

## SUMMING GENERALIZED CLOSED $U$ -SETS FOR WALSH SERIES

KAORU YONEDA

**ABSTRACT.** A countable union of closed  $U$ -sets for Walsh series in certain generalized sense is again a  $U$ -set in the same sense.

**1. Introduction.** Let  $\mu \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x)$  be a Walsh series. A subset  $E$  of the dyadic group is said to be a  $U$ -set if

$$(1) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere except on } E$$

implies that  $\mu$  is the zero series.

Wade [2] proved that if  $E_1, E_2, \dots$  are closed  $U$ -sets, then  $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k$  is also a  $U$ -set.

In this paper we shall generalize Wade's theorem. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a certain class of Walsh series. A subset  $E$  of the dyadic group is said to be a  $U$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$  if  $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$  and

$$(2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere except on } E$$

imply that  $\mu$  is the zero series. We have already proved in [3] that when  $E$  is a closed subset of the dyadic group, (1) holds if and only if (2) holds and

$$(3) \quad \hat{\mu}(k) = o(1) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore a closed subset of the dyadic group is a  $U$ -set in the classical sense if and only if it is a  $U$ -set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  which satisfies (3).

When  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies the following conditions, we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies the condition (L):

(i) a  $U$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$  is of measure zero;

(ii) if  $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$ , then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad \text{everywhere};$$

(iii) if  $\mu$  and  $\mu' \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $\alpha\mu + \alpha'\mu' \in \mathcal{A}$  for arbitrary real numbers  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha\mu + \alpha'\mu') &\sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\alpha\mu + \alpha'\mu')^{\wedge}(k)w_k(x) \\ &\equiv \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\alpha\hat{\mu}(k) + \alpha'\hat{\mu}'(k))w_k(x); \end{aligned}$$

---

Received by the editors June 18, 1984.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42C25.

*Key words and phrases.* Uniqueness, Walsh series.

©1985 American Mathematical Society  
0002-9939/85 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

(iv) if  $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$ , then 
$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(k \dot{+} j) w_k(x) \in \mathcal{A} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots$$

We shall prove the following theorem.

**THEOREM 1.** *When a class of Walsh series  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies the condition (L) and if  $E_1, E_2, \dots$  are closed U-sets for  $\mathcal{A}$ , then  $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k$  is also a U-set for  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

**2. Notations and lemmas.** In this paper we shall use the following notations. Let  $I_n^p$  be the set of all 0-1 sequences,  $(t_1, t_2, \dots)$ , such that  $\sum_{k=1}^n t_k/2^k = p/2^n$ .  $I_n^p$  is called a *dyadic interval of rank n*. For convenience,  $I_n(x)$  denotes the dyadic interval of rank  $n$  containing  $x$ . A dyadic interval is closed and open. We refer the details of the dyadic group, Walsh functions, the operation  $\dot{+}$  and so on to Fine's paper [1].

**LEMMA 2.** *When  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies the condition (L), if  $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $I$  is a dyadic interval, then there exists a Walsh series  $\mu^* \in \mathcal{A}$  which satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i) 
$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}^*(k) w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad \text{on } I,$$
- (ii) 
$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}^*(k) w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly everywhere except on } I.$$

**PROOF.** From the hypothesis, there exist an element of the dyadic group,  $x_0$ , and an integer  $N$  such that  $I = I_N(x_0)$ . Set

$$\hat{\mu}^*(k) = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{j=0}^{2^N-1} w_j(x_0) \hat{\mu}(k \dot{+} j)$$

for  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}^*(k) w_k(x) &= \sum_{s=0}^{2^{n-N}-1} \sum_{k=s2^N}^{(s+1)2^N-1} \hat{\mu}^*(k) w_k(x) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{2^{n-N}-1} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{2^N-1} \hat{\mu}^*(s2^N \dot{+} k) w_{s2^N \dot{+} k}(x) \right) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{2^{n-N}-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^N-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{j=0}^{2^N-1} w_j(x_0) \hat{\mu}(s2^N \dot{+} k \dot{+} j) \right\} w_{s2^N \dot{+} k}(x) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{2^{n-N}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{2^N-1} \frac{1}{2^N} w_j(x_0) \sum_{k=0}^{2^N-1} \hat{\mu}(s2^N \dot{+} k \dot{+} j) w_{s2^N \dot{+} k}(x) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{2^{n-N}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{2^N-1} \frac{1}{2^N} w_j(x_0) w_j(x) \sum_{k=0}^{2^N-1} \hat{\mu}(s2^N \dot{+} k \dot{+} j) w_{s2^N \dot{+} k}(x) \times w_j(x) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{2^{n-N}-1} \frac{1}{2^N} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{2^N-1} w_j(x_0 \dot{+} x) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{k=s2^N}^{(s+1)2^N-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{j=0}^{2^N-1} w_j(x_0 + x) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2^N-1} w_j(x_0 + x) = \begin{cases} 2^N, & \text{for } x \in I_N(x_0), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}^*(k) w_k(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x), & \text{for } x \in I_N(x_0), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is obvious that  $\mu^*$  satisfies the conclusion.

LEMMA 3. *If a Walsh series  $\mu$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i)  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad a.e.;$
- (ii)  $\sup_n \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| < \infty \quad \text{everywhere except on a countable set};$
- (iii)  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad \text{everywhere};$

then  $\mu$  is the zero series.

Lemma 3 is Theorem 3 in [3].

