

# A note on the restriction of Fourier multipliers from weighted $L^p$ spaces to Lorentz spaces

勘 甚 裕 一

(金沢大学 理工研究域 機械工学系)

菅 野 絢 子

(東京都立調布北高等学校)

佐 藤 圓 治

(山形大学 理学部数理科学科)

山形大学紀要 (自然科学) 第 17 卷第 4 号別刷

平成 25 年 (2013) 2 月

# A note on the restriction of Fourier multipliers from weighted $L^p$ spaces to Lorentz spaces

Yuichi KANJIN, Ayako KANNO and Enji SATO

## Abstract

Let  $p$  be in  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $\phi(x)$  a bounded continuous function on  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $T_\phi f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi) e^{ix\xi} d\xi$ , and  $T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x) = \sum_m \phi(m) \hat{F}(m) e^{imx}$ . Anderson-Mohanty [1] showed that if  $T_\phi$  is bounded on a weighted  $L^p$  space on  $\mathbb{R}$  then  $T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}$  is bounded on the corresponding weighted  $L^p$  space on  $\mathbb{T}$ , whose result is a generalization of Berkson-Gillespie [2]. In this paper, we generalize the result from weighted  $L^p$  spaces to Lorentz spaces with an alternative proof.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $X$  be the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  or the one dimensional torus  $\mathbb{T} = [-\pi, \pi)$  and  $w(x)$  a nonnegative function on  $X$ . Also let  $L_w^p(X)$  be the set of all measurable function  $f$  on  $X$  with  $\|f\|_{L_w^p(X)} < \infty$ , where

$$\|f\|_{L_w^p(X)} = \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_X |f(x)|^p w(x) dx \right)^{1/p} \quad (1 \leq p < \infty).$$

In particular, we denote  $L^p(X) = L_w^p(X)$  and  $\|f\|_{L^p(X)} = \|f\|_{L_w^p(X)}$  when  $w(x) = 1$  on  $X$ .

**Definition 1.** Let  $\phi(x)$  be a bounded continuous function on  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\{\Psi(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  a bounded sequence on the integer group  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Then, we define

$$T_\phi f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi) e^{ix\xi} d\xi \quad (f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})),$$

and

$$T_\Psi F(x) = \sum_m \Psi(m) \hat{F}(m) e^{imx} \quad (F \in P(\mathbb{T})),$$

where we denote the Fourier transform of  $f$  by  $\hat{f}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) e^{-i\xi x} dx$ , by  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  the set of all infinitely differentiable functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  with compact support, by  $\hat{F}(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} F(x) e^{inx} dx$  the Fourier coefficient of  $F$ , and by  $P(\mathbb{T})$  the set of all trigonometric polynomials on  $\mathbb{T}$ . A bounded continuous function  $\phi$  is called an  $L_w^p(\mathbb{R})$ -multiplier, if there exists a constant  $C$  such that  $\|T_\phi f\|_{L_w^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|f\|_{L_w^p(\mathbb{R})}$  ( $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ ), and a bounded sequence  $\Psi$  is called an  $L_w^p(\mathbb{T})$ -multiplier, if there exists a constant  $C$  such that  $\|T_\Psi F\|_{L_w^p(\mathbb{T})} \leq C \|F\|_{L_w^p(\mathbb{T})}$  ( $F \in P(\mathbb{T})$ ).

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 42A45; Secondary 46E30.

Key words and phrases. Fourier multiplier, Ap condition, Lorentz spaces.

The first author was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Science Research (C) (No.24540167), Japan Society for the Promotion Science. The third author was supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research(C)(No.23540182), Japan Society for the Promotion Science.

Here, we denote by  $M_{p,w}(X)$  the set of all  $L_w^p(X)$ -multipliers, by  $\|T_\phi\|_{M_{p,w}(X)}$  the operator norm on  $L_w^p(X)$ , and  $\|T_\phi\|_{M_p(X)} = \|T_\phi\|_{M_{p,w}(X)}$ , when  $w(x) = 1$  on  $X$ .

