# THE REARRANGEMENT INEQUALITY FOR THE ERGODIC MAXIMAL FUNCTION

#### L. EPHREMIDZE

**Abstract**. The equivalence of the decreasing rearrangement of the ergodic maximal function and the maximal function of the decreasing rearrangement is proved. Exact constants are obtained in the corresponding inequalities.

**2000** Mathematics Subject Classification: 28D05, 26D15. Key words and phrases: Measure-preserving ergodic transformation, ergodic maximal function, decreasing rearrangement.

Let  $(X, \mathbb{S}, \mu)$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure space and  $T : X \to X$  be a measurepreserving ergodic transformation. For a measurable function f the ergodic maximal function is defined as

$$Mf(x) = \sup_{N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |f(T^{k}x)|, \quad x \in X.$$

The decreasing rearrangement of f is the function  $f^*$  defined on  $[0,\infty)$  by

$$f^*(t) = \inf\left\{\lambda : \mu(|f| > \lambda) \le t\right\}$$
(1)

and its maximal function is denoted by  $f^{**}$ :

$$f^{**}(t) = \frac{1}{t} \int_{0}^{t} f^{*}(\tau) d\tau, \quad t > 0.$$

The equivalence of  $(Mf)^*$  and  $f^{**}$ , i.e., the validity of inequalities

$$cf^{**}(t) \le (Mf)^{*}(t) \le Cf^{**}(t)$$

with constants c and C independent of f and t (these inequalities sometimes are called rearrangement inequalities) was proved by several authors when Mstands for Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator (see [8], [5] for the one-dimensional case and [1] for higher dimensions). This fact is very useful in the proofs of many theorems on the related topics (see [2]).

In the present paper, we prove analogous inequalities for the ergodic maximal operator (see (2) below). The constants  $\frac{1}{2}$  and 1 in these inequalities are exact and the corresponding examples are constructed.

ISSN 1072-947X / \$8.00 / © Heldermann Verlag www.heldermann.de

**Theorem.** Let  $f \in L(X)$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{2}f^{**}(t) \le (Mf)^{*}(t) \le f^{**}(t)$$
(2)

when  $0 < t < \mu(X)$ .

*Remark.* If  $\mu(X) < \infty$  and  $t \ge \mu(X)$ , then  $(Mf)^*(t) = 0$ . Thus the second inequality in (2) is valid for each t > 0, while the first inequality fails to hold whenever  $t \ge \mu(X)$  unless f is identically zero.

In the proof of the theorem we can take function f nonnegative since all functions considered depend only on the modulus of f. We shall also assume that the measure space  $(X, \mathbb{S}, \mu)$  is nonatomic. The case when the space has atoms can easily be reduced to the nonatomic case by "putting" suitable measurable sets into the atoms, keeping the values of f inside the atoms unchanged and defining T correspondingly. This process does not change the distribution functions  $\lambda \mapsto \mu(f > \lambda)$  and  $\lambda \mapsto \mu(Mf > \lambda)$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ . Consequently  $f^*(t)$ and  $(Mf)^*(t)$  keep the same values for each t > 0.

The following notation will be used:  $f^+ = \max(f, 0), f^- = \max(-f, 0).$  $S_n(f)(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n f(T^k x)$  and  $A_n(f)(x) = \frac{1}{n+1}S_n(f)(x).$   $\mathbf{1}_E$  stands for the characteristic function of E.  $\{f > 0\}$  or (f > 0) means  $\{x \in X : f(x) > 0\}.$ 

Since a weak-type estimate for the ergodic maximal operator has a simple form

$$\mu(Mf > \lambda) \le \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{(Mf > \lambda)} f \, d\mu, \tag{3}$$

where  $f \in L(X)$ ,  $\lambda > 0$  (see, e.g., [7]), the second inequality in (2) can be proved easily and it is given below for the sake of completeness.

Proof of the inequality  $(Mf)^*(t) \leq f^{**}(t), t > 0$ . Since  $\frac{1}{\mu(E)} \int_E f d\mu \leq \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f^*(\tau) d\tau$  for each measurable E with  $\mu(E) = t$  and  $f^{**}(t)$  is a decreasing function (see, e.g., [2]), we have

$$f^{**}(t) \ge \sup_{\mu(E)\ge t} \frac{1}{\mu(E)} \int_{E} f \, d\mu.$$
 (4)

Consider the nontrivial case when  $(Mf)^*(t) > 0$ . It follows from definition (1) that

$$0 < \lambda < (Mf)^*(t) \Longrightarrow \mu(Mf > \lambda) > t.$$
(5)

