

Mandatory Assignment 2, Functional Analysis

Peter Lund Andersen, btv124

Problem 1

Part (a)

It follows from **Homework week 4, problem 2(a)** that f_N converges weakly to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$ if and only if $T(f_N)$ converges to $T(0) = 0$ for all $T \in H^*$. We also know from Riesz representation theorem (**Homework week 2, problem 1**) that for every bounded linear functional $T \in H^*$ there exists a unique $y \in H$ such that $T(F_N) = \langle F_N, y \rangle$. Now for a given $y \in H$ we have from linearity (of the first coordinate) in inner product that

$$\langle F_N, y \rangle = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N^2} e_n, y \right\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N^2} \langle e_n, y \rangle$$

Since $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an ONB we have that $\bar{y} = \overline{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle y, e_n \rangle} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\langle y, e_n \rangle} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle e_n, y \rangle$, so $\sum_{n=1}^{N^2} \langle e_n, y \rangle$ converges to \bar{y} for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore we have for all $y \in H$ (and hence all $T \in H^*$ that $T(F_N) = \langle F_N, y \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N^2} \langle e_n, y \rangle$ converges to $0 = \langle 0, y \rangle = T(0)$ for $N \rightarrow \infty$ and hence F_N converges weakly to 0. *Could be more explicit here.* ✓

Using Parseval's Identity (**Folland, Theorem 5.27 (b)**) We have for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\|F_N\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\langle F_N, e_i \rangle|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N^2} \langle e_n, e_i \rangle \right|^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N^2} |\langle e_i, e_i \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} N^2 = 1$$

Where we have used that $(e_n) \subset H$ is an ONB so $\langle e_n, e_i \rangle$ is equal to 0 if $n \neq i$ and equal to 1 if $n = i$. ✓

Part (b)

For a given $g \in \text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ there exists a $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i f_i$ where $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$. Then we have that

$$\|g\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i F_i \right\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \|F_i\| = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$$

Therefore we can conclude that $\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \overline{B_H(0, 1)}$. Since $\overline{B_H(0, 1)}$ is closed with respect to the norm topology, we have that $\overline{\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{\|\cdot\|} \subset \overline{B_H(0, 1)}$. Since $\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a convex subset of H it follows from **Theorem 5.7** that $\overline{\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{\|\cdot\|} = \overline{\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{\tau_w}$. Now as H is a Hilbert space and therefore reflexive we can use **Theorem 6.3** to say that $\overline{B_H(0, 1)}$ is compact with respect to τ_w . We now have that

$$\overline{\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{\|\cdot\|} = \overline{\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{\tau_w} \subset \overline{B_H(0, 1)}^{\tau_w}$$

Using that a closed subset of a compact set is compact (**Folland, Proposition 4.22**) we can therefore conclude that $K = \overline{\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{\tau_w}$ is weakly compact. ✓ Since $F_N \rightarrow 0$ weakly from **Problem 1(a)** we can now use **Homework 5, Problem 1** to say that there exists a sequence $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in norm to 0. Since $K = \overline{\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{\|\cdot\|}$ we know that K contains all the limits points of norm convergence and hence $0 \in K$. ✓

Part (c)

For a given $g \in \text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ we have that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\langle g, e_i \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i f_i, e_j \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \left\langle \frac{1}{i} \sum_{k=1}^{i^2} e_k, e_j \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{i} \sum_{k=1}^{i^2} \langle e_k, e_j \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{i} 1_{(i^2 \geq j)}$$

