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

$$
M f(x)=\sup _{N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\left|f\left(T^{k} x\right)\right|, \quad x \in X
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{*}(t)=\inf \{\lambda: \mu(|f|>\lambda) \leq t\} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
c f^{* *}(t) \leq(M f)^{*}(t) \leq C f^{* *}(t)
$$

with constants $c$ and $C$ independent of $f$ and $t$ (these inequalities sometimes are called rearrangement inequalities) was proved by several authors when $M$ stands 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.

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2} f^{* *}(t) \leq(M f)^{*}(t) \leq f^{* *}(t) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

when $0<t<\mu(X)$.
Remark. If $\mu(X)<\infty$ and $t \geq \mu(X)$, then $(M f)^{*}(t)=0$. Thus the second inequality in (2) is valid for each $t>0$, while the first inequality fails to hold whenever $t \geq \mu(X)$ 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 $\lambda \longmapsto \mu(f>\lambda)$ and $\lambda \longmapsto \mu(M f>\lambda), \lambda>0$. Consequently $f^{*}(t)$ and $(M f)^{*}(t)$ keep the same values for each $t>0$.

The following notation will be used: $f^{+}=\max (f, 0), f^{-}=\max (-f, 0)$. $S_{n}(f)(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n} f\left(T^{k} x\right)$ and $A_{n}(f)(x)=\frac{1}{n+1} S_{n}(f)(x) . \quad \mathbf{1}_{E}$ 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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu(M f>\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{(M f>\lambda)} f d \mu \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

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 $(M f)^{*}(t) \leq f^{* *}(t), t>0$. 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

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{* *}(t) \geq \sup _{\mu(E) \geq t} \frac{1}{\mu(E)} \int_{E} f d \mu \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<\lambda<(M f)^{*}(t) \Longrightarrow \mu(M f>\lambda)>t \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because of (3) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda \leq \frac{1}{\mu(M f>\lambda)} \int_{(M f>\lambda)} f d \mu, \quad \lambda>0 . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from (5) and (4) that

$$
\sup _{0<\lambda<(M f)^{*}(t)} \frac{1}{\mu(M f>\lambda)} \int_{(M f>\lambda)} f d \mu \leq f^{* *}(t)
$$

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

For the proof of the first inequality in (2) we need
Lemma. Let $g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{0}=\{0,1,2, \ldots\}$ and $g \in L(X)$. Then

$$
\mu(M g \geq 1)=\min \left(\int_{X} g d \mu, \mu(X)\right) .
$$

Proof. That $\mu(M g \geq 1)=\mu(X)$ whenever $\int_{X} g d \mu \geq \mu(X)$ follows from the Individual Ergodic Theorem:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{n}(g)(x)=\frac{1}{\mu(X)} \int_{X} g d \mu \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{X} g d \mu<\mu(X) . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{0}=g \quad \text { and } \quad g_{n+1}=\mathbf{1}_{\left(g_{n} \geq 1\right)}+\left(g_{n}-1\right)^{+} \circ T . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Observe that $g_{n}$ takes only nonnegative integer values and

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{n}=\mathbf{1}_{\left(g_{n} \geq 1\right)}+\left(g_{n}-1\right)^{+}, \quad n=0,1, \ldots \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we consider another sequence

$$
h_{0}=g-1 \quad \text { and } \quad h_{n+1}=-h_{n}^{-}+h_{n}^{+} \circ T,
$$

then, as it can easily be checked by induction,

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{n}=g_{n}-1, \quad n=0,1, \ldots . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

That

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X} h_{n}^{+} d \mu=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X}\left(g_{n}-1\right)^{+} d \mu=0 \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{X} g_{n+1} d \mu & =\int_{X} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{g_{n} \geq 1\right\}} d \mu+\int_{X}\left(g_{n}-1\right)^{+} \circ T d \mu= \\
& =\int_{X} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{g_{n} \geq 1\right\}} d \mu+\int_{X}\left(g_{n}-1\right)^{+} d \mu=\int_{X} g_{n} d \mu,
\end{aligned}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{X} g_{n} d \mu=\int_{X} g d \mu \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

