Jaroslav Tišer On strict preponderant maxima

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 22 (1981), No. 3, 561--567

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/106097

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1981

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

COMMENTATIONES MATHEMATICAE UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE 22,3 (1981)

ON STRICT PREPONDERANT MAXIMA J. TIŠER

.

<u>Abstract</u>: It is proved that the set of points of strict preponderant maxima of a real-valued function of n variables is of measure zero. The proof uses the fact that each set of positive measure contains a compact, all points of which are points of upper symmetric density greater or equal than one half.

<u>Key words</u>: Preponderant maximum, Density Theorem. Classification: 26B35

It was shown in [3],[4],[1] that the set of points at which real-valued function defined on a Euclidean n-space takes on a strict density maximum, is of measure zero. We shall give a characterization of the set of points of strict preponderant maxima of a function (defined below).

The ideas of the proof of Proposition and Theorem are the same as in [1]. Lemma 2 improves a similar assertion in [1], where the property of a compact K contained in a set of positive measure is only $D^{-}(x,K) \ge \frac{1}{2}$ (D^{-} denotes ordinary upper metric density).

We assume that a Euclidean n-space R_n is fixed throughout this paper.

<u>Definition</u>. Let $A \subset R_n$, $x \in R_n$. Outer upper symmetric density of the set A at the point x is

- 561 -

$$D_{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{A}) = \overline{\lim_{\mu \to 0_{\mathbf{f}}} \frac{|\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{r}) \cap \mathbf{A}|}{|\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{r})|}}$$

If A is measurable, we leave out the word "outer". Similarly, we define lower density using lim.

<u>Definition</u>. Let f be a real-valued function on a Euc-Tidean n-space R_n . If $x \in R_n$ has the property

$$D_{s}^{-}(x,[t;f(t) \ge f(x)]) < \frac{1}{2}$$

we say that f attains a strict preponderant maximum at x.

We shall also need the following notation:

 $M_{\infty}(f) = \{x \in R_n; D_s^-(x, \{t; f(t) \ge f(x)\}) < \infty \}$, $0 < \infty \le 1$. Especially, $M_{\frac{1}{2}}(f)$ is the set of points of strict preponderant maxima of a function f.

Lemma 1. For arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\beta > 0$ that $\frac{|B(\mathbf{x}, \beta \mathbf{r}) \cap B(0, \mathbf{r})|}{|B(\mathbf{x}, \beta \mathbf{r})|} \ge \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$

for any r > 0 and $x \in B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{R}_n$.

We leave out the proof of this lemma because of its simple geometrical interpretation.

<u>Lemma 2</u>. If $A \subset R_n$ is a measurable set and |A| > a > 0, then there is a compact KCA such that

(i) |K|Za

(ii) $D_s(\mathbf{x},K) \ge \frac{1}{2}$ for every $\mathbf{x} \in K$.

<u>Proof</u>. There is no loss of generality in assuming that A is a compact subset of a unit cube $Q \subset R_n$. Let E_k be a finite $\frac{1}{k}$ -net of the cube Q, \mathcal{D} denotes a family of balls

$$\mathfrak{D} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{t} B(\mathbf{x}, \frac{1}{k}); \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{E}_{k}^{2}$$

and (σ_k) - a sequence of real numbers such that $\sigma_k \ge 0$,

 $1 > \sigma'_1 > \sigma'_2 > \dots > 0.$

We shall form an increasing sequence of compact sets $K_m^1 = \bigcup \{S \cap A; S \in \mathcal{D}, \text{ diam } S \ge \frac{1}{m}, \frac{|S \cap A|}{|S|} > 1 - \sigma_1^2\}, m = 1, 2, \dots$ If x is any point of density of A, then x belongs to all but We can find an m_1 so that $|K_{m_1}| > a$. We relabel $K_{m_1} = K_1$ and let \mathfrak{B}_1 denote the finite family of all S $\in \mathfrak{D}$ satisfying diam $S \ge \frac{1}{m_1}$ and $\frac{|S \cap A|}{|S|} > 1 - \sigma_1$. That is to say $K_1 = \bigcup_{S \in B_1} S \cap A$. Now put for $m = m_1 + 1, \ldots$

 $K_{m}^{2} = \bigcup \{ S \cap K_{1}; S \in \mathcal{D}, \frac{1}{m_{1}} > \text{diam } S \ge \frac{1}{m}, \frac{|S \cap K_{1}|}{|s|} > 1 - \sigma_{2}^{2} \}.$ Similarly, $|K_m^2| \not | K_1|$. Hence there is an $m_2 > m_1$ such that $|K_{m_2}^2| > a$ and at the same time $\frac{|S \cap K_{m_2}^2|}{|S|} > 1 - \sigma_1$ for $S \in \mathcal{B}_1$, because \mathcal{B}_1 is a finite family. Relabel $K_{m_2}^2 = K_2$ and let \mathcal{B}_2 be the finite family of all $S \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfying $\frac{1}{m_1} > \text{diam } S \ge \frac{1}{m_2}$ and $\frac{|S \cap K_1|}{|S|} > 1 - \sigma_2^{\prime}$.