Where $1_{(i^2 \geq j)}$ is indicator function. We then note that $\langle g, e_i \rangle \geq 0$ and is real valued since α_i has to be real valued. Now for a given $h \in K$ we have that since $K = \overline{\text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{\|\cdot\|}$ then there exists a sequence $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{co}\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $h_n \rightarrow h$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. It now follows Hilbert space theory (**Folland**, Proposition 5.21) that $\langle h_n, e_i \rangle \rightarrow \langle h, e_i \rangle$ for all $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore we have that $\langle h, e_i \rangle$ is real valued and non-negative for all $h \in K$. Now assume that 0 is not an extreme point, then there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $h_1, h_2 \in K$ different from 0 such that $0 = \alpha h_1 + (1 - \alpha)h_2$. Since $h_1 \neq 0$ we know that there exists a $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\langle h_1, e_n \rangle \neq 0$. Using linearity of the inner product we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0, e_n \rangle &= \langle \alpha h_1 + (1 - \alpha)h_2, e_n \rangle \Rightarrow \\ 0 &= \alpha \langle h_1, e_n \rangle + (1 - \alpha) \langle h_2, e_n \rangle \Rightarrow \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \langle h_1, e_n \rangle &= \langle h_2, e_n \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle h_1, e_n \rangle \neq 0$ and we know that $\langle h_1, e_n \rangle \in \mathbb{R}_+$ then it follows that $\langle h_2, e_n \rangle$ has to be negative, since $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} < 0$, which is a contradiction. Hence 0 cannot be written as a convex combination so $0 \in \text{Ext}(K)$. ✓

Since K is a non-empty, compact and convex subset of H with respect to the weak topology, it now follows from Krein-Milman (**Theorem 7.8**) that $K = \overline{\text{co}(\text{Ext}(K))}^{\tau_w}$. We now assume that $\text{Ext}(K) \subset F \cup \{0\}$ which will be proved in **Part (d)**. Assume that $f_{n_0} \notin \text{Ext}(K)$, let $F' = \{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{n_0\}\}$ and let $K' = \overline{\text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})}^{\tau_w}$. Using Krein-Milman we must then have that $K' = K$ and hence $f_{n_0} \in K'$. We can reuse the arguments of **Problem 1(b)** to say that since $\text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})$ is compact then $K' = \overline{\text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})}^{\tau_w} = \overline{\text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})}^{\|\cdot\|}$ per **Theorem 5.7**. So $f_{n_0} \in K'$ if and only if there exists a sequence $g_n \in \text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})$ such that $\|g_n - f_{n_0}\| \rightarrow 0$. It follows from **Homework week 5, Problem 2(b)** that $\text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})$ is given by

Why is this applicable here?

$$\text{co}(F' \cup \{0\}) = \left\{ \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq n_0}}^n \alpha_i f_i, n \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \leq 1 \right\}$$

For a $g \in \text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})$ we have that

$$\langle g, f_{n_0} \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq n_0}}^n \alpha_i f_i, f_{n_0} \right\rangle = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq n_0}}^n \alpha_i \langle f_i, f_{n_0} \rangle = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq n_0}}^n \alpha_i \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{n_0} \left\langle \sum_{n=1}^{i^2} e_n, \sum_{m=1}^{n_0^2} e_m \right\rangle = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq n_0}}^n \alpha_i \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{n_0} \min\{i^2, n_0^2\}$$

Where we have that $\frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{n_0} \min\{i^2, n_0^2\} = \min\left\{\frac{i}{n_0}, \frac{n_0}{i}\right\}$ and we see that for all $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus n_0$ we have that $\min\left\{\frac{i}{n_0}, \frac{n_0}{i}\right\} \leq \frac{n_0}{n_0+1}$. This holds since for $i < n_0$ we have that $\frac{i}{n_0} < \frac{n_0}{n_0+1}$ and for $i > n_0$ we have that $\frac{n_0}{i} \leq \frac{n_0}{n_0+1}$. Therefore we can conclude that for all $g \in \text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})$ we have that $\langle g, f_{n_0} \rangle \leq \frac{n_0}{n_0+1} < 1$. Hence for any sequence $g_n \rightarrow f_{n_0}$ we would have from **Folland, Proposition 5.21** that $\langle g_n, f_{n_0} \rangle \rightarrow \langle f_{n_0}, f_{n_0} \rangle = \|f_{n_0}\|^2 = 1$. But this contradicts our conclusion about $\langle g, f_{n_0} \rangle \leq \frac{n_0}{n_0+1} < 1$ and therefore no sequence in $\text{co}(F' \cup \{0\})$ converges to f_{n_0} and therefore $f_{n_0} \notin K'$. Hence we can conclude that $K' \neq K$ and f_{n_0} then has to be an Extreme point. Calculate. ✓

Part (d)

