# ON $L_{\infty}$ UNIVERSALLY BAD SEQUENCES IN ERGODIC THEORY 

A. Biró

We prove an arithmetical condition (conditions (c) or (d) of the theorem) for a subsequence of the positive integers to be $L_{\infty}$ universally bad. As a consequence, we prove (Corollary 1) that every $L_{\infty}$ universally bad sequence is $\delta$-sweeping out for some $\delta>0$. This problem was posed by J. Rosenblatt [2, p. 231] and (as I was informed by R. Jones and J. Rosenblatt) A. Bellow and R. Jones also solve it by a different method in [1], as a corollary of their main result there. Our Corollary 2 shows that one can test $L_{\infty}$ universal badness of sequences on the special dynamical system $([0,1], B, \lambda, x \rightarrow 2 x(\bmod 1))$ consisting of Borel sets of $[0,1]$ with the Lebesgue measure, and transformation $x \rightarrow 2 x(\bmod 1)$.

By a dynamical system ( $\Omega, A, \mu, T$ ) we mean a non-atomic probability space ( $\Omega, A, \mu$ ) together with an ergodic measure preserving transformation $T$. A strictly increasing sequence $a_{1}<a_{2}<\cdots<a_{n}<\cdots$ of positive integers is called $L_{\infty}$ universally bad, if for every dynamical system there is an $f \in L_{\infty}(\Omega)$ for which the pointwise ergodic theorem along the subsequence $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ is not true, i.e., for which $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right)$ fails to converge in a set of $\omega$ of positive measure.

THEOREM. The following statements are equivalent for a given strictly increasing sequence ( $a_{1}<a_{2}<\cdots$ ) of positive integers.
(a) There exists a dynamical system $(\Omega, A, \mu, T)$ such that for every $f \in L_{\infty}(\Omega)$,

$$
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right)
$$

is convergent for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$; i.e., $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ is not $L_{\infty}$ universally bad.
(b) For every $c>0$ there exists a dynamical system ( $\Omega, A, \mu, T$ ) and an $\varepsilon>0$ with the property that if $G \in A, \gamma$ is the characteristic function of $G$, and

$$
\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) \geq c
$$

for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, then $\mu(G) \geq \varepsilon$.
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(c) For every $0<c<1$ there is an $\varepsilon>0$ such that if $n$ is a positive integer, $H \subseteq\{1,2, \ldots, n\}, \chi$ is the characteristic function of $H$, and $|H|<\varepsilon n$, then

$$
\left|\left\{1 \leq x \leq n: \max _{k=1,2, \ldots} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi\left(x+a_{i}\right) \geq c\right\}\right| \leq(1-\varepsilon) n
$$

(d) For every $0<c, c^{*}<1$, there is an $\varepsilon>0$ such that if $n$ is a positive integer, $H \subseteq\{1,2, \ldots, n\}, \chi$ is the characteristic function of $H$, and $|H|<\varepsilon n$, then

$$
\left|\left\{1 \leq x \leq n: \max _{k=1,2, \ldots} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi\left(x+a_{i}\right) \geq c\right\}\right| \leq c^{*} n
$$

(e) For every dynamical system $(\Omega, A, \mu, T)$, with the notation

$$
M(g)(\omega)=\sup _{k=1,2, \ldots}\left|\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} g\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right)\right|
$$

if $g_{i} \in L_{\infty}(\Omega)$ for $i=1,2, \ldots,\left\|g_{i}\right\|_{\infty} \leq 1,\left\|g_{i}\right\|_{1} \rightarrow 0$, then $\left\|M\left(g_{i}\right)\right\|_{1} \rightarrow 0$.
Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b). Let $(\Omega, A, \mu, T)$ be the dynamical system from (a), and $\varepsilon=c$. Since $\gamma \in L_{\infty}(\Omega)$, we have, by (a),

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right)=\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) \geq c
$$

for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, so by Lebesgue's theorem,

$$
\mu(G)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) d \mu=\int_{\Omega} \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) d \mu \geq c
$$

which proves (b).
(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c). The proof depends on the following lemma of Rohlin ([3], Theorem 8.1.):

Given any dynamical system $(\Omega, A, \mu, T), \varepsilon>0$ and positive integer $n$, there is a measurable set $D \in A$ such that $D, T^{-1} D, \ldots, T^{-(n-1)} D$ are pairwise disjoint, and $\mu\left(D \cup T^{-1} D \cup \cdots \cup T^{-(n-1)} D\right)>1-\varepsilon$.

