

ALMOST PERIODIC EXTENSIONS OF FUNCTIONS, II

BY

S. HARTMAN AND C. RYLL-NARDZEWSKI (WROCLAW)

The following properties of a subset A of the real axis L were introduced in [1].

I : A has property I (or is an I -set or belongs to the class I : $A \in I$) if every bounded real or complex valued function on A which is uniformly continuous on A with respect to the usual metric in L can be extended to an almost periodic (a. p.) function over L .

I_0 : Terms and definition are analogous but the uniform continuity is not assumed.

As was pointed out in [1], these properties make sense for an arbitrary locally compact abelian group G instead of L . Obviously, the uniform continuity must then be understood with respect to the uniform group structure in G . No attention was given in [1] to property I except for $G = L$ (only I_0 was investigated in the general case). However, we find suitable to treat here both I and I_0 for arbitrary abelian locally compact groups in spite of the fact that I is irrelevant for compact groups since every set is then an I -set. Similarly, two other properties defined in [1] for sequences of reals may be now reformulated for the general case:

$A \in O$ if $\mu(\tilde{A}) = 0$, \tilde{A} (or A^\sim) denoting the weak closure of A , i. e. its closure in the Bohr compactification \tilde{G} of the group G (for the definition see [1], p. 24) and μ being the Haar measure in \tilde{G} ,

$A \in B$ if there is a compact set $K \subset G$ such that $A + K = G$.

The unsolved problem P 452 in [1] was: does I_0 or even I imply O ? The unsolved problem P 453 was: does I_0 or even I imply the negation B' of B ?

Both problems were formulated only for $G = L$ and for $A = \{a_n\}$ ($a_{n+1} > a_n$). We must correct at this place some error in [1]: property B was there defined as $a_{n+1} - a_n < d$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$). But then the implication $I \rightarrow B'$ is false for bounded sequences and for unbounded it follows from $I_0 \rightarrow B'$; thus the second question in P 453 should not have been posed at all. If we had adopted for B our present definition, $I \rightarrow B'$

would be equivalent with $I_0 \rightarrow B'$. This equivalence is true for all locally compact non-compact groups, as can be easily proved; for compact groups B is fulfilled trivially by every set and so $I \rightarrow B'$ is wrong. Thus, at any rate, we have to drop the second part of P 453. It remains the question: does I_0 imply B' for non-compact groups? (P_c 453 ⁽¹⁾).

Now we are able to answer positively the first part of P 452 for non-discrete separable groups and P_c 453 for separable non-compact groups. The corresponding theorems and some corollaries resulting therefrom are object of section 2. Section 1 is devoted to a preparatory "thickening theorem" (Theorem 1). In section 3 we deal with the problem of finding a. p. extensions the Fourier series of which converge absolutely.

1. THEOREM 1. *If A is an I_0 -set in a separable abelian locally compact group G , then there exists a neighbourhood V of the identity (i. e. of the zero element) in G such that $E = A + V$ is an I -set.*

Proof. We notice that every I_0 -set consists of isolated points only and so in view of the separability of G we may arrange A in a sequence $\{a_n\}$. Next we show that it is sufficient to find a compact neighbourhood V with the following property:

- (*) for every 0-1 sequence $\{t_n\}$ there is an a. p. function such that $f(a_n + u) = t_n$ ($u \in V$; $n = 1, 2, \dots$).

If f is a real valued function, defined and uniformly continuous on E and if $a < b$, then we put $E_1 = \{x \in E: f(x) < a\}$ and $E_2 = \{x \in E: f(x) > b\}$, and we have to prove that $\tilde{E}_1 \cap \tilde{E}_2 = \emptyset$. This will show that E is an I -set, in view of the evident lemma (cf. [1], Lemma 1): If f is a bounded real function defined on a subset E of a normal topological space X and the closures of the sets $\{x \in E: f(x) < a\}$ and $\{x \in E: f(x) > b\}$ are disjoint for any numbers a and $b > a$, then f has an extension to a continuous function on X .

