

# Lecture notes, Singular Integrals

Joaquim Bruna, UAB

April 28, 2016

# Chapter 1

## The Hardy-Littlewood maximal function

In this chapter we will deal with the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function in a rather general context and show its role in some important aspects of Harmonic Analysis. We begin with some definitions.

### 1.1 Some definitions

We will denote by  $(X, \mu), (Y, \nu), \dots$  measure spaces, although most of the time  $X = \mathbf{R}^d$  equipped with Lebesgue measure.  $L^p(X)$  denotes the usual Lebesgue spaces, and  $L^0(X)$  the space of measurable functions equipped with the notion of convergence in measure.

We denote by  $\lambda_f$  the distribution function of  $f$ ,

$$\lambda_f(s) = \mu\{|f| > s\}.$$

If  $\varphi$  is increasing then

$$\int_X \varphi(|f|) d\mu = \int_X \int_0^{|f(x)|} \varphi'(s) ds d\mu(x) = \int_0^{+\infty} \varphi'(s) \lambda_f(s) ds.$$

In particular,  $\|f\|_p^p = p \int_0^{+\infty} s^{p-1} \lambda_f(s) ds$ .

The Tchebichev's inequality: if  $f \in L^p(X), p < +\infty$ , and  $A_s = \{x : |f(x)| > s\}$ , then

$$s^p \mu(A_s) \leq \int_{A_s} |f^p| d\mu \leq \int_X |f^p| d\mu = \|f\|_p^p.$$

The functions  $f$  such that  $\mu(A_s) = O(s^{-p}), p < \infty$ , are said to be *weak*  $L^p$ -functions, a space that we denote by  $L^{p,\infty}(X)$ . A typical example of a weak  $L^1$  function which is not in  $L^1$  is  $|x|^{-d}$  in  $\mathbf{R}^d$ .

If a mapping  $T : L^p(X) \rightarrow L^q(Y)$ ,  $1 \leq p, q \leq +\infty$ , satisfies

$$\|Tf\|_q \leq C\|f\|_p$$

we say that it is of *strong type*  $(p, q)$ . If  $T$  is linear, this amounts to  $T$  being continuous from  $L^p(X)$  to  $L^q(Y)$ . If  $T$  is of strong type  $(p, q)$ ,  $q < +\infty$  then

$$s^q \nu\{|Tf| > s\} \leq \|Tf\|_q^q \leq (C\|f\|_p)^q.$$

A mapping such that

$$\nu\{|Tf| > s\} \leq \left(\frac{C\|f\|_p}{s}\right)^q.$$

and thus mapping  $L^p$  to  $L^{q, \infty}$  is said to be of *weak type*  $(p, q)$ ,  $q < +\infty$ . By definition, when  $q = +\infty$  weak type  $(p, \infty)$  will be identified with strong type,  $\|Tf\|_\infty \leq C\|f\|_p$

## 1.2 How maximal functions arise

Suppose we have a family of linear operators  $T_t : L^p(X) \rightarrow L^0(Y)$  depending on  $t > 0$  and we are interested in the statement "the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} T_t f(x)$  exists a.e. on  $X$ "; or that  $X = Y$  and we are interested in the statement "  $\lim_t T_t f(x) = f(x)$  for a.e.  $x$ ". Often in analysis we know that this is the case if  $f$  belongs to a certain class of functions  $E$ , and often this class  $E$  is dense in  $L^p$ . For instance, consider the model case in which  $X = \mathbf{R}^d$  and

$$T_t f(x) = \frac{1}{|B(x, t)|} \int_{B(x, t)} f(y) dy,$$

is the average of  $f$  in the ball  $B(x, t)$ ; when  $f$  is say continuous with compact support (a dense subspace of the  $L^p(X)$ ), then trivially  $T_t f(x) \rightarrow f(x)$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .

Coming back to the general situation, assume  $Y = X$  and that we are interested in the statement  $\lim_t T_t f(x) = f(x)$  a.e.  $x$ . We consider the maximal operator

$$T^* f(x) = \sup_t |T_t f(x)| \leq +\infty.$$

Note that  $T^*$  is not linear but sub-additive:  $T^*(f + g) \leq T^*f + T^*g$ .

