

ON THE MAXIMAL EXTENSION IN THE MIXED ULTRADIFFERENTIABLE WEIGHT SEQUENCE SETTING

GERHARD SCHINDL

ABSTRACT. For the ultradifferentiable weight sequence setting it is known that the Borel map which is assigning to each function the infinite jet of derivatives (at 0) is surjective onto the corresponding weighted sequence class if and only if the sequence is strongly nonquasianalytic for both the Roumieu- and Beurling-type classes. Sequences which are nonquasianalytic but not strongly nonquasianalytic admit a controlled loss of regularity and we determine the maximal sequence for which such a mixed setting is possible for both types, hence get information on the controlled loss of surjectivity in this situation. Moreover, we compare the optimal sequences for both arising mixed strong nonquasianalyticity conditions in the literature.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of the injectivity and surjectivity of the Borel map \mathcal{B} in the ultradifferentiable setting has a long tradition and these properties have been fully characterized in terms of the defining weight sequence M when assuming some basic standard growth and regularity properties (and similarly for weight functions ω as well).

For the injectivity, known as the *Denjoy-Carleman Theorem* we refer to [6, Theorem 1.3.8] and to [10, Theorem 4.2]. The ultradifferentiable class is quasianalytic, i.e. \mathcal{B} defined on this class is injective, if and only if the defining sequence M is quasianalytic, i.e. condition (nq) in Section 2.3 is violated. The characterization for the surjectivity has been treated in [12], here the crucial condition is (γ_1) also known under the name "strong nonquasianalyticity condition". Both characterizations are valid for both the Roumieu- and Beurling-type classes.

Moreover, it has turned out and is known that in the quasianalytic setting strictly containing the real analytic functions, for both the Beurling- and Roumieu-type classes the Borel map can never be surjective onto the corresponding sequence classes (e.g. see [22, Theorem 3]). In [4] and [5] it has been shown that the image of \mathcal{B} is small and the "size of the failure" has been measured with different concepts, for more details we refer to the introductions and citations in these papers. However, it is still an open question to give a full characterization of the image of \mathcal{B} in this setting.

In the case when the sequence M is nonquasianalytic but not strongly nonquasianalytic, and here the real-analytic functions are always strictly contained in the function class, then by the known results it follows that \mathcal{B} is neither injective nor surjective (for both types). It is also known that for this case a controlled loss of regularity is possible ("mixed settings"), see the characterizations obtained in [21]. In [8] these results have been generalized by involving a ramification parameter

Date: February 8, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 26E10, 46A13, 46E10.

Key words and phrases. Spaces of ultradifferentiable functions, weight sequences, Borel map, (non)quasianalyticity, maximal extension, mixed setting.

G. Schindl is supported by FWF-Project J 3948-N35 and P32905-N.

$r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and dealing with special classes of ultradifferentiable ramification spaces introduced in [20] and needed for the study of the surjectivity of the (asymptotic) Borel map in the ultraholomorphic setting.

In this context we point out that in the weight sequence setting there do exist two, in general different, relevant mixed conditions denoted by $(M, N)_{\gamma_1}$ and $(M, N)_{SV}$ in this work, see Section 2.3. $(M, N)_{\gamma_1}$ is easier to handle and the "more natural" generalization of (γ_1) , it has been introduced in [3] and also used in [15]. Finally, in [8] and [9] the ramified generalization is arising, see Section 5. By the construction from [15, Sect. 4.1] the optimal (i.e. largest) sequence expressed in terms of this condition is already known, it is called the *descendant*. However, the main results from [21] (and [8]) yield that $(M, N)_{SV}$ is the correct (but more technical) characterizing condition in the mixed setting and the optimal sequence expressed in terms of this condition has not been computed so far.

In $(M, N)_{\gamma_1}$ the sequence of quotients of M , denoted by $(\mu_j)_j$ is arising, whereas $(M, N)_{SV}$ is connected to the sequence of roots $(M_j)^{1/j}$ and these sequences are comparable (up to a constant) if and only if M satisfies the technical assumption *moderate growth*. For the sake of completeness we mention that in the mixed weight function setting there does exist only one relevant mixed condition, for both the Borel and Whitney jet mapping and for both types, see [2], [17], [18].

The aim of this paper is to compute the optimal sequence expressed in terms of $(M, N)_{SV}$ and to compare it with the descendant. So this study will provide more information on the difference of the relevant conditions and give answer to the following question: When given a nonquasianalytic sequence N , which (strictly smaller) sequence M is maximal among all sequences allowing such a mixed setting (see Theorem 3.3)? This gives also a first information to attack the following problem: How far is the Borel map from being surjective in the nonquasianalytic but not strongly nonquasianalytic setting? Unfortunately, it seems that for the proofs from [4] and [5] the quasianalyticity for the weight sequence is indispensable but can we transfer the results to this situation? This question has been asked by Prof. Javier Sanz after a talk of the author about the results from [5] during a research stay at the Universidad de Valladolid.

We summarize now the contents of this article: After collecting and recalling some basic notation in Section 2, in Section 3 we compute and study the optimal sequence for $(M, N)_{SV}$ (in Sect. 3.2) and compare it with the descendant, see Theorem 3.10 in Sect. 3.3. In Section 4 we construct an example which shows that in general there is a difference between the optimal sequences for these conditions. It turns out that such a difference can only occur when the arising expression in the strong nonquasianalyticity condition is behaving "very irregular".

Section 5 rephrases the results from Section 3 in the r -ramified versions, see Theorems 5.4 and 5.9. Of course, alternatively another equivalent possibility would be to prove the results for the generalized situation and by putting $r = 1$ recover the results from Section 3 as a Corollary.

In the final Section 6 we provide some information on the size of the failure of the injectivity and surjectivity of \mathcal{B} for sequences which are nonquasianalytic but not strongly nonquasianalytic, see Propositions 6.2 and 6.4. The problem of injectivity, treated in Section 6.1, gives information on the size of the kernel of \mathcal{B} (resp. on the quantity of ultradifferentiable flat functions). This question is somehow "dual" to the problem of the failure of surjectivity. It has been motivated by a question asked by Prof. Fernando Sanz (also from the Universidad de Valladolid).

Acknowledgements. The author wishes to thank Armin Rainer and David N. Nenning, both from the University of Vienna, for interesting and helpful discussions during the preparation of this article and for their careful reading of a preliminary version.

2. NOTATION

We write $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_{>0} := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. With \mathcal{B} we denote the *Borel map* (at 0) given by $\mathcal{B}(f) := (f^{(p)}(0))_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$. With the symbol \mathcal{E} we denote the class of smooth functions, with $[\cdot]$ we denote ultradifferentiable classes either of *Roumieu-type*, denoted with $\{\cdot\}$, or of *Beurling-type*, denoted with (\cdot) , but not mixing the cases.

2.1. Weight sequences. Given a sequence $M = (M_j)_j \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we also use $m = (m_j)_j$ defined by $m_j := \frac{M_j}{j!}$ and $\mu_j := \frac{M_j}{M_{j-1}}$, $\mu_0 := 1$. M is called *normalized* if $1 = M_0 \leq M_1$ holds true which can always be assumed without loss of generality. For any $r > 0$ we denote the r -th power of M by $M^r = (M_j^r)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$.

M is called *log-convex* if

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} : M_j^2 \leq M_{j-1}M_{j+1},$$

equivalently if $(\mu_j)_j$ is nondecreasing. If M is log-convex and normalized, then both $j \mapsto M_j$ and $j \mapsto (M_j)^{1/j}$ are nondecreasing and $(M_j)^{1/j} \leq \mu_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.

If m is log-convex, then M is called *strongly log-convex*, denoted by (slc). For our purposes it is convenient to consider the following set of sequences

$$\mathcal{LC} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}} : M \text{ is normalized, log-convex, } \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} (M_j)^{1/j} = +\infty\}.$$

We see that $M \in \mathcal{LC}$ if and only if $1 = \mu_0 \leq \mu_1 \leq \dots$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_j = +\infty$ (e.g. see [13, p. 104]) and there is a one-to-one correspondence between M and $\mu = (\mu_j)_j$ by taking $M_p := \prod_{i=0}^p \mu_i$.

M has the condition *moderate growth*, denoted by (mg), if

$$\exists C \geq 1 \forall j, k \in \mathbb{N} : M_{j+k} \leq C^{j+k} M_j M_k.$$

In [10] it is denoted by (M.2) and called *stability under ultradifferential operators*. We can replace in this condition M by m by changing the constants. It is known (e.g. see [15, Lemma 2.2]) that for any given $M \in \mathcal{LC}$ condition (mg) is equivalent to $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\mu_{2j}}{\mu_j} < +\infty$ and to $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\mu_j}{(M_j)^{1/j}} < +\infty$. The latter condition shows that sequences of quotients and roots are comparable up to a constant.

M has (γ_1) (see [12]) if

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\mu_j}{j} \sum_{k \geq j} \frac{1}{\mu_j} < +\infty.$$

In the literature (γ_1) is also called "strong nonquasianalyticity condition", see [12] and in [10] it is denoted by (M.3). In [12] the surjectivity of \mathcal{B} has been characterized in terms of (γ_1) .

Let $M, N \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be given, we write $M \preceq N$ if $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \left(\frac{M_j}{N_j}\right)^{1/j} < +\infty$. We call M and N *equivalent*, denoted by $M \approx N$, if $M \preceq N$ and $N \preceq M$. This equivalence does preserve (mg). Finally, write $M \leq N$ if $M_p \leq N_p$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

We mention that in [12, Prop. 1.1] it has been shown that (γ_1) for log-convex M implies that there does exist an equivalent sequence N having (slc), so (γ_1) "implies" (slc).

With M^{lc} we denote the log-convex minorant of given M , i.e. M^{lc} is the largest sequence among all sequences L which are log-convex and satisfy $L \leq M$. For concrete formulas computing M^{lc} we refer to [6], alternatively M^{lc} can be obtained by using the so called associated weight function of M , see [10, (3.2), Prop. 3.2] and [11, Chapitre I, 1.8].

2.2. Ultradifferentiable sequence and function spaces. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $h > 0$ be given, then for a sequence $\mathbf{a} := (a_p)_p \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we put

$$|\mathbf{a}|_{M,h} := \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{|a_p|}{h^p M_p},$$

and $\Lambda_{M,h} := \{(a_p)_p \in \mathbb{C} : |\mathbf{a}|_{M,h} < +\infty\}$. Furthermore we set

$$\Lambda_{(M)} := \{(a_p)_p \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}} : \forall h > 0 : |\mathbf{a}|_{M,h} < +\infty\},$$

and

$$\Lambda_{\{M\}} := \{(a_p)_p \in \mathbb{C} : \exists h > 0 : |\mathbf{a}|_{M,h} < +\infty\}.$$

$\Lambda_{(M)}$ is the weighted sequence space of *Beurling-type*, $\Lambda_{\{M\}}$ of *Roumieu-type*. We endow $\Lambda_{(M)}$ resp. $\Lambda_{\{M\}}$ with a natural projective, respectively inductive, topology via

$$\Lambda_{(M)} = \varprojlim_{h>0} \Lambda_{M,h}, \quad \Lambda_{\{M\}} = \varinjlim_{h>0} \Lambda_{M,h}.$$

When $M \preceq M'$, then clearly $\Lambda_{[M]} \subseteq \Lambda_{[M']}$, so equivalence of weight sequences preserves the associated weighted sequence spaces.

Analogously, the (local) ultradifferentiable class of Roumieu-type is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\{M\}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}) := \{f \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}) : \forall K \subseteq \mathbb{R} \text{ compact } \exists C, h > 0 \forall j \in \mathbb{N} \forall x \in K : |f^{(j)}(x)| \leq Ch^j N_j\},$$

and the Beurling-type by

$$\mathcal{E}_{(M)}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}) := \{f \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}) : \forall K \subseteq \mathbb{R} \text{ compact } \forall h > 0 \exists C_h > 0 \forall j \in \mathbb{N} \forall x \in K : |f^{(j)}(x)| \leq C_h h^j N_j\}.$$

When $M \preceq M'$, then clearly $\mathcal{E}_{[M]} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{[M']}$ is valid. Moreover, $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (m_p)^{1/p} > 0$ implies $\mathcal{E}_{\{M^{\text{lc}}\}} = \mathcal{E}_{\{M\}}$ and $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (m_p)^{1/p} = +\infty$ implies $\mathcal{E}_{(M^{\text{lc}})} = \mathcal{E}_{(M)}$, see [13, Theorem 2.15]. However, in general one has only $\Lambda_{[M^{\text{lc}}]} \subseteq \Lambda_{[M]}$.

