## Name: Solutions

1. Let  $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ . For  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , show

$$\sum_{n=-N}^{N} |\hat{F}(n)|^2 \le ||F||_2^2.$$

Deduce that

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{F}(n)|^2 \le ||F||_2^2$$

[Hint: see the proof for  $F \in C(\mathbb{T})$ .]

Solution: The proof in the notes of Bessel's inequality (Proposition 2.1.2) was given for  $F \in C(\mathbb{T})$  but the same proof works for  $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ .

2. Could there be  $F \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$  such that  $\hat{F}(n) = 1/\sqrt{n}$  for  $n \ge 1$  and  $\hat{F}(n) = 0$  for  $n \le 0$ ? Solution: No because if there was such F, then

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{F}(n)|^2 = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} = \infty$$

and that would violate the second inequality in Q1.

- Could there be F ∈ L<sup>1</sup>(T) such that F̂(n) = (-1)<sup>n</sup> for each n ∈ Z?
   Solution: No because that would violate the Riemann Lebesgue Lemma (Corollary 2.6.9 in the notes).
- 4. Show that there is F ∈ C(T) with Â(n) = 1/2<sup>n</sup> for n ≥ 1 and Â(n) = 0 for n ≤ 0.
  Solution: We consider the sum

$$F(\zeta) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \zeta^n$$

for  $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ . As explained in the proof of Theorem 2.6.2 in the notes, this series is uniformly convergent for  $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$  and so defines  $F \in C(\mathbb{T})$ .

We could invoke the Weierstrass M-test to show this or use a bare hands proof as in the proof of Theorem 2.6.2. The Weierstrass M-test says that if  $f_n: X \to \mathbb{C}$  are functions on a set X and there exist  $M_n \ge 0$  such that  $\sup_{x \in X} |f_n(x)| \le M_n$  for each nand  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n < \infty$ , then  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x)$  converges uniformly on X (meaning that f(x) =  $\lim_{N\to\infty}\sum_{n=1}^N f_n(x)$  exists for each  $x \in X$  and the limit is uniform in the sense that given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $N_0$  such that

$$N \ge N_0 \Rightarrow \left| f(x) - \sum_{n=1}^N f_n(x) \right| < \varepsilon \quad (\forall x \in X).$$

(The uniformity is that the the same  $N_0$  works for all  $x \in X$  at the same time.) One usual consequence of the *M*-test if that if we assume *X* is a topological space (as  $X = \mathbb{T}$  is in our problem) and that each  $f_n$  is continuous, then *f* must be continuous as a uniform limit of continuous functions. Also, if it makes sense to integrate over *X* we can integrate *f* by exchanging the order of the sum and the integral.

Instead of using the *M*-test stuff, we could follow the model used in the proof of Theorem 2.6.2. For  $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ ,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{1}{2^n} \zeta^n \right| = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = 1 < \infty$$

and so the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \zeta^n$  is absolutely convergent, hence convergent. It makes sense then to define  $F(\zeta)$  as we did above. To show uniform convergence, take  $\varepsilon > 0$  and choose  $N_0$  large enough that  $\sum_{n=N_0+1}^{\infty} 1/2^n < \varepsilon$ . Then for  $N \ge N_0$  we have

$$\left| F(\zeta) - \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2^n} \zeta^n \right| = \left| \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \zeta^n \right| \le \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \le \sum_{n=N_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} < \varepsilon.$$

That established uniform convergence of the partial sums  $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2^n} \zeta^n$  to  $F(\zeta)$ . As the partical sums are continuous on  $\mathbb{T}$ , we have  $F \in C(\mathbb{T})$ .