**Theorem 1.** If  $T^*$  is of weak type  $(p, q)$ , then the class

$$E = \{f : \lim_t T_t f(x) = f(x) \text{ a.e. } x\}$$

is closed in  $L^p(X)$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $f_n \in E$  approach  $f$ . To show that  $f \in E$ , we will show that for fixed  $s > 0$ , the set  $\{x : \limsup_t |T_t f(x) - f(x)| > s\}$  has zero measure. Now, from

$$|T_t f(x) - f(x)| \leq |T_t f(x) - T_t f_n(x)| + |T_t f_n(x) - f_n(x)| + |f_n(x) - f(x)|,$$

and the fact that  $f_n \in E$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_t |T_t f(x) - f(x)| &\leq \limsup_t |T_t f(x) - T_t f_n(x)| + |f_n(x) - f(x)| \leq \\ &\leq T^*(f - f_n)(x) + |f_n(x) - f(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\{x : \limsup_t |T_t f(x) - f(x)| > s\} \subset \{x : T^*(f - f_n)(x) > \frac{s}{2}\} \cup \{|f_n(x) - f(x)| > \frac{s}{2}\}$$

Then the hypothesis and Tchebychev's inequality imply

$$\mu\{x : \limsup_t |T_t f(x) - f(x)| > s\} \leq \left(\frac{C}{s}\|f - f_n\|_p\right)^q + \left(\frac{C}{s}\|f - f_n\|_p\right)^p,$$

and so making  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  we are done.  $\square$

Note that we can deal in an analogous way with the statement "the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} T_t f(x)$  exists a.e. on  $X$ ", for which we would work with  $\limsup_t T_t f(x) - \liminf_t T_t f(x)$ , bounded by  $2T^*f$ .

All this gives the basic recipe to prove a.e. convergence results: find a good dense class and prove a weak estimate for the maximal associated function. This is somehow similar to the situation in the uniform boundedness principle for families of operators defined in Banach spaces.

### 1.3 The general setting for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function

The standard setting is  $\mathbf{R}^d$  where we consider the means

$$T_t f(x) = \frac{1}{|B(x, t)|} \int_{B(x, t)} f(y) dy,$$

that make sense for  $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ , and ask about their a.e. limit.

Having this in mind we will consider however a more general situation of potential interest. We suppose that we are still in  $X = \mathbf{R}^d$  and we are given the balls  $B(x, \delta)$  in some way, satisfying

- They increase in  $\delta$ .
- For fixed  $x$ , their intersection is  $x$  and their union is  $\mathbf{R}^d$ .

- There exists  $c_1 > 1$  such that whenever  $B(x, \delta) \cap B(y, \delta) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $B(y, \delta) \subset B(x, c_1\delta)$  ( and so also  $B(x, \delta) \subset B(y, c_1\delta)$ , engulfing property). We denote by  $B^*$  the ball obtained from  $B$  dilating by  $c_1$  its radius. In particular  $x \in B(y, \delta)$  does not imply  $y \in B(x, \delta)$ , but it does imply  $y \in B(x, c_1\delta)$ .

and that the regular Borel measure satisfies

- The map  $x \mapsto \mu(U \cap B(x, \delta))$  is continuous in  $x$ . This implies that the means of  $f \in L^1_{loc}$  are continuous in  $x$  too.
- There exists  $c_2 > 1$  such that  $\mu(B(x, c_1\delta)) \leq c_2\mu(B(x, \delta))$  (doubling condition)

Note that we do not require that the measures of balls just depend on the radius, they might depend on  $x$  too.

We then define the *centered Hardy-Littlewood maximal function* by

$$Mf(x) = \sup_{\delta} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta))} \int_{B(x, \delta)} |f(y)| d\mu(y). \quad (1.1)$$

The uncentered maximal function  $\overline{M}f$  is defined using all balls containing  $x$ , so trivially  $Mf \leq \overline{M}f$ . But if  $x \in B(y, \delta)$ , then  $B(y, \delta)$  is included in  $B(x, c_1\delta)$ , and  $B(x, \delta)$  in  $B(y, c_1\delta)$ , so that all these balls have the same measure up to constants; it then follows that  $\overline{M}f \leq CMf$  for some constant  $C$ .

The following are examples of this general setting, besides the standard Euclidean balls.

- Fix a star-shaped domain  $U$  with respect the origin in  $\mathbf{R}^d$ , for instance a convex set containing the origin, and put  $B(x, \delta) = x + \delta U$ , so that  $U$  is the "unit ball".
- A quasi-distance  $\rho(x, y)$  satisfies the three basic properties:
  1.  $\rho(x, y) = 0$  only if  $x = y$ .
  2.  $\rho(x, y) \leq c\rho(y, x)$
  3.  $\rho(x, y) \leq C(\rho(x, z) + \rho(z, y))$

If we then set  $B(x, \delta) = \{y : \rho(x, y) < \delta\}$  we get a system of balls with the above requirements. Conversely we can define a quasidistance from the balls by defining  $\rho(x, y) = \inf\{\delta : y \in B(x, \delta)\}$ .