Because of (3) we have

$$\lambda \le \frac{1}{\mu(Mf > \lambda)} \int_{(Mf > \lambda)} f \, d\mu, \quad \lambda > 0.$$
(6)

728

It follows from (5) and (4) that

$$\sup_{0<\lambda<(Mf)^*(t)}\frac{1}{\mu(Mf>\lambda)}\int_{(Mf>\lambda)}f\,d\mu\leq f^{**}(t).$$

Consequently, if we let  $\lambda$  in (6) tend to  $(Mf)^*(t)$  from the left, we get the second inequality in (2).  $\Box$ 

For the proof of the first inequality in (2) we need

**Lemma.** Let  $g: X \to \mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and  $g \in L(X)$ . Then

$$\mu(Mg \ge 1) = \min\left(\int_X g \, d\mu, \, \mu(X)\right).$$

*Proof.* That  $\mu(Mg \ge 1) = \mu(X)$  whenever  $\int_X g \, d\mu \ge \mu(X)$  follows from the Individual Ergodic Theorem:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} A_n(g)(x) = \frac{1}{\mu(X)} \int_X g \, d\mu \tag{7}$$

for a.a.  $x \in X$  (see, e.g., [7]). Thus it is sufficient to consider the case where

$$\int_{X} g \, d\mu < \mu(X). \tag{8}$$

We shall use the filling scheme method (see [6], [7] or [3]) truncating the function g at level 1. Let

$$g_0 = g$$
 and  $g_{n+1} = \mathbf{1}_{(g_n \ge 1)} + (g_n - 1)^+ \circ T.$  (9)

Observe that  $g_n$  takes only nonnegative integer values and

$$g_n = \mathbf{1}_{(g_n \ge 1)} + (g_n - 1)^+, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$
 (10)

If we consider another sequence

$$h_0 = g - 1$$
 and  $h_{n+1} = -h_n^- + h_n^+ \circ T$ ,

then, as it can easily be checked by induction,

$$h_n = g_n - 1, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$
 (11)

That

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{X} h_{n}^{+} d\mu = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{X} (g_{n} - 1)^{+} d\mu = 0$$
(12)

## L. EPHREMIDZE

is proved in [3] (see (19) therein). At the same time, since T is measurepreserving and (10) holds, we obtain

$$\int_{X} g_{n+1} d\mu = \int_{X} \mathbf{1}_{\{g_n \ge 1\}} d\mu + \int_{X} (g_n - 1)^+ \circ T d\mu =$$
$$= \int_{X} \mathbf{1}_{\{g_n \ge 1\}} d\mu + \int_{X} (g_n - 1)^+ d\mu = \int_{X} g_n d\mu,$$

 $n = 0, 1, \ldots$  Thus, for each  $n \ge 0$ , we have

$$\int_{X} g_n \, d\mu = \int_{X} g \, d\mu. \tag{13}$$

We also use the equality of sets

$$\left\{x : \max_{0 \le m \le n} S_m(h_0)(x) \ge 0\right\} = (h_n \ge 0),\tag{14}$$

 $n = 0, 1, \ldots$ , which is proved in [4] (see Lemma 2; see also Lemma 1.1 in [3], where the basic idea of the proof is given). Since

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^{n} g(T^{k}x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} A_{n}(g)(x) < 1$$

for a.a. x (see (7), (8)), we have

$$(Mg \ge 1) = \left\{ x : A_n(g)(x) \ge 1 \text{ for some } n \ge 0 \right\}$$
$$= \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ x : \max_{0 \le m \le n} A_m(g)(x) \ge 1 \right\} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ x : \max_{0 \le m \le n} S_m(h_0)(x) \ge 0 \right\}$$
$$= \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} (h_n \ge 0) = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} (g_n \ge 1)$$

(the first equality holds if we neglect the sets of measure 0 and all other equalities are exact; (see (11), (14)). Thus

$$\mu(Mg \ge 1) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mu(g_n \ge 1) \tag{15}$$

(that  $(g_n \ge 1) = (h_n \ge 0), n = 0, 1, \dots$ , is an increasing sequence of sets follows from definition (9) and also from (14)).

It follows from (13) and (10) that

$$\int_X g \, d\mu = \int_X g_n \, d\mu = \int_X (\mathbf{1}_{\{g_n \ge 1\}} + (g_n - 1)^+) \, d\mu = \mu(g_n \ge 1) + \int_X (g_n - 1)^+ \, d\mu.$$

Hence, taking into account (15) and (12), we get

$$\mu(Mg \ge 1) = \int\limits_X g \, d\mu.$$

730

Proof of the inequality  $\frac{1}{2}f^{**}(t) \leq (Mf)^{*}(t), 0 < t < \mu(X)$ . Fix  $t \in (0, \mu(X))$ and assume  $f^{**}(t) = \lambda_0$ . We shall show that

$$\mu\left(Mf \ge \frac{1}{2}\,\lambda_0\right) > t.\tag{16}$$

The first inequality in (2) follows from (16) by virtue of definition (1).