Assume that for a given $c$ assertion (c) is not true. Then for every $\varepsilon>0$ there is a positive integer $n, H \subseteq\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$ such that $|H|<\varepsilon n$,

$$
\left|\left\{1 \leq x \leq n: \max _{k=1,2, \ldots .} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi\left(x+a_{i}\right) \geq c\right\}\right|>(1-\varepsilon) n .
$$

Apply Rohlin's lemma for this $\varepsilon$ and $n$, and for any given dynamical system ( $\Omega, A, \mu$, $T$ ); then we get a set $D \in A$, and let

$$
G_{\varepsilon}=\bigcup_{h \in H} T^{-n+h} D
$$

Denote by $\gamma_{\varepsilon}$ the characteristic function of $G_{\varepsilon}$; then for $1 \leq x \leq n$ and $\omega \in T^{-n+x} D$,

$$
\sup _{k=1,2, \ldots} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_{\varepsilon}\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) \geq \max _{k=1,2, \ldots} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi\left(x+a_{i}\right)
$$

Hence, from the conditions, $\mu\left(G_{\varepsilon}\right)=|H| \mu(D)<\varepsilon n \mu(D) \leq \varepsilon$. On the other hand,

$$
\mu\left(\omega: \sup _{k=1,2, \ldots} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_{\varepsilon}\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) \geq c\right)>(1-\varepsilon) n \mu(D)>(1-\varepsilon)^{2}>1-2 \varepsilon
$$

Here we can neglect the small values of $k$, because the measure of the set $\left\{\omega\right.$ : $T^{a_{i}} \in G_{\varepsilon}$ for some $i \leq 1 / \sqrt{\varepsilon}\}$ is at most $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \mu\left(G_{\varepsilon}\right)<\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. So for $G_{\varepsilon}$ we know that $\mu\left(G_{\varepsilon}\right)<\varepsilon$ and

$$
\mu\left(\omega: \sup _{k>1 / \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_{\varepsilon}\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) \geq c\right)>1-2 \varepsilon-\sqrt{\varepsilon}
$$

So if $G=\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{\varepsilon / 2^{j}}$, the characteristic function of $G$ is $\gamma$, then $\mu(G)<\varepsilon$, and by the Borel-Cantelli lemma (since $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2 \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{j}}+\sqrt{\varepsilon / 2^{j}}<\infty$ ) we have

$$
\mu\left(\omega: \limsup _{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) \geq c\right)=1
$$

This proves that (b) is not true.
(c) $\Rightarrow$ (d). Implication (d) $\Rightarrow$ (c) would be trivial, but we have to prove now the converse. Assume that assertion (d) is not true with a given $c$ and $c^{*}$. Then for every $\varepsilon>0$ there is a positive integer $n, H \subseteq\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$, such that $|H|<\varepsilon n$, and with the notation

$$
G=\left\{1 \leq x \leq n: \max _{k=1,2, \ldots} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi\left(x+a_{i}\right) \geq c\right\}
$$

we have $|G| / n>c^{*}$. We would like to show that this can be satisfied with numbers arbitrarily close to 1 in place of the fixed $0<c^{*}<1$. Now choose an integer $m$ with $1 \leq m \leq n$, and let $H_{1}=H \cup(H+m), G_{1}=G \cup(G+m)$; these are subsets of $\{1,2, \ldots, n+m\}$. We want to maximize $\frac{\left|G_{1}\right|}{n+m}$. Assume that $\frac{\left|G_{1}\right|}{n+m} \leq c_{1}^{*}$ for every $1 \leq m \leq n$ with some $c_{1}^{*}$. It follows that

$$
|\{g \in G: g+m \in G\}| \geq 2|G|-c_{1}^{*}(n+m),
$$

and summing with respect to $m$ gives

$$
2 n|G|-c_{1}^{*} n^{2}-c_{1}^{*} \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \leq \sum_{m=1}^{n}|\{g \in G: g+m \in G\}|
$$