We know that the weak topology is a LCTVS and that K is weakly compact and convex set. Since $\{F_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a subset such that $K = \overline{\text{co}(F)}^{\tau_w}$ we have from Milman (**Theorem 7.9**) that $\text{Ext}(K) \subset \overline{F}^{\tau_w}$. Since $\overline{F}^{\tau_w} \subset K$ and K is weakly compact it follows from **Folland, Proposition 4.22** that \overline{F}^{τ_w} is weakly compact. It follows from the definition of weak convergence that since $F_N \rightarrow 0$ weakly for $N \rightarrow \infty$ then $0 \in \overline{F}^{\tau_w}$. Now since F is countable set in the Hilbert space we know that the closure of F contain exactly all of its limitpoints. But a sequence in $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset F$ will either have a $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $F_{n_0} = h_n$ for infinitely many n or each F_N will only appear finitely many times. If this happens then we have that $h_n \rightarrow 0$ weakly. So if $F_{n_0} = h_n$ for infinitely many n we must have that if $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges then the convergence point has to be f_{n_0} since weak convergence is unique. Therefore we have that $\overline{F}^{\tau_w} = \{f_N : N \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$ and then it follows that there are no other extreme points in K since $\text{Ext}(K) = \overline{F}^{\tau_w}$. Could be written a bit neater. ✓

We note that weak converges is unique, since it is equivalent with convergence of $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$ for every $f \in X^*$, and Hahn-Banach Extension Theorem (**Theorem 2.7**) tells us that the bounded linear functionals separate points.

Problem 2

Part (a)

We note that from **Theorem 7.13** we know that there for all $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ exists a unique adjoint operator T^\dagger such that $(T^\dagger y^*)(x) = y^*(Tx)$ for all $x \in X$ for all $y^* \in Y^*$ and we note that $T^\dagger \circ y^* \in X^*$. From **Homework week 4, Problem 2(a)** we know that if x_n converges weakly to x then $f(x_n)$ converges to $f(x)$ for all $f \in X^*$ so it especially holds for $T^\dagger \circ y^*$. Hence for a given $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ we know that for all $y^* \in Y^*$ it holds that if x_n converges weakly to x then $T^\dagger \circ y^*(x_n) = y^*(T(x_n))$ converges to $T^\dagger \circ y^*(x) = y^*(T(x))$ and we can conclude, using **Homework week 4, Problem 2(a)**, that $T(x_n)$ converges weakly to $T(x)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. ✓

Part (b)

We first proof that in a Banach space, a sequence converges in norm, then it also converges weakly. So for $x_n \rightarrow x$ in norm we have that for all $f \in X^*$ it holds that

$$\|f(x_n) - f(x)\| = \|f(x_n - x)\| \leq \|f\| \|x_n - x\|$$

Where we used linearity of f and that it is bounded. Since $x_n \rightarrow x$ we know that $\|x_n - x\| \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ and hence $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$ and it now follows from **Homework week 4, Problem 2(a)** that x_n converges weakly to x .

For a given $T \in \mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ and a weakly convergent sequence, $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset X$, it follows from **Homework 4, Problem 2(b)** that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_n\| < \infty$ and it therefore also holds for any subsequence $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Using compactness of T we have from **Proposition 8.2** that the bounded sequence $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains a subsequence (so a subsubsequence of $(x_n)_{n \rightarrow \infty}$) $(x_{n_{k_p}})_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $T(x_{n_{k_p}})$ converges to a $y \in Y$. Then it follows from the small results above that $T(x_{n_{k_p}}) \rightarrow y$ weakly. We know that every compact operator is linear, so **Problem 2(a)** tells us that $T(x_n) \rightarrow T(x)$ weakly and using uniqueness of weak convergence we get that $T(x_{n_{k_p}})$ has to converge to weakly $T(x)$, which only happens if it also converges in norm to $T(x)$. Since we have proved that every subsequence of $T(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a convergent subsubsequence with the same limit, it now follows that $T(x_n)$ converges to $T(x)$. ✓

Part (c)