Inductively, we proceed in the above fashion to obtain a sequence (K $_{j}$) of compact sets and a sequence of finite families $(\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{j}})$ of the balls of \mathfrak{D} such that

(1) Kj ⊂ A, Kj-1⊃Kj (2) $|K_i| > a$ (3) for $S \in \mathcal{B}_k \xrightarrow{[K_j \cap S]} > 1 - \sigma'_k, j \ge k$ (4) diam $S \leq \frac{1}{m_{\nu-1}}$ for $S \in \mathcal{B}_k$ $(m_0 = 1)$

- 563 -

(5) $K_j \subset \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{B}_j} S$ If we put $K = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_j} K_j$, it is clear that $K \subset A$ and $|K| \geq a$. Let $x \in K$. For every k there is $S_k \in \mathcal{B}_k$ such that $x \in S_k$ and $\frac{|K_j \cap S_k|}{|S_k|} > 1 - \sigma_k$ for $k \leq j$. Therefore $\frac{|K \cap S_k|}{|S_k|} \geq 1 - \sigma_k$ for every k.

Hence there is a sequence of balls $(S_k) \subset \mathfrak{D}$ such that $x \in S_k$ for every k and diam $S_k \rightarrow 0$. Let us choose $\varepsilon > 0$. We can find k_0 that $k \geq k_0$ implies

Let us choose another $\mathcal{E}_1 > 0$. By Lemma 1, there exists $\beta > 0$ such that if we denote by \widetilde{S}_k the ball with the center at \mathbf{x} and diam $\widetilde{S}_k = \beta \cdot \operatorname{diam} S_k$, then

$$\frac{|\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{k}} \cap \widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_{\mathbf{k}}|}{|\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \ge \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_1.$$

Now

$$\frac{|K \cap \widetilde{S}_{k}|}{|\widetilde{S}_{k}|} \geq \frac{|K \cap \widetilde{S}_{k} \cap S_{k}|}{|\widetilde{S}_{k}|} \geq \frac{|\widetilde{S}_{k} \cap S_{k}|}{|\widetilde{S}_{k}|} - \varepsilon \quad \frac{|S_{k}|}{|\widetilde{S}_{k}|} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_{1} - \varepsilon_{2} \frac{|S_{k}|}{|\widetilde{S}_{k}|} =$$
$$= \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_{1} - \varepsilon_{1}^{n} \text{ for } k \geq k_{0}.$$

Since $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ is arbitrary small, we have $D_s(x,K) \ge \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon \beta^n$. But also $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary and this completes the proof.

Lemma 3. If f is a measurable function, then $M_{\infty}(f)$ is a measurable set.

<u>Proof.</u> It suffices to show that if r is fixed, then the function $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{x}) = |B(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{r}) \cap \{t;f(t) \ge f(\mathbf{x})\}|$ is measurable. Let $E = \{x; \chi_r(x) < \lambda\}$ for $\lambda > 0$. Let us introduce an auxiliary function $\phi(x)$ given by

 $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \sup \{ c \in \mathbf{R}; | \{t; f(t) \ge c \} \cap B(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}) | \ge \lambda \}.$

Clearly, $E = \{x; f(x) > \phi(x)\}$. We will show $\phi(x)$ is an upper semicontinuous function, thereby establishing the lemma.

Let x_0 be fixed, $c > \phi(x_0)$. By definition of $\phi(x)$ we have

 $|\{t;f(t)\geq c\}\cap B(x_0,r) = \lambda - d, d>0.$

By choosing $\sigma' > 0$ small enough, we obtain

 $|B(x,r) \setminus B(x_0,r)| < d$ for $x \in B(x_0, \sigma')$,

hence $|ft;f(t) \ge c \beta \cap B(x,r)| < \lambda + d - d = \lambda$ i.e.

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{c} \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}_0, o^{\prime}).$$

<u>Proposition</u>. If $f:\mathbb{R}_n \to \mathbb{R}$ is measurable, then $|M_1(f)| = 2$ = 0.

<u>Proof.</u> Suppose not. There is a positive number a > 0 such that $|M_{\frac{1}{2}}(f)| > a$. Since f is measurable, by Lusin's Theorem and Lemma 2, there is a compact $K \subset M_{\frac{1}{2}}(f)$ satisfying (i),(ii) of Lemma 2 and on which f is continuous. Then there is an $x_0 \in C K$ that $f(t) \ge f(x_0)$ for every $t \in K$. This implies $K \subset \{t; f(t) \ge f(x_0)\}$ hence

$$D_{\mathbf{s}}^{-}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \{\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t}) \ge \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{0})\}) \ge \frac{1}{2}$$

contradicting the fact that $x_0 \in M_{\frac{1}{2}}(f)$.

