Blahoslav Harman Subadditive maximal ergodic theorem

Mathematica Slovaca, Vol. 34 (1984), No. 3, 307--312

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/128976

Terms of use:

© Mathematical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1984

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://project.dml.cz

SUBADDITIVE MAXIMAL ERGODIC THEOREM

BLAHOSLAV HARMAN

The paper is aimed to generalize the so called maximal ergodic theorem, which can be formulated (see, e.g., [1]) as follows:

Let (X, S, μ, T) be a dynamical system, that is $X \neq \emptyset$, S is a σ — algebra on X, μ — measure on S and T: $X \rightarrow X$ a measure preserving transformation. Let f be an μ — integrable function defined on a set X. Let us denote $E = \{x \in X; \exists k \in N: f(x) + ... + f(T^{k-1}x) \ge 0\}$. Then

$$\int f \chi_E d\mu \ge 0. \tag{1}$$

The proof of this maximal ergodic theorem is based on the assertion, whose formal modifications (see [1], [2], [3]) can be formulated in common form as: Let us denote $E_n = \{x \in X; \exists k \le n: f(x) + ... + f(T^{k-1}x) \ge 0\}$. Then

$$\int f\chi_{E_n} d\mu \ge 0. \tag{2}$$

The proof of the assertion (1) is based only on the suitable limitation by using (2). Therefore (2) can be regarded as a kernel of a maximal ergodic theorem. If f is a nonnegative integrable function, then (2) is trivial. In this case a nontrivial consequence of (2) is the following assertion:

Let $a \ge 0$, $f \ge 0$. Let us denote

$$F_n = \{x \in X; \exists k \leq n: f(x) + \ldots + f(T^{k-1}x) \geq ka\},\$$

or

$$H_n = \{x \in X; \exists k \leq n: f(x) + \ldots + f(T^{k-1}x) \leq ka\} \quad \text{resp.}$$

Then

$$\int f\chi_{F_n} d\mu \ge a\mu(F_n), \tag{3}$$

resp.

$$\int f \chi_{H_n} d\mu \leq a \mu(H_n). \tag{4}$$

The generalization of the mentioned classical theorem is based on the changing of the integral with respect to a measure (that is of some linear functional defined on a set of integrable functions) by a sublinear functional I defined on a set F which is a subset of a set R^x , where X is a nonempty set. A measure preserving transformation is replaced by a transformation to which the functional I is

307

invariant. The exact formulation of the demands on the objects X, F, I, T is formulated in § 1.

In § 2 there are formulated some lemmas.

§ 3 is devoted to the generalized variant of a maximal ergodic theorem.

§ 4 contains an example using an integral with respect to a premeasure which is one of the representatives of the nonlinear functional I. The main importance of this example lies in showing the impossibility of the generalization of (4).

§ 1. Fundamental properties of a system (X, F, I, T)

- 1. Let us assume X to be a nonempty set. Let us denote a subset of a set of all real functions defined on X by the symbol F. The following conditions must be fulfilled:
 - a) If f, g are elements of F, then $f + g \in F$, max $(f, g) = f \lor g \in F$, min $(f, g) = f \land g \in F$.
 - b) If $c \in R$, $f \in F$, then $cf \in F$.
 - c) If $e: X \to R$ is the map defined by the formula e(x) = 1, then $e \in F$.
- 2. Let us denote by the symbol I a functional I: $F \rightarrow R$ with the following properties:
 - a) If $f, g \in F, f \leq g$, then $I(f) \leq I(g)$.
 - b) If $f \in F$, $c \in R$, then I(cf) = cI(f).
 - c) If $f \in F$, $g \in F$, $f \ge 0$, $g \ge 0$, then $I(f+g) \le I(f) + I(g)$ (subadditivity).
 - d) If $a \in R$, $a \ge 0$, $f \in F$, then $I(f) = I(f \land a) + I(f f \land a)$ (additivity in a horizontal sense).
 - e) Let $f_n \in F$ for $n \in N$, $f_n \nearrow f \in R^x$. Let a sequence $\{I(f_n)\}$ be upper bounded by a constant K. Then $f \in F$ and $I(f) \leq K$.
- 3. Let us denote by the symbol T a transformation T: $X \rightarrow X$. The following conditions on T must be fulfilled:
 - a) If $f \in F$, $Tf: X \to R$, $x \mapsto f(Tx)$, then $Tf \in F$.
 - b) If $f \in F$, then I(Tf) = I(f).

§ 2. Some elementar properties

This paragraph is devoted to simple lemmas, which aim at securing the correction of the following considerations.

Lemma 1. Let $f \in F$, $f \ge 0$, $a \ge 0$. Let us denote

$$M = \{x \in X; f(x) > 0\}.$$

Then $I(f + a\chi_M) = I(f) + aI(\chi_M)$.

Proof: The assertion of lemma is the straightforward consequence of a property 2d from § 1 (additivity in a horizontal sense) of the functional I.

$$I(f + a\chi_M) = I((f + a\chi_M) \land a) + I((f + a\chi_M) - (f + a\chi_M) \land a) =$$

= $I(a\chi_M) + I(f) = I(f) + aI(\chi_M).$ Q.E.D.