Finally, for each $h > 0$ and we define the Banach space

$$\mathcal{D}_{M,h}([-1, 1]) := \{f \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}) : \text{supp}(f) \subseteq [-1, 1], \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|f^{(p)}(x)|}{h^p M_p} < +\infty\},$$

and the ultradifferentiable test function class of Roumieu-type

$$\mathcal{D}_{\{M\}}([-1, 1]) := \varinjlim_{h>0} \mathcal{D}_{M,h}([-1, 1]),$$

which is a countable (LB) -space, and of Beurling-type

$$\mathcal{D}_{(M)}([-1, 1]) := \varprojlim_{h>0} \mathcal{D}_{M,h}([-1, 1]),$$

which is a Fréchet space.

Then for the *Borel map* \mathcal{B} (at 0) we get

$$\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{D}_{[M]}([-1, 1]), \mathcal{E}_{[M]}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \Lambda_{[M]}, \quad \mathcal{B}(f) := (f^{(p)}(0))_{p \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

The nontriviality of the classes $\mathcal{D}_{[M]}([-1, 1])$ is characterized in terms of M by the nonquasianalyticity condition, see [6, Theorem 1.3.8] and [10, Theorem 4.2].

We recall: Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given, then $\mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1]) \neq \{0\}$ if and only if N is *nonquasianalytic*, denoted by (nq), which means that N satisfies

$$\sum_{p=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\nu_p} < +\infty.$$

Clearly, each N having (γ_1) is nonquasianalytic and it is known that (nq) implies $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (n_p)^{1/p} = \lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \nu_p/p = +\infty$, e.g. see [10, Lemma 4.1], which does imply that both types of ultradifferentiable functions are containing the class of real-analytic functions, e.g. see [13, Prop. 2.12 (4), (5)]. Equivalence of sequences belonging to \mathcal{LC} does preserve (nq).

For given $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ we introduce the following sets of sequences

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq, R} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}} : \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (m_p)^{1/p} > 0, \quad M \leq N\},$$

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq, B} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}} : \lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (m_p)^{1/p} = +\infty, \quad M \leq N\}.$$

Obviously we have $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, B} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}$, $N \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}$ provided that $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (n_p)^{1/p} > 0$ and finally $N \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, B}$ provided that $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (n_p)^{1/p} = +\infty$ is valid. We also introduce the smaller sets

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, R} := \{M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, R} : M \in \mathcal{LC}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B} := \{M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, B} : M \in \mathcal{LC}\}.$$

Note that by normalization the relation $M \leq N$ does precisely mean $M_p \leq C^p N_p$ for some $C \geq 1$ and all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence replacing M by the equivalent sequence $\widetilde{M}^C := (M_p/C^p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ we get $\widetilde{M}^C \leq N$. This shows that, since both the weighted sequence spaces $\Lambda_{[M]}$ and the ultradifferentiable (test) function classes are stable w.r.t. \approx , for our purposes instead of treating $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}$, $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, B}$, equivalently we could also consider the set

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq, R} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}} : \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (m_p)^{1/p} > 0, \exists C \geq 1 : M \leq CN\},$$

resp.

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq, B} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}} : \lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (m_p)^{1/p} = +\infty, \exists C \geq 1 : M \leq CN\},$$

and similarly $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$, $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$, see also [8, Remark 3.1 (i)]. Analogously also the relevant mixed conditions are not infected by such a modification, see (iii) in Remark 2.1. Note that M is (strongly) log-convex if and only if \widetilde{M}^C is so for some/each $C > 0$.

2.3. Strong nonquasianalyticity conditions in the mixed setting. For any given nonquasianalytic $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we write $(M, N)_{SV}$ if

$$\exists s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} : \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\lambda_{p,s}^{M,N}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} < +\infty,$$

with $\lambda_{p,s}^{M,N} := \sup_{0 \leq j < p} \left(\frac{M_p}{s^p N_j} \right)^{1/(p-j)}$, and we write $(M, N)_{\gamma_1}$, if

$$\sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\mu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} < +\infty.$$

Remark 2.1. *Inspecting the proof of [8, Lemma 2.4] (see also [21, 2(a)]) we get the following (translated into the notation from the previous section):*

(i) *If $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, B}$, then*

$$(2.1) \quad \forall p, s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} : \lambda_{p,s}^{M,N} \leq C\nu_p,$$

C denoting the constant from $M \leq CN$.

(ii) *If $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$, then even $\lambda_{p,s}^{M,N} \leq C \min\{\mu_p, \nu_p\}$ for all $p, s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, C denoting the constant from $M \leq CN$. Hence in this situation $(M, N)_{\gamma_1}$ implies $(M, N)_{SV}$. If M has in addition (mg), which is equivalent to $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\mu_j}{(M_j)^{1/j}} < +\infty$, then also the converse is true and so $(M, N)_{\gamma_1}$ is equivalent to $(M, N)_{SV}$ (and similarly for the ramified conditions, too).*

(iii) *$(M, N)_{\gamma_1}$ resp. $(M, N)_{SV}$ is valid if and only if $(\widetilde{M}^C, N)_{\gamma_1}$ resp. $(\widetilde{M}^C, N)_{SV}$ holds for some/any $\widetilde{M}^C := (M_p/C^p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$, $C \geq 1$ (w.l.o.g. take $C \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$). The parameter $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ in $(M, N)_{SV}$ is then stretched by C and similarly this is valid for the ramified conditions as well.*

Now we are ready to recall the main results [8, Thm. 3.2, Thm. 4.2] (with $r = 1$ there) in our notation, see also [21].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ and $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, B}$ be given. Then TFAE:*

- (i) $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}$ resp. $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{(N)}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{(M)}$,
- (ii) $(M, N)_{SV}$ is valid.

Consequently, if (i) or (ii) holds true, then N has to be nonquasianalytic.

In fact, in [8] the assumption on M has been $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$ and we point out:

- (a) For the Roumieu case, a careful inspection of the proof of [8, Thm. 3.2] (with $r = 1$) shows that the assumption log-convexity on M is superfluous and the estimate (2.1) suffices to conclude.
- (b) For the Beurling case [8, Thm. 4.2] we give more details: In the proof of [8, Thm. 4.5] the technical result [3, Lemme 16] has been applied in order to reduce this situation to the Roumieu case. We have to avoid the choice $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{\mu_k}$ since $k \mapsto \mu_k$ is not nondecreasing anymore necessarily. In order to conclude take e.g. $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{k}$ or any other nonincreasing sequence of positive real numbers tending to 0 as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Then the constructed sequence R will not be log-convex anymore necessarily, i.e. (i) on [8, p. 562] will fail. However, the other properties for the sequences R and S listed there are still valid and sufficient to conclude since, as pointed out above for the Roumieu case, the log-convexity for the smaller sequence is not required necessarily.
- (c) The same is true for the more general Theorem 5.1 ($r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$) in Section 5.

3. OPTIMAL SEQUENCES IN THE MIXED SETTING

3.1. The mixed strong nonquasianalyticity condition. In [15, Section 4.1], which is based on an idea arising in the proof of [12, Proposition 1.1], it has been shown that to each $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ satisfying (nq) we can associate a sequence S^N with good regularity properties denoted by the *descendant*.

We recall the construction of S^N defined by its quotients

$$\sigma_p^N := \frac{\tau_1 p}{\tau_p}, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, \quad \sigma_0^N := 1,$$

with

$$\tau_p := \frac{p}{\nu_p} + \sum_{j \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_j}, \quad p \geq 1,$$

and S^N satisfies the following properties (see [15, Lemma 4.2]):

- (i) $\sigma_p^N \geq 1$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s^N := (S_p^N/p!)_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{LC}$ (so S^N is strongly log-convex),
- (ii) there exists $C > 0$ such that $\sigma_p^N \leq C\nu_p$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (iii) $(S^N, N)_{\gamma_1}$,
- (iv) if N enjoys (mg), then S^N does have (mg) too,
- (v) S^N is optimal/maximal in the following sense: If $M \in \mathcal{LC}$ is given with $\mu_p \leq C\nu_p$ for some $C \geq 1$ and $(M, N)_{\gamma_1}$, then $\mu_p \leq D\sigma_p^N$ follows for some constant $D \geq 1$.

We also have that $B^{-1}\sigma_p^N \leq \nu_p \leq B\sigma_p^N$ for some $B \geq 1$ and all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ (which implies $S^N \approx N$) if and only if N does have (γ_1) resp. if and only if $(N, N)_{SV}$, see [8, Theorem 5.2].

Remark 3.1. By the previous comments (i) and (ii) we have $S^N \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$. Replacing S^N by the equivalent sequence ("modified descendant") $\widetilde{S}^N := (S_p^N/C^p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$, C denoting the constant from (ii) (w.l.o.g. $C \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$), we see that $\widetilde{S}^N \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$ and $(\widetilde{S}^N, N)_{\gamma_1}$ holds by combining comment (iii) above and (iii) in Remark 2.1. By (ii) in Remark 2.1 also $(\widetilde{S}^N, N)_{SV}$ holds true and by (iii) there finally property $(S^N, N)_{SV}$ follows.

This shows that for any $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ satisfying (nq) the set of all sequences belonging to $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$ (hence to $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$) and satisfying $(\cdot, N)_{SV}$ is never empty.

(Of course, $N \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$ is valid automatically, but $(N, N)_{SV}$ if and only if N has (γ_1) .)

3.2. Optimal sequence for the mixed Schmets-Valdivia-condition. The aim is now to determine the maximal sequence L belonging to the set $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}$ resp. $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, B}$ and satisfying $(L, N)_{SV}$, i.e. the maximal sequence such that Theorem 2.2 is valid and hence admitting the maximal possible control of loss of regularity within the ultradifferentiable weight sequence setting. So L will determine the largest possible sequence space $\Lambda_{[L]}$ which is contained in the image of the Borel map \mathcal{B} when being considered on $\mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ (and N is fixed).

Lemma 3.2. Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and assume that N is nonquasianalytic. For any $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we define the sequence $L^s = (L_p^s)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ as follows:

$$(3.1) \quad L_0^s := 1, \quad L_p^s := s^p \min_{0 \leq j \leq p-1} \left\{ \left(\frac{p}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{p-j} N_j \right\}, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}.$$

For convenience we will always write $L \equiv L^1$.

Then we get:

- (i) $(L^s, N)_{SV}$ holds true for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ (note that $L^s \approx L^t$ for all $s, t \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$),
- (ii) for any $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $(M, N)_{SV}$ we get $M \preceq L^s$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$,
- (iii) $L^s \preceq N$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.

Since there exists $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$ with $(M, N)_{SV}$, e.g. take the descendant S^N (see Remark 3.1), assertions (i), (ii) and (iii) hold true for the log-convex minorant $(L^s)^{lc} \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$ as well.

Proof. (i) Let $s, p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $0 \leq l \leq p-1$, then

$$\left(\frac{L_p^s}{s^p N_l} \right)^{1/(p-l)} = \left(\frac{s^p \min_{0 \leq j \leq p-1} \left\{ \left(\frac{p}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{p-j} N_j \right\}}{s^p N_l} \right)^{1/(p-l)} \stackrel{\leq}{\underbrace{l=j}} \frac{p}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}},$$

hence $(L^s, N)_{SV}$ follows.

(ii) $(M, N)_{SV}$ does precisely mean that we can find some $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $C \geq 1$ such that for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and all $0 \leq j \leq p-1$ we have $M_p \leq s_0^p C^{p-j} N_j \left(\frac{p}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{p-j}$. So $M_p \leq C^p L_p^{s_0}$ follows for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ for this value $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. By $L^s \approx L^t$ for all $s, t \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we are done.

(iii) We have $L_p^s \leq \frac{p}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} s^p N_{p-1}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ (choosing $j = p-1$) and so for $L^s \preceq N$ it is sufficient to find $C \geq 1$ such that for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$:

$$\frac{p}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} s^p N_{p-1} \leq C^p N_p \Leftrightarrow \left(\frac{s}{C} \right)^p \leq \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}.$$

We have $\frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p+1} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \geq \frac{1}{p} \geq \varepsilon^p$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ when choosing $0 < \varepsilon$ small enough ($\frac{1}{p^{1/p}} \rightarrow 1$ as $p \rightarrow +\infty$). Hence the desired estimate is valid by choosing C sufficiently large (depending on N and given s).

