

# Uniqueness of Almost Everywhere Convergent Vilenkin Series

W. R. Wade

*Abstract.* D. J. Grubb [3] has shown that uniqueness holds, under a mild growth condition, for Vilenkin series which converge almost everywhere to zero. We show that, under even less restrictive growth conditions, one can replace the limit function 0 by an arbitrary  $f \in L^q$ , when  $q > 1$ .

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathbf{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , and  $\mathcal{P} := \{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$  be any sequence of integers which satisfies  $p_n \geq 2$ . For each  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  set  $P_n := p_0 p_1 \cdots p_{n-1}$ , where the empty product is by definition 1. The *multiplicative Vilenkin group* associated with  $\mathcal{P}$  is the set  $G := \{(x_0, x_1, \dots) : x_k \in \mathbf{N} \text{ and } 0 \leq x_k < p_k\}$  together with the operation

$$x + y := (x_0 \oplus y_0, x_1 \oplus y_1, \dots),$$

where  $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots)$ ,  $y = (y_0, y_1, \dots)$  and, for each  $k$ ,  $x_k \oplus y_k$  represents the sum of  $x_k$  and  $y_k$  modulo  $p_k$ . The dual group of  $G$  is the system  $(w_n, n \in \mathbf{N})$ , defined for  $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots)$ , by

$$(1) \quad w_n(x) := \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i n_k x_k}{p_k}\right),$$

where the coefficients  $n_k$  are integers which satisfy  $0 \leq n_k < p_k$  and  $n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} n_k P_k$  (see Vilenkin [4] for details). When  $p_k := 2$  for all  $k$ , the group  $G$  is called the *dyadic group* and the characters  $w_n$  are called the *Walsh system*. When  $p_k = O(1)$ , the system  $\{w_n\}$  is called a (multiplicative) Vilenkin system of *bounded type*.

It is well known that  $G$  is a compact group for each collection of radices  $\mathcal{P}$ , and that the corresponding *Vilenkin system*  $\{w_n\}$  is a complete orthonormal system on  $G$ . Moreover, the group  $G$  can be identified with the interval  $[0, 1)$  by taking an  $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots) \in G$  to the number

$$\bar{x} := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} x_k P_{k+1}^{-1}.$$

Under this identification, Haar measure on  $G$  is taken to Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1)$ .

Received by the editors March 1, 2002.  
AMS subject classification: 43A75, 42C10.  
©Canadian Mathematical Society 2004.

A *Vilenkin series* is a series of the form  $S := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k w_k$ , where  $a_k$  is some sequence of complex numbers. For each  $x \in G$  and  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , the *partial sums* of a Vilenkin series  $S$  are defined by

$$S_n(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k w_k(x).$$

The partial sums  $S_{p_n}$  form a martingale in  $L^1(G)$  which allows one to use martingale convergence theorems on Vilenkin series.

A Vilenkin-Fourier series  $Sf$  is a Vilenkin series whose coefficients can be computed by the following formula for some integrable function  $f$ :

$$a_k = \widehat{f}(k) := \int_G f \overline{w_k} dm, \quad k \in \mathbf{N}.$$

We shall prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** *Suppose that  $S$  is a Vilenkin series,  $\{n_\nu\}$  is a subsequence of positive integers,  $f \in L^q(G)$  for some  $q > 1$ , and  $E$  is a countable subset of  $G$ . If*

$$(2) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} S_{p_{n_\nu}}(x) = f(x)$$

for almost every  $x \in G$ ,

$$(3) \quad \limsup_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} |S_{p_{n_\nu}}(x)| < \infty, \quad x \notin E,$$

and if

$$(4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n^{-1} S_{p_n}(x) = 0, \quad x \in E,$$

then  $S$  is the Vilenkin-Fourier series of  $f$ .

Theorem 1 is known when  $f$  is a finite-valued, integrable function and (2) holds off a countable set rather than almost everywhere (see D. J. Grubb [3], and Bokaev and Skvortsov [1]). Grubb [3] has also shown that if  $S_{p_n} \rightarrow 0$  almost everywhere on  $G$  and (3) holds everywhere on  $G$ , then  $S$  is the zero series. Clearly, Theorem 1 contains all these results when  $f \in L^q$ ,  $q > 1$ , i.e., shows that uniqueness holds under mild growth conditions for simultaneously almost everywhere convergence and nonzero limits.