In 1965, de Leeuw [4] proved the following:

**Theorem A.** *If  $\phi$  is an  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ -multiplier for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , then  $\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}$  is an  $L^p(\mathbb{T})$ -multiplier.*

In 2003, Berkson-Gillespie [2] obtained a generalization of de Leeuw's result under the  $A_p$  condition (cf. [8]).

We say that for  $1 < p < \infty$  a nonnegative function  $w(x)$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $A_p$  condition, if there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$\left( \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w(t) dt \right) \left( \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q (w(t))^{\frac{1}{p-1}} dt \right)^{p-1} \leq C$$

for all bounded interval  $Q$ , when  $|Q|$  is the length of  $Q$ . Then we denote  $w \in A_p(\mathbb{R})$ . Also we denote

$$A_p(\mathbb{T}) = \{w \in A_p(\mathbb{R}) \mid w \text{ is a } 2\pi \text{ periodic function on } \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Berkson-Gillespie's result is the following:

**Theorem B.** *Let  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $U \in A_p(\mathbb{T})$ . Put  $u = U|_{\mathbb{T}}$ , the restriction of  $U$  on  $\mathbb{T}$ . If  $\phi$  is an  $L_U^p(\mathbb{R})$ -multiplier, then  $\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}$  is an  $L_u^p(\mathbb{T})$ -multiplier with  $\|T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}\|_{M_{p,u}(\mathbb{T})} \leq \|T_\phi\|_{M_{p,U}(\mathbb{R})}$ .*

In 2009, Anderson-Mohanty [1] generalized Theorem B by the simple calculation. Their result is the following:

**Theorem C.** *Let  $U$  be a nonnegative  $2\pi$  periodic measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $1 < p < \infty$ . Also we assume that  $u = U|_{\mathbb{T}} \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ . Then we obtain that  $\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}$  is in  $M_{p,u}(\mathbb{T})$  with  $\|T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}\|_{M_{p,u}(\mathbb{T})} \leq \|T_\phi\|_{M_{p,U}(\mathbb{R})}$ , if  $\phi$  is in  $M_{p,U}(\mathbb{R})$ .*

In this paper, we shall generalize Theorem C to Lorentz spaces with an alternative proof which is different from Anderson-Mohanty [1]. First we introduce Lorentz spaces.

**Definition 2.** *Let  $U$  be a nonnegative  $2\pi$  periodic function on  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $u = U|_{\mathbb{T}}$ ,  $\mu(E) = \int_E U(x) dx$  and  $\nu(E) = \int_E u(x) dx$  for a measurable set  $E$ . We assume  $u \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ . For  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , we define the Lorentz space  $L^{p,q}(\mu) = \{f \mid \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\mu)} < \infty\}$ , where*

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\mu)} = \begin{cases} \left( q \int_0^\infty (t\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |f(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} & (q < \infty) \\ \sup_{t>0} t\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |f(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}} & (q = \infty) \end{cases}$$

and we define  $L^{p,q}(\nu) = \{F \mid \|F\|_{L^{p,q}(\nu)} < \infty\}$  in the same way as  $L^{p,q}(\mu)$ , too. It is known that  $L^{p,q}(\mu) = L^p(\mu)$ , where  $L^p(\mu)$  is the usual  $L^p$  space with respect to the measure  $\mu$ , and  $L^{p,q}(\nu) = L^p(\nu)$  for  $p = q$ . Also we define  $\|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} = \sup_{\|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} \leq 1} \|T_\phi f\|_{L^{p,q}(\mu)}$  and  $\|T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}\|_{L^p(\nu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\nu)}$ , too.

Throughout this paper, the letters  $C$ ,  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  will be used to denote positive constants not necessarily the same at each occurrence.