Finally we claim that  $\hat{F}(n) = 1/2^n$  for  $n \ge 0$  and  $\hat{F}(n) = 0$  for  $n \le 0$ .

$$\begin{split} \hat{F}(n) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} F(\zeta) \zeta^{-n} \, d\lambda(\zeta) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left( \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2^m} \zeta^m \right) \zeta^{-n} \, d\lambda(\zeta) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2^m} \zeta^{m-n} \, d\lambda(\zeta) \\ &= \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2^m} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \zeta^{m-n} \, d\lambda(\zeta) \end{split}$$

(where I am using  $\lambda$  for normalised arc length measure on T). The last step is justified by uniform convergence of the series. We know  $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \zeta^{m-n} d\lambda(\zeta) = 0$  if  $m \neq n$  and is 1 if m = n. So if  $n \leq 0$  we always get 0 but of  $n \geq 1$  we pick up one nonzero contribution of  $1/2^n$  once  $N \geq n$ . Hence the Fourier coefficients  $\hat{F}(n)$  are as claimed. 5. For F ∈ L<sup>1</sup>(T), let σ<sub>N</sub>F = (1/N)(S<sub>0</sub>F+S<sub>1</sub>F + S<sub>2</sub>F + · · · + S<sub>N-1</sub>F). (Note<sup>1</sup>.) Compute V<sub>N</sub>F = 2σ<sub>2N</sub>F − σ<sub>N</sub>F in terms of the Fourier coefficients of F.
Show that lim<sub>N→∞</sub> ||V<sub>N</sub>F − F||<sub>1</sub> = 0 (for F ∈ L<sup>1</sup>(T)).
Solution: We know

$$S_N F(\zeta) = \sum_{n=-N}^{N} \hat{F}(n)\zeta^n, \quad \sigma_N F(\zeta) = \sum_{n=-N}^{N} (1 - |n|/N)F(n)\zeta^n,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} V_N F(\zeta) &= 2\sigma_{2N} F(\zeta) - \sigma_N F(\zeta) \\ &= 2\sum_{n=-2N}^{2N} (1 - |n|/(2N)) F(n) \zeta^n - \sum_{n=-N}^N (1 - |n|/N) F(n) \zeta^n \\ &= \sum_{n=-N}^N (2 - |n|/N - 1 + |n|/N) F(n) \zeta^n + \sum_{N < |n| < 2N} 2(1 - |n|/(2N)) F(n) \zeta^n \\ &= \sum_{n=-N}^N \hat{F}(n) \zeta^n + \sum_{N < |n| < 2N} 2(1 - |n|/(2N)) F(n) \zeta^n \end{aligned}$$

We also know from Fejér's theorem (Corollay 2.6.1) applied to the case  $B = L^1(\mathbb{T})$  that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \|F - \sigma_N F\|_1 = 0.$$

It follows of course that  $\lim_{N\to\infty} ||F - \sigma_{2N}F||_1 = 0$  and so

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \|V_N F - F\|_1 = \lim_{N \to \infty} \|2\sigma_{2N} F - 2F - \sigma_N F + F\|_1$$
  
= 
$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \|2(\sigma_{2N} F - F) - (\sigma_N F - F)\|_1$$
  
$$\leq \lim_{N \to \infty} 2\|\sigma_{2N} F - F\|_1 + \|\sigma_N F - F\|_1 = 0$$

6. Find the Cesàro sum of  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n$  for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , |z| < 1.

Solution: For  $z \neq 1$  fixed, the partial sums are

$$s_n \sum_{j=0}^n z^j = \frac{1-z^{n+1}}{(1-z)}$$

(Geometric sum formula  $a + ar + \cdots + ar^{n-1} = a(1 - r^n)(1 - r)$  valid if  $r \neq 1$ .) One could argue that  $s_0$  is the first partial sum.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>There should be the  $S_0F$  term to make this consistent with the notation in the notes. 8/12/207

Then, the Cesàro sums are

$$\sigma_n = \frac{1}{n} (s_0 + s_1 + \dots + s_{n-1})$$
  
=  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1-z^j}{1-z}$   
=  $\frac{1}{n(1-z)} \left( n - \frac{1-z^n}{1-z} \right)$   
=  $\frac{1}{1-z} - \frac{1-z^n}{n(1-z)^2}$ 

If |z| = 1 (and we are already excluding z = 1) the  $z^n$  term has modulus 1 and so the limit is  $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sigma_n = 1/(1-z)$ .

That is the Cesàro sum of the series (but it is not a convergent series because  $z^n \not\to 0$  as  $n \to \infty$ .

If we look at the case z = 1, we find that  $s_n = n+1$  and  $\sigma_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} s_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} j+1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n k = \frac{1}{n} \frac{n(n+1)}{2} = (n+1)/2 \to \infty$ .

