi \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n.
\]

Conversely, the formulas \((2.11)\) define solutions of equation \((1.6)\).

Proof. The case of \(h(e) \neq 0\) is Proposition 2.1. Suppose that \(h(e) = 0\). The functional equation \((2.1)\) becomes

\[
(2.12) \quad f = (d - c)(bb_n\mu_{nq} - ab_m\mu_{mq}),
\]

\[
(2.13) \quad g = db_n\mu_{nq} + cb_m\mu_{mq} + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j,
\]

\[
(2.14) \quad h = a\mu_{mq} + b\mu_{nq}, \quad h_q = -da\mu_{mq} - cb\mu_{nq},
\]

\[
(2.15) \quad h_j = -c_j a\mu_{mq} - c_j b\mu_{nq} \quad \text{for all} \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, \hat{q}, \ldots, n\}.
\]

If \(m_q - n_q = 1\), then

\[
(2.16) \quad f = a(c - d)b_k\mu_k, \quad g = dg_q + (c - d)b_k\mu_k + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j,
\]

\[
(2.17) \quad h = a\mu_k, \quad h_q = -d\mu_k, \quad h_j = -c_j \mu_k \quad \text{for all} \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, \hat{q}, \ldots, n\},
\]

where \(k \in \{n_q, \ldots, m_q\}\) and \(a \neq 0\).

Proof. That the set \(\{g, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_m\}\) is linearly dependent means that

\[
\beta ag + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_i \mu_i = 0,
\]
where $\beta_0, \beta_1, ..., \beta_m$ are constants such that $(\beta_0, \beta_1, ..., \beta_m) \neq (0, 0, ..., 0)$. Since the set $\{\mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m\}$ is linearly independent, then $\beta_0 \neq 0$ and hence, we can write

$$g = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \mu_i \text{ where } a_i \in K.$$  

If we take $y = e$ in (13) we get

$$f = h(e)g + \sum_{i=1}^{m} h_{J(i)}(e)b_i \mu_i.$$  

Replacing $g$ by its form (2.18) in (14), and using (2.19) we get

$$h(e) \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \mu_i(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} h_{J(i)}(e)b_i \mu_i(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \mu_i(x)h(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \mu_i(x)h_{J(i)}(y).$$  

This can be written as follows

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_i(x) \left[ a_i \left( h(e) \mu_i(y) - h(y) \right) + b_i \left( h_{J(i)}(e) \mu_i(y) - h_{J(i)}(y) \right) \right] = 0.$$  

Since the set $\{\mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_m\}$ is linearly independent we deduce that

$$[a_i h(e) + b_i h_{J(i)}(e)] \mu_i = a_i h + b_i h_{J(i)} \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, ..., m.$$  

Here we discuss two cases

Case 1: Suppose that there exists $q \in \{1, ..., n\}$ such that $a_k b_s \neq a_s b_k$ for some pair $k, s \in \{n_q, ..., m_q\}$.

Replacing $i$ in (2.20) by $k$ and $s$ and using that $J(s) = J(k) = q$ we get respectively

$$a_k h + b_k h_q = [a_k h(e) + b_k h_q(e)] \mu_k,$$  

$$a_s h + b_s h_q = [a_s h(e) + b_s h_q(e)] \mu_s.$$  

Since $n \geq 2$, the set $\{1, ..., n, ..., n\}$ is not empty. Let $j \in \{1, ..., m, ..., m\}$ and let $p \in \{n_j, ..., m_j\}$. If we replace $i$ in (2.20) by $p$ and use that $J(p) = j$ we get that

$$[a_p h(e) + b_p h_j(e)] \mu_p = a_p h + b_p h_j.$$  

This three equations can be written in a matrix form:

$$AH = B\mu,$$

where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_k & b_k & 0 \\ a_s & b_s & 0 \\ a_p & 0 & b_p \end{pmatrix},$$

$$H^T = (h, h_q, h_j),$$

$$\mu^T = (\mu_k, \mu_s, \mu_p),$$

and

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} a_k h(e) + b_k h_q(e) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_s h(e) + b_s h_q(e) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_p h(e) + b_p h_j(e) \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Since $a_k b_s \neq a_s b_k$ and $b_p \neq 0$ we have

$$\det(A) = b_p (a_k b_s - a_s b_k) \neq 0.$$
Hence, the matrix $A$ has an inverse:

$$A^{-1} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} b_s & -b_k & 0 \\ -a_s & a_k & 0 \\ -b_s \frac{a}{b_p} & b_k \frac{a}{b_p} & \frac{a}{b_p} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\alpha = a_kb_s - a_sb_k$.