Assume that for a given $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, Y)$ and that T is not a compact operator. Then we have from **Proposition 8.2** that $T(\overline{B}_H(0, 1))$ is not totally bounded. This means that there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and all sets of open balls U_1, \dots, U_N with radius δ we have that $T(\overline{B}_H(0, 1)) \not\subset \cup_{i=1}^N U_i$. Then we can let $x_1 = 0$ and let $U_1 = B_Y(T(x_1), \delta)$ then since $T(\overline{B}_H(0, 1)) \setminus U_1 \neq \emptyset$ there exists a $x_2 \in \overline{B}_H(0, 1)$ such that $T(x_2) \in T(\overline{B}_H(0, 1)) \setminus U_1$ and we let $U_2 = B_Y(T(x_2), \delta)$. So in general we define x_n by observing that $T(\overline{B}_H(0, 1)) \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{n-1} U_i \neq \emptyset$ so there exists a $x_n \in \overline{B}_H(0, 1)$ such that $T(x_n) \in T(\overline{B}_H(0, 1)) \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{n-1} U_i$ and we define $U_n = B_Y(T(x_n), \delta)$. This defines a sequence in $\overline{B}_H(0, 1)$ where it holds that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \overline{B}_H(0, 1)$ and that $T(x_n) \in U_m$ if and only if $n = m$ hence we have that $\|T(x_n) - T(x_m)\| \geq \delta$ for all $n \neq m$. ✓

For a given sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \overline{B}_H(0, 1)$ that lies in the closed unit ball we have that we can define the sequence in $f_n(y) = \langle y, x_n \rangle$ for all $y \in H$ and it follows from Riesz Representation Theorem that $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset H^*$ and we also have since $\|f_n\| = \|x_n\| \leq 1$ it lies in the closed unit ball of H^* . Since H is a separable Hilbert space we know from **Theorem 5.13** that $\overline{B}_{H^*}(0, 1)$ is metrizable with respect to the weak* topology and from Alaoglu's Theorem (**Theorem 6.1**) that the closed unit ball in H^* is compact with respect to the weak* topology. This means that $\overline{B}_{H^*}(0, 1)$ is sequential compact with respect to τ_w^* and the sequence $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \overline{B}_{H^*}(0, 1)$ contains a subsequence $(f_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that converges to an element, $f_0 \in \overline{B}_{H^*}(0, 1)$ in the weak* topology. Let $x_0 \in H$ be the element such that $f_0(y) = \langle y, x_0 \rangle$. It now follows from **Homework week 4, Problem 2(c)** that since $f_{n_k} \rightarrow f_0$ in the weak* topology we have that $f_{n_k}(y) \rightarrow f_0(y)$ for all $y \in H$, and \cdot . This is equivalent to $\langle y, x_{n_k} \rangle \rightarrow \langle y, x_0 \rangle$ which again is equivalent to convergence of the conjugated so $\langle x_{n_k}, y \rangle \rightarrow \langle x_0, y \rangle$. This in turn shows that per **Homework week 4, Problem 2(a)** we have x_{n_k} converges weakly to x_0 .

Hence take a given $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, Y)$ where it holds that $\|T(x_n) - T(x)\| \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all weakly convergent sequences x_n . Now assume that $T \notin \mathcal{K}(H, Y)$ and look at the sequence defined so that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \overline{B}_H(0, 1)$ and that $\|x_n - x_m\| \geq \delta$. Then we know that there exists a subsequence such that $x_{n_k} \rightarrow x$ weakly and it still holds that $\|T(x_{n_k}) - T(x_{n_p})\| \geq \delta$ for all $k \neq p$. But then the subsequence is not Cauchy and hence not convergent to any point in Y , especially $T(x)$. This is in contradiction with the assumptions about T and hence it has to be compact. ✓

Part (d)

For a given $T \in \mathcal{L}(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}), \ell_1(\mathbb{B}))$ and a given sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that converges to x weakly, it follows from **Problem 2(a)** that $T(x_n)$ converges weakly to $T(x)$ and then we know from **Remark 5.3** that $T(x_n)$ converges in norm to $T(x)$, since it is in $\ell_1(\mathbb{N})$. Knowing that $\ell_2(\mathbb{N})$ is a separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space we can now invoke the result of **Problem 2(c)** to say that $T \in \mathcal{K}(X, Y)$. ✓

Part (e)