The right hand side can be estimated with the number of pairs in $G$, so it is smaller than $|G|^{2} / 2$; hence

$$
c_{1}^{*}\left(3+\frac{1}{n}\right)>4 \frac{|G|}{n}-\left(\frac{|G|}{n}\right)^{2}
$$

Since the function $x \rightarrow 4 x-x^{2}$ is monotone increasing in [0,1], one can choose $1 \leq m \leq n$ such that

$$
\frac{\left|G_{1}\right|}{n+m}>\frac{4 c^{*}-\left(c^{*}\right)^{2}}{3+(1 / n)}=c^{*} \frac{4-c^{*}}{3+(1 / n)}
$$

On the other hand, it is trivial that if $\chi_{1}$ is the characteristic function of $H_{1}$, then for $x \in G_{1}$ we have $\max _{k=1,2, \ldots \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi_{1}\left(x+a_{i}\right) \geq c \text {. Summing up this process: }}^{\text {. }}$ starting with a set $H$ with the properties

$$
\begin{equation*}
H \subseteq\{1,2, \ldots, n\},|H|<\varepsilon n,\left|\left\{1 \leq x \leq n: \max _{k=1,2, \ldots} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi\left(x+a_{i}\right) \geq c\right\}\right|>c^{*} n \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

we can find a new set satisfying similar conditions with the same $c$, with larger $n$, with $2 \varepsilon$ in place of $\varepsilon$, and with $c^{*} \frac{4-c^{*}}{3+(1 / n)}$ in place of $c^{*}$. Fix an arbitrary $0<q<1$, and iterate this process. We want to achieve $c^{*} \geq q$.

Now $q$ is fixed, and we can start with arbitrarily small $\varepsilon$. With the first set $H$ $1 \leq|H| \leq \varepsilon n$, so for the first $n$ we have $\frac{1}{n} \leq \varepsilon$, and since $n$ increases, this will be always true. So we can assume for example $\frac{1}{n}<\frac{1-q}{2}$, and then, if $c^{*}<q$, then

$$
c^{*} \frac{4-c^{*}}{3+(1 / n)} \geq R_{1} c^{*}
$$

with a constant $R_{1}>1$ depending on $q$. This means that there is a constant $R_{2}$ (depending on $q$ and on the original $c^{*}$, but these are fixed numbers) such that after $R_{2}$ steps we will have $c^{*} \geq q$, so we will have (1) for the actual $H$ and $n$, with $q$ in place of $c^{*}$, and with $2^{R_{2}} \varepsilon$ in place of the original $\varepsilon$. If the original $\varepsilon$ is small enough, then $2^{R_{2}} \varepsilon$ is also small. This proves that assertion (c) is not true with this $c$.
(d) $\Rightarrow$ (e). Firstly, from (d) it follows that for every $c>0$ there is an $\varepsilon>0$ such that if $n$ is a positive integer, $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ is a function defined on the set $\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$, and $\sum_{x=1}^{n} \chi(x)<\varepsilon n$, then $\sum_{x=1}^{n} \max _{k=1,2, \ldots} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi\left(x+a_{i}\right)<c n$. Indeed, if $\chi$ is a characteristic function, then this is obvious from (d), but for general $\chi$ we have for every $\delta>0$ that $\chi \leq \delta+\chi_{\delta}$, where $\chi>\delta$.