Given any $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$ with $(M, N)_{SV}$ by (ii) we have $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (L_p^s/p!)^{1/p} > 0$ resp. $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (L_p^s/p!)^{1/p} = +\infty$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. (i) and (iii) for $(L^s)^{\text{lc}}$ follow by $(L^s)^{\text{lc}} \leq L^s$, for (ii) we apply [13, Lemma 2.6]: Here $M^{\text{lc}} = M \preceq L^s$ implies $M^{\text{lc}} = M \preceq (L^s)^{\text{lc}}$. \square

We summarize the consequences of this result:

- (a) For any given $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, B}$ with $(M, N)_{SV}$ we get that $M \preceq L^s$ for some/each $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. By Remark 3.1, in particular this holds true for the descendant $S^N \equiv M$ which implies $L^s \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, B} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, R}$, too. Consequently, some/each L^s is maximal w.r.t. \preceq among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, B}$ (resp. among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, R}$) and having $(M, N)_{SV}$, i.e. L^s is the maximal sequence such that Theorem 2.2 can be applied.
- (b) The same holds true for $(L^s)^{\text{lc}}$ instead of L^s by using again S^N and $(L^s)^{\text{lc}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$.

By combining Theorem 2.2, Remark 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 we immediately get the following result.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given. Then the set of sequences $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, B}$ and satisfying*

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}, \quad \text{resp.} \quad \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{(N)}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{(M)},$$

does have a maximal element which is given by some/each L^s .

Alternatively, we can use $(L^s)^{\text{lc}}$ which is maximal among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$.

Note that for this result it is not necessary to assume that N is *nonquasianalytic*: If there does exist $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, B}$ and satisfying $(M, N)_{SV}$, then nonquasianalyticity for N follows by the very definition of property $(M, N)_{SV}$.

On the contrary, if there does exist $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, B}$ and satisfying $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}$ resp. $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{(N)}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{(M)}$, then N has to be nonquasianalytic: Otherwise, by the

Denjoy-Carleman theorem we would get $\mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1]) = \{0\}$, but $\Lambda_{[M]}$ does contain at least all sequences with finitely many nonvanishing entries, a contradiction (the analogous argument has been given in [8]).

Remark 3.4. *If $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ is quasianalytic, then using the "convention" $0 = \frac{1}{+\infty}$ via (3.1) we could set for the sequence(s) $L_p^s = \delta_{p,0}$ (Kronecker delta) and then $\Lambda_{[L^s]} = \{(a_0, 0, 0, \dots) : a_0 \in \mathbb{C}\}$ which is clearly contained in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}_{[N]})$ (constant functions).*

However, since $\mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1]) = \{0\}$ it seems to be more natural to set in this case $L^s \equiv 0 \equiv S^N$ which corresponds to the trivial sequence space $\{0\}$.

In this context recall that, when given $N \in \mathcal{N}_{\geq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$ and N is quasianalytic, then none class $\Lambda_{[M]}$ with $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, R}, \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$ quasianalytic and such that $\mathcal{E}_{[M]}$ does strictly contain the class of real-analytic functions is contained in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}_{[N]})$. For this see the main results [16, Thm. 2, Thm. 3] and also the references therein concerning the nonsurjectivity of the Borel mapping in the quasianalytic setting.

By involving a second parameter C we get some more information on the technical sequence(s) L^s .

Remark 3.5. (i) *First we observe that instead of L^s given by (3.1) we can consider for any $C > 1$ the sequence*

$$(3.2) \quad L_0^{s,C} := 1, \quad L_p^{s,C} := s^p \min_{0 \leq j \leq p-1} \left\{ \left(\frac{Cp}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{p-j} N_j \right\}, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}.$$

Then $L_p^s \leq L_p^{s,C} \leq C^p L_p^s$, i.e. $L^s \approx L^{s,C}$ and the conclusions shown in Lemma 3.2 are valid for $L^{s,C}$ instead of L^s as well.

(ii) *The expression arising in the minimum in (3.2) is nondecreasing if and only if*

$$\left(\frac{Cp}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{p-j-1} N_{j+1} \geq \left(\frac{Cp}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{p-j} N_j \Leftrightarrow \nu_{j+1} \geq \frac{Cp}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}}.$$

Consequently the minimum is attained either at $j \in \mathbb{N}$ minimal such that $\nu_{j+1} > \frac{Cp}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}}$ is valid, if this happens for some $j+1 \leq p-1 \Leftrightarrow j \leq p-2$, or at $j = p-1$ if $\nu_{p-1} \leq \frac{Cp}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \Leftrightarrow \frac{\nu_{p-1}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq C$.

(iii) *If $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ has (γ_1) (i.e. $(N, N)_{\gamma_1}$ resp. equivalently $(N, N)_{S_V}$, see [8, Theorem 5.2]), then by choosing C sufficiently large ($C \geq \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$) we will have for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ that above the second case holds true which means that*

$$(3.3) \quad L_p^{s,C} = \frac{Cp}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} s^p N_{p-1}, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}.$$

By using this last observation we can prove the following result which shows that our approach is consistent with the characterization shown in [12].

Lemma 3.6. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given.*

- (i) *If N has (γ_1) , i.e. if N is strongly nonquasianalytic, then $N \approx L^{s,C}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $C \geq 1$.*
- (ii) *Conversely, if $N \approx L^s$ for some/each $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, then N does have (γ_1) .*

Proof. (i) By (i) and (iii) in Lemma 3.2 it remains to show $N \leq L^{s,C}$. By (3.3) this means that, when $C > 1$ is chosen sufficiently large ($C \geq \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$), for some $D \geq 1$ and all $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we want to have $D^p L_p^{s,C} = D^p \frac{C^p}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} s^p N_{p-1} \geq N_p \Leftrightarrow C(Ds)^p \geq \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$. The last estimate is clearly satisfied for any $D \geq 1$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ by (γ_1) and the choice of C . Since $L^{t,C_1} \approx L^{s,C}$ for all $C, C_1 \geq 1$ and $s, t \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we are done.

(ii) First, by the equivalence we see that N has to be nonquasianalytic: Otherwise, by recalling Remark 3.4, $N = (N_p)_p$ would be (equivalent to) the sequence 0, a contradiction to $N \in \mathcal{LC}$. Second, this equivalence implies $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (L_p^s/p!)^{1/p} = +\infty$ because $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (n_p)^{1/p} = +\infty$ holds true by the nonquasianalyticity of N . Then [13, Thm. 2.15] yields $\mathcal{E}_{[(L^s)^{lc}]} = \mathcal{E}_{[L^s]} = \mathcal{E}_{[N]}$ and this identity implies $N \approx (L^s)^{lc}$. (Alternatively this equivalence follows by using [13, Lemma 2.6] and the assumption $N \approx L^s$.) Lemma 3.2 yields $((L^s)^{lc}, N)_{SV}$ and Theorem 2.2 implies $(N, N)_{SV}$ because the verified equivalence implies $\Lambda_{[N]} = \Lambda_{[(L^s)^{lc}]}$. Thus (γ_1) for N follows, see [8, Theorem 5.2]. \square

By Lemmas 3.2, 3.6, Remark 3.5 and the comments on S^N we have that $S^N \approx L^{s,C} \approx N$ if and only if N has (γ_1) .

The next statement shows that L can be "relatively" near given N even if (γ_1) is violated for this sequence.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and assume that*

$$(3.4) \quad \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} < 1.$$

Then $N_p \leq L_p$ is valid for infinitely many numbers $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.

Proof. By (ii) in Remark 3.5 (with $C = 1$) we get $L_p = \frac{p}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} N_{p-1}$ for infinitely many values $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ (see (3.3)) and so $N_p \leq L_p \Leftrightarrow \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq 1$ for all such p . \square

One shall note that (3.4) can be satisfied for sequences which are violating (γ_1) . In this case $p \mapsto \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$ has to be "irregular" (strongly oscillating). For such sequences, having (3.4) but violating (γ_1) , Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 yield that:

- (i) $N \approx L$ fails, which means that $N \leq L$ is violated but, on the other hand,
- (ii) L is "relatively close" to N in the sense that even $L_p \geq N_p$ for infinitely many p . In particular, in this case L cannot be strictly smaller than N , i.e. $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{L_p}{N_p}\right)^{1/p} = 0$ fails.
- (iii) Consequently, the failure of \mathcal{B} from being surjective can be viewed as "relatively small" within the (mixed) ultradifferentiable weight sequence setting.

3.3. Comparison of the optimal sequences L and S^N . In this section we will compare the optimal sequence L from the previous section with the descendant S^N . The aim is to see that for many cases there is no difference between both optimal sequences which is an advantage because the descendant does have automatically good regularity properties and its definition is not as technical as for L .

First, we introduce the following conditions for given nonquasianalytic $N \in \mathcal{LC}$:

$$(3.5) \quad \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} > 0,$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} > 0.$$

Note that (3.5) implies (3.6) and (3.5) violates condition (γ_2) of [12] with the choice $k = 2$ there, (3.6) with the choice $k = 1$.

Recall that for any given $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ condition (mg) is equivalent to $\sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\nu_{2p}}{\nu_p} < +\infty$ (e.g. see [15, Lemma 2.2]) and using this we can prove the following statement.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and nonquasianalytic. If N has (mg), then (3.5) holds true, but the converse will fail in general.*

Proof. We prove that $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = 0$ violates (mg). (If \liminf is replaced by \lim this implication follows by combining [12, Prop. 1.1. (b), Prop. 1.6 (a)] and the comments between Ex. 1.7 and Ex. 1.8 in [12].)

If $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = 0$, then for all $\varepsilon \leq 1$ we can find $p_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ such that $\frac{\nu_{p_\varepsilon}}{p_\varepsilon} \sum_{k \geq 2p_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq \varepsilon \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k \geq 2p_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq \frac{p_\varepsilon \varepsilon}{\nu_{p_\varepsilon}}$. Since $\sum_{k \geq 2p_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = \sum_{k \geq 4p_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\nu_k} + \sum_{k=2p_\varepsilon}^{4p_\varepsilon-1} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \geq \sum_{k \geq 4p_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\nu_k} + \frac{2p_\varepsilon}{\nu_{4p_\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{2p_\varepsilon}{\nu_{4p_\varepsilon}}$ we arrive at $\frac{\nu_{4p_\varepsilon}}{\nu_{p_\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$. But this contradicts $\sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\nu_{2p}}{\nu_p} < +\infty$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, hence (mg) cannot hold true.

The converse implication fails in general which follows by [9, Example 1]. \square

These arising conditions are related to the technical assumption (mg) for the descendant.

Remark 3.9. (a) In [9, Lemma 6] a precise characterization has been given when S^N does have (mg).
 (b) There it has also been shown that (3.5) for N does imply (mg) for S^N .
 (c) However, [9, Example 1] provides an example for a sequence N not having (mg) but such that (3.5) holds true (and hence (mg) is valid for S^N).

In the next result we prove that for many sequences there does not exist any difference between the optimal but technical sequence(s) L^s introduced in this paper and the known descendant S^N .

Theorem 3.10. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and having (3.5) (which implies nonquasianalyticity for N). Then for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we have $S^N \approx L^s$.*

This is equivalent to the fact that S^N is maximal w.r.t. \preceq among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, B}$ (and also among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, \mathcal{LC}, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, \mathcal{LC}, B}$) and satisfying $(M, N)_{SV}$.

Moreover, this is equivalent to the fact that the inclusions $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{S^N\}}$ resp. $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{(N)}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{(S^N)}$ are optimal in the ultradifferentiable setting.

In particular, this statement does hold true for all nonquasianalytic $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ satisfying (mg).