For a given $T \in \mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ assume that T is surjective. It now follows from the Open mapping theorem (**Theorem 3.15**) that T is open. We therefore know that there exists a $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}_Y(0, r) \subset T(\overline{B}_X(0, 1))$. Since T is a compact operator it follows from **Definition 8.1** that $\overline{T(\overline{B}_X(0, 1))}$ is compact in Y and using **Folland, Proposition 4.22** we know that then $\overline{B}_Y(0, r)$ also has to be compact in Y . But this is a contradiction since we in **Mandatory Assignment 1, problem 3(e)** proved that the closed unit ball is non-compact in an infinite dimensional normed space. We now have a contradiction since we for a normed space have that

$\overline{B_Y(0, r)}$ is compact if and only if $\overline{B_Y}(0, 1)$ is compact. *why is this true? ✓*

Part (f)

We have for all $f, g \in L_2([0, 1], m)$ that

$$\langle M(f), g \rangle = \int_{[0,1]} t f(t) \overline{g(t)} dm(t) = \int_{[0,1]} t f(t) \overline{g(t)} dm(t) = \int_{[0,1]} f(t) \overline{t g(t)} dm(t) = \langle f, M(g) \rangle$$

using that $t \in [0, 1]$ so $\bar{t} = t$, and therefore M is a self-adjoint operator. We also know from **Homework week 6, problem 3(a)** that M has no eigenvalues. Hence if M was compact we could use The Spectral Theorem (**Theorem 10.1**), since $L_2([0, 1], m)$ is a separable per **Homework week 4, problem 4(a)**, and conclude that $L_2([0, 1], m)$ has an ONB consisting of eigenvectors. But this is a contradiction since M has no eigenvalues and therefore also has no eigenvectors. ✓

Problem 3

Part (a)

We have that $([0, 1], \mathbb{B}([0, 1]), m)$ is a finite, and then also σ -finite measure space with Hilbert space $H = L_2([0, 1], m)$. For the product measure space $([0, 1] \times [0, 1], \mathbb{B}([0, 1]) \otimes \mathbb{B}([0, 1]), m \otimes m)$ we have that $K \in L_2([0, 1] \times [0, 1], m \otimes m)$ since using Tonelli's theorem (**Folland, Theorem 2.37**) we get that

$$\|K\|^2 = \int_{[0,1] \times [0,1]} |K(s, t)|^2 dm \otimes m(s, t) = \int_{[0,1]} \int_{[0,1]} |K(s, t)|^2 dm(s) dm(t) \leq 1$$

Where we have used that $|K(s, t)| \leq 1$ for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$. It now follows that if we define $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, H)$ by

$$(Tf)(s) = \int_{[0,1]} K(s, t) f(t) dm(t) \quad s \in [0, 1], \quad f \in H$$

it follows the construction of (\square) in Lecture 9. It now follows from **Proposition 9.12** that T is Hilbert-Schmidt and hence per **Proposition 9.11** also compact. ✓

Part (b)

We first note that $K(s, t) = K(t, s)$, which trivially holds if $s = t$. Otherwise we can, without loss of generality, assume that $s > t$ and then $K(s, t) = (1 - s)t = K(t, s)$. It now follows that for all $f, g \in H$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(f), g \rangle &= \int_{[0,1]} \int_{[0,1]} K(s, t) f(t) dm(t) \overline{g(s)} dm(s) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \int_{[0,1]} f(t) \int_{[0,1]} K(s, t) \overline{g(s)} dm(s) dm(t) \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{=} \int_{[0,1]} f(t) \overline{\int_{[0,1]} K(t, s) g(s) dm(s)} dm(t) \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} f(t) \overline{Tg(t)} dm(t) = \langle f, T(g) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

(triangle for integrals
why? (Cauchy-Schwarz twice)?)

Where we at (*) used that $\int_{[0,1]} \left| \int_{[0,1]} K(s,t)f(t)dm(t)g(s) \right| dm(s) \leq \|K\|_2 \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 < \infty$ so we can use Fubini's theorem (**Folland, Theorem 2.37**). At (**) we used that $K(s,t) = K(t,s)$ and that it is real valued so $\overline{K(s,t)} = K(s,t)$. It thereby follows that $T = T^*$ so the operator is self-adjoint. write out

Part (c)