Our main theorem is the following:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ . We assume that*

$$\|T_\phi f\|_{L^{p,q}(\mu)} \leq \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} \quad (f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})).$$

*Then, there exists a constant  $C$  such that*

$$\|T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F\|_{L^{p,q}(\nu)} \leq C \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|F\|_{L^p(\nu)} \quad (F \in P(\mathbb{T})).$$

The following result is a special case of Theorem 1:

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $\phi$  be a bounded continuous function  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then, if we assume that*

$$\|T_\phi f\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\mu)} \leq \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,\infty}(\mu)} \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} \quad (f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})),$$

*we obtain that*

$$\|T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\nu)} \leq C \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,\infty}(\mu)} \|F\|_{L^p(\nu)} \quad (F \in P(\mathbb{T})).$$

Zafran [10](cf. [3, Remark 3]) showed that if  $1 < p < 2$  then there exists a Fourier multiplier operator  $T$  from  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$  to  $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $T$  is not a Fourier multiplier operator from  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$  to  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ . By this fact, we remark that Corollary 1 is not contained in Anderson-Mohanty [1].

## 2. The proof of Theorem 1

First we will prove a lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *When we define  $\omega_\delta(x) = e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi}x^2}$  ( $\delta > 0$ ), we have that*

- (i)  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \omega_\delta(x) dx = \int_0^{2\pi} f(x) dx \quad (f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})),$
- (ii)  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\sqrt{\delta})^{\frac{1}{p}} \|\omega_\delta F\|_{L^p(\mu)} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|F\|_{L^p(\nu)}.$

*Proof.* (i) It is easy to prove, but let us give the proof for readers convenience (cf. [1], [9](p.261)).

Since  $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \omega_\delta(x) e^{imx} dx = 2\pi e^{-\frac{\pi}{\delta}m^2}$  ( $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ ), we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(x) \omega_\delta(x) dx = \int_0^{2\pi} P(x) dx \quad (P \in P(\mathbb{T})).$$

Also since for  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$  and  $P \in P(\mathbb{T})$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (f(x) - P(x)) \omega_{\delta}(x) dx \right| \\
 & \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{2\pi j}^{2\pi(j+1)} |f(x) - P(x)| \omega_{\delta}(x) dx \\
 & = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(x) - P(x)| \omega_{\delta}(x + 2\pi j) dx \\
 & \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(x) - P(x)| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \omega_{\delta}(x + 2\pi j) dx \\
 & \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(x) - P(x)| \left( 2 \int_0^{\infty} \omega_{\delta}(t) dt \right) dx \\
 & \leq 2\pi \int_0^{2\pi} |f(x) - P(x)| dx \\
 & = 4\pi^2 \|f - P\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \omega_{\delta}(x) dx - \int_0^{2\pi} f(x) dx \right| \\
 & \leq \left| \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (f(x) - P(x)) \omega_{\delta}(x) dx \right| \\
 & \quad + \left| \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(x) \omega_{\delta}(x) dx - \int_0^{2\pi} P(x) dx \right| + \int_0^{2\pi} |f(x) - P(x)| dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

By the above facts we get the desired result, since we have that  $P(\mathbb{T})$  is dense in  $L^1(\mathbb{T})$ .

(ii) By  $|F(x)|^p U(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$  and (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\omega_{\delta} F\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p & = \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} x^2} |F(x)|^p U(x) dx \\
 & \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{p}} \int_0^{2\pi} |F(x)|^p u(x) dx \quad (\delta \rightarrow 0) \\
 & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \|F\|_{L^p(\nu)}^p,
 \end{aligned}$$

and  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\sqrt{\delta})^{\frac{1}{p}} \|\omega_{\delta} F\|_{L^p(\mu)} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|F\|_{L^p(\nu)}$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 1.* According to Kaneko-Sato [6], we proceed the proof. First we define that

$$\begin{aligned}
 F(x) & = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{F}(m) e^{imx} \quad (F \in P(\mathbb{T})), \\
 \gamma_{\delta}(x) & = \omega_{\delta}(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x) - T_{\phi}(\omega_{\delta} F)(x),
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\gamma_\delta\|_\infty = \sup\{t \mid |\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\gamma_\delta(x)| > t\}| > 0\},$$

where  $|E|$  is the Lebesgue measure of a measurable set  $E$ .