The proofs of Grubb and Bokaev and Skvortsov rely heavily on differentiation theory and do not seem to generalize to the case when the almost everywhere limit is nonzero, i.e., cannot be used to prove Theorem 1. Our proof is more primitive (a proof by contradiction), but reveals the essential nature of the growth condition (4) (see the lemma in Section 2).

## 2 Preliminaries

For each nonnegative integer  $n$ , define intervals of rank  $n$  on  $G$  by  $I_0(0) := G$ , and

$$I_n(j) := \left\{ x = (x_0, x_1, \dots) \in G : \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} x_k P_{k+1}^{-1} = \frac{j}{P_n} \right\}$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, P_n - 1, n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Recall that  $\{I_n(0)\}_{n=0}^\infty$  is a nested sequence of subgroups of  $G$  which forms a neighborhood base at the origin, and for each  $n$ ,  $\{I_n(j)\}_{j=0}^{P_n-1}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint compact sets in  $G$  whose union is  $G$  (see [4]). In particular, given  $x \in G$  and  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , there is a unique  $0 \leq j < P_n$  such that  $x \in I_n(j)$ . We shall denote this interval by  $I_n(x)$ .

Denote the Haar measure of a subset  $E$  of  $G$  by  $m(E)$  and Lebesgue measure of a subset  $E$  of  $[0, 1)$  by  $|E|$ . Notice that under the identification of  $G$  with  $[0, 1)$ , the interval  $I_n(j)$  corresponds to the interval  $[jP_n^{-1}, (j+1)P_n^{-1})$ . In particular,  $m(I_n(j)) = P_n^{-1}$  for  $0 \leq j < P_n$  and  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ .

It is well known that the partial sums of the Vilenkin-Fourier series of an integrable  $f$  satisfy

$$(6) \quad (S_{P_n} f)(x) = P_n \int_{I_n(x)} f \, dm$$

for  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Hence by Lebesgue's differentiation theorem,  $S_{P_n} f \rightarrow f$  almost everywhere, in  $L^q(G)$  norm,  $q \geq 1$ , and since the indefinite integral is absolutely continuous, we also have

$$(6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n^{-1} (S_{P_n} f)(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in G.$$

To prove Theorem 1, we shall construct a sequence of intervals on which  $S_{P_n}$  is nonzero. The following result shows that under hypothesis (4), this construction of intervals can proceed indefinitely, and can do so to avoid any unwanted point  $x^*$ .

**Lemma** *Let  $x^* \in G$  and  $S$  be a Vilenkin series which satisfies (4) at  $x = x^*$ . If  $S_{P_{n_0}}$  is nonzero on some  $I_0 := I_{n_0}(y_0)$ , then there is an interval  $J \subseteq I_0$  of rank  $m_0$  such that  $x^* \notin J$  and  $S_{P_{m_0}}$  is nonzero on  $J$ .*

**Proof** If  $x^* \notin I_0$ , there is nothing to prove. If  $x^* \in I_0$ , then  $I_0 = I_{n_0}(x^*)$ . By hypothesis  $S_{P_{n_0}}$  is nonzero on  $I_0$ . Since each Vilenkin function  $w_k$  whose index  $k$  satisfies  $k < P_{n_0}$  is constant on  $I_0$ , it follows that  $S_{P_{n_0}}(x) =: \alpha_0$  for all  $x \in I_0$ , where  $\alpha_0$  is some fixed nonzero constant. In particular, if  $\beta_0 := \alpha_0/P_{n_0}$ , then

$$(7) \quad S_{P_{n_0}}(x) = P_{n_0} \beta_0 \quad \text{for all } x \in I_0.$$

For each nonnegative integer  $k$ , let  $I_k := I_{n_0+k}(x^*)$  and let  $j_k$  be the index which satisfies  $I_{k+1} = I_{n_0+k+1}(j_k)$ . Set  $\mathcal{W}_k := \{\ell : I_{n_0+k+1}(\ell) \subset I_k, \ell \neq j_k\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{W}_k$  contains exactly  $P_{n_0+k} - 1$  integers,  $x^* \notin I_{n_0+k}(\ell)$  for all  $\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k$ , and

$$(8) \quad I_{n_0+k} = I_{n_0+k+1} \cup \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k} I_{n_0+k+1}(\ell).$$

