

(December 14, 2019)

## Examples: discussion 04

Paul Garrett garrett@math.umn.edu <http://www.math.umn.edu/~garrett/>

[This document is [http://www.math.umn.edu/~garrett/m/real/notes\\_2019-20/real-ex-04.pdf](http://www.math.umn.edu/~garrett/m/real/notes_2019-20/real-ex-04.pdf)]

[04.1] Give a *persuasive* proof that the function

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\text{for } x \leq 0) \\ e^{-1/x} & (\text{for } x > 0) \end{cases}$$

is infinitely differentiable at 0. Use this to make a *smooth step function*: 0 for  $x \leq 0$  and 1 for  $x \geq 1$ , and goes monotonically from 0 to 1 in the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Use this to construct a *family of smooth cut-off functions*  $\{f_n : n = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ : for each  $n$ ,  $f_n(x) = 1$  for  $x \in [-n, n]$ ,  $f_n(x) = 0$  for  $x \notin [-(n+1), n+1]$ , and  $f_n$  goes monotonically from 0 to 1 in  $[-(n+1), -n]$  and monotonically from 1 to 0 in  $[n, n+1]$ .

**Discussion:** In  $x > 0$ , by induction, the derivatives are finite linear combinations of functions of the form  $x^{-n}e^{-1/x}$ . It suffices to show that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} x^{-n}e^{-1/x} = 0$ . Equivalently, that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} x^n e^{-x} = 0$ , which follows from  $e^{-x} = 1/e^x$ , and

$$x^{-n}e^{-1/x} = \frac{x^n}{e^x} = \frac{x^n}{\sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{x^m}{m!}} \leq \frac{x^n}{\frac{x^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{as } x \rightarrow +\infty)$$

(This is perhaps a little better than appeals to L'Hospital's Rule.) Thus,  $f$  is smooth at 0, with all derivatives 0 there. ///

Next, we make a *smooth bump function* by

$$b(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\text{for } x \leq -1) \\ e^{\frac{1}{x^2-1}} & (\text{for } -1 < x < 1) \\ 0 & (\text{for } x \geq 1) \end{cases}$$

A similar argument to the previous shows that this is smooth. Renormalize it to have integral 1 by

$$\beta(x) = \frac{b(x)}{\int_{-1}^1 b(t) dt}$$

Then  $s(x) = \int_{-1}^x \beta(t) dt$  is a smooth (monotone) step function that goes from 0 at  $-1$  to 1 at 1. The minor modification  $s(x) = 2 \int_{-1}^x \beta(2t-1) dt$  gives a smooth (monotone) step  $s(x)$  function going from 0 at 0 to 1 at 1. ///

Then  $s(x+n+1)$  is a smooth, monotone step function going *up* from 0 to 1 in  $[-n-1, -n]$ , and  $s(n+1-x)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  is a smooth, monotone step function going *down* from 1 to 0 in  $[n, n+1]$ . Thus, the product  $f_n(x) = s(x+n+1) \cdot s(n+1-x)$  is the desired smooth cut-off function. ///

[04.2] Use a family of smooth cut-offs to show that test functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  are dense in Schwartz functions on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Discussion:** Let  $s_n(x)$  be a smooth cut-off function, identically 0 for  $|x| \geq n+1$ , identically 1 for  $|x| \leq n$ , real-valued, and going smoothly from 0 to 1 (or vice-versa) in the two edge-case intervals  $[-n-1, -n]$  and  $[n, n+1]$ . Given a Schwartz function  $f$ , we claim that the pointwise products  $s_n \cdot f$  are test functions converging in  $\mathcal{S}$  to  $f$ . Certainly they are test functions.

Certainly  $0 \leq s_n(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and for all  $n$ . Thus, we estimate one family of seminorms easily:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^m |(s_n f)(x) - f(x)| &= \sup_{|x| \geq n} (1+x^2)^m |(s_n f)(x) - f(x)| \leq \sup_{|x| \geq n} (1+x^2)^m |f(x)| \\ &= \sup_{|x| \geq n} \frac{1}{1+x^2} (1+x^2)^{m+1} |f(x)| \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^{m+1} |f(x)| \end{aligned}$$

and the later  $\sup$  is independent of  $n$ . Thus, the latter expression goes to 0 at  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ .

The  $s_n$  are designed so that for each  $k$ , the family of  $k^{\text{th}}$  derivatives  $s_n^{(k)}(x)$  has a bound independent of  $n$ , for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Also,  $k^{\text{th}}$  derivatives with  $k \geq 1$  are identically 0 outside the bands  $n \leq |x| \leq n+1$ . To warm up, estimate just the first derivative on its own:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^m \cdot |(s_n f)'(x) - f'(x)| &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^m \cdot |s'_n f(x) + s_n f'(x) - f'(x)| \\ &\leq \sup_{n \leq |x| \leq n+1} (1+x^2)^m \cdot |s'_n f(x)| + \sup_{|x| \geq n} (1+x^2)^m \cdot |f'(x)| \\ &\leq \sup |s'_n(x)| \cdot \sup_{|x| \geq n} (1+x^2)^m \cdot |f(x)| + \sup_{|x| \geq n} (1+x^2)^m \cdot |f'(x)| \end{aligned}$$

As in the previous computation,

$$\sup_{|x| \geq n} (1+x^2)^m \cdot |f'(x)| \leq \sup_{|x| \geq n} \frac{1}{1+x^2} (1+x^2)^{m+1} \cdot |f'(x)| \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sup_{|x| \geq n} (1+x^2)^{m+1} \cdot |f'(x)|$$

which goes to 0 as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ .

The  $k^{\text{th}}$  derivatives are similarly estimated, applying Leibniz' rule  $k$  times. Thus,  $\nu(s_n f - f) \rightarrow 0$  for all the seminorms  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ . ///

**[04.3]** Show that multiplication by  $x$ , and also differentiation  $d/dx$ , are continuous linear maps  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ .

**Discussion:** By the definition of the topology on  $\mathcal{S}$ , and by the equivalent of continuity at 0 and continuity for linear maps, it suffices to show that, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and seminorm  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  and seminorm  $\mu$  on Schwartz functions  $\varphi$  such that  $\mu(\varphi) < \delta$  implies  $\nu(\varphi) < \varepsilon$ .

For

$$\nu(\varphi) = \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^n \cdot |f^{(i)}(x)|$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(xf)^{(i)}(x)| &= |(f + xf')^{(i-1)}(x)| = |(2f' + xf'')^{(i-2)}(x)| = \dots = |(if^{(i-1)} + xf^{(i)})(x)| \\ &\leq k \cdot |f^{(i-1)}(x)| + (1+x^2) |f^{(i)}(x)| \end{aligned}$$

by induction. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(xf) &= \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^n \cdot |f^{(i)}(x)| \leq \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} k \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^n |f^{(i-1)}(x)| + \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |(1+x^2)^{n+1} f^{(i)}(x)| \\ &\leq 2k \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |(1+x^2)^{n+1} f^{(i)}(x)| \end{aligned}$$

So if we make

$$\mu(f) = \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |(1+x^2)^{n+1} f^{(i)}(x)|$$

smaller than  $\varepsilon/2k$ , then  $|\nu(xf)| < \varepsilon$ , giving the continuity of multiplication by  $x$ . ///

Even more simply,  $|(f')^{(i)}(x)| = |f^{(i+1)}(x)|$  gives

$$\nu(f') = \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^n \cdot |(f')^{(i)}(x)| = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq k+1} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^n \cdot |f^{(i)}(x)| \leq \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k+1} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^n \cdot |f^{(i)}(x)|$$

So if we make

$$\mu(f) = \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k+1} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |(1+x^2)^{n+1} f^{(i)}(x)|$$

smaller than  $\varepsilon$ , then  $|\nu(f')| < \varepsilon$ . ///

[04.4] Show that  $\delta(\varphi) = \varphi(0)$  is a tempered distribution.

**Discussion:** By the definition of the topology on  $\mathcal{S}$ , and by the equivalence of continuity at 0 and continuity for linear maps, it suffices to show that, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $\eta > 0$  and seminorm  $\nu$  on Schwartz functions  $\varphi$  such that  $\nu(\varphi) < \eta$  implies  $|\varphi(0)| < \varepsilon$ . This succeeds for  $\nu(\varphi) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\varphi(x)|$  and  $\eta = \varepsilon$ . ///

[04.5] Show that the principal value integral  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{|x| > \varepsilon} \frac{f(x)}{x} dx$  is a tempered distribution, and satisfies  $x \cdot u = 1$ .