CASE 1. We show the proof in the case  $1 \leq q < \infty$ .

By  $\gamma_\delta(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\gamma}_\delta(\xi) e^{ix\xi} d\xi$ , we have that  $|\gamma_\delta(x)| \leq 2\pi \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\delta(x) &= \omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x) - T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x) \\ &= \omega_\delta(x) \sum_m \phi(m) \hat{F}(m) e^{imx} - T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\gamma}_\delta(\xi) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma_\delta(x) e^{-i\xi x} dx \\ &= \sum_m \phi(m) \hat{F}(m) \hat{\omega}_\delta(\xi - m) - \phi(\xi) \widehat{\omega_\delta F}(\xi), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(1) \quad \widehat{\omega_\delta F}(\xi) = \sum_m \hat{F}(m) \hat{\omega}_\delta(\xi - m).$$

Hence, by (1) we get that

$$\hat{\gamma}_\delta(\xi) = \sum_m \hat{F}(m) \hat{\omega}_\delta(\xi - m) (\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)),$$

and

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \sum_m \hat{F}(m) \hat{\omega}_\delta(\xi - m) (\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)) \right| d\xi \\ &\leq \sum_m |\hat{F}(m)| \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\omega}_\delta(\xi - m) |\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)| d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by  $\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x) = \gamma_\delta(x) + T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| &\leq \|\gamma_\delta\|_\infty + |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)| \\ &\leq 2\pi \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3) \quad \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\} \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)| > t - 2\pi \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}\}.$$

For  $a > 2 \cdot 2\pi \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \int_a^\infty (t \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \left( \int_a^\infty (t \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)| > t - 2\pi \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{a-2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}^\infty ((t + 2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}) \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t + 2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{a-2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}^\infty \left( \frac{t + 2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}{t} \right) t (\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by  $\frac{t+2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}{t} \leq 1 + \frac{2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}{a-2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}} \leq 2$  for  $t \geq a - 2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \int_a^\infty (t\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \leq 2 \left( \int_0^\infty (t\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & = 2 \|T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)\|_{L^{p,q}(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Also by the assumption of  $T_\phi$ , we obtain that

$$(4) \quad \|T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)\|_{L^{p,q}(\mu)} \leq \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|\omega_\delta F\|_{L^p(\mu)},$$

and for  $a > 2 \cdot 2\pi\|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ , we get that

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left( \int_a^\infty (t\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \leq \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|\omega_\delta F\|_{L^p(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we show  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 0$ . In fact, by  $\omega_\delta(x) = e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi}x^2}$ , we have that  $\widehat{\omega}_\delta(\xi) = \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \omega_{4\pi^2/\delta}(\xi)$ , and by (2)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} & \leq \sum_m |\hat{F}(m)| \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\omega}_\delta(\xi - m) |\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)| d\xi \\ & = \sum_m |\hat{F}(m)| \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{\delta}(\xi-m)^2} |\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)| d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  be fixed. For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\eta_0 > 0$  such that  $|\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)| < \varepsilon$  for  $|\xi - m| < \eta_0$ . Then, we estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{\delta}(\xi-m)^2} |\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)| d\xi \\ & = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{|m-\xi| < \eta_0} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{\delta}(\xi-m)^2} |\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)| d\xi \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{|m-\xi| > \eta_0} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{\delta}(\xi-m)^2} |\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)| d\xi \\ & = (\alpha) + (\beta), \text{ say.} \end{aligned}$$

In  $(\alpha)$ , we have

$$(6) \quad (\alpha) < \varepsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{\delta}(\xi-m)^2} d\xi \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-t^2} dt = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi}.$$

In  $(\beta)$ , since

$$|\phi(m) - \phi(\xi)| \leq |\phi(m)| + |\phi(\xi)| \leq 2 \|\phi\|_\infty,$$

we obtain that

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} (\beta) & \leq \frac{2 \|\phi\|_\infty}{2\pi} \int_{|m-\xi| \geq \eta_0} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{\delta}(\xi-m)^2} d\xi \\ & = \frac{\|\phi\|_\infty}{\pi\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\delta}}\eta_0}^\infty e^{-t^2} dt \rightarrow 0 \quad (\delta \rightarrow 0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that  $(\alpha) + (\beta) < 2\varepsilon$  for  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ , and we obtain  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 0$ .

