#### Applied Analysis (APPM 5450): Final — Solutions

 $7.30 \,\mathrm{am} - 10.00 \,\mathrm{am}$ , May 6, 2010. Closed books.

**Problem 1:** (28p) Four points for each question. No motivation required.

- (a) State the axioms for a  $\sigma$ -algebra.
- (b) Let *H* be a Hilbert space, and let  $A \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ . Which statements are necessarily true: (i) If  $A^* A = I$ , then ||A x|| = ||x|| for all  $x \in H$ .
  - (ii) If ||Ax|| = ||x|| for all  $x \in H$ , then (Ax, Ay) = (x, y) for all  $x, y \in H$ .
  - (iii) If (Ax, Ay) = (x, y) for all  $x, y \in H$ , then A is unitary.
- (c) Let  $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of Schwartz functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  that are all supported in the interval I = [-1, 1]. Suppose further that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \sup_{x \in I} |\varphi_n(x) - \varphi(x)| \right) = 0.$$

Which of the following statements are necessarily true:

- (i)  $\varphi_n \to \varphi$  in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ .
- (ii)  $\varphi_n \to \varphi$  in  $\mathcal{S}^*(\mathbb{R})$ .
- (iii)  $\varphi_n \to \varphi$  in norm in  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty]$ .
- (d) Define an operator A on  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  via  $[A u](x) = \frac{1}{2}(u(x) + u(-x))$ . (To be rigorous, we could define A on  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$  and then extend it to  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  via a density argument.) Specify  $\sigma(A)$ .
- (e) Let  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , and define functions  $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset L^p(\mathbb{R})$  via  $f_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \chi_{[0,n]}$ . For which  $p \in [1, \infty]$  does  $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  converge weakly?
- (f) Define  $f \in \mathcal{S}^*(\mathbb{R})$  via  $f(x) = \sin(x)$ . What is  $\hat{f}$ ?
- (g) Let  $\mathcal{F}: L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to L^2(\mathbb{R})$  denote the Fourier transform. What is the spectrum of  $\mathcal{F}$ ?

### Solution:

- (a) See text book.
- (b) (i) is TRUE since ||Ax||<sup>2</sup> = (Ax, Ax) = (A\*Ax, x) = (Ix, x) = ||x||<sup>2</sup>.
  (ii) is TRUE due to the polarization identity.
  (iii) is FALSE since the condition does not imply that the operator is onto (the right-shift operator on l<sup>2</sup>(N) provides a counter example).
- (c) (i) is FALSE since, for instance, ||φ<sub>n</sub> − φ||<sub>1,0</sub> = ||φ'<sub>n</sub> − φ'||<sub>u</sub> need not converge to zero.
  (ii) is TRUE.
  (iii) is TRUE.
- (d)  $\sigma(A) = \{0, 1\}$ . (Note that A is a projection operator.)
- (e) For  $p \ge 2$ . We have  $||f_n||_{\infty} = n^{-1/2}$  so clearly  $f_n \to 0$  in  $L^{\infty}$  (in norm, even). For finite p, we have  $||f_n||_p = n^{\frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{2}}$ . For p > 2, we see that  $\lim_{n \to \infty} ||f_n|| = 0$ , while for p < 2, we have  $\lim_{n \to \infty} ||f_n||_p = \infty$  so  $(f_n)$  cannot possibly converge weakly. In the borderline case p = 2 we have  $||f_n||_2 = 1$ , but we can show weak convergence by verifying that  $(f_n, g) \to 0$  for all g in a dense subset (such as the compactly supported functions).
- (f)  $\hat{f} = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2i} (\tau_1 \delta \tau_{-1} \delta)$  (so that  $\langle \hat{f}, \varphi \rangle = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2i} (\varphi(-1) \varphi(1))$ ). To see this, observe that  $\sin(x) = \frac{1}{2i} (e^{ix} e^{-ix})$ , that  $\mathcal{F}[e^{ikx} \varphi] = \tau_k \hat{\varphi}$ , and that  $\mathcal{F}1 = \sqrt{2\pi} \delta$ .
- (g)  $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) = \sigma_{p}(\mathcal{F}) = \{1, -1, i, -i\}$ . Partial credit is given for the answer that  $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda| = 1\}$  which you can deduce from the fact that  $\mathcal{F}$  is unitary.