- These quasi-distances may be non isotropic. For instance, fixed positive exponents  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d$  set  $\rho(x, y) = \max |x_i - y_i|^{1/\alpha_i}$ .

- An interesting case arises in connection with the following fact in Riemannian geometry. Suppose we are given a family of vector fields  $D_1, \dots, D_k, k < d$  in  $\mathbf{R}^d$ . If at each point these vectors, together with their commutators, span the whole of  $\mathbf{R}^d$  it can be proved that for sufficiently close points  $x, y$  there exists a curve  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^d$  joining these two points,  $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$  and such that at each point  $\gamma(t)$  the tangent vector lies in the span of  $D_1, \dots, D_k$ . It makes sense then to define  $\rho(x, y)$  as the infimum of the lengths of all such curves. This is a quasidistance. This situation appears in particular in function theory in several complex variables.

## 1.4 Estimates for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function

Our purpose is to prove

**Theorem 2.** In the setting described above, with  $Mf$  defined as in (1.1), one has

1. For  $f \in L^p(\mu), 1 \leq p \leq +\infty, Mf$  is finite  $\mu$ -almost everywhere.
2. For  $f \in L^1(\mu), Mf$  satisfies a weak  $L^1$ -estimate

$$\mu\{Mf > s\} \leq \frac{C}{s} \|f\|_1$$

3. For  $f \in L^p(\mu), 1 < p \leq +\infty, Mf$  is also in  $L^p$  and  $\|Mf\|_p \leq A_p \|f\|_p$ .

Note that the first statement follows from the others, than the last statement is trivial for  $p = +\infty$  and that in the standard case, euclidian balls and Lebesgue measure, then the first statement holds for all  $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ .

We need the following Vitali-type covering lemma.

**Lemma 1.** Assume that  $E$  is the union of a finite number of balls  $B_1, \dots, B_N$ . Then we can extract a subcollection  $\hat{B}_1, \dots, \hat{B}_k$  of mutually disjoint balls such that  $\mu(\cup_{j=1}^k \hat{B}_j) = \sum_j \mu(\hat{B}_j) \geq c\mu(E)$ , the constant  $c$  depending just on  $c_1, c_2$ .

*Proof.* We first chose  $\hat{B}_1$  the ball with biggest radius, then  $\hat{B}_2$  is chosen as the biggest among the remaining not meeting  $\hat{B}_1$ , and so on till we have no more balls. If  $B_i$  has not been selected it must meet some of the  $\hat{B}_j$ . If  $\hat{B}_j$  is the first one meeting  $B_i$ , since when choosing the  $j$ -th ball it has not been selected,  $B_i$  has radius not bigger than that of  $\hat{B}_j$ , whence  $B_i \subset \hat{B}_j^*$ . Thus  $E \subset \cup_j \hat{B}_j^*$ , therefore  $\mu(E) \leq \sum_j \mu(\hat{B}_j^*) \leq C \sum_j \mu(\hat{B}_j)$ .  $\square$

We give now the proof of the theorem. We work with the equivalent uncentered version  $\overline{M}f$  and consider  $A_s = \{\overline{M}f > s\}$ , which is open. Every  $x \in A_s$  is the center of some ball  $B_x$  such that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(B_x)} \int_{B_x} |f(y)| d\mu(y) > s.$$

A fixed compact set  $K$  of  $A_s$  will be covered by a finite number of these balls to which we apply the lemma, to get disjoint balls  $B_j$  such that

$$\mu(K) \leq C \sum_j \mu(B_j) \leq \frac{C}{s} \sum_j \int_{B_j} |f(y)| d\mu(y) = \frac{C}{s} \int_{\cup B_j} |f(y)| d\mu(y) \leq \frac{C}{s} \|f\|_1.$$

Since  $K$  is arbitrary this proves the second statement. Now assume that  $f \in L^p(\mu)$ ,  $1 < p$  and consider again  $A_s$ . Let  $f_1(x)$  be equal to  $f(x)$  if  $|f(x)| > \frac{s}{2}$  and zero otherwise (so that  $f_1 \in L^1(\mu)$ ), and put  $f = f_1 + f_2$ , with  $f_2$  bounded by  $\frac{s}{2}$ . Then  $\overline{M}f \leq \overline{M}f_1 + \overline{M}f_2 \leq \overline{M}f_1 + \frac{s}{2}$ , whence  $A_s \subset \{\overline{M}f_1 > \frac{s}{2}\}$ . By the estimate we just proved for  $L^1$ ,

$$\mu(A_s) \leq \frac{C}{s} \|f_1\|_1 = \frac{C}{s} \int_{|f| > \frac{s}{2}} |f(y)| d\mu(y).$$

