

ON INTEGRAL TRANSFORMATIONS WITH POSITIVE KERNEL¹

EMILIO GAGLIARDO

1. Let X, Y be two totally σ -finite measure spaces and let F_X, F_Y be the classes of measurable functions defined, and finite a.e., in X, Y , respectively.

Let $K(x, y) \geq 0$ be a measurable non-negative function on $X \times Y$.

Let us denote by T, T^* the transformations:

$$(Tu)(y) = \int_X K(x, y)u(x)dx, \quad (T^*v)(x) = \int_Y K(x, y)v(y)dy,$$

the domain of T being the set of the functions $u(x) \in F_X$ such that the first integral exists and is finite for almost all y , and the domain of T^* being analogously defined.

We are interested in the study of necessary and sufficient conditions in order that T restricted to $L^p(X)$ be a bounded transformation of $L^p(X)$ into $L^q(Y)$ with bound $\leq c_0$.

Obviously such a necessary and sufficient condition is given by:

$$(1.1) \quad \iint_{X \times Y} K(x, y)u(x)v(y) dx dy \leq c_0 \|u\|_{L^p(X)} \|v\|_{L^q(Y)},$$

$$\forall u \in L^p(X), \forall v \in L^q(Y).$$

In the present paper we will prove the necessity of the following sufficient condition:

[1.1] THEOREM (N. ARONSAJN²). *Let $1 < q \leq p < +\infty, 1/p' + 1/p = 1/q' + 1/q = 1$. A sufficient condition in order that T restricted to $L^p(X)$ be a bounded transformation of $L^p(X)$ into $L^q(Y)$ with bound $\leq c_0$ is that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist two measurable functions $\phi(x), \psi(y)$, positive and finite a.e., such that:*

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (T\phi)(y) &\leq (c_0 + \epsilon)(\psi(y))^{q'/q}, \\ (T^*\psi)(x) &\leq (c_0 + \epsilon)(\phi(x))^{p/p'}, \end{aligned}$$

Presented to the Society, January 24, 1963 under the title *On bounded integral transformations, with positive kernel*; received by the editors July 30, 1963, and, in revised form, October 11, 1963.

¹ Paper written under Research Grant GP-439 with the National Science Foundation, University of Kansas.

² See [1, p. 36]; also more particular results of I. Schur, G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, G. Pólya [3, p. 227], and of Holmgren (see T. Carleman [2, p. 112]). For the sake of completeness we give here also the proof of this theorem.

no other condition for $p = q$,

$$(1.3) \quad \iint_{X \times Y} K(x, y)\phi(x)\psi(y) \, dx dy \leq c_0 + \epsilon \quad \text{for } p \neq q.$$

In §3 we will prove the following:

[1.II] THEOREM. Let $1 < p < +\infty, 1 < q < +\infty$.

A necessary condition in order that T restricted to $L^p(X)$ be a bounded transformation of $L^p(X)$ into $L^q(Y)$ with bound $\leq c_0$ is given by (1.2) with ϕ, ψ , positive and finite a.e., satisfying:

$$(1.4) \quad \|\phi\|_{L^p(X)} \leq 1, \quad \|\psi\|_{L^q(Y)} \leq 1.$$

This theorem in the case $p = q = 2$ is due to S. Karlin [4].

[1.III] COROLLARY. Obviously (1.2)–(1.3) is weaker than (1.2)–(1.4), and, consequently, for $q \leq p$ both (1.2)–(1.3) and (1.2)–(1.4), a posteriori equivalent,³ are necessary and sufficient.

[1.IV] REMARK. For $q > p$, as we will show by an example, even the stronger condition (1.2)–(1.4) is in general not sufficient.

[1.V] REMARK. For $\epsilon = 0$ Theorem [1.II] does not hold.

[1.VI] REMARKS. For $q = 1, p$ finite or not, a necessary and sufficient condition is: $\|\int_Y K(x, y) \, dy\|_{L^{p'}(X)} \leq c_0$. For $p = +\infty, q$ finite or not, a necessary and sufficient condition is: $\|\int_X K(x, y) \, dx\|_{L^q(Y)} \leq c_0$.

2. Proof of Theorem [1.I].

Case $p \neq q$. Given $u \in L^p(X), v \in L^{q'}(Y)$, we note that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_X \int_Y K(x, y)u(x)v(y) \, dx dy \right| \\ &= \left| \int_X \int_Y K^{1/q-1/p} \phi^{1/q-1/p} \psi^{1/q-1/p} K^{1/p} \frac{\psi^{1/p}}{\phi^{1/p'}} u K^{1/q'} \frac{\phi^{1/q'}}{\psi^{1/q}} v \, dx dy \right| \\ &\leq \left(\int_X \int_Y K(x, y)\phi(x)\psi(y) \, dx dy \right)^{1/q-1/p} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_X \int_Y K(x, y) \frac{\psi}{\phi^{p/p'}} |u|^p \, dx dy \right)^{1/p} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_X \int_Y K(x, y) \frac{\phi}{\psi^{q'/q}} |v|^{q'} \, dx dy \right)^{1/q'} \\ &\leq (c_0 + \epsilon) \|u\|_{L^p(X)} \|v\|_{L^{q'}(Y)}. \end{aligned}$$

³ In the following meaning: functions ϕ, ψ satisfying (1.2), (1.4) satisfy also (1.3), and conversely if there exist ϕ, ψ satisfying (1.2), (1.3) then there exist also $\bar{\phi}, \bar{\psi}$ (may be different) satisfying (1.2), (1.4).