Also we show

$$\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\delta} \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\}) \geq C_1 \nu(\{x \in \mathbb{T} \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\}).$$

Putting  $G(x) = T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)$ , we have  $\omega_\delta T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x) = \omega_\delta G(x)$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) G(x)| > t\}) \\ &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(\{x \in [2\pi j, 2\pi(j+1)) \mid e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} x^2} |G(x)| > t\}) \\ &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} (u+2\pi j)^2} |G(u)| > t\}) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} (u+2\pi j)^2} |G(u)| > t\}) \end{aligned}$$

and for  $s \in [0, 2\pi)$  and  $u \in [0, 2\pi)$  we have that  $s + 2\pi(j+1) \geq u + 2\pi j$  and  $e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} (s+2\pi(j+1))^2} \leq e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} (u+2\pi j)^2}$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} (u+2\pi j)^2} |G(u)| > t\}) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} (s+2\pi(j+1))^2} |G(u)| > t\}) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{2\pi}^{\infty} \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} s^2} |G(u)| > t\}) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\delta}} \int_{\sqrt{\pi\delta}}^{\infty} \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid e^{-x^2} |G(u)| > t\}) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have that for  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2\pi}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} (u+2\pi j)^2} |G(u)| > t\}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\delta}} \int_{\sqrt{\pi\delta}}^1 \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid |G(u)| > te\}) dx \\ &\geq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{\pi\delta}} \nu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid |G(u)| > te\}), \end{aligned}$$

and we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\pi\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid e^{-\frac{\delta}{4\pi} (u+2\pi j)^2} |G(u)| > t\}) \\ &\geq C_2 \nu(\{u \in [0, 2\pi) \mid |G(u)| > te\}) \end{aligned}$$

for  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2\pi}$ . Hence, we get that for  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2\pi}$ ,

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\}) \\ &\geq C_2 \nu(\{x \in [0, 2\pi) \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > te\}) \end{aligned}$$



and we obtain that

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\delta} \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\}) \\ & \geq C_2 \nu(\{x \in \mathbb{T} \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > te\}). \end{aligned}$$

Now by (5), (9) and Fatou's Lemma, we have that

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left( \int_a^\infty (t \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} (\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C (\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{p}} \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|\omega_\delta F\|_{L^p(\mu)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left( \int_a^\infty (t \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} (\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \geq \left( \int_a^\infty \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (t (\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\}))^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \geq \left( \int_{ae}^\infty (C_3 t \nu(\{x \in [0, 2\pi] \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 1(ii) we have that

$$(11) \quad (\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{p}} \|\omega_\delta F\|_{L^p(\mu)} \rightarrow \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|F\|_{L^p(\nu)} \quad (\delta \rightarrow 0).$$

After all, when  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , by (10) and (11) we obtain that

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left( \int_{ae}^\infty (t \nu(\{x \in [0, 2\pi] \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \leq C \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|F\|_{L^p(\nu)} \end{aligned}$$

and for  $a \downarrow 0$  in (12),

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F\|_{L^{p,q}(\nu)} & = \left( \int_0^\infty (t \nu(\{x \in [0, 2\pi] \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}})^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \leq C \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|F\|_{L^p(\nu)}. \end{aligned}$$

CASE 2. We prove the case  $q = \infty$ .