We get after some computations that there exist $a, b \in K$ such that

$$h = a\mu_k + b\mu_s,$$

$$h_q = -\frac{a}{b_s}a\mu_k - \frac{a}{b_k}b\mu_s,$$

$$h_j = -\frac{a}{b_p}a\mu_k - \frac{a}{b_p}b\mu_s + \alpha_j\mu_p,$$

where $\alpha_j \in K$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{q}, \ldots, n\}$. If we put $d := a_s/b_s$, $c := a_k/b_k$, $c_j := a_p/b_p$ we get that

$$h = a\mu_k + b\mu_s,$$

$$h_q = -d a\mu_k - c b\mu_s,$$

$$h_j = -c_j a\mu_k - c_j b\mu_s + \alpha_j\mu_p,$$

for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{q}, \ldots, n\}$. Since $a_s b_k \neq a_k b_s$, we have $d \neq c$.

If $a = b = \alpha_j = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{q}, \ldots, n\}$ then $h = h_q = h_j = 0$ which gives that $f = 0$. Since $f$ is a nonzero function we deduce that $(a, b, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\tilde{q}}, \ldots, \alpha_n) \neq (0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$.

Since we have $m_j - n_j \geq 1$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{q}, \ldots, n\}$, then the set $\{n_j, \ldots, \tilde{p}, \ldots, m_j\}$ is not empty. Hence we can choose $l \in \{n_j, \ldots, \tilde{p}, \ldots, m_j\}$, where $j \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{q}, \ldots, n\}$.

Replacing $i$ in equation (2.20) by $l$ we get

$$[a_l h(e) + b_l h_j(e)]\mu_l = a_l h + b_l h_j.$$ 

Deriving the expressions of $h(e)$ and $h_j(e)$ from equations (2.32) and (2.33) and replacing the functions $h$, and $h_j$ by their forms, the equation (2.34) can be written as follows

$$[a_l(a + b) - b_l(c_j a + c_j b - \alpha_j)]\mu_l = a_l(a\mu_k + b\mu_s) + b_l(-c_j a\mu_k - c_j b\mu_s + \alpha_j\mu_p).$$

Hence

$$[(a + b)(a_l - b_l c_j) + b_l \alpha_j]\mu_l = a_l(a_l - b_l c_j)\mu_k + b_l(a_l - b_l c_j)\mu_s + b_l\alpha_j\mu_p.$$ 

The set $\{\mu_s, \mu_k, \mu_p, \mu_l\}$ is linearly independent because $\mu_s, \mu_k, \mu_p, \mu_l$ are distinct. Thus we get that

$$(2.35) \quad b_l \alpha_j = 0, \quad a(a_l - b_l c_j) = 0, \quad b(a_l - b_l c_j) = 0, \quad (a + b)(a_l - b_l c_j) + b_l \alpha_j = 0.$$ 

Since the coefficients $b_l$ are nonzero for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ we get from the first relation of (2.35) that $\alpha_j = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{q}, \ldots, n\}$. Hence $(a, b) \neq (0, 0)$ because $(a, b, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \neq (0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Thus we get from the second and the third equation of (2.35) that $a_l = c_j b_l$ for all $l \in \{n_j, \ldots, \tilde{p}, \ldots, m_j\}$. Since $c_j = a_p/b_p$ we get that $a_l = c_j b_l$ for all $l \in \{n_j, \ldots, m_j\}$ where $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \tilde{q}, \ldots, n\}$. This means that $a_p/b_p = a_l/b_l = c_j$, and hence $a_p b_l = a_l b_p$ for all $p, l \in \{n_j, \ldots, m_j\}$, and for all
Since \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \hat{q}, \ldots, n\} \). This proves the uniqueness of \( q \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \).