(The formula  $\sum_{k=1}^{n} k = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$  is a well-known one that can be established by induction. If you did not know it you could argue using the fact that  $s_j > n/2$  for about half the values of j, those with j > n/2, and then that will give  $\sigma_n$  bigger than about  $\frac{1}{n}(n/2)^2$ . To make that watertight you would need to account for things a little more carefully, depending on n even or odd and stuff.)

7. Let  $G = \mathbb{R}$ . What is Haar measure  $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}}$ ? Show that the characteristic function of the unit interval [0, 1] is in  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$  and compute its Fourier transform.

*Solution:* Haar measure  $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}}$  is usually taken to be just Lebesgue length measure (though the definition allows any positive multiple of that measure).

The characteristic function  $\chi_{[0,1]}$  is certainly in  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$  because it is measurable and has integral (of its absolute value)  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\chi_{[0,1]}| dx = 1$ .

It's Fourier transform is

$$\widehat{\chi_{[0,1]}}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{[0,1]}(x) e^{-2\pi i x \xi} \, dx = \int_0^1 e^{-2\pi i x \xi} \, dx = \left[\frac{e^{-2\pi i x \xi}}{-2\pi i \xi}\right]_{x=0}^1 = \frac{1 - e^{-2\pi i \xi}}{2\pi i \xi}$$

(for 
$$\xi \in \mathbb{R}$$
).

8. For  $G = \mathbb{Z}$ , what is Haar measure  $\lambda_{\mathbb{Z}}$ ? What does it mean for  $F, H : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$  to be equal almost everywhere? How is the Fourier transform of  $F \in L^1(\mathbb{Z}, \lambda_{\mathbb{Z}})$  defined?

Solution: Haar measure  $\lambda_{\mathbb{Z}}$  is counting measure (usually taken as that).

The only subset of  $\mathbb{Z}$  with counting measure zero is the empty set. So F(n) = H(n) almost everywhere means  $\lambda_{\mathbb{Z}}(\{n : F(n) \neq H(n)\}) = 0$  or F(n) = H(n) everywhere (for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ).

The characters of  $\mathbb{Z}$  are in one to one correspondence with elements  $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$  or all the characters are of the form  $\chi_{\zeta}(n) = \zeta^n$ , where  $\zeta = \chi_{\zeta}(1)$ . The Fourier transform of  $F \in L^1(\mathbb{Z}, \lambda_{\mathbb{Z}})$  is

$$\hat{F}(\chi_{\zeta}) = \hat{F}(\zeta) = \int_{\mathbb{Z}} F(n)\overline{\zeta^n} \, d\lambda_{\mathbb{Z}}(n) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} F(n)\overline{\zeta^n}$$

9. For  $G = \mathbb{Z}$ , find an exhaustion  $\mathbb{Z} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$  by compact sets.

Solution: We could take  $K_n = \{-n, -n+1, \dots, n-1, n\} = \{j \in \mathbb{Z} : |j| \le n\}$ . The  $K_n$  are compact (since finite), have union  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $K_n \subset K_{n+1}^{\circ} = K_{n+1}$  (as  $\mathbb{Z}$  has the discrete topology where all subsets are open).

For the distance function  $d_n \colon \hat{\mathbb{Z}} \times \hat{\mathbb{Z}} \to [0, \infty)$  given by

$$d_n(\chi_1, \chi_2) = \sup_{g \in K_n} |\chi_1(g) - \chi_2(g)|$$

find  $\chi \in \hat{\mathbb{Z}}$  with  $d_n(\chi, 1) = 0$  but  $\chi \neq 1$ . [Hint:  $\hat{\mathbb{Z}}$  is given in Proposition 1.3.11 (iii). Here 1 stands for the trivial character, which could also be written  $\chi_0, \chi_0(n) = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .] Solution: There is no such  $\chi$  as soon as  $1 \in K_n$  because if  $1 \in K_n$ , then  $d_n(\chi, 1) = 0$  implies  $|\chi(1) - 1| = 0 \Rightarrow \chi(1) = 1 \Rightarrow \chi(n) = \chi(1)^n = 1$  for all n. So  $\chi = 1$ .

Richard M. Timoney