We can show it in the same way as the case 1. In fact, for  $a > 2 \cdot 2\pi \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t > a} t \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq \sup_{u > a - 2\pi \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}} \left( \frac{u + 2\pi \|\hat{\gamma}_\delta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}{u} \right) u \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)| > u\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq 2 \sup_{t > 0} t \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}} = 2 \|T_\phi(\omega_\delta F)\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\mu)} \\ & \leq C \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|\omega_\delta F\|_{L^p(\mu)}, \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t > a} t \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x) T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}} F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C \|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)} \|\omega_\delta F\|_{L^p(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Also since by (9)

$$\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x)T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}F(x)| > t\}) \geq C_2\nu(\{x \in [0, 2\pi) \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}F(x)| > te\})$$

for sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ , we have for  $t > a$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & C_1t\nu(\{x \in [0, 2\pi) \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}F(x)| > te\}) \\ & \leq \sup_{t>a}(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{p}}t\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\omega_\delta(x)T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}F(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C_2(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{p}}\|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu)\rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)}\|\omega_\delta F\|_{L^p(\mu)}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . By Lemma 1(ii) we have that

$$C_1t\nu(\{x \in [0, 2\pi) \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}F(x)| > te\}) \leq C_2\|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu)\rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)}\|F\|_{L^p(\mu)}$$

for  $t > a$ . Hence, when  $a \downarrow 0$ , we obtain that

$$t\nu(\{x \in [0, 2\pi) \mid |T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}F(x)| > t\}) \leq C_3\|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu)\rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)}\|F\|_{L^p(\nu)}$$

for  $t > 0$  and

$$\|T_{\phi|_{\mathbb{Z}}}F\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\nu)} \leq C_3\|T_\phi\|_{L^p(\mu)\rightarrow L^{p,q}(\mu)}\|F\|_{L^p(\nu)}.$$

Therefore, we get the desired result.  $\square$

### 3. The converse of Theorem 1

We shall consider the converse of Theorem 1 by the method of Igari [5].

**Definition 3.** For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $\phi(x)$  be a bounded continuous function on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and

$$\tilde{T}_\varepsilon F(x) = \sum_m \phi(\varepsilon m)\hat{F}(m)e^{imx} \quad (F \in L^2(\mathbb{T})).$$

Also let  $U(x)$  be a nonnegative function on  $\mathbb{R}$  with homogeneous of degree  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  i.e.  $U(\varepsilon x) = \varepsilon^\gamma U(x)$  ( $\varepsilon > 0$ ), and  $u(x)$  the  $2\pi$  periodic function on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $u(x)$  is the restriction of  $U(x)$  on  $[-\pi, \pi)$ . For example, we give  $U(x) = |x|^\gamma$  ( $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ ).

Then we obtain the result which is the converse result of Theorem 1.

**Theorem 2.** Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Under the above notation, we assume that there exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\|\tilde{T}_\varepsilon F\|_{L_u^p(\mathbb{T})} \leq C\|F\|_{L_u^p(\mathbb{T})}$  for all  $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ , where  $C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$  is the set of all infinitely differentiable functions on  $\mathbb{T}$ . Then we obtain that

$$\|T_\phi f\|_{L_v^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|f\|_{L_v^p(\mathbb{R})} \quad (f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})).$$

*Proof.* For  $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ , we define  $f_\varepsilon(x) = f(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$ . Since  $\text{supp } f_\varepsilon \subset (-\pi, \pi)$  for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we may assume  $f_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ . Then, we have

$$\tilde{T}_\varepsilon f_\varepsilon(x) = \sum_n \phi(\varepsilon n)\hat{f}_\varepsilon(n)e^{inx}.$$

On the other hand, we get that  $\hat{f}_\varepsilon(n) = \varepsilon\hat{f}(\varepsilon n)$ , and  $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon f_\varepsilon(x) = \sum_n \phi(\varepsilon n)\varepsilon\hat{f}(\varepsilon n)e^{inx}$ . Since by the assumption  $\|\tilde{T}_\varepsilon f_\varepsilon\|_{L_u^p(\mathbb{T})} \leq C\|f_\varepsilon\|_{L_u^p(\mathbb{T})}$ , we have that  $\|f_\varepsilon\|_{L_u^p(\mathbb{T})}^p =$