Consequently, using the form of \( g \) we obtain

\[
g = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \mu_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{i=n_2}^{m_2} a_i \mu_i + \cdots + \sum_{i=n_m}^{m} a_i \mu_i
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=n_q}^{m_q} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{j \neq q}^{n} \sum_{i=n_j}^{m_j} a_i \mu_i
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=n_q}^{m_q} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{j \neq q}^{n} c_j \sum_{i=n_j}^{m_j} b_i \mu_i.
\]

Hence

\[
g = \sum_{i=n_q}^{m_q} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j.
\]

Here, we treat two cases:

**Case 1.1:** Suppose that \( m_q - n_q = 1 \). We may take \( s = n_q \) and \( k = n_q + 1 = m_q \).

In this case we have

\[
g = a_{n_q} \mu_{n_q} + a_{m_q} \mu_{m_q} + \sum_{j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j, \quad g_q = b_{n_q} \mu_{n_q} + b_{m_q} \mu_{m_q},
\]

and we get from (2.32) that

\[
h(e) = a + b, \quad h_q(e) = -da - cb, \quad h_j(e) = -c_j a - c_j b.
\]

Using those forms we obtain that

\[
f = h(e)g + h_q(e)g_q + \sum_{j \neq q}^{n} h_j(e)g_j
\]

\[
= h(e)(a_{n_q} \mu_{n_q} + a_{m_q} \mu_{m_q}) + h_q(e)g_q + \sum_{j \neq q}^{n} (h_j(e) + c_j h(e))g_j
\]

\[
= (a + b)(a_{n_q} \mu_{n_q} + a_{m_q} \mu_{m_q}) + (-da - cb)(b_{n_q} \mu_{n_q} + b_{m_q} \mu_{m_q}).
\]

Since \( a_{n_q} = db_{n_q} \) and \( a_{m_q} = cb_{m_q} \) we obtain after simplification that

\[
f = b(d - c)b_{n_q} \mu_{n_q} + a(c - d)b_{m_q} \mu_{m_q}
\]

\[
= (d - c)(bb_{n_q} \mu_{n_q} - ab_{m_q} \mu_{m_q}).
\]

**Case 1.2:** Suppose that \( m_q - n_q \geq 2 \). In this case we can choose an element \( r \in \{n_q, \ldots, m_q\} \) such that \( r \neq s \) and \( r \neq k \). Substituting the forms of \( h, h_q, h(e) \), and \( h_q(e) \) in (2.20) and replacing \( i \) by \( r \) we find

\[
(a_r(a + b) + b_r(-da - cb))\mu_r = a_r(a \mu_k + b \mu_s) + b_r(-da \mu_k - cb \mu_s),
\]

which can be written as follows

\[
[a_r(a + b) + b_r(-da - cb)]\mu_r = a(a_r - b_r d) \mu_k + b(a_r - c_r b) \mu_s.
\]

Since \( \mu_k, \mu_k, \mu_r \) are distinct the set \( \{\mu_r, \mu_k, \mu_r\} \) is linearly independent. This implies that

\[
a_r(a + b) + b_r(-da - cb) = 0, \quad a(a_r - db_r) = 0, \quad b(a_r - cb_r) = 0.
\]
Taking in account that \((a, b) \neq (0,0)\) and \(c \neq d\) we deduce that either \(a \neq 0\) and \(b = 0\), or \(b \neq 0\) and \(a = 0\).
Assume that \(a \neq 0\) and \(b = 0\). In this case we find that \(a_r = db_r\). Noting that \(a_s = db_s\) we deduce that \(a_i = db_i\) for all \(i \in \{n_1, ..., k, ..., m_q\}\). Thus, using equation (2.36) we get that

\[
g = \sum_{i=n_q}^{m_n} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j
\]

\[
= d \sum_{i=n_q, i \neq k}^{m_q} b_i \mu_i + a_k \mu_k + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j
\]

\[
= d \sum_{i=n_q, i \neq k}^{m_q} b_i \mu_i + cb_k \mu_k + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j
\]

\[
= dg + (c - d) b_k \mu_k + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j.
\]

Using that \(b = 0\) we deduce from (2.32) that \(h = a \mu_k, h_q = -d a \mu_k, h_j = -c_j a \mu_k\), for all \(j \in \{1, ..., q, ... n\}\).

\[
f = h(e)g + h_q g_q + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} h_j(e)g_j
\]

\[
= a g - dag_k - a \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j
\]

\[
= a \left( dg + (c - d) b_k \mu_k + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j \right) - dag - a \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_j g_j
\]

\[
= a(c - d) b_k \mu_k.
\]

So we obtain solution (a).
The case of \(a = 0\) and \(b \neq 0\) can be treated in a similar way.

