SOLUTIONS SHEET 7

YANNIS BÄHNI

Exercise 1.

Lemma 1.1. $q: X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a sublinear functional and $f \leq q$ on Y.

Proof. Let $\lambda \geq 0$. Moreover, let $\{A_1, \ldots, A_n\} \subseteq G$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for any $x \in X$ we have that

$$\frac{1}{n}p\left(A_1(\lambda x) + \dots + A_n(\lambda x)\right) = \frac{1}{n}p\left(\lambda A_1(x) + \dots + \lambda A_n(x)\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n}p\left(\lambda\left(A_1(x) + \dots + A_n(x)\right)\right)$$
$$= \lambda \frac{1}{n}p(A_1(x) + \dots + A_n(x))$$

since each A_i is linear and p is a sublinear functional on X. Thus also $q(\lambda x) = \lambda q(x)$. Let $x, y \in X$. Furthermore, fix some $\varepsilon > 0$. By definition of the infimum, we find $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in G$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_m \in G$, such that

$$q(x) \le \frac{1}{n} p\left(A_1(x) + \dots + A_n(x)\right) \le q(x) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

and

$$q(y) \le \frac{1}{m} p\left(B_1(y) + \dots + B_m(y)\right) \le q(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

We estimate

$$\frac{1}{n}p(A_{1}(x) + \dots + A_{n}(x)) = \frac{m}{mn}p(A_{1}(x) + \dots + A_{n}(x))$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn}\sum_{k=1}^{m}p(A_{1}(x) + \dots + A_{n}(x))$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{mn}\sum_{k=1}^{m}p(B_{k}(A_{1}(x) + \dots + A_{n}(x)))$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn}\sum_{k=1}^{m}p(B_{k}A_{1}(x) + \dots + B_{k}A_{n}(x))$$

(Yannis Bähni) University of Zurich, Rämistrasse 71, 8006 Zurich *E-mail address*: yannis.baehni@uzh.ch.

by the linearity of elements in G, the closedness of G under composition and the property that $p(Ax) \le p(x)$ holds for all $x \in X$ and $A \in G$. Similarly we estimate

$$\frac{1}{m}p(B_{1}(y) + \dots + B_{m}(y)) = \frac{n}{mn}p(B_{1}(y) + \dots + B_{m}(y))$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn}\sum_{k=1}^{n}p(B_{1}(y) + \dots + B_{m}(y))$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{mn}\sum_{k=1}^{n}p(A_{k}(B_{1}(y) + \dots + B_{m}(y)))$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn}\sum_{k=1}^{n}p(A_{k}B_{1}(y) + \dots + A_{k}B_{m}(y)).$$

Hence the sublinearity of p together with the commutativity of G yields

$$q(x) + q(y) + \varepsilon \ge \frac{1}{n} p \left(A_1(x) + \dots + A_n(x) \right) + \frac{1}{m} p \left(B_1(y) + \dots + B_m(y) \right)$$

$$\ge \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{k=1}^{m} p \left(B_k A_1(x) + \dots + B_k A_n(x) \right)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{k=1}^{n} p \left(A_k B_1(y) + \dots + A_k B_m(y) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} p \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_k A_{\ell}(x) \right) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} p \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} A_k B_{\ell}(y) \right) \right)$$

$$\ge \frac{1}{mn} \left(p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_k A_{\ell}(x) \right) + p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} A_k B_{\ell}(y) \right) \right)$$

$$\ge \frac{1}{mn} p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_k A_{\ell}(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} A_k B_{\ell}(y) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn} p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_k A_{\ell}(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} B_{\ell} A_{k}(y) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn} p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_k A_{\ell}(x) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} B_{\ell} A_{k}(y) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn} p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_k A_{\ell}(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_k A_{\ell}(y) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn} p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \left(B_k A_{\ell}(x) + B_k A_{\ell}(y) \right) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{mn} p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_k A_{\ell}(x+y) \right)$$

$$\geq q(x+y).$$

Since ε was arbitrary, we conclude that

$$q(x + y) \le q(x) + q(y)$$

holds for all $x, y \in X$. Lastly, we show that $f \leq q$ on Y. Let $y \in Y$. Moreover, let $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in G$. Then

$$f(y) = \frac{1}{n} n f(y)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} f(y)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} f(A_k y)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} f(A_1 y + \dots + A_n y)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} p(A_1 y + \dots + A_n y)$$

by the assumption that f(Ay) = f(y), $Ay \in Y$, f is linear and $f \le p$ on Y for all $y \in Y$ and $A \in G$. Taking the infimum over all finite sets of G finally yields the result.