For each  $\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k$ , fix a point  $x_\ell$  in  $I_{n_0+k+1}(\ell)$ . Suppose for a moment that  $\nu$  is an integer which satisfies  $P_{n_0+k} \leq \nu < P_{n_0+k+1}$ . By (8) and (1), the set  $\{w_\nu(x) : x = x^*$  or  $x = x_\ell$  for some  $\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k\}$  contains every  $p_{n_0+k}$ th root of unity. Since, for any  $p$ , the sum of  $p$ th roots of unity is zero, it follows that  $w_\nu(x^*) = -\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k} w_\nu(x_\ell)$  for each  $\nu \in [P_{n_0+k}, P_{n_0+k+1})$ . In particular

$$(9) \quad S_{P_{n_0+k+1}}(x^*) - S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x^*) = - \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k} (S_{P_{n_0+k+1}} - S_{P_{n_0+k}})(x_\ell).$$

Suppose that the lemma is false. Since  $x^* \notin I_{n_0+k+1}(\ell)$ , it follows that

$$(10) \quad S_{P_{n_0+k+1}}(x) = 0, \quad x \in I_{n_0+k+1}(\ell)$$

for all  $\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k$ . We shall use this to prove that

$$(11) \quad S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x^*) = P_{n_0+k}\beta_0$$

for  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ . Notice that this will lead to a contradiction. Indeed, by (11),

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x^*)}{P_{n_0+k}} = \beta_0 \neq 0$$

contrary to hypothesis. It remains to prove (11).

We shall prove (11) by induction on  $k$ . By (7), (11) holds for  $k = 0$ . Suppose that (11) holds for some  $k \geq 1$ . Fix  $\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k$  and  $x \in I_{n_0+k+1}(\ell)$ . By (10),

$$0 = S_{P_{n_0+k+1}}(x) = (S_{P_{n_0+k+1}}(x) - S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x)) + S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x).$$

Since  $S_{P_{n_0+k}}$  is constant on  $I_{n_0+k}(x^*)$ , it follows from this identity and (11) that

$$S_{P_{n_0+k+1}}(x) - S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x) = -S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x^*) = -P_{n_0+k}\beta_0.$$

Substituting  $x = x_\ell$  into this last identity, and summing over  $\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k$ , we have by (9) that

$$(12) \quad S_{P_{n_0+k+1}}(x^*) - S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x^*) = - \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{W}_k} (-P_{n_0+k}\beta_0) = (p_{n_0+k} - 1)P_{n_0+k}\beta_0.$$

Combining (11) and (12), we finally obtain

$$S_{P_{n_0+k+1}}(x^*) = (p_{n_0+k} - 1)P_{n_0+k}\beta_0 + S_{P_{n_0+k}}(x^*) = p_{n_0+k}P_{n_0+k}\beta_0 = P_{n_0+k+1}\beta_0.$$

Thus (11) holds for all  $k \geq 0$ . ■

### 3 A Proof of Theorem 1

For simplicity, we assume that  $n_\nu = n$ . Obvious modifications change this proof into one which holds for subsequences. Suppose to the contrary that  $S$  is not the Vilenkin-Fourier series of  $f$ . Then the series  $S - Sf$  is not the zero series, *i.e.*, we can find an integer  $n_0$  such that  $S_{P_{n_0}} - S_{P_{n_0}} f$  is nonzero on some interval  $I_{n_0}$  of rank  $n_0$ .

Let  $E := \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ . Then (4) holds for  $x = x_1$ , and it follows from (6) that (4) holds for the series  $S - Sf$  at  $x = x_1$ . Hence by the lemma, we can choose an interval  $I_{m_0}$  of rank  $m_0 > n_0$  such that  $x_1 \notin I_{m_0}$  and  $S_{P_{m_0}} - S_{P_{m_0}} f$  is nonzero on  $I_{m_0}$ . We claim that there is an interval  $I_{n_1}$ , of rank  $n_1$ , such that  $I_{n_1} \subseteq I_{m_0}$  and

$$(13) \quad |S_{P_{n_1}}(x)| > 1 + |(S_{P_{n_1}} f)(x)| \quad \text{for all } x \in I_{n_1}.$$

Suppose the claim is false. Then given any interval  $J \subseteq I_{m_0}$ , of rank  $j \geq m_0$ , there is at least one point  $x \in J$  such that  $|S_{P_j}(x)| \leq 1 + |(S_{P_j} f)(x)|$ . But  $S_{P_j}$  is constant on intervals of rank  $j$ , hence

$$(14) \quad |S_{P_j}| \leq 1 + |S_{P_j} f|$$

on  $J$  for all  $j \geq m_0$  and all  $J \subseteq I_{m_0}$ . Hence (14) holds everywhere on  $I_{m_0}$  for all  $j \geq m_0$ .

Since  $S_{P_j} f \rightarrow f$  in  $L^q(G)$  norm, (14) implies that  $\xi_j := S_{P_j} - S_{P_j} f$  is bounded in  $L^q(I_{m_0})$  norm. Since by (2),  $\xi_j \rightarrow f - f = 0$  almost everywhere on  $I_{m_0}$ , as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows from a generalized Bounded Convergence Theorem (see [5]) that  $\int_{I_{m_0}} \xi_j dm \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . But by orthogonality and the fact that  $\xi_{m_0}$  is constant on  $I_{m_0}$ , we have

$$0 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{I_{m_0}} \xi_j dm = \int_{I_{m_0}} \xi_{m_0} dm = m(I_{m_0})\xi_{m_0}(y_0)$$

for any  $y_0 \in I_{m_0}$ . Therefore,  $\xi_{m_0} := S_{P_{m_0}} - S_{P_{m_0}} f$  is zero on  $I_{m_0}$ , contrary to the choice of  $m_0$ . This contradiction proves (13).

Inequality (13) contains two consequences which hold everywhere on  $I_{n_1}$ :

$$|S_{P_{n_1}}| > 1 + |S_{P_{n_1}} f| \geq 1 + 0 = 1,$$

and

$$|S_{P_{n_1}} - S_{P_{n_1}} f| \geq |S_{P_{n_1}}| - |S_{P_{n_1}} f| > 1 > 0.$$

Thus we have found an interval  $I_{n_1} \subset I_{n_0}$  such that  $x_1 \notin I_{n_1}$ ,  $|S_{P_{n_1}}| > 1$ , and  $S_{P_{n_1}} - S_{P_{n_1}} f \neq 0$  on  $I_{n_1}$ . Continuing this construction, we generate nested intervals  $I_{n_k}$  such that

$$(15) \quad x_k \notin I_{n_k}$$

and

$$(16) \quad |S_{P_{n_k}}| > k \quad \text{on } I_{n_k}.$$

Since the intervals  $I_{n_k}$  are compact, there is a point  $x_0$  which belongs to all  $I_{n_k}$ . By (16), then,  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |S_{P_{n_k}}(x_0)| = \infty$ . In view of (4), this forces  $x_0 \in E$ , *i.e.*,  $x_0 = x_k$  for some  $k$ . Thus  $x_k \in I_{n_k}$ , which contradicts (15). ■

## References

- [1] N. A. Bokaev and V. A. Skvortsov, *A generalization of a uniqueness theorem for series in multiplicative systems*. Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh. 1987, 11–15.
- [2] J. E. Daly and K. L. Phillips, *A note on  $H^1$  multipliers for locally compact Vilenkin groups*. Canad. Math. Bull. **41**(1998), 392–397.
- [3] D. J. Grubb, *Sets of uniqueness in compact 0-dimensional metric groups* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **301**(1987) 239–249.
- [4] N. Ya. Vilenkin, *On a class of complete orthonormal systems*. Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, Ser. Mat. **11**(1947), 363–400.
- [5] W. R. Wade, *The bounded convergence theorem*. Amer. Math. Monthly **81**(1974), 387–389.

*Mathematics Department*  
*University of Tennessee*  
*Knoxville, Tennessee 37996*  
*U.S.A.*  
*e-mail: wade@math.uth.edu*