Lemma 2. Let $f \in F$. Let us denote

$$M = \{x \in X; f(x) > 0\}$$

Then $\chi_M \in F$.

Proof: Let us denote $g_n = \min(n \max(f, 0), e)$ for $n \in N$. It is easy to see $g_n \in F$, $g_n \leq e$. Therefore the sequence $\{I(g_n)\}$ is upper bounded by the constant I(e). Moreover $g_n \nearrow \chi_M$. By using the property 2e we obtain $\chi_M \in F$.

Q.E.D.

Lemma 3. Let $f \in F$, $f \ge 0$, $A \subset X$, $\chi_A \in F$. Then $f\chi_A \in F$. Proof: Let us denote $h_n = \min(f, n\chi_A)$, $n \in N$.

Evidently $h_n \in F$, $I(h_n) \leq I(f)$. Therefore $\{I(h_n)\}$ is an upper bounded sequence. Moreover $h_n \wedge f\chi_A$. By using 2e we obtain $f\chi_A \in F$.

Q.E.D.

§ 3. Maximal ergodic theorem

An assertion analogical to the classical maximal ergodic theorem will be proved in the next paragraph. For its formulation we need some notations. Let $f \in F$, $f \ge 0$, $a \ge 0$, $k \in N$. Let us denote

$$S_{k} = f + Tf + ... + T^{k-1}f - ka$$

$$M_{n} = \max (0, S_{1}, ..., S_{n})$$

$$A_{n} = \{x \in X; M_{n}(x) > 0\}.$$

By lemmas 2, 3 the functions S_k , M_n , χ_{A_n} are elements of F.

Theorem 1. Let $f \in F$, $f \ge 0$. Let f be a bounded function. Let $a \ge 0$. Then $I(f\chi_{A_n}) \ge aI(\chi_{A_n})$.

Proof. For a = 0 an assertion of the theorem is trivial.

Let us assume a > 0. It is evident that $M_n \ge S_k$. However, $TS_k = Tf + ... + T^k f - ka = S_{k+1} - f + a$ thus it follows that $f + TM_n \ge S_{k+1} + a$. All these relationships are valid for k = 1, 2, ..., n.

It is easy to see that $f + TM_n \ge f - a + a = S_1 + a$. Hence

$$(f + TM_n)\chi_{A_n} \ge \max (S_1, S_2, ..., S_{n+1})\chi_{A_n} + a\chi_{A_n} = = \max (0, S_1, ..., S_{n+1})\chi_{A_n} + a\chi_{A_n} = = M_{n+1}\chi_{A_n} + a\chi_{A_n}$$

309

and then

$$f\chi_{A_n} \ge \chi_{A_n} M_{n+1} - (TM_n)\chi_{A_n} + a\chi_{A_n} \ge \ge \chi_{A_n} M_n - (TM_n)\chi_{A_n} + a\chi_{A_n} = = M_n - (TM_n)\chi_{A_n} + a\chi_{A_n}.$$

For obtaining the last inequality, the relationship $M_{n+1} \ge M_n$ and $M_n(x) > 0$ iff $x \in A_n$ has been employed. Let k > 1 such that $M_n - (TM_n)\chi_{A_n} + ka\chi_{A_n} \ge 0$. This is possible because of the assumption a > 0 and the fact that the functions f, M_n, TM_n are bounded and all functions occurring in this inequality are equal to zero for $x \notin A_n$. Moreover there is valid

$$I(M_n + ka\chi_{A_n}) = I(M_n - (TM_n)\chi_{A_n} + ka\chi_{A_n} + (TM_n)\chi_{A_n}) \leq \\ \leq I(M_n - (TM_n)\chi_{A_n} + ka\chi_{A_n}) + I((TM_n)\chi_{A_n}) \leq \\ \leq I(M_n - (TM_n)\chi_{A_n} + ka\chi_{A_n}) + I(TM_n) = \\ = I(M_n - (TM_n)\chi_{A_n} + a\chi_{A_n} + (k - 1)a\chi_{A_n}) + I(M_n) \leq \\ \leq I(f\chi_{A_n} + (k - 1)a\chi_{A_n}) + I(M_n) \leq I(f\chi_{A_n}) + a(k - 1)I(\chi_{A_n}) + I(M_n).$$

From lemma 1 it follows that

$$I(M_n + ka\chi_{A_n}) = I(M_n) + kaI(\chi_{A_n}).$$

By applying the last inequality we obtain after a short arrangement the assertion of the theorem.

Q.E.D.

The following theorem can be considered as a limit case of the preceding one. Firstly we must introduce the notations.

$$A = \{x \in X; \exists p \in N: f(x) + f(Tx) + \dots + f(T^{p-1}x) > pa\}.$$

Theorem 2. Let $f \in F$, $f \ge 0$, $a \ge 0$. Let f be a bounded function. Then $I(f\chi_{A_n}) \ge aI(\chi_A)$.