Proof. By Remark 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 it remains to show $L^s \preceq S^N$. By (3.5) the descendant S^N does have (mg) and so, by Stirling's formula, it suffices to show that there exists $D \geq 1$ such that for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we get $(L_p^s/p!)^{1/p} \leq D \frac{\sigma_p^N}{p}$. Then (3.1) implies for $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$

$$(L_p^s/p^p)^{1/p} = s \min_{0 \leq j \leq p-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1-j/p} p^{-j/p} (N_j)^{1/p} \leq s \frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}},$$

by choosing $j = 0$. By Stirling's formula it is enough to prove now

$$\begin{aligned} s \frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} &\leq D \frac{\sigma_p^N}{p} = D \frac{\tau_1}{\tau_p} \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{p}{\nu_p} + \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} &\leq \frac{D\tau_1}{s} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \Leftrightarrow \frac{p}{\nu_p} \leq \left(\frac{D\tau_1}{s} - 1 \right) \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{D\tau_1/s - 1} &\leq \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equivalence holds true if and only if $D\tau_1/s - 1 > 0 \Leftrightarrow D > s/\tau_1$. Finally, (3.5) implies (3.6), thus by choosing $D \geq 1$ sufficiently large (depending on given N and s) we are done. \square

Conclusion:

Remark 3.1, Lemma 3.6 and Theorem 3.10 yield that we have

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \forall C \geq 1 : S^N \approx L^{s,C},$$

whenever

$$\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} > 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} < +\infty,$$

and in the latter case we even have $S^N \approx L^{s,C} \approx N$.

We close this section with the following observation:

By definition we get

$$\frac{\nu_p}{\sigma_p} = \frac{\nu_p/p}{\sigma_p/p} = \frac{1}{\tau_1} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \tau_p = \frac{1}{\tau_1} \left(1 + \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \right),$$

which means that the growth of $p \mapsto \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$ is measuring and restricting the size of the difference between a nonquasianalytic sequence $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ and its descendant S^N . (In particular, when N is satisfying (γ_1) , then $\sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{\nu_p}{\sigma_p} < +\infty$ and so $S^N \approx N$ follows.) Similarly,

$$\left(\frac{N_p}{L_p^s} \right)^{1/p} \underset{j=0}{\geq} \frac{1}{s} \frac{(N_p)^{1/p}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k},$$

so here the behavior of $p \mapsto \frac{(N_p)^{1/p}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$ can be used to determine the difference between N and L^s . (Note that $\frac{(N_p)^{1/p}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$ is valid.)

4. A (COUNTER)-EXAMPLE ON THE OPTIMAL SEQUENCE

The aim is to show that in general $S^N \approx L^{s,C}$ will fail by constructing explicitly an appropriate N . Thus L is in general more optimal than S^N . The previous conclusion and Lemma 3.7 indicate that the oscillation or irregularity of $p \mapsto \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$ has to show up in order to destroy the equivalence. First we mention the following easy observation:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given. If $S^N \approx L^{s,C}$ is violated, then (γ_1) for N cannot hold true and $L^{s,C} \approx N$ has to fail.*

Proof. We can assume that N is nonquasianalytic, otherwise by the conventions from Remark 3.4 we would get $S^N \equiv L^{s,C} \equiv 0$. If now N has (γ_1) , then $S^N \approx N$ follows and so $S^N \preceq L^{s,C} \preceq N$ implies $S^N \approx L^{s,C}$.

Hence, when $S^N \approx L^{s,C}$ is violated then (γ_1) has to fail and, by Lemma 3.6, $L^{s,C} \approx N$ cannot be valid. \square

To come up with the example, first we need some preparation and have to recall some statements.

The starting idea is as follows and has been suggested by Armin Rainer. Since $s^N := (S_p^N/p!)_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{LC}$, i.e. the descendant S^N is normalized and has (slc), we have that the ultradifferentiable classes $\mathcal{E}_{\{S^N\}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{(S^N)}$ are closed under composition and do satisfy more important stability properties, see [13] and [14].

Since s^N is normalized and log-convex, the mapping $p \mapsto (s_p^N)^{1/p}$ is nondecreasing and consequently for each sequence $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $S^N \approx M \Leftrightarrow s^N \approx m$ we get $\frac{1}{C}(m_j)^{1/j} \leq (s_j^N)^{1/j} \leq (s_k^N)^{1/k} \leq C(m_k)^{1/k}$ for some $C \geq 1$ and all $1 \leq j \leq k$. Thus each M which is equivalent to S^N has to satisfy

$$(4.1) \quad \exists C \geq 1 \forall 1 \leq p \leq q : (m_p)^{1/p} \leq C(m_q)^{1/q},$$

i.e. the sequence $(m_p^{1/p})_{p \geq 1}$ has to be *almost increasing*.

Applying this information to $M \equiv L^s$, the equivalence $S^N \approx L^s$ implies (with Stirling's formula) that the sequence $((L_p^s/p^p)^{1/p})_{p \geq 1}$ has to be almost increasing. Since $L^s \approx L^t$ for all $s, t \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we see that in this situation $((L_p/p^p)^{1/p})_{p \geq 1}$ has to be almost increasing and

$$(L_p/p^p)^{1/p} = \min_{0 \leq j \leq p-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1-j/p} p^{-j/p} (N_j)^{1/p}.$$

Given $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $0 \leq j < j+1 \leq p-1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1-j/p} p^{-j/p} (N_j)^{1/p} \geq \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1-(j+1)/p} p^{-(j+1)/p} (N_{j+1})^{1/p} \\ \Leftrightarrow & 1 \geq \left(\frac{\nu_{j+1}}{p} \right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \right)^{1/p} \Leftrightarrow 1 \geq \frac{\nu_{j+1}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, when having

$$(4.2) \quad 1 \geq \frac{\nu_{p-1}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k},$$

then by log-convexity (i.e. $j \mapsto \nu_j$ is nondecreasing) we get that

$$(4.3) \quad (L_p/p^p)^{1/p} = \min_{0 \leq j \leq p-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1-j/p} p^{-j/p} (N_j)^{1/p} \underset{j=p-1}{=} \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1/p} \frac{p^{1/p}}{p} (N_{p-1})^{1/p}.$$

Hence, in order to violate (4.1) for L , it suffices to prove now that for any $C \geq 1$ large we can find an integer p satisfying (4.2) and some other integer $q > p$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad (L_p/p^p)^{1/p} = \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1/p} \frac{p^{1/p}}{p} (N_{p-1})^{1/p} \geq C \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq q} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1/q} \frac{q^{1/q}}{q} (N_{q-1})^{1/q} (\geq C(L_q/q^q)^{1/q}).$$

If $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} < 1$, then (4.2) and so (4.3) does hold true for infinitely many numbers p and for each such integer p we have $p^{1/p} \frac{1}{\left(\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}\right)^{1/p}} \geq (\nu_p)^{1/p}$. Hence, the left-hand side in (4.3) yields for such integers $p (\geq 2)$

$$(L_p/p^p)^{1/p} = \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1/p} \frac{p^{1/p}}{p} (N_{p-1})^{1/p} \geq \frac{(\nu_p)^{1/p}}{p} (N_{p-1})^{1/p} = \frac{(N_p)^{1/p}}{p}.$$

This lim inf-requirement is connected to condition (3.5) before as follows:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be nonquasianalytic. Then $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = 0$, i.e. $\neg(3.5)$, does imply $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq 1$.*

Proof. When $\liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} > 1$, then there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $p \geq p_\varepsilon$ we get $\frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \geq 1 + \varepsilon$. Hence

$$\frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} + \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k=p}^{2p-1} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \iff \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \geq 1 + \varepsilon - \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k=p}^{2p-1} \frac{1}{\nu_k},$$

and $1 + \varepsilon - \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k=p}^{2p-1} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \geq \varepsilon \iff 1 \geq \frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k=p}^{2p-1} \frac{1}{\nu_k}$ which holds true because $\frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k=p}^{2p-1} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq \frac{\nu_p}{p} \frac{p}{\nu_p} = 1$. Consequently, we get $\frac{\nu_p}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \geq \varepsilon > 0$ for all $p \geq p_\varepsilon$ which proves (3.5). \square

Similarly, when $\limsup_{q \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_q}{q} \sum_{k \geq q} \frac{1}{\nu_k} > A \geq 1$, then $q^{1/q} \frac{1}{\left(\sum_{k \geq q} \frac{1}{\nu_k}\right)^{1/q}} < \frac{(\nu_q)^{1/q}}{A^{1/q}}$ for infinitely many integers and here we have for such numbers q

$$(L_q/q^q)^{1/q} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \geq q} \frac{1}{\nu_k}} \right)^{1/q} \frac{q^{1/q}}{q} (N_{q-1})^{1/q} \leq \frac{1}{A^{1/q}} \frac{(\nu_q)^{1/q}}{q} (N_{q-1})^{1/q} = \frac{1}{A^{1/q}} \frac{(N_q)^{1/q}}{q}.$$

Summarizing, by recalling that by Stirling's formula $p^{1/p}$ and p are growing similarly up to a constant, we have shown the following observation:

Lemma 4.3. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be nonquasianalytic. Assume that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ (or more generally for all $i \geq i_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$) we can find integers $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, $p_{i+1} > q_i > p_i$, and constants $A_i \geq 1$, $C_i > 0$, such that $\frac{(A_i)^{1/q_i}}{C_i} \geq b_i$, $(b_i)_{i \geq 1}$ being a sequence in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} b_i = +\infty$, and such that*

- (I) $\frac{\nu_{p_i}}{p_i} \sum_{k \geq p_i} \frac{1}{\nu_k} < 1$,
- (II) $\frac{\nu_{q_i}}{q_i} \sum_{k \geq q_i} \frac{1}{\nu_k} > A_i$,
- (III) $C_i (n_{p_i})^{1/p_i} \geq (n_{q_i})^{1/q_i}$.

Then $((L_p/p^p)^{1/p})_{p \geq 1}$ is not almost increasing, hence $S^N \approx L^s$ cannot hold true.

We are now constructing N satisfying the requirements from Lemma 4.3. N will be defined in terms of the sequence of quotients $(\nu_j)_{j \geq 1}$ and for this let $(a_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$, $(b_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ be strictly increasing sequences such that $a_j > 1$ for all $j \geq 1$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} a_j = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} b_j = +\infty$.

The required sequences $(p_i)_i$ and $(q_i)_i$ (in $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$) will be defined iteratively with $p_{i+1} > q_i > p_i$ and increasing fast enough to guarantee at least (for given p_i)

$$(4.5) \quad p_1 > 2, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} : \quad q_i \geq 2p_i - 1 \iff \frac{q_i - p_i}{p_i - 1} \geq 1.$$

For the sequence $(a_j)_j$ we require that

$$(4.6) \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} : \frac{p_{i+1} - 2}{p_i - 2} < \frac{q_i - p_i}{p_i - 2} a_i \implies \frac{p_{i+1} - q_i}{p_i - 2} < \frac{q_i - p_i}{p_i - 2} a_i,$$

i.e. a_i is depending on p_i , q_i and p_{i+1} .