**Discussion:** Let  $u$  be that functional. For fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , integrate by parts. The boundary terms at  $\pm N$  for  $N$  large go to 0 because  $f$  is Schwartz. Boundary terms at  $\pm\varepsilon$  are

$$u(f) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \left( \left[ \log |x| \cdot f(x) \right] - \int_{|x| > \varepsilon} f'(x) \cdot \log |x| dx \right)$$

The boundary terms

$$\log |\varepsilon| \cdot f(\varepsilon) - \log |-\varepsilon| \cdot f(-\varepsilon) = (2\varepsilon \cdot \log \varepsilon) \cdot \frac{f(\varepsilon) - f(-\varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon}$$

are 0: differentiability of  $f$  at 0 implies that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(\varepsilon) - f(-\varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon} = f'(0)$$

and in particular the limit *exists*, while

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varepsilon \cdot \log \varepsilon = 0$$

Thus,

$$|u(f)| = \left| \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{|x| > \varepsilon} f'(x) \cdot \log |x| dx \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'(x) \cdot \log |x| dx \right|$$

Further,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'(x) (1+x^2) \cdot \frac{\log |x|}{1+x^2} dx \right| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2) |f'(x)| (1+x^2) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\log |x||}{1+x^2} dx$$

The latter integral is a finite constant, so to make  $|u(f)|$  small it suffices to make the seminorm

$$\mu(f) = \sup_{0 \leq i \leq 1} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1+x^2) |f^{(i)}(x)|$$

small, proving the continuity. ///

For  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$(x \cdot u)(f) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{|x| \geq \varepsilon} \frac{x \cdot f(x)}{x} dx = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{|x| \geq \varepsilon} f(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} 1 \cdot f(x) dx = 1(\varphi)$$

thinking of 1 as the integrate-against-1 distribution, since  $\varphi$  is continuous at 0. Thus,  $x \cdot u = 1$ . ///

[04.6] Reprove  $\widehat{\delta} = 1$  by approximating  $\delta$  by Gaussians.

**Discussion:** We know that  $u_n(x) = \sqrt{n} \cdot e^{-\pi n x^2}$  is an *approximate identity*, meaning that

$$u_n(f) \longrightarrow f(0) = \delta(f)$$

for every  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ , which is exactly to say that  $u_n \rightarrow \delta$  in the weak dual topology on  $\mathcal{S}^*$ . Fourier transform on tempered distributions is continuous, so Fourier transform and the weak-dual-topology limit can be interchanged:

$$\widehat{\delta} = \lim_n \widehat{u_n} = \lim_n e^{-\pi x^2/n}$$

the latter by earlier computations of Fourier transforms of Gaussians. By Lebesgue dominated convergence, for  $f \in L^1$ ,

$$\lim_n \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\pi x^2/n} \cdot f(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lim_n e^{-\pi x^2/n} \cdot f(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} 1 \cdot f(x) dx = 1(f) \quad (\text{for all } f \in \mathcal{S})$$

That is,  $\widehat{\delta} = 1$ . ///

[04.7] Show that  $\lim_n \frac{1}{1+(x-n)^2} = 0$  in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})^*$ .

**Discussion:** It is implicit in the question that the functionals are *integrate against* the functions  $\frac{1}{1+(x-n)^2}$ . By definition of the weak dual topology on  $\mathcal{S}^*$ , we must show that for every  $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$

$$\lim_n \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1+(x-n)^2} \cdot f(x) dx = 0$$

We could do a direct computation. Also, we can observe that the functions  $g_n(x) = 1/(1+(x-n)^2)$  go to 0 pointwise, and for a given Schwartz function  $f$  the functions  $g_n \cdot f$  go to 0 pointwise, and are dominated by  $|f|$ . Thus, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, the limit of the integrals is the integral of the pointwise limit, which is 0. ///

[04.8] Determine the constant  $c$  such that  $x^2 \delta'' = c \cdot \delta$ .