**Problem 2:** (24p) Set  $H = L^2(\mathbb{R})$ , and consider for  $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$  the operator  $A_n \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  given by

$$[A_n u](x) = e^{-x^2/2n} u(x).$$

Each operator  $A_n$  is self-adjoint, and you may use this fact without proving it. Briefly motivate your answers to all questions below *except part* (c):

- (a) (4p) Is  $A_n$  compact?
- (b) (4p) Is  $A_n$  non-negative? Positive? Coercive?
- (c) (6p) Specify  $\sigma(A_n)$ ,  $\sigma_p(A_n)$ ,  $\sigma_c(A_n)$ , and  $\sigma_r(A_n)$ .
- (d) (6p) Does the sequence  $(A_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  converge in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ ? If so, specify the limit and the mode of convergence.
- (e) (4p) With  $\mathcal{F}$  the Fourier transform, describe the operator  $\hat{A}_n = \mathcal{F}^* A_n \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ . That is, specify the action of  $\hat{A}_n$  without referring to  $\mathcal{F}$ . Does  $(\hat{A}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  converge?

### Solution:

- (a) No,  $A_n$  is not compact. To prove this, set  $\varphi_j = 2^{j/2} \chi_{(2^{-j}, 2^{-j+1})}$ . Then  $(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a bounded sequence, but  $(A_n \varphi_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$  cannot have a convergent subsequence since it is an orthogonal sequence in which the vectors satisfy  $||A_n \varphi_j|| \ge e^{-1/2}$ .
- (b)  $A_n$  is positive (and hence non-negative). To see this, fix a non-zero vector u. Then pick an R such that  $\int_{|x| < R} |u(x)|^2 dx = \epsilon > 0$ . Then

$$(A_n u, u) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/2n} |u(x)|^2 \, dx \ge \int_{-R}^{R} e^{-x^2/2n} |u(x)|^2 \, dx \ge e^{-R^2/2n} \, \varepsilon > 0.$$

To see that  $A_n$  is not coercive, set  $\psi_j = \chi_{(j,j+1)}$ . Then  $||\psi_j|| = 1$ , and  $\lim_{i \to \infty} ||A_n \psi_j|| = 0$ .

- (c)  $\sigma(A_n) = \sigma_{\mathbf{c}}(A_n) = [0, 1]. \ \sigma_{\mathbf{p}}(A_n) = \sigma_{\mathbf{r}}(A_n) = \emptyset.$
- (d)  $(A_n)$  converges *strongly* to the identity. To prove this, fix any  $u \in H$ . Then

(1) 
$$||A_n u - u||^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(e^{-x^2/2n} - 1\right)^2 |u(x)|^2 dx.$$

The integrand in (1) converges pointwise to zero as  $n \to \infty$ . Moreover, the integrand is dominated by  $|u(x)|^2$ , and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u|^2 < \infty$ . Therefore, the LDCT applies, and  $\lim_{n \to \infty} ||A_n u - u||^2 = 0$ .

To see that  $(A_n)$  cannot converge in norm, set  $\psi_j = \chi_{(j,j+1)}$ . Then  $||\psi_j|| = 1$ , and so  $||A_n - I|| \ge ||(A_n - I)\psi_j|| \ge 1 - e^{-j^2/2n}$ . Taking the limit as  $j \to \infty$ , we see  $||A_n - I|| \ge 1$ .

(e) The key observation is that multiplication by a function in physical space corresponds to convolution in Fourier space. To formalize, set  $\varphi_n(x) = e^{-x^2/2n}$ , and pick  $v \in H$ . Then

$$\hat{A}_n v = \mathcal{F}^* \left[ A_n \left[ \mathcal{F} v \right] \right] = \mathcal{F}^* \left[ A_n \, \hat{v} \right] = \mathcal{F}^* \left[ \varphi_n \, \hat{v} \right] = \sqrt{2\pi} \, \check{\varphi}_n * v.$$

Since  $\check{\varphi}_n(t) = \sqrt{n} e^{-nt^2/2}$ , we find

$$[\hat{A}_n v](t) = \sqrt{n} \sqrt{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n (t-s)^2/2} v(s) \, ds.$$

Finally, observe that since  $\mathcal{F}$  is unitary, the convergence properties of  $(\hat{A}_n)$  are exactly the same as those of  $(A_n)$ . In other words,  $(\hat{A}_n)$  converges strongly (and not in norm) to  $\mathcal{F}^* I \mathcal{F} = I$ .