We make the ansatz

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{N_{q_i}}{q_i!} = n_{q_i} = (n_{p_i})^{q_i/p_i} C_i^{q_i} = \left(\frac{N_{p_i}}{p_i!} \right)^{q_i/p_i} C_i^{q_i} \iff N_{q_i} = q_i! \left(\frac{N_{p_i}}{p_i!} \right)^{q_i/p_i} C_i^{q_i},$$

with $C_i \geq 1$, $C_i \rightarrow +\infty$ as $i \rightarrow +\infty$ such that

$$(4.8) \quad C_1 \geq \frac{(p_1!)^{(q_1 - p_1)/(p_1 q_1)}}{((p_1 + 1) \cdots q_1)^{1/q_1}},$$

and such that (we have $p_i \geq p_2 > 2$, $i \geq 2$)

$$(4.9) \quad C_{i+1} \geq C_i^{\frac{q_i(q_{i+1} - p_{i+1})}{q_{i+1}(q_i - p_i)}} \left(a_i \frac{(p_{i+1}!)^{1/p_{i+1}} (N_{p_i})^{1/p_i}}{(p_i!)^{1/p_i} (N_{p_{i+1}})^{1/p_{i+1}}} 2^{i+2} \frac{q_{i+1} - p_{i+1}}{p_{i+1} - 2} \right)^{(q_{i+1} - p_{i+1})/q_{i+1}}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Consequently, by taking into account (4.5), we get

$$(4.10) \quad C_{i+1} \geq C_i^{\frac{q_i(q_{i+1} - p_{i+1})}{q_{i+1}(q_i - p_i)}} \left(a_i \frac{(p_{i+1}!)^{1/p_{i+1}} (N_{p_i})^{1/p_i}}{(p_i!)^{1/p_i} (N_{p_{i+1}})^{1/p_{i+1}}} \right)^{(q_{i+1} - p_{i+1})/q_{i+1}}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Moreover we set

$$(4.11) \quad A_i := (C_i \cdot b_i)^{q_i}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}.$$

Then, by (4.7), one has $\nu_{p_{i+1}} \cdots \nu_{q_i} = \frac{N_{q_i}}{N_{p_i}} = C_i^{q_i} \frac{q_i! (N_{p_i})^{q_i/p_i}}{(p_i!)^{q_i/p_i} N_{p_i}} = C_i^{q_i} \frac{q_i!}{p_i!} (p_i!)^{(p_i - q_i)/p_i} (N_{p_i})^{(q_i - p_i)/p_i}$, and so, when making the choice $\nu_{p_{i+1}} = \cdots = \nu_{q_i}$, we have to put

$$(4.12) \quad \nu_{p_{i+1}} = \cdots = \nu_{q_i} := C_i^{q_i/(q_i - p_i)} (N_{p_i})^{1/p_i} \frac{1}{(p_i!)^{1/p_i}} ((p_i + 1) \cdots q_i)^{1/(q_i - p_i)}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}.$$

Moreover, we set

$$(4.13) \quad \nu_{q_{i+1}} = \cdots = \nu_{p_{i+1}} := a_i \cdot \nu_{q_i} = a_i \cdot \nu_{p_{i+1}}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0},$$

and finally, in order to complete the definition of N :

$$(4.14) \quad \nu_0 = \cdots = \nu_{p_1} := 1.$$

Note: By (4.9) the choice for C_{i+1} is only depending on given values C_i , q_i , q_{i+1} , p_i , p_{i+1} , on a_i (related to p_i , q_i and p_{i+1} via (4.6)) and finally on N_{p_i} and $N_{p_{i+1}}$, involving again only terms depending on a_i , C_i , q_i and p_i . Hence this choice for C_{i+1} is then possible and used to determine $N_{q_{i+1}}$ via (4.7), hence $\nu_{p_{i+1}+1}, \dots, \nu_{q_{i+1}}, \nu_{q_{i+1}+1}, \dots, \nu_{q_{i+2}}$ via the above definitions.

Claim: $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ holds true. Normalization, i.e. $1 = N_0 \leq N_1$ follows because $1 = \nu_0 = \nu_1$ (recall $p_1 > 1$). For $k \mapsto \nu_k$ to be nondecreasing, first by (4.12) and (4.14), we need to check $\nu_{p_1} \leq \nu_{p_1+1}$, so

$$1 \leq C_1^{q_1/(q_1 - p_1)} (N_{p_1})^{1/p_1} \frac{1}{(p_1!)^{1/p_1}} ((p_1 + 1) \cdots q_1)^{1/(q_1 - p_1)} = C_1^{q_1/(q_1 - p_1)} \frac{1}{(p_1!)^{1/p_1}} ((p_1 + 1) \cdots q_1)^{1/(q_1 - p_1)},$$

because $N_{p_1} = 1$ by (4.14). This is valid by the choice of C_1 in (4.8).

Second, by (4.12) and (4.13) and because $a_i > 1$ it suffices to check $\nu_{p_{i+1}+1} \geq \nu_{p_{i+1}}$, $i \geq 1$, which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{i+1}^{q_{i+1}/(q_{i+1}-p_{i+1})} (N_{p_{i+1}})^{1/p_{i+1}} \frac{1}{(p_{i+1}!)^{1/p_{i+1}}} ((p_{i+1}+1) \cdots q_{i+1})^{1/(q_{i+1}-p_{i+1})} \\ & \geq \nu_{q_{i+1}} = a_i \nu_{p_{i+1}} = a_i C_i^{q_i/(q_i-p_i)} (N_{p_i})^{1/p_i} \frac{1}{(p_i!)^{1/p_i}} ((p_i+1) \cdots q_i)^{1/(q_i-p_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

We get $((p_i+1) \cdots q_i)^{1/(q_i-p_i)} \leq q_i^{(q_i-p_i)/(q_i-p_i)} = q_i \leq p_{i+1}+1 \leq ((p_{i+1}+1) \cdots q_{i+1})^{1/(q_{i+1}-p_{i+1})}$ and by taking into account (4.10) we have shown this inequality. Again, by (4.12) and (4.13) and since $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} a_j = +\infty$ we obtain $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \nu_p = +\infty$, hence $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} (N_p)^{1/p} = +\infty$ as well.

Claim: Requirement (III) holds true (with equality for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$). This is immediate by (4.7).

Claim: Requirement (II) holds true. We get $\frac{\nu_{q_i}}{q_i} \sum_{k \geq q_i} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = \frac{1}{q_i} + \frac{\nu_{q_i}}{q_i} \sum_{k \geq q_{i+1}} \frac{1}{\nu_k} > A_i \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k \geq q_{i+1}} \frac{1}{\nu_k} > \frac{A_i q_i - 1}{\nu_{q_i}}$. We have $\sum_{k \geq q_{i+1}} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \geq \frac{p_{i+1} - q_i}{\nu_{q_{i+1}}}$ by (4.13) and because all arising further summands are positive, hence it suffices to show (see (4.11)) that

$$\frac{p_{i+1} - q_i}{\nu_{q_{i+1}}} > \frac{A_i q_i - 1}{\nu_{q_i}} = \frac{(b_i C_i)^{q_i} q_i - 1}{\nu_{q_i}} \iff p_{i+1} > \frac{\nu_{q_{i+1}} ((b_i C_i)^{q_i} q_i - 1)}{\nu_{q_i}} + 1, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0},$$

which can be done by choosing p_{i+1} large enough (depending on given q_i , b_i and C_i). For this recall that C_i is only depending on given C_{i-1} , q_{i-1} , q_i , p_{i-1} , p_i , on a_{i-1} (related to p_i , q_i and p_i via (4.6)) and on $N_{p_{i-1}}$ and N_{p_i} via (4.9). Finally, $\nu_{q_{i+1}}$ is also only depending on these values, see (4.12) and (4.13).

Claim: Requirement (I) holds true. We see that $\frac{\nu_{p_i}}{p_i} \sum_{k \geq p_i} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = \frac{1}{p_i} + \frac{\nu_{p_i}}{p_i} \sum_{k \geq p_{i+1}} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq \frac{1}{2} \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k \geq p_{i+1}} \frac{1}{\nu_k} \leq \frac{p_i - 2}{2\nu_{p_i}}$.

For the series on the left-hand side we have by (4.12) and (4.13) that

$$\forall k \geq i \geq 1: \quad \sum_{k \geq p_{i+1}} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = \sum_{k \geq i} \frac{q_k - p_k}{\nu_{p_{k+1}}} + \sum_{k \geq i} \frac{p_{k+1} - q_k}{\nu_{q_{k+1}}} =: \sum_{k \geq i} \alpha_k + \sum_{k \geq i} \beta_k.$$

Thus, in order to conclude it suffices to verify

$$(4.15) \quad \forall k \geq i \geq 2: \quad \alpha_k < \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \frac{p_i - 2}{\nu_{p_i}}, \quad \beta_k < \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \frac{p_i - 2}{\nu_{p_i}},$$

because then $\sum_{k \geq p_{i+1}} \frac{1}{\nu_k} = \sum_{k \geq i} \alpha_k + \sum_{k \geq i} \beta_k < 2 \frac{p_i - 2}{\nu_{p_i}} \sum_{k \geq i} \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{p_i - 2}{\nu_{p_i}}$ for all $i \geq 2$.

First let $k = i \geq 2$, then we get (recall that $p_i \geq p_2 > 2$)

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i & < \frac{1}{2^{i+1}} \frac{p_i - 1}{\nu_{p_i}} \Leftrightarrow \frac{q_i - p_i}{\nu_{p_{i+1}}} < \frac{1}{2^{i+1}} \frac{p_i - 2}{\nu_{p_i}} \Leftrightarrow 2^{i+1} \frac{q_i - p_i}{p_i - 2} \nu_{p_i} = 2^{i+1} \frac{q_i - p_i}{p_i - 2} a_{i-1} \nu_{p_{i-1}+1} < \nu_{p_{i+1}} \\ & \Leftrightarrow 2^{i+1} \frac{q_i - p_i}{p_i - 2} a_{i-1} (C_{i-1})^{q_{i-1}/(q_{i-1}-p_{i-1})} (N_{p_{i-1}})^{1/p_{i-1}} \frac{1}{(p_{i-1}!)^{1/p_{i-1}}} ((p_{i-1}+1) \cdots q_{i-1})^{1/(q_{i-1}-p_{i-1})} \\ & < (C_i)^{q_i/(q_i-p_i)} (N_{p_i})^{1/p_i} \frac{1}{(p_i!)^{1/p_i}} ((p_i+1) \cdots q_i)^{1/(q_i-p_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

This holds true by the choice of C_i in (4.9) and because $(p_{i-1}+1) \cdots q_{i-1})^{1/(q_{i-1}-p_{i-1})} \leq q_{i-1} < p_i + 1 \leq ((p_i+1) \cdots q_i)^{1/(q_i-p_i)}$.

For β_i we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_i &< \frac{1}{2^{i+1}} \frac{p_i - 2}{\nu_{p_i}} \Leftrightarrow \frac{p_{i+1} - q_i}{\nu_{q_{i+1}}} < \frac{1}{2^{i+1}} \frac{p_i - 2}{\nu_{p_i}} \\
&\Leftrightarrow 2^{i+1} \frac{p_{i+1} - q_i}{p_i - 2} \nu_{p_i} = 2^{i+1} \frac{p_{i+1} - q_i}{p_i - 2} a_{i-1} \nu_{p_{i-1}+1} < \nu_{q_{i+1}} = a_i \nu_{p_{i+1}} \\
&\Leftrightarrow 2^{i+1} \frac{p_{i+1} - q_i}{p_i - 2} a_{i-1} C_{i-1}^{q_{i-1}/(q_{i-1}-p_{i-1})} (N_{p_{i-1}})^{1/p_{i-1}} \frac{1}{(p_{i-1}!)^{1/p_{i-1}}} ((p_{i-1} + 1) \cdots q_{i-1})^{1/(q_{i-1}-p_{i-1})} \\
&< a_i C_i^{q_i/(q_i-p_i)} (N_{p_i})^{1/p_i} \frac{1}{(p_i!)^{1/p_i}} ((p_i + 1) \cdots q_i)^{1/(q_i-p_i)},
\end{aligned}$$

which holds because $((p_{i-1} + 1) \cdots q_{i-1})^{1/(q_{i-1}-p_{i-1})} \leq q_{i-1} < p_i + 1 \leq ((p_i + 1) \cdots q_i)^{1/(q_i-p_i)}$ and $\frac{p_{i+1}-q_i}{p_i-2} a_{i-1} < \frac{q_i-p_i}{p_i-2} a_{i-1} a_i$ (see (4.6)) and finally again by (4.9).

Hence we have checked (4.15) for all $k = i \geq 2$ and so, in order to verify (4.15), we are proving now

$$(4.16) \quad \forall i \geq 2: \quad \frac{p_{i+1} - 2}{\nu_{p_{i+1}}} < \frac{p_i - 2}{\nu_{p_i}} \Leftrightarrow \frac{p_{i+1} - 2}{p_i - 2} \nu_{p_i} < \nu_{p_{i+1}} \Leftrightarrow \frac{p_{i+1} - 2}{p_i - 2} a_{i-1} \nu_{p_{i-1}+1} < a_i \nu_{p_{i+1}},$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{p_{i+1} - 2}{p_i - 2} a_{i-1} C_{i-1}^{q_{i-1}/(q_{i-1}-p_{i-1})} (N_{p_{i-1}})^{1/p_{i-1}} \frac{1}{(p_{i-1}!)^{1/p_{i-1}}} ((p_{i-1} + 1) \cdots q_{i-1})^{1/(q_{i-1}-p_{i-1})} \\
&< a_i C_i^{q_i/(q_i-p_i)} (N_{p_i})^{1/p_i} \frac{1}{(p_i!)^{1/p_i}} ((p_i + 1) \cdots q_i)^{1/(q_i-p_i)},
\end{aligned}$$

which follows by $\frac{p_{i+1}-2}{p_i-2} a_{i-1} < \frac{q_i-p_i}{p_i-2} a_{i-1} a_i$ (see (4.6)) and once again by (4.9).