Assume to the contrary that E_1 and E_2 have a common cluster point a in G . From (*) it follows that for every splitting $N = N_1 \cup N_2$ of the set N of positive integers the sets

$$\left[\bigcup_{n \in N_i} (a_n + V) \right]^\sim \quad (i = 1, 2)$$

are disjoint. Hence, for each weak neighbourhood U of a there must be an index n such that there exists a point $x \in E_1 \cap (a_n + V) \cap U$ and a point $y \in E_2 \cap (a_n + V) \cap U$. Hence $x - y \in V - V$. Since V is compact, the topology in $V - V$ is the same whether this set is considered in G or in \tilde{G} . So for every neighbourhood W of the identity in G we can find U such that for $x, y \in U$ the condition $x - y \in V - V$ implies $x - y \in W$. Hence

⁽¹⁾ The subscript c stands for "correct".

for every W there would be two points $x \in E_1$ and $y \in E_2$ such that $x - y \in W$. This contradicts the uniform continuity of f on E .

Let now $\{V_n\}$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) be a complete system of compact neighbourhoods of the identity in the (separable!) group G . If $t = \{t_n\}$ is a fixed 0-1 sequence, we put $N_1^t = \{n \in N : t_n = 0\}$, $N_2^t = \{n \in N : t_n = 1\}$, $A_1^t = \{a_n : n \in N_1\}$ and $A_2^t = \{a_n : n \in N_2\}$. Since \tilde{A}_1 and \tilde{A}_2 are disjoint in the (normal) space \tilde{G} we can find a neighbourhood U of the identity in \tilde{G} such that $\tilde{A}_1 + U$ and $\tilde{A}_2 + U$ are still disjoint. There is an n such that $V_n \subset U$ and so $(A_1 + V_n)^\sim$ and $(A_2 + V_n)^\sim$ are disjoint.

Let C be the cartesian product of \aleph_0 cyclic groups C_2 . We consider each t as an element of C and claim that for every fixed m the set

$$Z_m = \{t : (A_1^t + V_m)^\sim \cap (A_2^t + V_m)^\sim = \emptyset\}$$

is a subgroup of C . To show this one must prove that for $t_1, t_2 \in Z_m$, $N_1 = (N_1^{t_1} \cap N_1^{t_2}) \cup (N_2^{t_1} \cap N_2^{t_2})$, $N_2 = N_2^{t_1} \dot{-} N_2^{t_2}$ ($\dot{-}$ denoting the symmetric difference) and $A_i = \{a_n : n \in N_i\}$ ($i = 1, 2$) one has

$$(1) \quad (A_1 + V_m)^\sim \cap (A_2 + V_m)^\sim = \emptyset.$$

We observe that if a set D is disjoint with both $\tilde{D}_1 + V$ and $\tilde{D}_2 + V$, then it is also disjoint with $(D_1 \cup D_2)^\sim + V = (\tilde{D}_1 + V) \cup (\tilde{D}_2 + V)$. We put

$$D = [(A_2^{t_1} \setminus A_2^{t_2}) + V_m]^\sim, \quad D_1 = A_1^{t_1} \cap A_1^{t_2}, \quad D_2 = A_2^{t_1} \cap A_2^{t_2}.$$

Since $A_1 = (A_1^{t_1} \cap A_1^{t_2}) \cup (A_2^{t_1} \cap A_2^{t_2})$ and $A_2 = A_2^{t_1} \dot{-} A_2^{t_2}$ ($i = 1, 2$) we have to prove that

$$(2) \quad D \cap (\tilde{D}_1 + V_m) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad (3) \quad D \cap (\tilde{D}_2 + V_m) = \emptyset.$$

The analogous formulae with t_1 instead of t_2 and vice versa follow then by symmetry and the four together imply (1).

The set D is contained in $(A_2^{t_1} + V_m)^\sim$ and in view of $t_1 \in Z_m$ it is disjoint with the set $(A_1^{t_1} + V_m)^\sim$ containing $\tilde{D}_1 + V_m$. So (2) holds. On the other hand, $D \subset (A_1^{t_2} + V_m)^\sim$ (since $t_2 \in Z_m$ and $A_1^{t_1} \cup A_2^{t_1} = A$) whereas $\tilde{D}_2 + V_m$ is a subset of $(A_2^{t_2} + V_m)^\sim$. Hence (3) holds in view of $t_2 \in Z_m$.