We have that for all $s \in [0, 1]$, for all $f \in H$ that

$$\begin{aligned} Tf(s) &= \int_{[0,1]} K(s,t)f(t)dm(t) = \int_{[0,s]} K(s,t)f(t)dm(t) + \int_{(s,1]} K(s,t)f(t)dm(t) \\ &= \int_{[0,s]} (1-s)t f(t)dm(t) + (1-s) \int_{(s,1]} s(1-t)f(t)dm(t) \\ &= (1-s) \int_{[0,s]} t f(t)dm(t) + s \int_{[s,1]} (1-t)f(t)dm(t) \end{aligned}$$

Where we used that $[0, 1]$ is the disjoint union of $[0, s]$ and $(s, 1]$ and that we know the value of $K(s, t)$ in the two intervals since either $t \leq s$ or $s < t$. Lastly we used linearity of integrals and that the set $\{s\}$ can be added to the right integrals since it is a Lebesgue null-set. It is therefore clear that

$$\begin{aligned} Tf(0) &= (1-0) \int_{[0,0]} t f(t)dm(t) + 0 \int_{[0,1]} t f(t)dm(t) = 1 \int_{\{0\}} t f(t)dm(t) = 0 \\ Tf(1) &= (1-1) \int_{[0,1]} t f(t)dm(t) + 1 \int_{[1,1]} t f(t)dm(t) = 1 \int_{\{1\}} t f(t)dm(t) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

For the two integrals we have, using from **Homework Week 2, Problem 2(b)** $L_2([0, 1], m) \subset L_1([0, 1], m)$ so $\int_{[0,1]} |f(t)|dm(t) \leq \|f\|_2$ and we get that for all $h > 0$

The implication is the other way.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{[0,s+h]} t f(t)dm(t) - \int_{[0,s]} t f(t)dm(t) \right| &= \left| \int_{(s,s+h]} t f(t)dm(t) \right| \leq \left(\int_{(s,s+h]} dm(t) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_2 = \sqrt{h} \|f\|_2 \\ \left| \int_{[0,s+h]} (1-t)f(t)dm(t) - \int_{[0,s]} (1-t)f(t)dm(t) \right| &= \left| \int_{(s,s+h]} (1-t)f(t)dm(t) \right| \leq \sqrt{h} \|f\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

Where we used that $t, (1-t) \in [0, 1]$. Therefore since the difference goes to zero as $h \rightarrow 0$ we have that the two integrals are continuous. Since $s \mapsto s$ and $s \mapsto 1-s$ also are continuous it now follows that $Tf(s)$ is built out of continuous functions, so it is continuous. (✓)

Problem 4

part (a)

We have from **Homework week 7, Problem 1** that $g(x) = e^{-x^2}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Using **Homework week 7, problem 1(d)** we get that $S_{\sqrt{2}}(f)(x) = e^{-\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2} = e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} = g_0(x)$ also belongs to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. For $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we have that $g_k(x) = x^k g_0(x)$ and it now follows from **Homework week 7, Problem 1(a)** that $g_k \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$.

We have from **Proposition 11.4** that for $g_0(x) = e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$ it holds that $\mathcal{F}(g_0)(\xi) = \hat{g}_0(\xi) = g_0(\xi) = e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}}$. For $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we have that since $g_0(x), g_k(x) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{N}) \subset L_1(\mathbb{N})$ we can use **Proposition 11.13(d)** to say that

$$\mathcal{F}(g_k)(\xi) = \hat{g}_k(\xi) = (x^k g_0)^\wedge(\xi) = i^k (\partial^\xi \hat{g}_0)(\xi) = i^k g_0^{(k)}(\xi)$$

Since $g'_0(x) = -xe^{\frac{x^2}{2}}$, $g''_0(x) = -e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} + x^2e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$ and $g^{(3)}_0(x) = 3xe^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} - x^3e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(g_0)(\xi) &= \widehat{g_0}(\xi) = e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}} = g_0(\xi) \\ \mathcal{F}(g_1)(\xi) &= \widehat{g_1}(\xi) = i \left(-\xi e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}} \right) = -ig_1(\xi) \\ \mathcal{F}(g_2)(\xi) &= \widehat{g_2}(\xi) = i^2 \left(-e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}} + \xi^2 e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}} \right) = g_0(\xi) - g_2(\xi) \\ \mathcal{F}(g_3)(\xi) &= \widehat{g_3}(\xi) = i^3 \left(3\xi e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}} - \xi^3 e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}} \right) = -3ig_1(\xi) + ig_3(\xi)\end{aligned}$$

part b

Let $h_0(x) = g_0(x)$, $h_1(x) = 3g_1(x) - 2g_3(x)$, $h_2(x) = g_0(x) - 2g_2(x)$ and $h_3(x) = g_1(x)$, where we know that if $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ then $\alpha f_1 + \beta f_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ so $h_1, h_2, h_3 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. We then get by linearity of the Fourier transformation that