If $0 \leq g \leq 1$ is a function measurable on $\Omega, n$ is a large positive integer, then

$$
\int_{\Omega} g(\omega)=\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x=1}^{n} g\left(T^{x} \omega\right)
$$

Hence with the notation $\Omega_{1}=\left\{\omega: \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x=1}^{n} g\left(T^{x} \omega\right) \geq \varepsilon\right\}$ we have $\mu\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} g(\omega)$. Let $h$ be a fixed positive integer, $\Omega_{2}=\Omega-\Omega_{1}$; then applying the remark above for $\chi(x)=g\left(T^{x} \omega\right)$, we get

$$
\sum_{x=1}^{n-a_{h}} \max _{k=1,2, \ldots, h} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} g\left(T^{x+a_{i}} \omega\right)<c n
$$

for $\omega \in \Omega_{2}$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} \max _{k=1,2, \ldots, h} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} g\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) & =\frac{1}{n-a_{h}} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{x=1}^{n-a_{h}} \max _{k=1,2, \ldots, h} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} g\left(T^{x+a_{i}} \omega\right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} g(\omega)+c \frac{n}{n-a_{h}}
\end{aligned}
$$

estimating separately on the sets $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$. If we first let $n \rightarrow \infty$, and then $h \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $\|M(g)\|_{1} \leq c+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\|g\|_{1}$. Since $c$ can be arbitrarily small, this proves (e) (using positive and negative parts for general $g$ ).
(e) $\Rightarrow$ (a). It is easily seen from (e) (which is a weakened version of the usual maximal inequality) that if $f \in L_{\infty}(\Omega), f_{1}, f_{2}, \ldots, f_{i}, \ldots \in L_{\infty}(\Omega),\|f\|_{\infty} \leq C$, $\left\|f_{i}\right\|_{\infty} \leq C,\left\|f-f_{i}\right\|_{1} \rightarrow 0, C$ is a constant, and the pointwise ergodic theorem along the subsequence $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ is true for all $f_{i}$, then it is also true for $f$. So it is enough to find a dynamical system in which we know the pointwise ergodic theorem along the subsequence $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ for an (in this sense) dense set of functions.

Consider the dynamical system $([0,1], B, \lambda, x \rightarrow 2 x(\bmod 1)$ ). Here the set of trigonometric polynomials is dense in the above sense, so it is enough to know the theorem for the functions $x \rightarrow e^{2 \pi i n x}$ (where $n \neq 0$ is an integer), and for this it is enough to show that for any $\varepsilon>0$ the function series $h_{r}(x)=\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)^{r}} \sum_{j \leq(1+\varepsilon)^{r}} e^{2 \pi i\left(2^{a_{j}} n\right) x}$ is convergent for a.e. $x$. But this is true, because by Parseval's formula

$$
\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\left|h_{r}(x)\right|^{2} d x \leq \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)^{r}}<\infty ;
$$

hence $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\left|h_{r}(x)\right|^{2}$ is finite a.e., so $h_{r}(x) \rightarrow 0$ a.e., and this proves (a). The proof of the theorem is now complete.

Following Rosenblatt [2], we say that the sequence $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ is $\delta$-sweeping out (for a given $\delta>0$ ), if for every dynamical system $(\Omega, A, \mu, T)$ and every $\varepsilon>0$ there is a $G \in A$ with characteristic function $\gamma$ such that $\mu(G)<\varepsilon$, and

$$
\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma\left(T^{a_{i}} \omega\right) \geq \delta
$$

for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. Now we see that condition (b) of the theorem is exactly the statement that $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ is not $\delta$-sweeping out for any $\delta>0$. So equivalence (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) gives the following.

COROLLARY 1. The sequence $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ is $L_{\infty}$ universally bad if and only if it is $\delta$ sweeping out for some $\delta>0$.

From the proof of the theorem it is clear that if condition (a) is satisfied, then we can choose the special system $([0,1], B, \lambda, x \rightarrow 2 x(\bmod 1))$ there, the pointwise ergodic theorem along $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ will be true for $f \in L_{\infty}$, and the a.e. limit will be $\int_{0}^{1} f$. So we have:

COROLLARY 2. The sequence $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ is not $L_{\infty}$ universally bad if and only if the pointwise ergodic theorem along $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ is true in $([0,1], B, \lambda, x \rightarrow 2 x(\bmod 1))$ for $L_{\infty}$ functions, i.e., if and only iffor every bounded measurable function $f$ on the real line, periodic with respect to 1 one has for a.e. $x$,

$$
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(2^{a_{i}} x\right) \rightarrow \int_{0}^{1} f
$$
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