Then, by Fubini's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \|\overline{M}f\|_p^p &= \int_0^{+\infty} p s^{p-1} \mu(A_s) ds \leq C \int_0^{+\infty} s^{p-2} \int_{|f(y)| > \frac{s}{2}} |f(y)| d\mu(y) = \\ &= C \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |f(y)| \int_0^{2|f(y)|} s^{p-2} ds = A_p \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |f(y)|^p d\mu(y), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

One may check that the constant  $A_p$  behaves like  $\frac{1}{p-1}$  and explodes at 1. In fact, in the standard case, unless  $f = 0$ ,  $Mf$  is never integrable. Indeed, consider a ball  $B$  where  $|f|$  has a non-zero mass  $m$ ; for big enough  $|x|$  the ball  $B(x, k|x|)$  will include  $B$  and so  $Mf(x) \geq c|x|^{-d}$ , which is not integrable at infinity.

However, if  $f$  satisfies an additional condition,  $Mf$  is integrable over sets of finite measure:

**Proposition 1.** If  $A$  has finite measure, then

$$\int_A Mf d\mu \leq C\mu(A) + \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |f(x)| \log^+ |f(x)| d\mu(x).$$

This follows from the same proof as above, where now

$$\int_A |\overline{M}f| d\mu = \int_0^{+\infty} \mu\{x \in A, |\overline{M}f(x)| > s\} ds.$$

For  $s < 1$  we bound simply by  $\mu(A)$ , while for  $s > 1$  we use the weak inequality as before.

## 1.5 Some consequences

Of course the first consequence is Lebesgue's differentiation theorem

**Theorem 3.** For  $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ , one has

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|B(x, \delta)|} \int_{B(x, \delta)} f(y) dy = f(x), a.e.x.$$

In fact,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|B(x, \delta)|} \int_{B(x, \delta)} |f(y) - f(x)| dy = 0, a.e.x.$$

We already proved the first statement; now this gives trivially that  $|f| \leq Mf$  whence the maximal function associated to the second statement is bounded by  $2Mf$ ; since this second statement is also trivially true for continuous functions, we are done. The points above are called the *Lebesgue points* of  $f$ .

In dimension  $d = 1$ , the Lebesgue theorem becomes the fundamental theorem of calculus: for  $f \in L^1(\mathbf{R})$ , the indefinite integral

$$F(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt,$$

has a.e. a derivative equal to  $f(x)$ . As it is well known, the functions  $F$  of this form are exactly the absolutely continuous functions, meaning that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $\delta > 0$  such that the variation  $\sum_j |F(b_j) - F(a_j)|$  is less than  $\varepsilon$  for all consecutive intervals  $(a_j, b_j)$  with total length  $\sum_j (b_j - a_j) < \delta$ .

We now turn to another application of  $Mf$  in the standard setting, regarding *approximations of the identity*. Recall that an approximation of the identity is a family  $(\varphi_t)$  of the form  $\varphi_t(x) = t^{-d} \varphi(x/t)$ , with a fixed  $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$  with integral one. The term "approximation of the identity" comes from the fact that in a certain sense, one has that  $\lim_t \varphi_t = \delta_0$ , the unit for convolution. The precise statement is that

- If  $f \in L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ ,  $1 \leq p < +\infty$ , then  $\varphi_t * f \rightarrow f$  in  $L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$
- If  $f$  is continuous at  $x_0$  then  $\varphi_t * f(x_0) \rightarrow f(x_0)$ .

Approximate identities are related with summation methods for the Fourier integral and with classical PDE's as follows. For  $f \in L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$  or  $f \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  the inverse Fourier transform

$$f(x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \hat{f}(\xi) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \xi} d\xi,$$

does not makes sense as an absolutely convergent integral and so alternative summation methods are proposed. A general scheme is as follows: we



consider a continuous integrable function  $h$  such that  $h(0) = 1$  and the mean

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \hat{f}(\xi) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \xi} h(t\xi) d\xi.$$

Now, Fubini's theorem implies that

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \hat{f}(\xi) g(\xi) d\xi = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} f(y) \hat{g}(y) dy, f, g \in L^1(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

If  $\hat{h} = \Phi$ , the Fourier transform of  $h(t\xi)$  is  $t^{-d} \Phi(\frac{y}{t}) = \Phi_t(y)$ , whence the Fourier transform of  $e^{2\pi i x \cdot \xi} h(t\xi)$  is  $\Phi_t(y - x)$  and so