Observe that in view of the definition of Z_m the set $\{a_n + V_m\}$ fulfils partially condition (*), namely with respect to all 0-1 sequences from Z_m . We must now find V which would be good in general. We begin with proving that Z_m is measurable with respect to the Haar measure in C . For this purpose we will show that Z_m is an analytic subset of C . Let X be the space of all continuous functions on G with a topology of uniform convergence on compact sets. Since G is separable and locally compact (so σ -compact), X is a separable metrizable complete space. The almost periodic functions form a Borel set Y in X . In fact, denoting by $g = \{g_n\}$

$(g_n \in G)$ an element of the (separable) space G^{\aleph_0} , we have

$$(f \in Y) \equiv \bigwedge_{\varepsilon > 0} \bigvee_g \bigvee_{\mu \in N} \bigwedge_{z \in G} \bigvee_{n \leq \mu} \bigwedge_{u \in G} (|f(u+z) - f(u+g_n)| < \varepsilon).$$

The third and fifth quantor are obviously countable; the first can be replaced by a denumerable one (e. g. by taking ε rational), this being the case for the remaining quantors too, in view of the separability of G and G^{\aleph_0} and the uniform continuity of f . The sets of the form $\{f: f(u_0) = \alpha_0\}$ are evidently closed, hence Y is Borel. Now we write

$$(t \in Z_m) \equiv \bigvee_{t \in Y} \bigwedge_n (f(a_n + V_m) = t_n).$$

This is enough to see that Z_m is analytic. Since $C = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} Z_m$, $Z_m \subset Z_{m+1}$ and the Z_m 's are measurable, all Z_m 's for m sufficiently large are of positive Haar measure and hence open subgroups of C . Since C is compact, there must be an index m_0 such that $Z_{m_0} = C$. This means that the set $\{a_n + V_{m_0}\}$ has the desired property (*) and so it is an I -set.

Let us remark that Theorem 1 is irrelevant for discrete groups, because the assertion is then satisfied for $V = (0)$.

2. THEOREM 2. *If G is non-discrete and separable and A is an I_0 -set in G , then $\mu(\tilde{A}) = 0$.*

Proof. According to Theorem 1 we choose a neighbourhood V of the identity in G so that $A+V$ be an I -set. Since G is non-discrete, V consists of infinitely many points. If $x_1, x_2 \in V$, $x_1 \neq x_2$, then the set $\bigcup_{i=1}^2 (A+x_i)$ is an I_0 -set because every bounded function f on it can be obviously extended to a uniformly continuous function on $A+V$ and further to an a. p. function over G . In particular, one can put $f(x) = 0$ for $x \in A+x_1$ and $f(x) = 1$ for $x \in A+x_2$. Hence the weak closures $(A+x_1)^\sim = \tilde{A}+x_1$ and $(A+x_2)^\sim = \tilde{A}+x_2$ are disjoint. If now x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots are different points from V , then the sets $\tilde{A}+x_i$ are pairwise disjoint and the μ -measure of each of them is evidently equal to $\mu(\tilde{A})$. Since $\mu(\tilde{G}) = 1$, it must be $\mu(\tilde{A}) = 0$.

Remark 1. Theorem 2 does by no means imply that

$$\mu\left(\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (A+x_i)\right)^\sim\right) = 0.$$

It is still an open problem whether $\mu(\tilde{A}) = 0$ must hold for every I -set in a non-compact group (**P 547**).

Remark 2. In the intrinsic language of the group G , $\mu(\tilde{A}) = 0$ for A being an I -set means that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a non-negative

a. p. function equal to 1 on A whose mean value is less than ε . In fact, this follows at once from the known equation

$$\text{mean value of } f = \int_G f^*(x) d\mu,$$

where f^* is the continuous extension of an a. p. function f over \tilde{G} .

THEOREM 3. *In a separable, locally compact but non-compact group G property I_0 implies B' .*

Proof. Let $A \subset G$ and $A \in I_0$. By [5] (Theorem 1⁽²⁾) the set A has no weak accumulation points in G . Clearly, every subset $A_1 \subseteq A$ has this property too. Further, for every compact set $K \subseteq G$ we have

(i) the sets $A + K$ and $A_1 + K$ are weakly closed in G , as they are group-sums of a set weakly closed in G and a compact set.