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{h_0}(\xi) &= \widehat{g_0}(\xi) = g_0(\xi) = h_0(\xi) \\ \widehat{h_1}(\xi) &= 3\widehat{g_1}(\xi) - 2\widehat{g_3}(\xi) = 3(-ig_1(\xi)) - 2(-3ig_1(\xi) + ig_3(\xi)) = 3ig_1(\xi) - 2ig_3(\xi) = i(h_1(\xi)) \\ \widehat{h_2}(\xi) &= \widehat{g_0}(\xi) - 2\widehat{g_2}(\xi) = g_0(\xi) - 2(g_0(\xi) - g_2(\xi)) = -(g_0(\xi) - g_2(\xi)) = -h_2(\xi) \\ \widehat{h_3}(\xi) &= \widehat{g_1}(\xi) = -ig_1(\xi) = -ih_3(\xi)\end{aligned}$$

Part (c)

For a given $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ we note that from **Homework week 7, Problem 1(d)** we proved that $S_a(f) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, for all $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. It now follows that for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ we have that

$$\mathcal{F}(f)(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)e^{-ix\xi} dm(x) \stackrel{*}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(-y)e^{-i(-y)\xi} dm(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (S_{-1}f)(y)e^{iy\xi} dm(y) = \mathcal{F}^*(S_{-1}f)(\xi)$$

Where we at $*$ used change of variable $x = -y$ and that the Lebesgue measure is invariant under reflections (**Schilling, Theorem 4.7**). As $S_{-1}f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ it now follows from Fourier inversion theorem (**Theorem 12.11**) that

$$\mathcal{F}^2(f)(\xi) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F}(f))(\xi) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F}^*(S_{-1}f))(\xi) = (S_{-1}f)(\xi)$$

We therefore get that

$$\mathcal{F}^4(f)(\xi) = \mathcal{F}^2(\mathcal{F}^2(f))(\xi) = \mathcal{F}^2(S_{-1}f)(\xi) = (S_{-1}S_{-1}f)(\xi) = f(\xi)$$

Part (d)

For $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ where $\mathcal{F}f = \lambda f$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ we have, using linearity of Fourier transform, that $\mathcal{F}^4(f) = \lambda^4 f$. From **Problem 4(c)** we also have that $\mathcal{F}(f) = f$, hence we get that $\lambda^4 = 1$ which happens if and only if $\lambda \in \{1, i, -1, -i\}$. We can therefore conclude that any eigenvalue for \mathcal{F} has to be in the set $\{1, i, -1, -i\}$. We have in **Problem 4(b)** found four functions in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\mathcal{F}(h_k) = i^k h_k$ for $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and we can therefore conclude that the eigenvalues for \mathcal{F} precisely are $\{1, i, -1, -i\}$.

Problem 5

For a given $x_0 \in [0, 1]$ and for a given continuous function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with compact support where $f(x_0) > 0$ it follows from continuity of f that there for $\epsilon = \frac{f(x_0)}{2} > 0$ exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $f(x) > \frac{f(x_0)}{2}$ for all $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$. Since $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is dense in $[0, 1]$ we know that there for the non-empty open set $(x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$ exists a $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_0} \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$ and therefore $f(x_{n_0}) > \frac{f(x_0)}{2} > 0$. We therefore have that

$$\int_{[0,1]} f d\mu \geq \int_{(x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)} f d\mu \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} f(x_n) \delta_{x_n}(x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \geq 2^{-n_0} f(x_{n_0}) > 0$$

Be careful here.

It now follows from **Homework week 8, Problem 3(b)** that $x_0 \in \text{supp}(\mu)$. This argument holds for all $x_0 \in [0, 1]$ and hence $\text{supp}(\mu) = [0, 1]$