We also use the equality of sets

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{x: \max _{0 \leq m \leq n} S_{m}\left(h_{0}\right)(x) \geq 0\right\}=\left(h_{n} \geq 0\right) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

$n=0,1, \ldots$, 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

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^{n} g\left(T^{k} x\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{n}(g)(x)<1
$$

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

$$
\begin{aligned}
(M g \geq 1) & =\left\{x: A_{n}(g)(x) \geq 1 \text { for some } n \geq 0\right\} \\
& =\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}\left\{x: \max _{0 \leq m \leq n} A_{m}(g)(x) \geq 1\right\}=\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}\left\{x: \max _{0 \leq m \leq n} S_{m}\left(h_{0}\right)(x) \geq 0\right\} \\
& =\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(h_{n} \geq 0\right)=\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(g_{n} \geq 1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu(M g \geq 1)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(g_{n} \geq 1\right) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

(that $\left(g_{n} \geq 1\right)=\left(h_{n} \geq 0\right), n=0,1, \ldots$, is an increasing sequence of sets follows from definition (9) and also from (14)).

It follows from (13) and (10) that

$$
\int_{X} g d \mu=\int_{X} g_{n} d \mu=\int_{X}\left(\mathbf{1}_{\left\{g_{n} \geq 1\right\}}+\left(g_{n}-1\right)^{+}\right) d \mu=\mu\left(g_{n} \geq 1\right)+\int_{X}\left(g_{n}-1\right)^{+} d \mu .
$$

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

$$
\mu(M g \geq 1)=\int_{X} g d \mu
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu\left(M f \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{0}\right)>t \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first inequality in (2) follows from (16) by virtue of definition (1).
Let $E \in \mathbb{S}$ be a measurable set with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu(E)=t \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\mu(E)} \int_{E} f d \mu=\frac{1}{t} \int_{0}^{t} f^{*}(\tau) d \tau=\lambda_{0} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
g=\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{2} m \mathbf{1}_{\left(\left\{\frac{\lambda_{0}}{2} m \leq f<\frac{\lambda_{0}}{2}(m+1)\right\} \cap E\right)} .
$$

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

$$
\int_{X} \frac{2}{\lambda_{0}} g d \mu>\mu(E)
$$

and because of Lemma we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu(M g & \left.\geq \frac{\lambda_{0}}{2}\right)=\mu\left(M\left(\frac{2}{\lambda_{0}} g\right) \geq 1\right)=\min \left(\frac{2}{\lambda_{0}} \int_{X} g d \mu, \mu(X)\right) \\
& >\min (\mu(E), \mu(X))=t
\end{aligned}
$$

(see (17)). Since $M f \geq M g$, we have proved (16).
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 $(M f)^{*}(t)$ and $f^{* *}(t)$ are equal (e.g., for constant functions). A simple example below shows that the equality

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

can hold for $t$ such that $f^{* *}(t)$ does not vanish.
Example. Let $\widetilde{T}$ be a (Lebesgue) measure-preserving ergodic transformation of $\left[0 ; \frac{1}{2}\right.$ ) and define $T$ by the equalities $T(x)=x+\frac{1}{2}$ when $x \in\left[0 ; \frac{1}{2}\right)$ and
$T(x)=\widetilde{T}\left(x-\frac{1}{2}\right)$ when $x \in\left[\frac{1}{2} ; 1\right)$. Then $T$ is a measure-preserving ergidic transformation of $[0 ; 1)$. If $f=\mathbf{1}_{\left[\frac{1}{2} ; 1\right)}$, then $M f(x)=\frac{1}{2}$ when $x \in\left[0 ; \frac{1}{2}\right)$ and $M f(x)=1$ when $x \in\left[\frac{1}{2} ; 1\right)$. Thus $(M f)^{*}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)=\frac{1}{2}$, while $f^{* *}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)=1$.
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