Let us recall once more that for subsets of G the compactness and the weak compactness are equivalent, and, moreover,

(ii) on a bounded subset of G (i. e. such that its closure is compact) the strong and the weak topology coincide.

We will show now that both topologies coincide on $A + K$. For an arbitrary point $x_0 \in A + K$ we put

$$A_1 = \{y \in A : x_0 \notin y + K\}.$$

It is easy to see that $x_0 \in (A + K) \setminus (A_1 + K)$, the set $A \setminus A_1$ is finite and, moreover, that the set $(A + K) \setminus (A_1 + K)$ is bounded and weakly open in $A + K$ (see (i)). Hence, in view of (ii), the family of all sets of the form $U \cap ((A + K) \setminus (A_1 + K))$, where U is open in G and $x_0 \in U$, is a complete system of neighbourhoods in $A + K$ of the point x_0 in both topologies. Consequently, if there were a compact set $K \subseteq G$ such that $A + K = G$, then the weak topology in G would be the same as the strong, hence G would be a compact group.

An obvious consequence of Theorem 3 is that an I_0 -sequence $\{a_n\}$ on the real line has bounded differences: $a_{n+1} - a_n < d$. However, we do not know whether an I -set on the line must be of the relative measure 0, i. e. whether for an I -set A there is

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} |A \cap (0, T)| = 0,$$

| | denoting the Lebesgue measure. It would be so if $\mu(\tilde{A}) = 0$.

⁽²⁾ This was proved for the real line, but the proof remains valid for every separable locally compact abelian group.

3. Let us denote by $|a. p. (G)|$ the class of all complex valued almost periodic functions on an abelian topological group G , with absolutely convergent Fourier expansions. By the definition of the property I_0 every bounded function φ on $A \in I_0$ has an extension to an a. p. function f on G . One can ask about the existence of an extension belonging to $|a. p. (G)|$ ⁽³⁾. This new property of A will be denoted by $|I_0|$. Some positive partial answers will be given below.

If $f \in |a. p. (G)|$ and $f = \sum c_n \chi_n$, where χ_n are characters of G , then we define the norm $\|f\| = \sum |c_n|$.

LEMMA 1. *If $f \in |a. p. (H)|$ and h is a homomorphism from G into an abelian topological group H , then $fh \in |a. p. (G)|$ and $\|fh\| \leq \|f\|$.*

This inequality can be checked directly.

LEMMA 2. *If G is compact and F_1 and F_2 are closed and disjoint subsets of G , then there is a function $f \in |a. p. (G)|$ such that $f(x) = 0$ for $x \in F_1$ and $f(x) = 1$ for $x \in F_2$.*

Proof. From the well-known theorem of Pontrjagin it follows that there exists a homomorphism h of G into a finitely dimensional torus H such that the sets $h(F_1)$ and $h(F_2)$ are disjoint. There is a separating function g , i. e.

$$(4) \quad g(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } y \in h(F_1), \\ 1 & \text{for } y \in h(F_2), \end{cases}$$

which is regular enough (say indefinitely derivable) to have $g \in |a. p. (H)|$. Lemma 1, the property (4) and the evident inclusions

$$F_1 \subseteq h^{-1}h(F_1) \quad \text{and} \quad F_2 \subseteq h^{-1}h(F_2)$$

imply that the function $f = gh$ has all required properties.

THEOREM 4. *If $A \subset G$ and $A \in I_0$, and φ is a function with a finite range, then φ admits an extension to an f from $|a. p. (G)|$.*

Proof. It suffices to consider a function φ taking the values 0 and 1 only. Let k denote the natural embedding of G into its Bohr compactification \tilde{G} . From the property I_0 of A follows that the sets

$$\{k(x): x \in A \text{ and } \varphi(x) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{k(x): x \in A \text{ and } \varphi(x) = 1\}$$

have disjoint closures F_1, F_2 in \tilde{G} . By Lemma 2 there exists a function $g \in |a. p. (G)|$ which is equal to 0 on F_1 and is equal to 1 on F_2 . Obviously the function $f = gk$ has the desired property.

⁽³⁾ This question, in the case of real line, has been formulated by J.-P. Kahane, who has also observed that an I_0 -set A has property $|I_0|$ if and only if \tilde{A} is the Helson set (see [2], p. 139) in the Bohr compactification.

For some special class of I_0 -sets on the real line L we are able to give a complete solution.