**Discussion:** Compute directly: for  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (x^2 \delta'')(f) &= \delta''(x^2 \cdot f) = -\delta'(2x \cdot f + x^2 \cdot f') = \delta(2 \cdot f + 4x \cdot f' + x^2 f'') \\ &= 2 \cdot f(0) + 4 \cdot 0 \cdot f'(0) + 0^2 \cdot f''(0) = 2 \cdot f(0) = 2\delta(f) \end{aligned}$$

So  $x^2 \delta'' = 2\delta$ . ///

[04.9] Show that  $\sin(nx) \rightarrow 0$  in the  $\mathcal{S}^*$ -topology as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ .

**Discussion:** One approach: for  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ , certainly  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , so by Riemann-Lebesgue the Fourier transform is continuous and goes to 0 at infinity. The integral of  $f$  against  $\sin(nx)$  is the imaginary part of  $\widehat{f}(n)$ , so goes to 0. This satisfies the definition of  $\sin(nx) \rightarrow 0$  in the weak dual topology. ///

Less conceptually, but perhaps more simply, we can integrate by parts, with boundary terms going to 0 since  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ :

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \sin(nx) dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'(x) \frac{-\cos(nx)}{n} dx$$

In absolute value, this is estimated by

$$\int |f'(x)| \frac{1}{n} dx = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \int |f'(x)| dx$$

If we believe that  $\mathcal{S} \subset L^1$ , we're done. ///

**Remark:** Someone might be interested to see how hard it is to verify that  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  for all  $1 \leq p < +\infty$ , however reasonable the purported fact seems. It is direct, by an standard, elementary, reusable device: for  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f(x)|^p dx =; \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 + |x|^2)^{p\ell} \cdot |f(x)|^p \cdot \frac{1}{(1 + |x|^2)^{p\ell}} dx$$

for every  $\ell = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ . The latter is dominated by

$$\left( \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (1 + |x|^2)^{p\ell} |f(x)|^p \right) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{dx}{(1 + |x|^2)^{p\ell}} = \left( \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (1 + |x|^2)^\ell |f(x)| \right)^p \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{dx}{(1 + |x|^2)^{p\ell}}$$

For large enough  $\ell$ , the latter integral is convergent (to a finite value). The sup inside the  $p^{\text{th}}$  power is a fixed seminorm on  $\mathcal{S}$ . ///

[04.10] Solve  $u'' - \lambda \cdot u = \delta$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ , for  $\lambda \notin \mathbb{R}$ .

**Discussion:** Take the (extended as necessary, of course) Fourier transform of both sides:

$$1 = \widehat{\delta} = (-2\pi i \xi)^2 \widehat{u} - \lambda \cdot \widehat{u} = (4\pi^2 \xi^2 - \lambda) \cdot \widehat{u}$$

Obviously we want to *divide*, and we would obtain

$$\frac{-1}{4\pi^2 \xi^2 + \lambda} = \widehat{u}$$

The elementary pointwise division is in fact not necessarily legitimate, unless we somehow know a-priori that multiplication by the  $1/(4\pi^2 \xi^2 + \lambda)$  makes sense on all the entities involved.

So we should specify that we are asking for  $u \in \mathcal{S}^*$ , which is the most generous we can be and still use Fourier transforms in a usual (but not classical) fashion. For  $\lambda \notin \mathbb{R}$ , the function  $\frac{1}{4\pi^2 \xi^2 - \lambda}$  is smooth, and it and all its derivatives are bounded, it acts on  $\mathcal{S}$  by multiplication, so acts on  $\mathcal{S}^*$  by duality. Thus, we really do obtain the last equality, as tempered distributions.

Letting  $\psi_\xi(x) = e^{2\pi i \xi x}$ , so that we do not make question-begging errors, as an equality of tempered distributions,

$$u = \widehat{u}^\vee = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\psi_\xi d\xi}{4\pi^2 \xi^2 + \lambda}$$

Since the distribution  $1/(4\pi^2 \xi^2 - \lambda)$  is (or, properly, comes from) a function in  $L^1$ , the literal numerical integral can compute its (inverse) Fourier transform. By residues (!),

$$u(x) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{2\pi i \xi x} d\xi}{4\pi^2 \xi^2 + \lambda} = - \frac{e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}|x|}}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}$$

where  $\sqrt{\lambda}$  is the square root of  $\lambda$  with  $\text{Re}(\sqrt{\lambda}) > 0$ . ///