**Problem 3:** (18p) Let p be a real number such that  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , and let  $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of functions in  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$  that converges pointwise to a function f. In other words,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} f_n(x) = f(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Suppose further that all  $f_n$  satisfy

$$|f_n(x)| \le 2|f(x)|,$$
 for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

For each of the three sets of conditions on f given below, specify for which  $r \in [1, \infty)$  it is necessarily the case that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} ||f - f_n||_{L^r(\mathbb{R})} = 0.$$

- (a)  $|f| \le \chi_{[-1,1]}$ .
- (b)  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$  and  $|f(x)| \leq 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- (c)  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$ .

For each part, three points for a correct answer, and three points for a correct motivation.

# Solution: (a) $r \in [1, \infty)$ . (b) $r \in [p, \infty)$ . (c) r = p.

To motivate, we need to prove the claim when it is true, and provide counter-examples when it is not. The basic question we need to resolve is when

(2) 
$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x) - f_n(x)|^r \, dx = 0$$

The integrand in (2) converges to zero pointwise, and we want to bring the LDCT to bear. To this end, we construct a dominator h via

$$f(x) - f_n(x)|^r \le \left(|f(x)| + |f_n(x)|\right)^r \le \left(|f(x)| + 2|f(x)|\right)^r = 3^r |f(x)|^r =: h(x).$$

We will analyze each of the three assumptions to see when  $\int h < \infty$ .

- (a) If  $|f| \leq \chi_{[-1,1]}$ , then  $h \leq 3^r \chi_{[-1,1]}$  so  $\int h < r^3 2 < \infty$  and LDCT applies.
- (b) Case 1  $r \ge p$ : In this case,  $h(x) = 3^r |f(x)|^r \le 3^r |f(x)|^p$  since  $|f(x)| \le 1$ . Therefore,  $\int h \le r^3 ||f||_p^p < \infty$ , and LDCT applies.

<u>Case 2 - r < p</u>: In this case, the LDCT does not apply, and we look for a counter-example. Pick a real number  $\alpha$  such that  $-\frac{1}{r} < \alpha < -\frac{1}{p}$ , and set  $f(x) = x^{\alpha} \chi_{[1,\infty)}$ . Then  $f \in L^p$ . Set  $f_n = (1 - 1/n) f$ . Then  $f_n \to f$  pointwise, but  $||f - f_n||_r^r = ||(1/n)f||_r^r = \int_1^\infty n^{-r} x^{\alpha r} dx = \infty$ .

(c) <u>Case 1 - r > p</u>: When |f| is not necessarily bounded,  $|f|^r$  is not bounded by  $|f|^p$  and the LDCT does not apply. We look for a counter-example. Pick a real number  $\alpha$  such that  $-\frac{1}{p} < \alpha < -\frac{1}{r}$ , and set  $f(x) = x^{\alpha} \chi_{(0,1)}$ . Then  $f \in L^p$ . Set  $f_n = (1 - 1/n) f$ . Then  $f_n \to f$  pointwise, but  $||f - f_n||_r^r = ||(1/n)f||_r^r = \int_0^1 n^{-r} x^{\alpha r} dx = \infty$ .

<u>Case 2 - r = p</u>: In this case,  $\int h = \int 3^p |f|^p = 3^p ||f||_p^p < \infty$  so LDCT applies.

Case 3 - r < p: In this case, the same counter-example we constructed in part (b) works.

**Note:** A complete motivation requires counter-examples for the case where the claim does not hold. However, nobody provided them, so only one point was docked for such an omission. **Problem 4:** (15p) Let  $(c_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of complex numbers such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^6 |c_n|^2 < \infty,$$

and set

$$u(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \, e^{i \, n \, x}.$$

For which non-negative integers k is it necessarily the case that  $u \in C^k([-\pi, \pi])$ ? Motivate your answer without invoking the Sobolev embedding theorem.

# **Solution:** For k = 0, 1, 2.

Set  $u_N = \sum_{n=1}^N c_n e^{inx}$ . Then  $u_N \in C^k$  for all k. If we can prove that  $(u_N)_{N=1}^{\infty}$  is Cauchy in  $C^k$ , then we invoke the fact that  $C^k$  is complete to argue that the limit function  $u \in C^k$ .