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \hat{f}(\xi) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \xi} h(t\xi) d\xi = (f * \Phi_t)(x).$$

The most simple choice is  $h(x) = e^{-\pi|x|^2}$  (Gauss means), for which it is easy to compute that  $\Phi(\xi) = e^{-\pi|\xi|^2}$ , that is  $\hat{h} = h$ . For this choice we then have

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \hat{f}(\xi) e^{-t\pi|\xi|^2} e^{2\pi i x \cdot \xi} d\xi = (f * \Phi_{\sqrt{t}})(x).$$

The Gauss means are connected with the heath diffusion problem: indeed one can check that  $u(t, x) = (f * \Phi_{\sqrt{t}})(x)$  is a solution of the heath equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{4} \Delta_x u(x, t).$$

Another choice is  $h(x) = e^{-2\pi|x|}$  leading to the Abel means. One can check that in this case

$$\Phi(\xi) = c_d \frac{1}{(1 + |\xi|^2)^{(d+1)/2}}, c_d = \frac{\Gamma[\frac{d+1}{2}]}{\pi^{(d+1)/2}}.$$

and that in this case  $u(t, x) = f * \Phi_t(x)$  satisfies

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} + \Delta_x u(t, x) = 0.$$

that is, it is harmonic in the half-space. This function  $\Phi$  is called the Poisson kernel  $P$ .

In both cases, the pointwise limit  $\lim_t \Phi_t * f(x)$  becomes the vertical limit  $\lim_t u(x, t)$ . We expect that in both cases the initial boundary condition at  $t = 0$  is  $f$ , meaning  $\lim_t u(x, t) = f(x)$ . We know that this limit takes place in  $L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$  if  $f \in L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ , and now we would like to know about the pointwise behaviour. So we are led to consider the maximal function

$$(\Phi)^*(f)(x) = \sup_t |(\Phi_t * f)(x)|.$$

We will see next that in most cases this maximal function is dominated by  $Mf$ .

**Lemma 2.** If  $\Psi \in L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$  is positive and radial then  $|(\Psi * f)(x)| \leq \|\Psi\|_1 Mf(x)$ .

*Proof.* It is enough to prove it for  $\Psi$  simple, that is, of the form  $\Psi = \sum_j a_j \chi_{B_j}$  where  $\chi_{B_j}$  denotes the characteristic function of a ball  $B_j$  centered at zero and  $a_j \geq 0$ . In this case, noticing that  $\frac{1}{|B_j|} \chi_{B_j} * f(x)$  is the mean of  $f$  over  $B_j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\Psi * f)(x)| &\leq \sum_j a_j |(\chi_{B_j} * f)(x)| \leq \sum_j a_j |B_j| Mf(x) = \\ &= Mf(x) \sum_j a_j |B_j| = \|\Psi\|_1 Mf(x). \end{aligned}$$

□

It follows from the lemma that if  $\Phi_t$  is an approximation of the identity with  $\Phi$  radial then  $(\Phi)^*(f)(x) \leq Mf(x)$  and so it satisfies a weak estimate implying that  $\lim_t (f * \Phi_t)(x) = f(x)$  a.e. . This will hold as well if the *least radially decreasing majorant* of  $\Phi$ ,

$$\Psi(x) = \sup_{|y| \geq |x|} |\Phi(y)|,$$

is in  $L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$ .

This fact applies to both Gauss and Abel means and hence we get that the above solutions of the heat and Laplace equation have vertical boundary values equal to  $f$  a.e. It is not hard to see, for the Poisson kernel  $P$ , that not only the vertical maximal function

$$\sup_t |u(x, t)| = \sup_t |(f * P_t)(x)|,$$

is controlled by  $Mf$ , but also the *non-tangential maximal function*. This is defined by associating to each point  $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$  the cone in the upper half-space

$$\Gamma(x) = \{(y, t) : |x - y| \leq ct\}.$$

The corresponding maximal function

$$N^* f(x) = \sup_{(y, t) \in \Gamma(x)} |u(y, t)|,$$

is called the non-tangential maximal function. It can be proved by easy modification of the argument above that also it is controlled by  $Mf$ , that is,  $N^* f(x) \leq CMf(x)$  for some constant  $C$ , and therefore it satisfies as well a weak  $L^1$ - estimate. Since obviously pointwise non-tangential convergence occurs for continuous functions with compact support one gets

**Theorem 4.** (Fatou's theorem). If  $f \in L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$ , the harmonic function in the upper half-space  $u(x, t) = (f * P_t)(x)$  has non-tangential limit  $f(x)$  at almost all  $x$ .