5. THE RAMIFIED CASE

For the sake of completeness, we transfer the results from Section 3 to the ramified situation, i.e. when introducing a ramification parameter $r > 0$, see [8]. This setting and the corresponding conditions become meaningful when treating (nonstandard) ultradifferentiable ramification classes needed for the study of the surjectivity of the (asymptotic) Borel map and for proving (mixed) extension results in the *ultraholomorphic setting*. The parameter r is used to introduce the (mixed) growth index $\gamma(\cdot)$ which is measuring the opening of the sector under consideration, see [20], [7] and [9].

For arbitrary $r > 0$ we call N to be r -nonquasianalytic, denoted by (nq_r) , if

$$\sum_{p=1}^{+\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\nu_p} \right)^{1/r} < +\infty,$$

and so N has (nq_r) if and only if $N^{1/r}$ has (nq) . This condition implies $\lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} ((N_p)^{1/r}/p!)^{1/p} = +\infty$. Provided that $\nu_p \geq 1$, i.e. N is nondecreasing, we have that (nq_r) does imply (nq_s) for every $s < r$.

If $N \in \mathcal{LC}$, then we have

$$\omega(N) = \sup\{r > 0 : (\text{nq}_r)\},$$

with $\omega(N) := \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log(\nu_p)}{\log(p)}$ denoting the *index of quasianalyticity* (also called lower order of N), see the explanations and references given on [8, p. 541].

N has (γ_r) (see [20], [7]) if

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{(\nu_j)^{1/r}}{j} \sum_{k \geq j} \left(\frac{1}{\nu_k} \right)^{1/r} < +\infty,$$

so N has (γ_r) if and only if $N^{1/r}$ has (γ_1) .

For each $h > 0$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we define the Banach space

$$\mathcal{D}_{r,M,h}([-1,1]) :=$$

$$\{f \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}) : \text{supp}(f) \subseteq [-1,1], \quad f^{(rp+j)}(0) = 0 \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{N}, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}, \quad \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|f^{(rp)}(x)|}{h^p M_p} < +\infty\},$$

and the r -ramified ultradifferentiable test function class of Roumieu-type by

$$\mathcal{D}_{r,\{M\}}([-1,1]) := \lim_{h>0} \mathcal{D}_{r,M,h}([-1,1]),$$

which is a countable (LB) -space, respectively the Beurling-type by

$$\mathcal{D}_{r,(M)}([-1,1]) := \lim_{h>0} \mathcal{D}_{r,M,h}([-1,1]),$$

which is a Frechét space. In [8, Sect. 6] it has been shown that for given $M \in \mathcal{LC}$ the class $\mathcal{D}_{r,[M]}$ is nontrivial if and only if (nq_r) is valid.

In this setting let \mathcal{B}^r be the *ramified Borel map* (at 0) given by

$$\mathcal{B}^r : \mathcal{D}_{r,[M]}([-1,1]) \longrightarrow \Lambda_{[M]}, \quad \mathcal{B}^r(f) := (f^{(rp)}(0))_{p \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

For given $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ and $r > 0$ we introduce the following sets of sequences

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, R} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}} : \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{(M_p)^{1/r}}{p!} \right)^{1/p} > 0, \quad M \leq N\},$$

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, B} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}} : \lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{(M_p)^{1/r}}{p!} \right)^{1/p} = +\infty, \quad M \leq N\},$$

moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, R} &:= \{M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, R} : M \in \mathcal{LC}\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, B} &:= \{M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, B} : M \in \mathcal{LC}\}. \end{aligned}$$

For these classes the analogous inclusions as for the case $r = 1$ are clearly valid and similarly when the symbol \leq is replaced by \leq .

Finally, we introduce the following mixed conditions, see [8] and [9]: We write $(M, N)_{SV_r}$, if

$$\exists s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} : \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{(\lambda_{p,s}^{M,N})^{1/r}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \left(\frac{1}{\nu_k} \right)^{1/r} < +\infty,$$

and $(M, N)_{\gamma_r}$, if

$$\sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{(\mu_p)^{1/r}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \left(\frac{1}{\nu_k} \right)^{1/r} < +\infty.$$

Condition $(M, M)_{\gamma_r}$ is precisely (γ_r) introduced and used in [20] and the analogous version of Remark 2.1 is valid.

Summarizing [8, Thm. 3.2, Thm. 4.2] we can recall the following result:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ with $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, B}$ be given, $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Then TFAE:*

- (i) $\mathcal{B}^r(\mathcal{D}_{r,\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}$ resp. $\mathcal{B}^r(\mathcal{D}_{r,(N)}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{(M)}$,
- (ii) $(M, N)_{SV_r}$ is valid.

Consequently, if (i) or (ii) holds true, then N has to satisfy (ng_r) .

Note that this statement does also hold true for other different types of nonstandard ramification spaces introduced in [20], namely $\mathcal{L}_{r,[N]}$, $\mathcal{N}_{r,[N]}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{r,[N]}$, see [8, Sect. 5.3, Thm. 5.5].

5.1. Optimal sequence for the mixed strong nonquasianalyticity condition. There does also exist a ramified version of the descendant, see [9, Remark 9].

First, let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and satisfying (ng_r) , $r > 0$. Then $S^{N,r}$ shall denote the *descendant* of $N^{1/r}$, so

$$\sigma_k^{N,r} := \frac{\tau_1^r k}{\tau_k^r}, \quad \sigma_0^{N,r} := 1,$$

with

$$\tau_k^r := \frac{k}{(\nu_k)^{1/r}} + \sum_{j \geq k} \left(\frac{1}{\nu_j} \right)^{1/r}, \quad k \geq 1,$$

and we summarize:

- (i) $\sigma_k^{N,r} \geq 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $s^{N,r} := (S_k^{N,r}/k!)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{LC}$ (so $S^{N,r}$ is strongly log-convex),
- (ii) there exists $C > 0$ such that $\sigma_k^{N,r} \leq C(\nu_k)^{1/r}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (iii) $(S^{N,r}, N^{1/r})_{\gamma_1}$,
- (iv) if N enjoys (mg) (equivalently $N^{1/r}$ does so for some/each $r > 0$), then $S^{N,r}$ does have (mg) too ($r > 0$ arbitrary).
- (v) $S^{N,r}$ is optimal/maximal in the following sense: If $M \in \mathcal{LC}$ is given with $\mu_k \leq C(\nu_k)^{1/r}$ and $(M, N^{1/r})_{\gamma_1}$, then $\mu_k \leq D\sigma_k^{N,r}$ follows.

We also have that $C^{-1}\sigma_k^{N,r} \leq (\nu_k)^{1/r} \leq C\sigma_k^{N,r}$ if and only if $N^{1/r}$ does have (γ_1) resp. if and only if $(N, N)_{\gamma_r}$.

Unfortunately this construction is in general not well-behaved under applying ramification, i.e. $\sigma^{N,r} \neq (\sigma^{N,1})^{1/r}$, and so in [9, (14)] the following relevant sequence has been introduced (denoted by $L^{N,r}$ there, but we prefer to write M instead of L to avoid confusion):

$$(5.1) \quad M^{N,r} := (S^{N,r})^r.$$

Hence $M^{N,r} \in \mathcal{LC}$ and moreover

- (i) $\frac{(M_p^{N,r})^{1/r}}{p!} \in \mathcal{LC}$ (because $S^{N,r}$ is strongly log-convex),
- (ii) $\mu_k^{N,r} = (\sigma_k^{N,r})^r \leq C\nu_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (iii) $((M^{N,r})^{1/r}, N^{1/r})_{\gamma_1}$, equivalently $(M^{N,r}, N)_{\gamma_r}$ holds true,
- (iv) if $M' \in \mathcal{LC}$ is given with $\mu'_k \leq C\nu_k$ and $(M', N)_{\gamma_r}$, i.e. $((M')^{1/r}, N^{1/r})_{\gamma_1}$, then $\mu'_k \leq D^r(\sigma_k^{N,r})^r = D^r\mu_k^{N,r}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and consequently $M^{N,r}$ is maximal (up to a constant) among all sequences satisfying $\mu'_k \leq C\nu_k$ and $(M', N)_{\gamma_r}$,
- (v) $S^{N,r}$ has (mg) if and only if $M^{N,r}$ does so.

Remark 3.1 takes now the following form:

Remark 5.2. By the previous comments (i) and (ii) we have that $M^{N,r} \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, B}$. Replacing $M^{N,r}$ by the equivalent sequence $\widetilde{M}^{N,r} := (M_p^{N,r}/C^p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$, C denoting the constant from (ii) (w.l.o.g.

$C \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$), we see that $\widetilde{M^{N,r}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, B}$ and $(\widetilde{M^{N,r}}, N)_{\gamma_r}$ by comment (iii) above and (iii) in Remark 2.1. By (ii) in Remark 2.1 also $(\widetilde{M^{N,r}}, N)_{SV_r}$ holds true and by (iii) there finally property $(M^{N,r}, N)_{SV_r}$ follows.

This shows that for any $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ satisfying (nq_r) the set of all sequences belonging to $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, B}$ (hence to $\mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, R}$) and satisfying $(\cdot, N)_{SV_r}$ is never empty.

5.2. Optimal sequence for the mixed Schmets-Valdivia-condition. In the following we set for any $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $r > 0$

$$L^{N;s} := L^s, \quad L^{r;s} := \left(L^{N^{1/r};s} \right)^r.$$

Using this notation, by applying Lemma 3.2 the following result becomes immediate.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and assume that N has (nq_r) , $r > 0$.*

Then

- (i) $(L^{r;s}, N)_{SV_r}$ holds true for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$,
- (ii) for any $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $(M, N)_{SV_r}$ we get $M \preceq L^{r;s}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$,
- (iii) $L^{r;s} \preceq N$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$,

Since there exists $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, B}$ with $(M, N)_{SV_r}$, e.g. take the sequence $M^{N,r}$ (see Remark 5.2), assertions (i), (ii) and (iii) hold true for the log-convex minorant $(L^{r;s})^{\text{lc}}$ as well.

Summarizing the consequences of this result we have:

- (a) For any given $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, B}$ with $(M, N)_{SV_r}$ we get that $M \preceq L^{r;s}$ for some/each $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. By Remark 5.2, in particular this holds true for the sequence $M^{N,r} \equiv M$ which implies $L^{r;s} \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, B} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, R}$. Consequently, some/each $L^{r;s}$ is maximal w.r.t. \preceq among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, B}$ (resp. among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, R}$) and having $(M, N)_{SV_r}$, i.e. $L^{r;s}$ is the maximal sequence such that Theorem 5.1 can be applied.
- (b) The same holds true for $(L^{r;s})^{\text{lc}}$ instead of $L^{r;s}$ and $(L^{r;s})^{\text{lc}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, B}$ by using again $M^{N,r}$.

By combining Theorem 5.1, Remark 5.2 and Lemma 5.3 we immediately get the following result.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.*

Then the set of sequences $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, B}$ and satisfying

$$\mathcal{B}^r(\mathcal{D}_{r, \{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}, \quad \text{resp.} \quad \mathcal{B}^r(\mathcal{D}_{r, (N)}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{(M)},$$

does have a maximal element which is given by some/each $L^{r;s}$.

Alternatively, we can use $(L^{r;s})^{\text{lc}}$ which is maximal among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, B}$.

Note that for this result it is not necessary to assume that N has (nq_r) by similar reasons as for the case $r = 1$ and by taking into account the characterization of the (non)triviality of $\mathcal{D}_{r, [N]}([-1, 1])$ in terms of (nq_r) , see [8, Theorem 6.1].

Now Remark 3.4 turns into:

Remark 5.5. *If $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ does not have (nq_r) , then using the convention $0 = \frac{1}{+\infty}$ we put $L^{r;s} \equiv 0$ which is corresponding to the trivial class of sequences $\{0\}$.*

In this case it also makes sense to set $S^{N,r} \equiv 0 \equiv M^{N,r}$.