Case $p = q$. Since $1/q - 1/p = 0$ the proof here given does not require the boundedness of the integral in (1.3).

3. Proof of Theorem [1.II].

[3.I] LEMMA. Let B be a Banach space and P a convex cone in B . By calling this cone "positive," B will be taken as an ordered Banach space. Let us suppose for B and P that every bounded increasing sequence in P converges, more precisely:

$$(3.1) \quad \{u_n\} \subset P, \quad u_{n+1} - u_n \in P, \quad \|u_n\| \leq M < +\infty \Rightarrow u_n \rightarrow u \in P.$$

Let S be a (not necessarily linear) transformation defined in P such that

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} S(P) &\subset P, \\ S \text{ is nondecreasing: } u, v, v - u \in P &\Rightarrow Sv - Su \in P, \\ S \text{ is continuous,}^4 \\ \|u\| \leq 1 &\Rightarrow \|Su\| \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then for every $\sigma > 0$ there is $u \in P$ such that:

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} (1 + \sigma)u - Su &\in P, \\ \|u\| \leq 1, \quad u \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA. Choose $p \in P$, $p \neq 0$, $\|p\| \leq \sigma/(1 + \sigma)$ and consider the sequence $\{u_n\} \subset P$ defined as follows:

$$u_1 = p, \quad u_n = p + \frac{1}{1 + \sigma} Su_{n-1}.$$

Obviously by induction,

$$\|u_n\| \leq 1, \quad u_{n+1} - u_n \in P.$$

So by (3.1), and since S is continuous:

$$u_n \rightarrow u \in P, \quad \|u\| \leq 1, \quad u = p + \frac{1}{1 + \sigma} Su.$$

Hence also:

$$u \neq 0, \quad (1 + \sigma)u - Su = (1 + \sigma)p \in P.$$

The necessity of (1.2), (1.4) follows from Lemma [3.I] by taking $B = L^p(X)$, $u \in P \Leftrightarrow u(x) \geq 0$ a.e.,

⁴ In the strong topology, or, more generally, relative to any topology for which (3.1) holds, and the norm is lower semicontinuous.

$$S(u) = \left(\frac{1}{c_0} T^* \left(v_0 + \frac{1}{c_0 + \epsilon} T \left(u_0 + \frac{1}{1 + \sigma} u \right) \right)^{q/q'} \right)^{p'/p},$$

where

$$v_0(y) > 0 \text{ a.e.}, \quad \|v_0\|_{L^q} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{c_0 + \epsilon},$$

$$u_0(x) > 0 \text{ a.e.}, \quad \|u_0\|_{L^p} \leq \frac{\sigma}{1 + \sigma},$$

and σ is such that

$$c_0(1 + \sigma)^{2p/p'} \leq c_0 + \epsilon.$$

For, in the present case, (3.3) becomes

$$\left(\frac{1}{c_0} T^* \left(v_0 + \frac{1}{c_0 + \epsilon} T \left(u_0 + \frac{1}{1 + \sigma} u \right) \right)^{q/q'} \right)^{p'/p} \leq (1 + \sigma)u$$

$$\|u\|_{L^p(X)} \leq 1,$$

and by putting

$$\phi = u_0 + \frac{1}{1 + \sigma} u, \quad \psi = \left(v_0 + \frac{1}{c_0 + \epsilon} T\phi \right)^{q/q'},$$

we note that:

$$T\phi = (c_0 + \epsilon)(\psi^{q'/q} - v_0) \leq (c_0 + \epsilon)\psi^{q'/q},$$

$$T^*\psi \leq c_0((1 + \sigma)u)^{p/p'} = c_0(1 + \sigma)^{2p/p'}(\phi - u_0)^{p/p'} \leq (c_0 + \epsilon)\phi^{p/p'},$$

$$\|\phi\|_{L^p(X)} \leq \frac{\sigma}{1 + \sigma} + \frac{1}{1 + \sigma} = 1, \quad \phi \geq u_0 > 0 \text{ a.e.},$$

$$\|\psi\|_{L^{q'}(Y)} \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon}{c_0 + \epsilon} + \frac{c_0}{c_0 + \epsilon} \right)^{q/q'} = 1, \quad \psi \geq (v_0)^{q/q'} > 0 \text{ a.e.}$$