$$B = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^6 \, |c_n|^2 < \infty,$$

let j be a non-negative integer, and let M and N be integers such that M < N. Then for any x we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial^{j}\left(u_{N}(x)-u_{M}(x)\right)\right| &= \left|\partial^{j}\sum_{n=M+1}^{N}c_{n}\,e^{inx}\right| = \left|\sum_{n=M+1}^{N}(in)^{j}\,c_{n}\,e^{inx}\right| \leq \sum_{n=M+1}^{N}n^{j}\left|c_{n}\right| \leq \{\text{Cauchy-Schwartz}\} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{n=M+1}^{N}n^{2j-6}\right)^{1/2}\,\left(\sum_{n=M+1}^{N}n^{6}\left|c_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\sum_{n=M+1}^{\infty}n^{2j-6}\right)^{1/2}\,B = D_{M,j}\,B, \end{aligned}$$
where

W

$$D_{M,j} = \left(\sum_{n=M+1}^{\infty} n^{2j-6}\right)^{1/2}$$

It follows that

$$||u_N - u_M||_{C^k} \le \sum_{j=0}^k D_{M,j} B_j$$

Observe that  $\lim_{M\to\infty} D_{M,j} = 0$  when 2j - 6 < -1. Since j is an integer, this happens when j = 0, 1, 2.

**Note:** Most answers to this questions consisted of a demonstration that the sum  $\partial^k u = \sum c_n (in)^k e^{inx}$  converges in the L<sup>2</sup>-norm when  $k \leq 3$ . This shows that  $u \in H^3$ , not that  $u \in C^3$ . To get to  $C^3$ , you need to invoke some type of Sobolev embedding results such as the one used above.

Also note that while the question asked for a *motivation* that did not merely invoke the Sobolev embedding theorem, it can of course be used to arrive at the correct answer. The theorem says that  $H^m(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset C^k(\mathbb{T}^d)$ when k < m - d/2. In our case, we find that  $u \in H^3(\mathbb{T}^1)$ , so m = 3 and d = 1. We must have k < 3 - 1/2, or, in other words, k = 0, 1, 2.

**Problem 5:** (15p) Define  $f \in S^*(\mathbb{R})$  via f(x) = |x|/(1+|x|). Calculate the distributional derivatives f' and f''. Please motivate carefully.

Solution: Observe that 
$$f(x) = \frac{1+|x|-1}{1+|x|} = 1 - \frac{1}{1+|x|}$$
.

First we evaluate f'. Fix  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then

$$\begin{split} \langle f', \varphi \rangle &= -\langle f, \varphi' \rangle = - \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi'}_{=0} + \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{1}{1-x} \,\varphi' + \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+x} \,\varphi' \\ &= \left[ \frac{1}{1-x} \,\varphi \right]_{-\infty}^{0} - \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{1}{(1-x)^{2}} \,\varphi + \left[ \frac{1}{1+x} \,\varphi \right]_{0}^{\infty} + \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+x)^{2}} \,\varphi \\ &= \varphi(0) - \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{1}{(1-x)^{2}} \,\varphi - \varphi(0) + \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+x)^{2}} \,\varphi = \langle g, \varphi \rangle \end{split}$$

where g = f' is a regular function given by

$$f'(x) = g(x) = \frac{\operatorname{sign}(x)}{(1+|x|)^2}.$$

(The definition of g(0) is arbitrary.)

Observe that in the calculation above we used that  $\lim_{x \to \pm \infty} \varphi(x) = 0$  for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Proceeding to f'' = g', we find

$$\begin{split} \langle f'', \, \varphi \rangle &= \langle g', \, \varphi \rangle = -\langle g, \, \varphi' \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{1}{(1-x)^2} \, \varphi' - \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+x)^2} \, \varphi' \\ &= \left[ \frac{1}{(1-x)^2} \, \varphi \right]_{-\infty}^{0} - \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{2}{(1-x)^3} \, \varphi - \left[ \frac{1}{(1+x)^2} \, \varphi \right]_{0}^{\infty} - \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{(1+x)^3} \, \varphi \\ &= \varphi(0) - \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{2}{(1-x)^3} \, \varphi + \varphi(0) - \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{(1+x)^3} \, \varphi. \end{split}$$

We see that

$$f'' = g' = 2\delta + h_s$$

where h is a regular function given by

$$h(x) = -\frac{2}{(1+|x|)^3}.$$

Note: Many solutions given involved sign errors, mistaken calculations of the derivative, *etc.* Such errors of course only result in a very minor loss of points, but notice that they are entirely unnecessary. The *signs* are obvious if you simply sketch the graphs of f and f'. Moreover, away from the origin, f is a regular function and its distributional derivatives must coincide with its classical derivatives, which can easily be evaluated.