**Case 2**: Suppose that \(a_s b_k = a_k b_s\) for all \(k, s \in \{n_j, ..., m_j\}\) and all \(j = 1, 2, ..., n\).
This means that there exists \(v_j \in K\) such that \(a_i = v_j b_i\) for all \(i \in \{n_j, ..., m_j\}\).
Hence we have

\[
g = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \mu_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{i=n_2}^{m_2} a_i \mu_i + ... + \sum_{i=n_m}^{m} a_i \mu_i
\]

\[
= v_1 \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} b_i \mu_i + v_2 \sum_{i=n_2}^{m_2} b_i \mu_i + ... + v_n \sum_{i=n_m}^{m} b_i \mu_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_j g_j.
\]
Substituting the last form of \( g \) in (2.4) we get that
\[
 f(xy) = g(x)h(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y) 
\]
\[
 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_jg_j(x)h(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y) 
\]
\[
 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)(v_jh + h_j)(y). 
\]

This equation has the form of the functional equation (2.6). According to Lemma 2.2 we deduce that \( f = 0 \), which is not true by hypothesis. Thus this case cannot occur. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Theorem 2.6 gives all solutions of the functional equation (1.6).

**Theorem 2.6.** Let \((f, g, h, h_1, h_2, ..., h_n)\) be a solution of the functional equation (1.6). Then the solutions have one of the following forms:

1. \( f = ab\chi, g = b\chi - \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_kg_k, h = a\chi, h_j = ac_j\chi, \) for \( j = 1, 2, ..., n, \)

where \( \chi : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow K \) is any nonzero multiplicative function such that \( \chi \neq \mu_i \) for all \( i \in \{1, 2, ..., m\} \), and \( a, b \in K^* \), and \( c_j \in K \) for \( j = 1, 2, ..., n \).

2. there exists a unique \( q \in \{1, ..., n\} \) and there exist constants \( a, b, c, d, c_j \in K \) for \( j \in \{1, ..., \hat{q}, ..., n\} \), with \( c \neq d \) and \( (a, b) \neq (0, 0) \) such that

- If \( m_q - n_q = 1 \), then
  \[
  f = (d - c)(bb_m\mu_{m_q} - ab_{m_q}\mu_{m_q}), 
  \]
  \[
  g = db_{m_q}\mu_{m_q} + cb_{m_q}\mu_{m_q} + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_jg_j, 
  \]
  \[
  h = a\mu_{m_q} + b\mu_{m_q}, \quad h_q = -da\mu_{m_q} - cb\mu_{n_q}, 
  \]
  \[
  h_j = -c_ja\mu_{m_q} - c_jb\mu_{n_q} \quad \text{for all} \; j \in \{1, ..., \hat{q}, ..., n\}. 
  \]

- If \( m_q - n_q \geq 2 \), then
  \[
  f = a(c - d)b_k\mu_k, \quad g = dg_q + (c - d)b_k\mu_k + \sum_{j=1, j \neq q}^{n} c_jg_j, 
  \]
  \[
  h = a\mu_k, \quad h_q = -da\mu_k, \quad h_j = -c_j\mu_k \quad \text{for all} \; j \in \{1, ..., \hat{q}, ..., n\}, 
  \]

where \( k \in \{n_q, ..., m_q\} \) and \( a \neq 0 \).

3. \( f = 0, \; g = \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_kg_k, \; h : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow K \) is any nonzero function, \( h_j = -c_jh, \)

for all \( j \in \{1, ..., n\} \) where \( c, c_j \in K \).

4. \( f = 0, \; g : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow K \) is any function, \( h = h_j = 0 \) for all \( j \in \{1, ..., n\} \).
**Proof.** The statements (1), (2) and (3) are proved in Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.1. It is left to treat the case of \( f = 0 \).

Assume that \( f = 0 \). The functional equation (1.6) reduces to

\[
g(x)h(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y) = 0.
\]

Here we discuss two cases:

If \( h = 0 \) then we get that

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j(x)h_j(y) = 0.
\]

Using the form (1.7) of \( g \) this can be written as follows

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i h_{J(i)}(y)\mu_i(x) = 0
\]

Since \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m \) are distinct multiplicative functions, the set \( \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m\} \) is linearly independent, hence \( h_{J(i)} = 0 \) because \( b_i \neq 0 \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, m \). Using the fact that \( J \) is surjective we deduce that \( h_j = 0 \) for all \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \). This is the solution (5) of Theorem 2.6.