THEOREM 5. *Every sequence of reals $\{t_n\}$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) such that*

$$(5) \quad t_1 > 0, \quad t_{n+1}/t_n > 1 + \delta \quad (\delta > 0)$$

belongs to $|I_0|$.

Proof. Strzelecki has shown in [7] that sequences satisfying (5) belong to I_0 . Now, let us observe that if A is an arbitrary I_0 -set and if it can be split into a finite number of parts A_1, \dots, A_k such that $A_i \in |I_0|$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$), then $A \in |I_0|$. In fact, by Theorem 4 there are functions $e_1, \dots, e_k \in |\text{a. p.}|$ such that e_i is equal to 1 on A_i and vanishes on the remaining A_j . If φ is a bounded function on A and f_i denotes an $|\text{a. p.}|$ extension of $\varphi|_{A_i}$, then it is easy to check that $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i f_i$ is an $|I_0|$ -extension of φ .

In view of this remark we can restrict our consideration to sequences satisfying

$$(6) \quad t_1 > 0, \quad t_{n+1}/t_n > 3 + \delta \quad (\delta > 0).$$

Mycielski has proved [4] that, given a sequence $A = \{t_n\}$ fulfilling (6), there is a periodic continuous function $F(t)$ such that every 0-1 function on A has an extension on the whole line of the form $F(qt)$, where q is a suitably chosen constant $\neq 0$. If we take $F(t)$ sufficiently smooth, e. g. continuously derivable, then F is an $|\text{a. p.}|$ -function and all functions $F(qt)$ have clearly the same norm:

$$(7) \quad \|F(q\cdot)\| = C \text{ for all } q \neq 0.$$

Let φ be a bounded function on A . We may assume that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$. We form now the dyadic expansion of φ :

$$\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} j_i/2^i, \quad \text{where } j_i = 0 \text{ or } 1, i = 1, 2, \dots$$

We know that there is an $|\text{a. p.}|$ -extension f_i of j_i such that $\|f_i\| = C$ (see (7)), hence the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i/2^i$ (which is absolutely convergent in the norm $\|\cdot\|$) gives the required extension of φ .

The general problem of the equality $I_0 = |I_0|$ remains open (**P 548**). Let us mention that the answer would be positive if we were able to prove the following

CONJECTURE. *If T is a linear operator from a Banach space X into the space $m(A)$ of all bounded numerical functions defined on an abstract set A , such that the range of T contains the set $E(A)$ of all 0-1 valued functions on A , then $T(X) = m(A)$.*

In order to see that the Conjecture really implies $I_0 = |I_0|$ one has to put $X = |a. p. (G)|$ and $T(f) = f|_A$ ($f \in X, A \in I_0$) and to apply Theorem 4.

On the other hand, it turns out that the Conjecture formulated above is equivalent to the following (unpublished) problem of S. Mazur and W. Orlicz: A set Q in a Banach space is called *barrel* if every sequence of linear functionals ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots which is pointwise convergent to zero on Q is a bounded sequence, i. e. $\sup_n \|\xi_n\| < \infty$. Is the set $E(A)$ a barrel in $m(A)$?

Added in proof. Problems P 452 and P 453 have already been solved (see [6] and [3] respectively).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Hartman and C. Ryll-Nardzewski, *Almost periodic extensions of functions*, Colloquium Mathematicum 12 (1964), p. 23-39.
- [2] J.-P. Kahane and R. Salem, *Ensembles parfaits et séries trigonométriques*, Paris 1963.
- [3] J.-P. Kahane, *Ensembles de Ryll-Nardzewski et ensembles de Helson*, this volume, p. 87-91.
- [4] J. Mycielski, *On a problem of interpolation by periodic functions*, Colloquium Mathematicum 8 (1961), p. 95-97.
- [5] C. Ryll-Nardzewski, *Concerning almost periodic extensions of functions*, ibidem 12 (1964), p. 235-237.
- [6] — *Interpolation sets in compact groups*, ibidem, to appear.
- [7] E. Strzelecki, *On a problem of interpolation by periodic and almost periodic functions*, Colloquium Mathematicum 11 (1963), p. 91-99.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE WROCLAW UNIVERSITY

Reçu par la Rédaction le 31. 12. 1964