When using the notation ($s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, $r > 0$ and $C > 1$)

$$L^{N;s,C} := L^{s,C}, \quad L^{r;s,C} := L^{N^{1/r};s,C},$$

then the conclusions from Remark 3.5 can be generalized and so Lemma 3.6 reads in the ramified version as follows:

Lemma 5.6. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given.*

- (i) *If N has (γ_r) , then $N \approx L^{r;s,C}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $C \geq 1$.*
- (ii) *Conversely, if $N \approx L^{r;s}$ for some/each $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, then N does have (γ_r) .*

5.3. Comparison of the optimal sequences $L^{r;s}$ and $M^{N,r}$. Given $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ satisfying (nq_r) , $r > 0$, it makes sense to consider

$$(5.2) \quad \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{(\nu_p)^{1/r}}{p} \sum_{k \geq 2p} \left(\frac{1}{\nu_k} \right)^{1/r} > 0,$$

and

$$(5.3) \quad \liminf_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{(\nu_p)^{1/r}}{p} \sum_{k \geq p} \left(\frac{1}{\nu_k} \right)^{1/r} > 0.$$

Again (5.2) implies (5.3) and N has (5.2) resp. (5.3) if and only if $N^{1/r}$ has (3.5) resp. (3.6).

It is also immediate that N has (mg) if and only if $N^{1/r}$ does so and hence, by repeating the arguments from Lemma (3.8) for $N^{1/r}$, we get the following:

Lemma 5.7. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and satisfying (nq_r) , $r > 0$. If N has (mg), then (5.2) holds true.*

The converse will fail in general by applying [9, Example 1] to $N^{1/r}$ (i.e. replacing ν_k by $(\nu_k)^{1/r}$ in the construction there).

Moreover we transfer Remark 3.9 into this setting:

- Remark 5.8.**
- (a) [9, Lemma 6] applied to $N^{1/r}$ yields a precise characterization when $S^{N,r}$ does have (mg).
 - (b) (5.2) for N does imply (mg) for $S^{N,r}$ and so for $M^{N,r}$.
 - (c) However, [9, Example 1] applied to $N^{1/r}$ provides an example for a sequence N not having (mg) but such that (5.2) holds true and hence (mg) is valid for $S^{N,r}$ resp. equivalently for $M^{N,r}$.

Finally, we generalize Theorem 3.10.

Theorem 5.9. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and having (5.2) for some $r > 0$ (which implies (nq_r)). Then for all $s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we get $M^{N,r} \approx L^{r;s}$.*

This is equivalent to the fact that $M^{N,r}$ defined in (5.1) is maximal w.r.t. \leq among all sequences $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, r, B}$ (and also among all $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, \mathcal{LC}, r, B}$) and satisfying $(M, N)_{SV_r}$.

Moreover, if $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, this is equivalent to the fact that the inclusions $\mathcal{B}^r(\mathcal{D}_{\{r, N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M^{N,r}\}}$ resp. $\mathcal{B}^r(\mathcal{D}_{r, (N)}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{(M^{N,r})}$ are optimal in the ultradifferentiable setting.

In particular this statement does hold true for all $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ satisfying (nq_r) and (mg) (resp. equivalently $N^{1/r} \in \mathcal{LC}$ is nonquasianalytic and satisfies (mg)). This result should be compared with [9, Theorem 5].

For the proof one has to show $(L^{N^{1/r};s})^r = L^{r;s} \preceq M^{N,r} = (S^{N,r})^r$. So one requires $L^{N^{1/r};s} \preceq S^{N,r}$ which follows immediately by the proof of Theorem 3.10 applied to $N^{1/r}$ instead of N . Note also that only when involving \mathcal{B}^r we have to restrict r to $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$.

6. ON THE FAILURE OF INJECTIVITY AND SURJECTIVITY IN THE NONQUASIANALYTIC SETTING

6.1. On the failure of injectivity. The aim of this section is the study of the failure for \mathcal{B} of being injective in the nonquasianalytic ultradifferentiable weight sequence setting. We show that this failure is large when measured w.r.t. vector space dimension.

We call a given smooth function f *flat* (at $x = 0$) if $f^{(k)}(0) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

First we recall [12, Theorem 2.2], which follows from [6, Theorem 1.3.5], for a proof see also [19, Lemma 5.1.6].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given and assume that $a := \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\nu_j} < +\infty$, i.e. N is required to be nonquasianalytic. Then there exists a smooth function φ whose support is contained in $[-a, a]$, such that $0 \leq \varphi(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in [-a, a]$, and $\varphi^{(j)}(0) = \delta_{j,0}$ (Kronecker delta). Furthermore we have $\|\varphi^{(j)}\|_{\infty} \leq 2^j N_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

So φ is a nontrivial function ($\varphi(0) = 1$) with compact support and $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_{\{M\}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$ (take $h = 2$).

In fact, by inspecting the proof of [19, Lemma 5.1.6] we see that $\text{supp}(\varphi) = [-a, a]$.

Departing from this constructed function φ we put $\varphi_c(x) := \varphi(cx)$ and $b := \frac{a}{c}$. So the support of φ_c equals $[-\frac{a}{c}, \frac{a}{c}] = [-b, b]$ and $\varphi_c^{(j)}(x) = c^j \varphi^{(j)}(cx)$ for all $x \in [-b, b]$ which implies $\varphi_c^{(j)}(0) = 0$ for $j \geq 1$ and $\varphi_c(0) = \varphi(0) = 1$, i.e. $\varphi_c^{(j)}(0) = \delta_{0,j}$. If $c \geq a$, then clearly $\varphi_c \in \mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])$ (take $h = 2c$). On the other hand note that, given a nonquasianalytic N with $a := \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\nu_j} < +\infty$, then we can replace N by the equivalent sequence $\tilde{N} = (N_j/a^j)_j$ which satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{\nu}_j} = 1$.

For the Beurling type we have to recall that in the proof of [12, Theorem 2.1 (a)(i)] even a sequence $(\chi_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ of functions with compact support in the ultradifferentiable class $\mathcal{E}_{(N)}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$ has been constructed which satisfies $\chi_p^{(j)}(0) = \delta_{j,p}$. So everything from above holds true for the Beurling type classes $\mathcal{D}_{(N)}([-1, 1])$ as well by choosing $\varphi := \chi_0$ and making again a rescaling. Note that in the proof of [12, Theorem 2.1 (a)(i)] for the construction again Lemma 6.1 has been used.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be given with $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, R}$ resp. $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\preceq, B}$ and such that $(M, N)_{SV}$ holds true.*

Then for any $\mathbf{a} \in \Lambda_{[M]}$ there do exist infinitely many functions in $\mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ which are mapped onto \mathbf{a} by \mathcal{B} . In fact we can assume that these functions do belong to an infinite dimensional vector space having dimension \mathfrak{c} .

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, first we get that N is nonquasianalytic and so $a := \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\nu_j} < +\infty$, and second $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}$ resp. $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{(N)}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{(M)}$.

Thus for each given $\mathbf{a} \in \Lambda_{[M]}$ we can find some $f_{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ such that $\mathcal{B}(f_{\mathbf{a}}) = \mathbf{a}$. Then for all flat $g \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ we get:

$$\mathcal{B}(g + f_{\mathbf{a}}) = (g^{(k)}(0) + f_{\mathbf{a}}^{(k)}(0))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \mathbf{a}.$$

For a concrete construction of such (nontrivial and pairwise different) flat functions we can take some φ_c with $c \geq 3a$. So $\text{supp}(\varphi_c) \subseteq [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$ because $b = \frac{a}{c} \leq \frac{1}{3}$ and clearly $\varphi_c \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$.

Then define

$$\psi_c(x) := \varphi_c \left(x - \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad x \in \left[-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3} \right], \quad \psi_c(x) = 0, \quad x \in [-1, 1] \setminus \left[-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3} \right],$$

hence $\psi_c \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ having $\text{supp}(\psi_c) = [-\frac{a}{c}, \frac{a}{c}]$ and each ψ_c is flat at $x = 0$. We introduce now the following linear span:

$$\mathcal{V} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^l \alpha_i \psi_{c_i} : l \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}, 3a < c_1 < \dots < c_l \right\}.$$

First, by the previous arguments it is clear that for each $g \in \mathcal{V}$ we have $\mathcal{B}(g + f_{\mathbf{a}}) = \mathbf{a}$ and $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$. Finally the functions ψ_{c_i} are linearly independent: We have to show that

$$\lambda_1 \psi_{c_1} + \dots + \lambda_k \psi_{c_k} = 0 \implies \lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_k = 0.$$

If $l = 1$, then $\lambda_1 = 0$ is clear since $\psi_{c_1} \neq 0$. If $l > 1$, then we take $x \in \text{supp}(\psi_{c_1}) \setminus \text{supp}(\psi_{c_2})$. This set is nonempty because $c_1 < c_2$ and so $\lambda_1 = 0$ has to be satisfied. Then proceed by iteration to get $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_{k-1} = 0$ and $\lambda_k = 0$ follows since $\psi_{c_k} \neq 0$. \square

Using φ_c from Lemma 6.1 we can also prove a multiplicative variant of the previous statement. For given $\mathbf{a} = (a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and any $c > 0$ we get that $\mathcal{B}(\varphi_c \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}}) = \mathbf{a}$ because

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} : (\varphi_c \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}})^{(k)}(0) = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} \binom{j}{k} \underbrace{\varphi_c^{(j)}(0)}_{=\delta_{j,0}} \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}}^{(k-j)}(0) = f_{\mathbf{a}}^{(k)}(0) = a_k.$$

Fix now $c \geq a$, then $\varphi_c \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$: Here $b \leq 1$ and since $\varphi_c, f_{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ the log-convexity for N implies stability under pointwise multiplication for this class, e.g. see the proof of [19, Prop. 2.0.8].

Then define $\mathcal{V}_1 := \{ \varphi_c + \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i \psi_{c_i} : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}, l \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, 3a < c_1 < \dots < c_l \}$ and for any function $g \in \mathcal{V}_1$ we get

$$\mathcal{B}(g \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}}) = \left(\sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} \binom{k}{j} \left(\varphi_{c_1}^{(j)}(0) f_{\mathbf{a}}^{(k-j)}(0) + \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i \psi_{c_i}^{(j)}(0) f_{\mathbf{a}}^{(k-j)}(0) \right) \right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (f_{\mathbf{a}}^{(k)}(0))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \mathbf{a},$$

because $\psi_{c_i}^{(j)}(0) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi_{c_1}^{(j)}(0) = \delta_{j,0}$. It is clear that $\mathcal{V}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ and so $g \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ for any $g \in \mathcal{V}_1$.

However, note that \mathcal{V}_1 is only an affine space and by this construction and assuming \mathbf{a} arbitrary we cannot take functions belonging to a vector space W : If $g, h \in W$ with $\mathcal{B}(g \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}}) = \mathbf{a} = \mathcal{B}(h \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}})$, then $g + h \in W$ but $\mathcal{B}((g + h) \cdot f_{\mathbf{a}}) = 2\mathbf{a}$ because \mathcal{B} is clearly linear, a contradiction for any given $\mathbf{a} \neq 0$.

But when considering $\mathbf{a} = 0$, then we can construct an infinite dimensional vector space as follows: First, for $\mathbf{a} = 0$ we can find $f \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ such that $\mathcal{B}(f) = \mathbf{a}$. Since N is nonquasianalytic we can assume that $f \neq 0$ (e.g. take any function with compact support contained in $[-1, 1]$ and such that 0 is not contained in $\text{supp}(f)$). Then set $\mathcal{V}_2 := \{ \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i \varphi_{c_i} : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}, l \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, a < c_1 < \dots < c_l \}$, so again $\mathcal{V}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ and $g \cdot f \in \mathcal{D}_{[N]}([-1, 1])$ for any $g \in \mathcal{V}_2$. Moreover

$$\mathcal{B}(g \cdot f) = \mathcal{B} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i \varphi_{c_i} \right) \cdot f \right) = \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i \mathcal{B}(\varphi_{c_i} \cdot f) = 0,$$

since $\varphi_{c_i}^{(j)}(0) = \delta_{j,0}$ and $f^{(j)}(0) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. The space \mathcal{V}_2 is again infinite dimensional because each set $\{\varphi_{c_1}, \dots, \varphi_{c_l}\}$ is linearly independent analogously as for the functions ψ_{c_i} shown above.

Remark 6.3. *For the sake of completeness we mention that (the proof of) Proposition 6.2 can be transferred to the r -ramified setting ($r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$): In order to do so it is crucial to have functions $\varphi_c \in \mathcal{D}_{r,[N]}([-1, 1])$ (when being nontrivial) with $\varphi_c^{(j)}(0) = \delta_{j,0}$. The existence of such functions is ensured by Lemma 6.1 applied to the so-called r -interpolating sequence $P^{N,r}$, see [8, Sect. 2.5, Lemma 3.5] and [20, Lemma 2.3] for more details.*

However, the "multiplicative variant" seems to be not clear since in general $\mathcal{D}_{r,[N]}([-1, 1])$ is not closed under the pointwise product of functions.