If \( h \neq 0 \), then there exists \( y_0 \in K \) such that \( h(y_0) \neq 0 \). Taking \( y = y_0 \) in (2.44) we deduce that

\[
g = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j g_j,
\]

where \( c_j = -h_j(y_0)/h(y_0) \). Replacing \( g \) in (2.44) by its new form (2.45) we get

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} [c_j h(y) + h_j(y)]g_j(x) = 0.
\]

Proceeding as in the first case we deduce that \( h_j = -c_j h \) for all \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \).

This is the solution (4), and this completes the proof. \( \square \)

The following theorem gives the solutions of the functional equation (1.6) when \( n = 2 \).

**Theorem 2.7.** Let \( (f, g, h, h_1, h_2) \) be a solution of the functional equation

\[
f(xy) = g(x)h(y) + g_1(x)h_1(y) + g_2(x)h_2(y), \quad x, y \in M,
\]

such that \( g_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i \mu_i, \ g_2 = \sum_{i=N+1}^{m} b_i \mu_i, \) where \( N \geq 2, \ m - N \geq 2 \), \( \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m\} \) are distinct nonzero multiplicative functions and \( b_1, \ldots, b_m \) are all nonzero. Then we have one of the following forms:

1. \[f = ab\chi, \ g = b\chi - c_1\mu_1 - c_2\mu_2, \ h = a\chi, \ h_1 = ac_1\chi, \ h_2 = ac_2\chi, \]
   where \( \chi : M \to K \) is any nonzero multiplicative function such that \( \chi \neq \mu_i \) for all \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\} \), and \( a, b \in K^* \) and \( c_1, c_2 \in K \).

2. \[f = (d - c)(bb_1\mu_1 - ab_2\mu_2), \ g = db_1\mu_1 + cb_2\mu_2 + c_2g_2, \]
   \[h = ab_2 + b_1\mu_1, \ h_1 = -da\mu_2 - cb\mu_1, \ h_2 = -c_2a\mu_2 - c_2b\mu_1, \]
   where \( a, b, c, d, c_2 \in K \) such that \( c \neq d \) and \( (a, b) \neq (0, 0) \).
\[ f = a(c - d)b_k \mu_k, \quad g = dg_1 + (c - d)b_k \mu_k + c_2 g_2, \]
\[ h = a \mu_k, \quad h_1 = -d a \mu_k, \quad h_2 = -c_2 \mu_k, \]
where \( k \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \), \( N \geq 3 \) and \( a, b, c, d, c_2 \in K \) such that \( c \neq d \) and \( a \neq 0 \).

\[ f = (d - c)(b b_{N+1} \mu_{N+1} - a b_m \mu_m), \quad g = d b_{N+1} \mu_{N+1} + c b_m \mu_m + c_1 g_1, \]
\[ h = a \mu_m + b \mu_{N+1}, \quad h_1 = -c_1 a \mu_m - c_1 b \mu_{N+1}, \quad h_2 = -d a \mu_m - c b \mu_{N+1}, \]
where \( m - N = 2 \), \( a, b, c, d, c_1 \in K \) such that \( c \neq d \) and \( (a, b) \neq (0, 0) \).

\[ f = a(c - d)b_k \mu_k, \quad g = dg_1 + (c - d)b_k \mu_k + c_1 g_1, \]
\[ h = a \mu_k, \quad h_1 = -c_1 \mu_k h_2 = -d a \mu_k, \]
where \( m - N \geq 3 \), \( k \in \{N + 1, \ldots, m\} \) and \( a, b, c, d, c_1 \in K \) such that \( c \neq d \) and \( a \neq 0 \).

\[ f = 0, \quad g = c_1 g_1 + c_2 g_2, \quad h : M \rightarrow K \text{ is any nonzero function}, \quad h_1 = -c_1 h, \quad h_2 = -c_2 h, \text{ where } c_1, c_2 \in K. \]

\[ f = 0, \quad g : M \rightarrow K \text{ is any function}, \quad h_1 = h_2 = 0. \]
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