An application of *Hahn-Banach* now yields the existence of a linear mapping $F: X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $F|_Y = f$ and $F \le q$ on X. Observe, that $q \le p$ simply by choosing the finite set to be $\{id_X\}$. Hence $F \le p$ on X. Thus we have to show a final lemma.

Lemma 1.2.
$$\forall x \in X \forall A \in G (F(Ax) = F(x)).$$

Proof. Fix $x \in X$ and $A \in G$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider $\{id_X, A, A^2, \dots, A^{n-1}\}\subseteq G$. On one hand we have that

$$F(Ax) - F(x) = F(Ax - x)$$

$$\leq q(Ax - x)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} p \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A^k (Ax - x) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} p \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(A^{k+1} x - A^k x \right) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} p (A^n x - x)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \left(p(A^n x) + p(-x) \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \left(p(x) + p(-x) \right)$$

and on the other

$$F(Ax) - F(x) = F(Ax - x)$$

$$= -F(x - Ax)$$

$$\geq -q(x - Ax)$$

$$\geq -\frac{1}{n}p\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}A^{k}(x - Ax)\right)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{n}p\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(A^{k}x - A^{k+1}x)\right)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{n}p(x - A^{n}x)$$

$$\geq -\frac{1}{n}(p(x) + p(-A^{n}x))$$

$$= -\frac{1}{n}(p(x) + p(A^{n}(-x)))$$

$$\geq -\frac{1}{n}(p(x) + p(-x)).$$

Hence

$$|F(Ax) - F(x)| \le \frac{1}{n} \left(p(x) + p(-x) \right).$$

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ was arbitrary, we conclude that

$$|F(Ax) - F(x)| = 0$$

and thus

$$F(Ax) = F(x)$$
.

Exercise 2. See separate sheet.

Exercise 3.

Lemma 1.3. Let $y \in H$ and define a mapping $\varphi_y : H \to \mathbb{K}$ by $\varphi_y(x) := \langle A(y), x \rangle$. Then $\varphi_y \in \mathcal{L}(H, \mathbb{K})$.

Proof. Clearly, φ_y is linear since $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is linear in the second component. Moreover, φ_y is bounded. Indeed, using Cauchy-Schwarz yields

$$|\varphi_{v}(x)| = |\langle A(y), x \rangle| \le ||A(y)|| ||x||$$

for all $x \in H$.

Thus we may define a family

$$\mathcal{F} := \{ \varphi_v : y \in \partial B_1(0) \} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H, \mathbb{K}).$$

Let $x \in H$. Then for any $y \in \partial B_1(0)$ we have that

$$|\varphi_y(x)| = |\langle A(y), x \rangle| = |\langle y, A(x) \rangle| \le ||y|| ||A(x)|| = ||A(x)||$$

by symmetry and again Cauchy-Schwarz. Hence

$$\sup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} |T(x)| = \sup_{y \in \partial B_1(0)} |\varphi_y(x)| \le ||A(x)||$$

for all $x \in H$. Since any Hilbert space is a Banach space, an application of *Banach-Steinhaus* yields the existence of a constant c > 0 such that

$$\sup_{T\in\mathcal{F}}||T||=\sup_{y\in\partial B_1(0)}||\varphi_y||\leq c.$$

For $x \in H$ such that $A(x) \neq 0$ we have that

$$||A(x)||^{2} = \langle A(x), A(x) \rangle$$

$$= ||x|| \langle A(x/||x||), A(x) \rangle$$

$$= ||x|| \varphi_{x/||x||}(A(x))$$

$$\leq ||x|| ||\varphi_{x/||x||}(A(x))|$$

$$\leq ||x|| ||A(x)|| ||\varphi_{x/||x||}||$$

$$\leq c ||x|| ||A(x)||$$

and thus dividing both sides by ||A(x)|| yields the boundedness of A.