6.2. On the failure of surjectivity in the nonquasianalytic setting. Our aim is to show that in the situation of Theorem 2.2 the inclusion $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}$ will be strict for all N which are not strongly nonquasianalytic. More precisely, in this situation the complement $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \setminus \Lambda_{\{M\}}$ will be large in the following sense, see [1, Def. 1.4] and the references therein:

A set \mathcal{L} in a vector space V is called *lineable* in V if $\mathcal{L} \cup \{0\}$ does contain an infinite dimensional vector space.

In order to do so we start with the following preparation: Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given, then the function θ_N defined by

$$\theta_N(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{N_k}{(2\nu_k)^k} \exp(2i\nu_k x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

is satisfying the following requirements: $\theta_N \in \mathcal{E}_{\{N\}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$ and

$$(6.1) \quad \theta_N^{(j)}(0) = i^j s_j \text{ with } s_j^1 := s_j \geq N_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We refer to [22, Theorem 1], for a detailed proof see also [19, Prop. 3.1.2] and [13, Lemma 2.9]. It is not difficult to see that θ_N does not belong to the Beurling type class $\mathcal{E}_{(N)}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$.

Using this function we can show the following:

Proposition 6.4. *Let $N \in \mathcal{LC}$ be given such that (γ_1) fails. Then we get:*

For any sequence $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}$ with $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}$ we have a strict inclusion, more precisely the set

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \setminus \bigcup_{M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}} \Lambda_{\{M\}}$$

is lineable in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1]))$ (the constructed vector space does have dimension \aleph_0).

Proof. By Theorem 2.2 we see that for any $M \in \mathcal{N}_{\leq, R}$ with $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \supseteq \Lambda_{\{M\}}$ condition $(M, N)_{SV}$ has to be satisfied, hence N is nonquasianalytic and by Lemma 3.2 in order to conclude it is sufficient to show lineability for the set $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \setminus \Lambda_{\{L\}}$ for the maximal sequence $L \equiv L^1$ (see (3.1)).

Take $\theta_N \in \mathcal{E}_{\{N\}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])$ such that $\psi^{(j)}(0) = \delta_{j,0}$ and $\text{supp}(\psi) \subseteq [-1, 1]$ (e.g. take $\psi \equiv \varphi_c$, $c \geq a := \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\nu_j}$ from the previous section) and set

$$\Theta_N := \theta_N \cdot \psi.$$

Then $\Theta_N \in \mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])$ because log-convexity of N implies that the class is closed under pointwise multiplication (e.g. see the proof of [19, Prop. 2.0.8]). Moreover we have

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} : \Theta_N^{(k)}(0) = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} \binom{k}{j} \theta_N^{(j)}(0) \psi^{(k-j)}(0) = \theta_N^{(k)}(0) = i^k s_k.$$

Claim I: $\mathcal{B}(\Theta_N) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \setminus \Lambda_{\{L\}}$.

Clearly $\mathcal{B}(\Theta_N) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1]))$ holds true. Since N does not have (γ_1) , by Lemma 3.6 we know that $L \approx N$ is violated. Now assume that there would exist some $\mathbf{a} = (a_j)_j \in \Lambda_{\{L\}}$ with $\mathcal{B}(\Theta_N) = \mathbf{a}$, then

$$\exists C, h > 0 \forall j \in \mathbb{N} : N_j \leq |\Theta_N^{(j)}(0)| = |a_j| \leq Ch^j L_j,$$

which would imply $N \preceq L$. By Lemma 3.2 this would imply $L \approx N$, a contradiction.

Claim II: $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])) \setminus \Lambda_{\{L\}}$ is lineable in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1]))$.

First, for each $h > 0$ we set $N^h := (h^j N_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. Obviously $N^h \approx N$ and $\nu_j^h := \frac{N_j^h}{N_{j-1}^h} = h\nu_j$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, and $\nu_0^h := 1$. Moreover each N^h is clearly log-convex and normalized for all $h \geq 1$. So it makes sense to consider θ_{N^h} and $\Theta_{N^h} := \theta_{N^h} \cdot \psi$. We have $\Theta_{N^h} \in \mathcal{D}_{\{N^h\}}([-1, 1]) = \mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])$ by the equivalence of the sequences. By the previous comments we get

$$\forall h \geq 1 \exists A_h, B_h \geq 1 \forall j \in \mathbb{N} : h^j N_j = N_j^h \leq |\Theta_{N^h}^{(j)}(0)| \leq A_h B_h^j N_j^h = A_h (B_h h)^j N_j,$$

and

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N} \forall h \geq 1 : \Theta_{N^h}^{(j)}(0) = i^j s_j^h, \quad s_j^h \geq N_j^h = h^j N_j.$$

We introduce iteratively a sequence of functions $(\Phi_j)_{j \geq 1}$ and strictly increasing sequences of numbers $(A_j)_{j \geq 1}$, $(B_j)_{j \geq 1}$, $(C_j)_{j \geq 1}$ such that $B_{j+1} > C_j > B_j (> \max_{1 \leq i \leq j-1} B_i)$ as follows: First set

$$\Phi_1 := \Theta_N (= \Theta_{N^1}),$$

which implies

$$\exists A_1, B_1 \geq 1 \forall l \in \mathbb{N} : N_l \leq |\Phi_1^{(l)}(0)| = |\Theta_N^{(l)}(0)| \leq A_1 B_1^l N_l.$$

Then we put iteratively

$$\Phi_{j+1} := A_j \cdot \Theta_{N^{C_j}}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0},$$

satisfying

$$\exists A_{j+1}, B_{j+1} \geq 1 \forall l \in \mathbb{N} : A_j N_l^{C_j} = A_j C_j^l N_l \leq |\Phi_{j+1}^{(l)}(0)| \leq A_{j+1} B_{j+1}^l N_l.$$

The choices of the sequences yield

$$(6.2) \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N} \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} : \Phi_{j+1}^{(l)}(0) = A_j \Theta_{N^{C_j}}^{(l)}(0) = A_j i^l s_l^{C_j}, \quad s_l^{C_j} \geq N_l^{C_j} = C_j^l N_l,$$

and $\Phi_1^{(l)}(0) = i^l s_l = i^l s_l^1$, $s_l^1 \geq N_l$. Finally, we define the set

$$\mathcal{V} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \Phi_i, k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C} \right\},$$

so $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\{N\}}([-1, 1])$ and the functions Φ_i are linearly independent. We prove that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}) \cap \Lambda_{\{L\}} = \{0\}$ is valid.

Let $f \in \mathcal{V}$, $f \neq 0$, so $f = \alpha_1 \Phi_1 + \dots + \alpha_k \Phi_k$ for some $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ with $\alpha_k \neq 0$. We can assume $k \geq 2$ since the case $k = 1$ follows by Claim I above. Hence for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ by (6.2) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} |f^{(l)}(0)| &= |\alpha_1 \Phi_1^{(l)}(0) + \dots + \alpha_k \Phi_k^{(l)}(0)| = |\alpha_1 i^l s_1^l + \dots + \alpha_k i^l A_{k-1} s_l^{C_{k-1}}| = |\alpha_1 s_1^l + \dots + \alpha_k A_{k-1} s_l^{C_{k-1}}| \\ &\geq |\alpha_k| A_{k-1} C_{k-1}^l N_l - (k-1) \max_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} |\alpha_i| A_{k-1} B_{k-1}^l N_l \\ &= N_l A_{k-1} B_{k-1}^l \left(|\alpha_k| \left(\frac{C_{k-1}}{B_{k-1}} \right)^l - (k-1) \max_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} |\alpha_i| \right), \end{aligned}$$

and the last expression is bounded by below by $N_l A_{k-1} B_{k-1}^l$ for all $l \geq l_k$ large because by the choice $C_{k-1} > B_{k-1}$. Note that the value $k \geq 2$ is only depending on the given function f . Consequently, when assuming that there would exist some $\mathbf{a} = (a_j)_j \in \Lambda_{\{L\}}$ with $\mathcal{B}(f) = \mathbf{a}$, then we would get

$$\exists C, h \geq 1 \forall j \geq l_k : A_{k-1} B_{k-1}^j N_j \leq |f^{(j)}(0)| = |a_j| \leq Ch^j L_j,$$

which would imply, by enlarging the constants C, h sufficiently (if necessary), that $N \leq L$. Hence $L \approx N$ would follow, a contradiction because N does not have (γ_1) by assumption. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Bernal-González, D. Pellegrino, and J.B. Seoane-Sepúlveda. Linear subsets of nonlinear sets in topological vector spaces. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 51(1):71–130, 2014.
- [2] J. Bonet, R. Meise, and B. A. Taylor. On the range of the Borel map for classes of non-quasianalytic functions. *North-Holland Mathematics Studies - Progress in Functional Analysis*, 170:97–111, 1992.
- [3] J. Chaumat and A.-M. Chollet. Surjectivité de l’application restriction à un compact dans les classes de fonctions ultradifférentiables. *Math. Ann.*, 298:7–40, 1994.
- [4] C. Esser and G. Schindl. How far ist the Borel map from being surjective in quasianalytic ultradifferentiable classes? *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 466(1):986–1008, 2018.
- [5] C. Esser and G. Schindl. On the construction of large algebras not contained in the image of the Borel map. *Res. Math.*, 75(22), 2020.
- [6] L. Hörmander. *The analysis of linear partial differential operators I, Distribution theory and Fourier analysis*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [7] J. Jiménez-Garrido, J. Sanz, and G. Schindl. Injectivity and surjectivity of the asymptotic Borel map in Carleman ultraholomorphic classes. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 469(1):136–168, 2019.
- [8] J. Jiménez-Garrido, J. Sanz, and G. Schindl. The surjectivity of the Borel mapping in the mixed setting for ultradifferentiable ramification spaces. *Monatsh. Math.*, 191(3):537–576, 2020.
- [9] J. Jiménez-Garrido, J. Sanz, and G. Schindl. Ultraholomorphic extension theorems in the mixed setting. *Banach J. Math. Anal.*, 14(4):1630–1669, 2020.
- [10] H. Komatsu. Ultradistributions. I. Structure theorems and a characterization. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.*, 20:25–105, 1973.
- [11] S. Mandelbrojt. *Séries adhérentes, Régularisation des suites, Applications*. Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1952.
- [12] H.-J. Petzsche. On E. Borel’s theorem. *Math. Ann.*, 282(2):299–313, 1988.
- [13] A. Rainer and G. Schindl. Composition in ultradifferentiable classes. *Studia Math.*, 224(2):97–131, 2014.
- [14] A. Rainer and G. Schindl. Equivalence of stability properties for ultradifferentiable function classes. *Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fís. Nat. Ser. A. Mat. RACSAM*, 110(1):17–32, 2016.
- [15] A. Rainer and G. Schindl. Extension of Whitney jets of controlled growth. *Math. Nachr.*, 290(14–15):2356–2374, 2017.
- [16] A. Rainer and G. Schindl. On the Borel mapping in the quasianalytic setting. *Math. Scand.*, 121(2):293–310, 2017.
- [17] A. Rainer and G. Schindl. On the extension of Whitney ultrajets. *Studia Math.*, 245(3):255–287, 2019.
- [18] A. Rainer and G. Schindl. On the extension of Whitney ultrajets, II. *Studia Math.*, 250(3):283–295, 2020.
- [19] G. Schindl. Spaces of smooth functions of Denjoy-Carleman-type, 2009. Diploma Thesis, Universität Wien, available online at http://othes.univie.ac.at/7715/1/2009-11-18_0304518.pdf.

- [20] J. Schmets and M. Valdivia. Extension maps in ultradifferentiable and ultraholomorphic function spaces. *Studia Math.*, 143(3):221–250, 2000.
- [21] J. Schmets and M. Valdivia. On certain extension theorems in the mixed Borel setting. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 297:384–403, 2003.
- [22] V. Thilliez. On quasianalytic local rings. *Expo. Math.*, 26:1–23, 2008.

G. SCHINDL: FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1, A-1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA.

E-mail address: `gerhard.schindl@univie.ac.at`