$\varepsilon^{\gamma+1} \|f\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R})}^p$ . On the other hand, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{T}_\varepsilon f_\varepsilon\|_{L_u^p(\mathbb{T})}^p &= \left\| \sum_n \phi(\varepsilon n) \varepsilon \hat{f}(\varepsilon n) e^{inx} \right\|_{L_u^p(\mathbb{T})}^p \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{\pi}{\varepsilon}} \left| \sum_n \phi(\varepsilon n) \hat{f}(\varepsilon n) e^{in\varepsilon t} \right|^p U(t) dt \cdot \varepsilon^{\gamma+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and we have that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{(-\frac{\pi}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\pi}{\varepsilon})}(t) \left| \sum_n \phi(\varepsilon n) \hat{f}(\varepsilon n) e^{in\varepsilon t} \right|^p U(t) dt \cdot \varepsilon^{\gamma+1} \leq C \varepsilon^{\gamma+1} \|f\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R})}^p.$$

Moreover, by the definition of the Riemann integral, we have that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \chi_{(-\frac{\pi}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\pi}{\varepsilon})}(t) \sum_n \phi(\varepsilon n) \hat{f}(\varepsilon n) e^{in\varepsilon t} \varepsilon = T_\phi f(t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\phi f\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R})}^p &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \chi_{(-\frac{\pi}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\pi}{\varepsilon})}(t) \left| \sum_n \phi(\varepsilon n) \hat{f}(\varepsilon n) e^{in\varepsilon t} \right|^p U(t) dt \\ &\leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{(-\frac{\pi}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\pi}{\varepsilon})}(t) \left| \sum_n \phi(\varepsilon n) \hat{f}(\varepsilon n) e^{in\varepsilon t} \right|^p U(t) dt \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R})}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\|T_\phi f\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|f\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R})} \quad (f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})). \quad \square$$

## References

- [1] K. F. Anderson and P. Mohanty, *Restriction and Extension of Fourier Multipliers Between Weighted  $L^p$  Spaces on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbb{T}^n$* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137(2009), 1689-1697.
- [2] E. Berkson and T. A. Gillespie, *On Restrictions of Multipliers in Weighted Settings*, Indiana Univ. Math. J.52(2003), 927-961.
- [3] M. G. Cowling and J. J. F. Fournier, *Inclusions and Noninclusion of Spaces of Convolution Operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 221(1976), 59-95.
- [4] K. de Leeuw, *On  $L^p$  Multipliers*, Ann. of Math. 81(1965), 364-379.
- [5] S. Igari, *Functions of  $L^p$ -multipliers*, Tohoku Math. J. 21(1969),304-320.
- [6] M. Kaneko and E. Sato, *Notes on Transference of Continuity from Maximal Fourier Multiplier Operators on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  to Those on  $\mathbf{T}^n$* , Interdisciplinary Information Sciences, 4(1998),97-107.
- [7] R. Larsen, *An Introduction to the Theory of Multipliers*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York (1971)
- [8] B. Muckenhoupt, *Weighted norm inequalities for the hardy maximal function*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.165(1972), 207-226.
- [9] E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, *Introduction to Fourier Analysis on Euclidean Spaces*, Princeton University Press, (1971).
- [10] M. Zafran, *Multiplier transformations of weak type*, Ann. of Math. (2)101(1975), 34-44.

MATHEMATICS SECTION, DIVISION OF INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, KANAZAWA UNIVERSITY KANAZAWA 920-1192, JAPAN  
E-mail address: kanjin@staff.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

CHOFU KITA HIGH SCHOOL CHOFU,182-0011,JAPAN

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, YAMAGATA UNIVERSITY, YAMAGATA, 990-8560, JAPAN  
E-mail address: esato@sci.kj.yamagata-u.ac.jp