Exercise 4.

Exercise 5.

a. We define

$$\mathcal{F} := \{B(\cdot, y) : y \in \partial B_1(0)\}.$$

Lemma 1.4. We have that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(X, \mathbb{K})$ and for all $x \in X$, there exists $c_x \geq 0$ such that $\sup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} |T(x)| \leq c_x$.

Proof. Let $y \in \partial B_1(0)$. Then $B(\cdot, y)$ is linear by definition of a bilinear functional. Moreover, for any $x \in X$ we have that

$$|B(x, y)| \le c_v ||x||$$

for some $c_y \geq 0$ by continuity of B in the first argument. Hence $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(X, \mathbb{K})$. Let $x \in X$. Then

$$|B(x,y)| \le c_x ||y|| = c_x$$

for some $c_x \geq 0$ by continuity of B in the second argument. Thus

$$\sup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} |T(x)| = \sup_{y \in \partial B_1(0)} |B(x, y)| \le c_x$$

for all $x \in X$.

An application of Banach-Steinhaus on the family $\mathcal F$ yields the existence of a constant $c \geq 0$ such that

$$\sup_{T\in\mathcal{F}}\|T\|\leq c.$$

Let $x, y \in X$. Then

$$|B(x, y)| = ||x|| ||y|| |B(x/||x||, y/||y||)|$$

$$\leq ||x|| ||y|| \sup_{\|\xi\|=1} |B(\xi, y/||y||)|$$

$$\leq ||x|| ||y|| \sup_{\|\xi\|=1} ||B(\xi, \xi)||$$

$$= ||x|| ||y|| \sup_{\|\xi\|=1} ||B(\cdot, \xi)||$$

$$\leq c ||x|| ||y||.$$

Lemma 1.5. Equip $X \times X$ with the norm $\|(x, y)\| := \|x\| + \|y\|$. Then B is continuous.

Proof. Let $(x, y) \in X \times X$ and $(x_n, y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $X \times X$ converging to (x, y). We claim that $x_n \to x$ and $y_n \to y$ in X. Indeed

$$||x_n - x|| \le ||x_n - x|| + ||y_n - y|| = ||(x_n, y_n) - (x, y)|| \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$ and similarly

$$||y_n - y|| \le ||x_n - x|| + ||y_n - y|| = ||(x_n, y_n) - (x, y)|| \to 0.$$

Moreover, since $y_n \to y$, y_n is bounded, i.e. there exists some $M \ge 0$ such that $||y_n|| \le M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$|B(x_n, y_n) - B(x, y)| = |B(x_n, y_n) - B(x, y_n) + B(x, y_n) - B(x, y)|$$

$$= |B(x_n - x, y_n) + B(x, y_n - y)|$$

$$\leq |B(x_n - x, y_n)| + |B(x, y_n - y)|$$

$$\leq c ||x_n - x|| ||y_n|| + c ||x|| ||y_n - y||$$

$$\leq c M ||x_n - x|| + c ||x|| ||y_n - y|| \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Lemma 1.6. B is a bilinear functional on \mathcal{P} which is continuous in each argument separately.

Proof. The bilinearity of B directly follows from the linearity of the integral. Fix $q \in \mathcal{P}$. Then for any $p \in \mathcal{P}$ we have that

$$|B(p,q)| = \left| \int_0^1 p(t)q(t)dt \right| \le \int_0^1 |p(t)||q(t)| dt \le \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |q(t)| \int_0^1 |p(t)| dt = c_q ||p||$$

since q is continuous. Similarly, for each fixed $p \in \mathcal{P}$ we get that $|B(p,q)| \le c_p ||q||$ for all $q \in \mathcal{P}$.