4. Proof of Remark [1.IV]. Consider the following example:

$$p = 2, \quad (p' = 2), \quad q = 4, \quad (q' = \frac{4}{3}), \quad X = (0, +\infty), \quad Y = (0, 1),$$

$$K(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{y} & \text{for } \frac{y}{2} < x < y, \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{(x+1)^{3/4}} & (0 < x < +\infty), \\ \psi(y) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{(y+1)^{3/4}} & (0 < y < 1).\end{aligned}$$

To prove the first inequality in (1.2) (with some suitable $c_0 + \epsilon$) it is enough to note that $(T\phi)(y)$ is bounded, and $\psi(y)$ has a positive infimum, and to prove the second inequality it is enough to note that $(T^*\psi)(x)$ is bounded, and is $\equiv 0$ for $x \geq 1$.

Conditions (1.4) are immediately verified.

Finally, to prove that T is not, however, a bounded transformation of $L^2(0, +\infty)$ into $L^4(0, 1)$ it is enough to consider the function:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{x^{1/4}} & \text{for } 0 < x < 1, \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases}$$

which belongs to $L^2(0, +\infty)$, while $(Tf)(y) \notin L^4(0, 1)$.

5. Proof of Remark [1.V]. Let us take $p=q=p'=q'=2$, $X=Y = x$ -axis,

$$K(x, y) = K(y, x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } |x - y| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases} \quad c_0 = \|T\| = 1.$$

We will prove that there are no non-negative ϕ, ψ , $\phi(x) \not\equiv 0 \not\equiv \psi(x)$, such that $\phi \in L^2(X)$, $T\phi \leq \psi$, $T\psi \leq \phi$.

Let us suppose that such ϕ, ψ exist. Putting $u(x) = \phi(x) + \psi(x)$, we have

$$u(x) \geq 0, \quad u(x) \not\equiv 0, \quad Tu \leq u, \quad Tu \leq T\phi + \phi \in L^2.$$

First case. Let us suppose $Tu = u$ a.e. This case can be easily excluded (for instance by taking Fourier transforms of both sides.)

Second case. $Tu < u$ on a set of positive measure. Then we can choose c_1, α_1 such that:

$$\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} u(x) dx - \int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} Tu dx \geq c_1 > 0 \quad \text{for } \alpha \geq \alpha_1.$$

On the other hand since $Tu \in L^2$ there is a set I of infinite measure such that

$$\int_{-\alpha-1/2}^{-\alpha+1/2} u(x) dx + \int_{\alpha-1/2}^{\alpha+1/2} u(x) dx = (Tu)(-\alpha) + (Tu)(\alpha) < c_1$$

for $\alpha \in I$.

From the definition of T it follows that for every $\alpha > 0$,

$$\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} u(x) dx - \int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} Tu dx \leq \int_{-\alpha-1/2}^{-\alpha+1/2} u(x) dx + \int_{\alpha-1/2}^{\alpha+1/2} u(x) dx,$$

and if we take $\alpha \geq \alpha_1$, $\alpha \in I$ we have a contradiction.

6. Proof of Remarks [1.VI].

First Remark: Sufficiency. Given $u \in L^p(X)$, $v \in L^\infty(Y)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_X \int_Y K(x, y) u(x) v(y) dx dy \right| &\leq \|v\|_{L^\infty(Y)} \int_X \int_Y K(x, y) |u(x)| dx dy \\ &\leq \|v\|_{L^\infty(Y)} \left\| \int_Y K(x, y) dy \right\|_{L^{p'}(X)} \|u\|_{L^p(X)} \\ &\leq c_0 \|u\|_{L^p(X)} \|v\|_{L^\infty(Y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Necessity. Since for every $u \in L^p(X)$, $v \in L^\infty(Y)$ we have

$$\int_X \int_Y K(x, y) u(x) v(y) dx dy \leq c_0 \|u\|_{L^p(X)} \|v\|_{L^\infty(Y)},$$

taking $v \equiv 1$ we have

$$\int_X u(x) \left(\int_Y K(x, y) dy \right) dx \leq c_0 \|u\|_{L^p(X)},$$

and since $u \in L^p(X)$ is still arbitrary:

$$\left\| \int_Y K(x, y) dy \right\|_{L^{p'}(X)} \leq c_0.$$

Second Remark. The proof is analogous.

REFERENCES

1. N. Aronszajn, F. Mulla and P. Szeptycki, *On spaces of potentials connected with L^p -spaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **12** (1963), 211–306.
2. T. Carleman, *Sur les équations intégrales singulières à noyau réel et symétrique*, Upsala, 1923.
3. G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1934.
4. S. Karlin, *Positive operators*, J. Math. Mech. **6** (1959), 907–937.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS