

# Problem Set 5

## Real Analysis II

Bennett Rennier  
barennier@gmail.com

January 15, 2018

**Ex 16.1** Find the Fourier Transform of  $\chi_{[a,b]}$  and in particular, find the Fourier transform of  $\chi_{[-n,n]}$ .

*Proof.* We see that

$$\mathcal{F}(\chi_{[a,b]}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{iux} \chi_{[a,b]} dx = \int_a^b e^{iu \cdot x} dx = \left[ \frac{e^{iux}}{iu} \right]_{x=a}^b = \frac{e^{iub} - e^{iua}}{iu}$$

in the general case. If we focus in particular on  $\chi_{[-n,n]}$ , then we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\chi_{[-n,n]}) &= \frac{e^{iun} - e^{-iun}}{iu} = \frac{\cos(un) + i \sin(un) - (\cos(-un) + i \sin(-un))}{iu} \\ &= \frac{\cos(un) + i \sin(un) - \cos(un) + i \sin(un)}{iu} = \frac{2i \sin(un)}{iu} = \frac{2 \sin(un)}{u} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex 16.2** Find a real-valued function  $f \in L^1$  such that  $\hat{f} \notin L^1$ .

*Proof.* We easily see that  $\chi_{[-1,1]}$  is an integrable function over the real numbers. As per the previous exercise, we also know that  $\mathcal{F}(\chi_{[-1,1]}) = 2 \frac{\sin x}{x}$ . Now, I claim that  $2 \frac{\sin x}{x}$  is not in  $L^1$ . To show this, we first see that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that

$$\int_{(n-1)\pi}^{n\pi} \left| \frac{\sin x}{x} \right| dx \geq \frac{1}{n\pi} \int_{(n-1)\pi}^{n\pi} |\sin x| dx = \frac{2}{n\pi}$$

This means that

$$\int_0^{m\pi} \left| \frac{\sin x}{x} \right| dx \geq \sum_{n=1}^{m\pi} \frac{2}{n\pi}$$

If we then let  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , we get that

$$\int_0^\infty \left| \frac{\sin x}{x} \right| dx \geq \frac{2}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n} = \infty$$

as the sum is the harmonic series. This proves that  $\frac{\sin x}{x} \notin L^1$ .

□

**Ex 16.4** If  $f$  is integrable, real-valued, and all the partial derivatives  $f_j = \partial f / \partial x_j$  are integrable, prove that the Fourier transform of  $f_j$  is given by  $\hat{f}_j(u) = -iu_j \hat{f}(u)$ .

*Proof.* Firstly, we can rearrange the integrals by Fubini's Theorem (as the function is integrable) like so:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f}_j(u) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{iu \cdot x} f_j(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_2} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}_n} e^{iu \cdot x} f_j(x) dx_n \cdots dx_2 dx_1 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_2} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_j} e^{iu \cdot x} f_j(x) dx_j dx_n \cdots dx_2 dx_1\end{aligned}$$

Applying integration by parts on the innermost integral, we get that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_j} e^{iu \cdot x} f_j(x) dx_j = \lim_{a_j \rightarrow \infty} [f(a) e^{iu \cdot a} - f(-a) e^{iu \cdot -a}] - \int_{\mathbb{R}_j} iu_j e^{iu \cdot x} f(x) dx_j$$

Since  $f_j$  is integrable, then we can use the same argument in Proposition 16.3 to see that  $f(a) \rightarrow 0$  as  $a_j \rightarrow \infty$ . This proves that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_j} e^{iu \cdot x} f_j(x) dx_j = - \int_{\mathbb{R}_j} iu_j e^{iu \cdot x} f(x) dx_j$$

Which means that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f}_j(u) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_2} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_j} e^{iu \cdot x} f_j(x) dx_j dx_n \cdots dx_2 dx_1 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_2} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}_j} -iu_j e^{iu \cdot x} f(x) dx_j dx_n \cdots dx_2 dx_1 \\ &= -iu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_2} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}_n} e^{iu \cdot x} f(x) dx_n \cdots dx_2 dx_1 = -iu_j \hat{f}(u)\end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex 16.7** If  $f$  is real-valued and continuously differentiable on  $\mathbb{R}$ , prove that

$$\left( \int |f|^2 dx \right)^2 \leq 4 \left( \int |xf(x)|^2 dx \right) \left( \int |f'|^2 dx \right)$$

*Proof.* We know that

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int |f(x)g(x)| dx$$

is a valid inner product on integrable functions. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz on this inner product, we see that

$$\langle xf(x), f'(x) \rangle^2 \leq \langle xf(x), xf(x) \rangle \langle f'(x), f'(x) \rangle$$

which means that

$$\int |xf(x)f'(x)| dx \leq \int |xf(x)|^2 dx \int |f'(x)|^2 dx$$

Now in order to prove the inequality, we must show that

$$\int |f(x)|^2 dx \leq 4 \int |xf(x)f'(x)| dx$$

However, this isn't true in general, so I'm not sure how to prove this. I am fairly sure that it has to do with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality under a different inner product that I'm not seeing.  $\square$