Proof. For a = 0 the assertion of the theorem is trivial. Let us assume a > 0. Evidently

$$A_n \subset A_{n+1}$$
$$A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$$

and then

Moreover $\chi_{A_n} \in F$, $I(\chi_{A_n}) \leq I(e)$ and $\chi_A \in F$. By lemma 3 $f\chi_A \in F$. By using the above mentioned relationships and theorem 1 we obtain $I(f\chi_A) \geq I(f\chi_{A_n})$. There-

fore $\{I(\chi_{A_n})\}$ is a sequence bounded by $\frac{1}{a}I(f\chi_A)$. Hence from $I(\chi_A) \leq \frac{1}{a}I(f\chi_A)$ the assertion of the theorem follows.

Q.E.D.

§ 4. Application of an integral with respect to a premeasure

In the preceding paragraph a positive result concerning the relation (3) was obtained. By applying an integral with respect to a premeasure a negative result concerning the relation (4) will be shown. Let us assume $f \in F$, $f \ge 0$, $a \ge 0$. Let us denote

$$N_n = \min (0, S_1, S_2, ..., S_n)$$

$$B_n = \{x \in X; N_n(x) < 0\}.$$

It will be shown that an arbitrary relation between the values $aI(\chi_{B_n})$ and $I(f\chi_{B_n})$ is allowed. The functional I will be replaced by an integral with respect to a premeasure which is introduced in [4]. Further properties of this integral have been worked out in [4], [5], [6]. The example given will be calculated by a method from [5], page 259. This method is applicable to the calculation of an integral of a real function of a real variable with respect to a premeasure μ . Let us denote this integral by a symbol $J_{\mu}(f)$. In order to get a better survey let us introduce a necessary formula

$$J_{\mu}(f)=\int_{R}g(t)d\lambda,$$

where λ is the Lebesgue measure and a function g is defined by the relation $g(t) = \mu(\{x \in X; f(x) > t\})$.

Let $X = \langle 0, 1 \rangle$, $\mu = \sqrt{\lambda}$. Let F be a set of all integrable functions with respect to the premeasure μ defined on the set $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$. The functional I will be defined as follows: $I(f) = J_{\mu}(f)$. As a transformation T define T: $\langle 0, 1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle 0, 1 \rangle$, $x \mapsto (x + \frac{1}{2}) \mod 1$.

It is evident that this transformation is λ -preserving and, due to the definition of μ , premeasure μ preserving. It is easy to show that $J_{\mu}(f) = J_{\mu}(Tf)$. Moreover from the properties of the integral with respect to a premeasure it follows that all conditions required in a system (X, F, I, T) are fulfilled.

In the following example we shall work with the function $N = N_2 = \min(0, S_1, S_2)$ and with the set $B = \{x \in (0, 1); N_2(x) < 0\}$.

Example. Let $g: \langle 0, 1 \rangle \rightarrow R$, $t \mapsto \sqrt{t}$, $f = g\chi \left\langle 0, \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle$.

Let $a \in \left(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}\right)$. After a short calculation we obtain

$$B = \langle 0, 4a^2 \rangle \cup \left\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right\rangle$$
$$I(f\chi_B) = J_\mu(f\chi_B) = \pi a^2$$
$$aI(\chi_B) = aJ_\mu(f\chi_B) = a \sqrt{4a^2 + \frac{1}{2}}$$

Let us denote

$$\xi=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2(\pi^2-4)}}\,.$$

It is easy to see that

$$I(f\chi_{B}) > aI(\chi_{B}) \quad \text{if} \quad a \in \left(\xi, \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}\right)$$
$$I(f\chi_{B}) = aI(\chi_{B}) \quad \text{if} \quad a = \xi$$
$$I(f\chi_{B}) < aI(\chi_{B}) \quad \text{if} \quad a \in (0, \xi).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] HALMOS, P. R.: Lectures on Ergodic Theory. Tokyo 1953.
- [2] WALTERS, P.: Ergodic Theory. Introductory Lectures. Springer, Berlin, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1975.
- [3] RIESZ, F.: Sur la théorie ergodique. Comm. Math. Helv. 17, 1945.
- [4] ŠIPOŠ, J.: Integral with respect to a premeasure. Math. Slov. 29, 1979, 141-155.
- [5] ŠIPOŠ, J.: Nonlinear integrals. Math. Slov. 29, 1979, 257–270.
- [6] ŠIPOŠ, J.: Integral representations of nonlinear functionals. Math. Slov. 29, 1979, 333-345.

Received February 16, 1982

Vysoká vojenská techn. škola katedra matematiky 031 19 Liptovský Mikuláš

СУБАДДИТИВНАЯ МАКСИМАЛЬНАЯ ЭРГОДИЧЕСКАЯ ТЕОРЕМА

Blahoslav Harman

Резюме

В работе приведено обобщение так называемой классической максимальной эргодической теоремы для случая сублинейного функционала. В примере использован нелинейный интеграл, основанный на понятии предмеры. На этом примере также показано, что с данной точки зрения не всегда возможно обобщение приведенной теоремы.