Lemma 4. For each
$$f:\mathbb{R}_n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$
, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $r > 0$ the function
 $\Theta(\mathbf{x}) = |B(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}) \cap \{t; f(t) \ge c\}$

is upper semicontinuous.

<u>Proof.</u> Let $x_0 \in R_n$, $\varepsilon > 0$. Then we can choose $\sigma' > 0$ such that $|B(x,r) \setminus B(x_0,r)| < \varepsilon$ for $x \in B(x_0,\sigma')$. Now

- 565 -

 $\Theta(\mathbf{x}) = |B(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{r}) \cap \{t;f(t) \ge c\}| \ge |B(\mathbf{x}_0,\mathbf{r}) \cap \{t;f(t) \ge c\}| +$

+ $|(B(x,r) \setminus B(x_0,r)) \cap \{t; f(t) \ge c\}| < \Theta(x_0) + \varepsilon$.

<u>Corollary</u>. The function $x \to D_{\mathbf{s}}^{-}(x, \{t; f(t) \ge c\})$ is measurable for each $f: \mathbb{R}_{n} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. We can write

 $D_{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x},\{\mathbf{t};\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t})\geq \mathbf{c}\}) = \lim_{\substack{m \to \infty \\ n \to \infty \\ k-kational}} \sup_{\substack{\{\mathbf{t}:\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t})\geq \mathbf{c}\} \cap B(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{r}) \\ |B(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{r})|}} \frac{|\mathbf{t}:\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t})\geq \mathbf{c}\} \cap B(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{r})|}{|B(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{r})|}$

<u>Theorem</u>. If f is arbitrary, then $|M_{\frac{1}{2}}(f)| = 0$. <u>Proof</u>. Let us define the function

$$u(\mathbf{x}) = \inf\{ \mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{Q}; \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t}) \ge \mathbf{c}\}) < \frac{1}{2} \}$$

where Q denotes rational numbers. Considering the corollary we get the measurability of u. Further, it is easy to find out that $f(x) \le u(x)$ almost everywhere, because each set $\{x; f(x) > q > u(x)\}$ where $q \in Q$, has measure zero.

If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{f})$, then we see from the definition of u that $u(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{x})$, i.e. $u(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x})$ almost everywhere in $\mathbf{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{f})$. Let us denote by M the set of all points of $\mathbf{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{f})$ which are points of outer density of $\mathbf{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{f})$ and $f(\mathbf{x}) = u(\mathbf{x})$. Clearly, $|\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{A}| = |\mathbf{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{f}) \cap \mathbf{A}|$ for each measurable set A. If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{M}$, then $D_{\mathbf{g}}^{-}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{i}; \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t}) \geq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \} < \frac{1}{2}$ and also

$$D_{\mathbf{x}}^{-}(\mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{M}; \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t}) \geq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\}) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

• Because u(x) = f(x) for $x \in M$, we have

$$D_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{M}; \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{t}) \geq \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{t} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

This is equivalent to the fact $D_{s}^{-}(x, \{t \in M_{\frac{1}{2}}(f); u(t) \ge u(x)\}) < \frac{1}{2}$. Considering that x is a point of outer density of $M_{\frac{1}{2}}(f)$, it is easy to prove that $D_{s}^{-}(x, \{t; u(t) \ge u(x)\}) < \frac{1}{2}$, i.e. $x \in M_{\frac{1}{2}}(u)$.

- 566 -

Therefore $M \subset M_{\frac{1}{2}}(u)$, which is of measure zero by Proposition and we have $|M_{\frac{1}{2}}(f)| = 0$.

J. Foran [2] showed that for an arbitrary function f of n variables $|\mathbf{M}_{2^{-n}}(f)| = 0$ holds. He formulated a problem (P 1019) there, if the number 2^{-n} can be improved. We can see now that 2^{-n} eas improved to $\frac{1}{2}$ for every n. A further improving is not possible because even the set

 $\{\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{s}}^{-}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}; \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t}) \geq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\}) \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$

equals R_n for $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = x_1$.

This problem was also solved in a different way by L. Zajíček [5].

As we said in the introduction, the characterization of the set of points of preponderant maxima is to be of measure zero. It follows from Theorem and from the simple fact that a characteristic function of a set E of measure zero attains its preponderant maxima exactly at the points of E.

References

- R.J.O'MALLEY: Strict essential minima, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 33(1972), 501-504.
- [2] J. FORAN: On the density maxima of a function, Colloq. Math. 37(1977), 245-247.
- [3] I.J. GOOD: The approximate local monotony of measurable functions, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 36(1940), 9-13.
- [4] Å, CSÁSZÁR: Sur la structure des ensembles de niveau des fonctions réelles à deux variables, Acta Sci. Math. Szeged 15(1954), 183-202.
- [5] L. ZAJÍČEK: A note on preponderant maxima, Colloq. Math., to appear.

Matematicko-fyzikální fakulta, Universita Korlova, Sokolovská 83. 18600 Praha 8. Československo

(Oblatum 3.3, 1981)

- 567 -