COROLLARY 4. *When  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies the condition (L), if  $E$  is a closed  $U$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $I$  is a dyadic interval which contains  $E$ , if a Walsh series  $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i)  $\sup_n \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| < \infty \quad \text{everywhere on } I \setminus E;$
- (ii)  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad a.e. \text{ on } I;$

then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere on } E.$$

PROOF. Since  $E$  is a closed set, for  $x_0 \in I \setminus E$ , there exists an integer  $N$  such that  $I_N(x_0) \subset I$  and

$$(4) \quad I_N(x_0) \cap E = \emptyset.$$

Let  $\mu^*$  be a Walsh series which is introduced in Lemma 2. Hence  $\mu^*$  satisfies that

$$(5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}^*(k) w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere on } I_N^c(x_0).$$

We shall prove that  $\mu^*$  satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3. Since  $\sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x)$  and  $\sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}^*(k)w_k(x)$  are equiconvergent on  $I_N(x_0)$ ,  $\mu^*$  satisfies (5), (i) and (ii) of Lemma 3. From (i) we have

$$(6) \quad \sup_n \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}^*(k)w_k(x) \right| < \infty \quad \text{everywhere on } I_N(x_0).$$

On the other hand from (5), (6) holds on  $I_N^c(x_0)$ . Hence (6) holds everywhere. From the definition of  $\hat{\mu}^*(k)$  and the hypothesis, we have  $\mu^* \in \mathcal{A}$ . By Lemma 3,  $\mu^*$  is the zero series. Then, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere on } I \setminus E.$$

Let  $\mu^{**}$  be a Walsh series associated with  $I$  which is introduced in Lemma 2. Since  $\mu^{**} \in \mathcal{A}$  and the  $2^n$ th partial sums of  $\mu^{**}$  and  $\mu$  are equiconvergent on  $I$ , we have

$$(7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}^{**}(k)w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere } I \text{ except on } E.$$

On the other hand, (7) holds on  $I^c$ . Hence (7) holds everywhere except on  $E$ . Since  $E$  is a  $U$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mu^{**}$  is the zero series. Therefore, (7) holds everywhere on  $I$ . Since the  $2^n$ th partial sums of  $\mu$  and  $\mu^{**}$  are equiconvergent, the proof of Corollary 4 is complete.

**LEMMA 5.** Let  $f_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , be a function which is continuous on the dyadic group, then the following set

$$N = \left\{ x: \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |f_n(x)| = \infty \right\}$$

is empty, countable or of the second category on itself.

The proof is due to [2].

**3. Proof of Theorem 1.** Set  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$ . Let  $\mu$  satisfy

$$(8) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad \text{everywhere except on } E.$$

Each  $E_i$  is a  $U$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$ , then from (i) of (L),  $E_i$  is of measure zero. Hence  $E$  is of measure zero. Consequently  $\mu$  satisfies (8) a.e. Set

$$N = \left\{ x: \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) \right| = \infty \right\}.$$

Since  $\sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x)$  is a continuous function on the dyadic group, by Lemma 5, three cases arise.

Now we shall assume that  $N$  is of the second category on itself. Set  $N_i = N \cap E_i$ . Then, there exist a dyadic interval  $I$  and an integer  $i_0$  such that  $N \cap I \neq \emptyset$  and  $N_{i_0} \cap I$  is dense in  $N \cap I$ . Since  $E_{i_0}$  is closed, we have  $N_{i_0} = N \cap E_{i_0}$ . We shall prove that

$$(9) \quad N \cap I = E_{i_0} \cap N \cap I \subseteq E_{i_0} \cap I.$$

It is obvious that  $N \cap I \supseteq E_{i_0} \cap N \cap I$ . If  $x \in N \cap I$ , then there exists a sequence of elements  $\{x_k\}_k$  such that  $x_k \in N_{i_0} \cap I$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x$ . Since  $x_k \in N_{i_0}$  and  $x_k \in I$ , we have  $x_k \in E_{i_0}$ .  $E_{i_0}$  is closed, therefore we have  $x \in E_{i_0}$ . Hence we proved the conclusion. It is obvious that  $E_{i_0} \cap I$  is a closed  $U$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$  and that  $E_{i_0} \cap I \subseteq I$ . Assume that  $x \notin E_{i_0} \cap I$ . Then  $x \notin N \cap I$ . Hence we have

$$\sup_n \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| < \infty \quad \text{in } I \setminus (E_{i_0} \cap I) \equiv I \setminus E_{i_0}.$$

By Corollary 4, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere on } I.$$

Hence we proved that

$$(10) \quad N \cap I = \emptyset.$$

(10) contradicts the assumption  $N \cap I \neq \emptyset$ . Therefore we have that  $N$  is not of the second category on itself. The proof is complete.

A subset  $E$  of the dyadic group is said to be a  $U_1$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$  [3] if  $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$  and

$$(2') \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad \text{everywhere except on } E$$

imply that  $\mu$  is the zero series.

We can prove analogously to Theorem 1 the following theorem.

**THEOREM 1'.** *When a class of Walsh series  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies the condition (L), if  $E_1, E_2, \dots$  are closed  $U_1$ -sets for  $\mathcal{A}$ , then  $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k$  is also a  $U_1$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

#### REFERENCES

1. N. J. Fine, *On Walsh functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **65** (1949), 372–414.
2. W. R. Wade, *Summing closed  $U$ -sets for Walsh series*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **29** (1971), 123–125.
3. K. Yoneda, *On generalized uniqueness theorems for Walsh series*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **43** (1984), 209–217.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF OSAKA PREFECTURE, SAKAI, OSAKA, JAPAN