Let  $E \in \mathbb{S}$  be a measurable set with

$$\mu(E) = t \tag{17}$$

such that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(E)} \int_{E} f \, d\mu = \frac{1}{t} \int_{0}^{t} f^{*}(\tau) d\tau = \lambda_{0}.$$
(18)

Since we assume that the space is nonatomic, such E exists (see, e.g., [2], Lemma 2.2.5). Define the function g as follows

$$g = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_0}{2} m \mathbf{1}_{\{\{\frac{\lambda_0}{2} m \le f < \frac{\lambda_0}{2}(m+1)\} \cap E\}}$$

Observe that  $g \leq f$ ,  $\frac{2}{\lambda_0}g$  takes only nonnegative integer values and  $f(x) - g(x) < \frac{\lambda_0}{2}$  for each  $x \in E$ . We have

$$\int_{E} g \, d\mu > \int_{E} f \, d\mu - \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \, \mu(E) = \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \, \mu(E)$$

(see (18)). Thus

$$\int\limits_X \frac{2}{\lambda_0} g \, d\mu > \mu(E)$$

and because of Lemma we have

$$\mu\left(Mg \ge \frac{\lambda_0}{2}\right) = \mu\left(M\left(\frac{2}{\lambda_0}g\right) \ge 1\right) = \min\left(\frac{2}{\lambda_0}\int_X g\,d\mu, \mu(X)\right)$$
$$> \min(\mu(E), \mu(X)) = t$$

(see (17)). Since  $Mf \ge Mg$ , we have proved (16).  $\Box$ 

At the end of the paper we shall show that the constants  $\frac{1}{2}$  and 1 are exact in the inequalities in (2) and cannot be improved. This is clear for 1 since it may happen that  $(Mf)^*(t)$  and  $f^{**}(t)$  are equal (e.g., for constant functions). A simple example below shows that the equality

$$\frac{1}{2}f^{**}(t) = (Mf)^*(t)$$

can hold for t such that  $f^{**}(t)$  does not vanish.

**Example.** Let  $\widetilde{T}$  be a (Lebesgue) measure-preserving ergodic transformation of  $[0; \frac{1}{2})$  and define T by the equalities  $T(x) = x + \frac{1}{2}$  when  $x \in [0; \frac{1}{2})$  and

## L. EPHREMIDZE

 $T(x) = \widetilde{T}(x - \frac{1}{2})$  when  $x \in [\frac{1}{2}; 1)$ . Then T is a measure-preserving ergidic transformation of [0; 1). If  $f = \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{2}; 1)}$ , then  $Mf(x) = \frac{1}{2}$  when  $x \in [0; \frac{1}{2})$  and Mf(x) = 1 when  $x \in [\frac{1}{2}; 1)$ . Thus  $(Mf)^*(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$ , while  $f^{**}(\frac{1}{2}) = 1$ .

#### References

- C. BENNETT and R. SHARPLEY, Weak type inequalities for H<sup>p</sup> and BMO. Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 35(1979), 201–229.
- 2. C. BENNETT and R. SHARPLEY, Interpolation of operators. *Academic Press, Boston* etc., 1988.
- L. EPHREMIDZE, On the distribution function of the majorant of ergodic means. Studia Math. 103(1992), 1–15.
- 4. L. EPHREMIDZE, On the uniqueness of the ergodic maximal function. Fund. Math. (to appear).
- C. HERZ, The Hardy–Littlewood maximal theorem. Symposium on harmonic analysis, 1–27, University of Warwick, 1968.
- J. NEVEU, The filling scheme and the Chacon–Ornstein theorem. Israel J. Math. 33(1979), 368–377.
- 7. K. PETERSEN, Ergodic theory. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge etc., 1983.
- F. RIESZ, Sur un theoreme de maximum de MM. Hardy et Littlewood. J. London Math. Soc. 7(1932), 10–13.

## (Received 17.08.2001)

Author's address: A. Razmadze Mathematical Institute Georgian Academy of Sciences 1, Aleksidze St., Tbilisi 380093 Georgia

Current address: Institute of Mathematis Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic Žitná 25, 115 67 Prague 1 Czech Republic E-mail: lasha@math.cas.cz