

## DIRICHLET SETS AND SOME UNIQUENESS THEOREMS FOR WALSH SERIES

Dedicated to Professor Tamotsu Tsuchikura on his sixtieth birthday

KAORU YONEDA

(Received August 23, 1982)

**1. Introduction.** Concerning the problem of uniqueness for Walsh series, we have already proved that a *Dirichlet set is always a U-set in the ordinary sense* and that a *subset of the dyadic group is a Dirichlet set if and only if it is a subset of some closed subgroup with Haar measure zero* [6].

In this paper, we shall generalize the above results and prove some uniqueness theorems for Dirichlet sets.

Fine [2] defined the *dyadic field*,  $\mathcal{F}$ , which is the set of all 0-1 sequences  $(\dots, t_{-1}, t_0, t_1, \dots)$  with  $t_i = 0$  or 1 and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow -\infty} t_n = 0$ . For convenience, when  $x = (\dots, t_i, \dots)$  satisfies  $t_i = 0$  for sufficiently large  $i$ , we shall identify  $x$  with  $(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} t_k/2^k)$ . For example,  $(\dots, 0, \overset{0}{1}, 1, 0, \dots) = 3$  and  $(\dots, 0, 0, \overset{1}{1}, 0, \dots) = 1/2$ . Define two operations: the addition denoted by  $+$  and the product denoted by  $\cdot$ . When  $x = (\dots, t_i, \dots)$  and  $y = (\dots, u_j, \dots)$  are arbitrary elements of  $\mathcal{F}$ , the addition is defined by

$$x + y = (\dots, |t_i - u_i|, \dots).$$

The product is defined by  $x \cdot y = (\dots, v_k, \dots)$  where

$$v_k \equiv \sum_{i+j=k} t_i u_j \pmod{2}.$$

The distance between  $x$  and  $y$  is given by

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |t_k - u_k|/2^k.$$

Hence  $\mathcal{F}$  becomes a metric space. Moreover it is easy to see that  $\mathcal{F}$  becomes a locally compact totally disconnected abelian group (see Rudin [4]).

The *dyadic group*,  $\mathcal{G}$ , is the subgroup of  $\mathcal{F}$  in which each ele-

ment has the form  $(\dots, 0, t_1, t_2, \dots)$ . For convenience, we shall identify  $(\dots, 0, t_1, t_2, \dots)$  with  $(t_1, t_2, \dots)$ .  $\mathcal{G}$  is a compact totally disconnected abelian group. For details of the dyadic group we shall refer the reader to Fine [1].

We shall introduce the concept of dyadic intervals.  $I_n^p$  denotes a *dyadic interval of rank  $n$*  which is a set of all elements  $(\dots, t_k, \dots) \in \mathcal{G}$  such that

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^n t_k/2^k = p/2^n,$$

for  $n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$  and  $p = 0, 1, \dots$ .  $I_n(x)$  denotes the dyadic interval of rank  $n$  which contains  $x$ . It is easy to see that  $I_0^0$  coincides with the dyadic group  $\mathcal{G}$  and any dyadic interval is closed and open in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Let  $\Gamma = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  be a subgroup of  $\mathcal{G}$ . The character functions of  $\mathcal{G}$  are called *Walsh functions*,  $\{w_n(x)\}_{n \in \Gamma}$ , which are defined by the equation

$$w_n(x) = (-1)^{\sum_{i+j=1} t_i n_j},$$

where  $x = (t_1, t_2, \dots) \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $n = (\dots, n_{-2}, n_{-1}, 0, \dots) \in \Gamma$ . Then  $\Gamma$  is the dual group of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

We shall introduce the dyadic measures (see [5]). A real valued set function  $m$  on the dyadic intervals is said to be a *dyadic measure* if it satisfies the following additivity

$$m(I_n^p) = m(I_{n+1}^{2p}) + m(I_{n+1}^{2p+1}),$$

for  $n = 0, 1, \dots$  and  $p = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1$ . When  $f(x)$  is an integrable function, set

$$m_f(I_n^p) = \int_{I_n^p} f(x) dx,$$

for each dyadic interval  $I_n^p$ . Then  $m_f$  becomes a dyadic measure. If  $m$  is a Radon measure on  $\mathcal{G}$ , then it is a dyadic measure which satisfies

$$\sup_n \left( \sum_{p=0}^{2^n-1} |m(I_n^p)| \right) < \infty.$$

Conversely, if a dyadic measure  $m$  satisfies the above condition, then there exists a Radon measure  $m^*$  such that  $m^*(I_n^p) = m(I_n^p)$  for each dyadic interval  $I_n^p$ . We shall identify  $m^*$  with  $m$ .

Let

$$\mu \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \equiv \sum_{k \in \Gamma} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x)$$

be an arbitrary Walsh series. The quantity

$$\begin{aligned} m_\mu(I_n^p) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{I_n^p} \sum_{k=0}^N \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) dx = \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) \int_{I_n^p} w_k(x) dx \\ &= (1/2^n) \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(p/2^n) \end{aligned}$$

is determined for each dyadic interval  $I_n^p$ . Moreover we have

$$m_\mu(I_n(x)) = (1/2^n) \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x).$$

The set function  $m_\mu$  becomes a dyadic measure and

$$(1.1) \quad \hat{\mu}(k) = \sum_{p=0}^{2^n-1} m_\mu(I_n^p) w_k(p/2^n) = \int_{\mathcal{G}} w_k(x) m_\mu(dx),$$

for  $0 \leq k < 2^n$  and  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , where  $\int_{I_n^p} m_\mu(dx) = m_\mu(I_n^p)$ . We shall call  $\hat{\mu}(k)$  the  $k$ -th Walsh Fourier coefficient of  $\mu$ .

Conversely, for an arbitrary dyadic measure  $m$ , the quantity (1.1) is determined for each  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ . It is easy to see that  $m_\mu$  coincides with  $m$ .

**2. Strong  $U$ -sets.** When  $\mathcal{A}$  is a certain class of Walsh series, a subset  $E$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  is said to be a  $U$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$ , if  $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$  and

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere except on } E,$$

imply that  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k$ . When  $E$  is not a  $U$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$ , it is called an  $M$ -set for  $\mathcal{A}$ .

A subset  $E$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  is said to be a *strong  $U$ -set*, if the equality

$$(2.2) \quad \sup_k |\hat{\mu}(k)| = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\hat{\mu}(k)|$$

holds for any Walsh series  $\mu$  which satisfies (2.1) everywhere except on  $E$ . It is easy to see that a *strong  $U$ -set* is a  $U$ -set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that  $\hat{\mu}(k) = o(1)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . The concept of strong  $U$ -set was introduced by Kahane [3] for trigonometric Fourier series of Radon measures.

A subset  $E$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  is called a *Dirichlet set*, if it satisfies the following equation:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} |1 - w_n(x)| = 0.$$

Kahane [3] proved that a *Dirichlet set defined on the unit circle is a strong  $U$ -set*. We shall prove the analogues of this result.

When  $\Delta$  is a subgroup of  $\Gamma$ , let  $H(\Delta)$  be the annihilator of  $\Delta$ , that is,

$$H(\Delta) = \{x; w_k(x) = 1 \text{ for all } k \in \Delta\}.$$

If  $\Gamma = \Delta + \Delta^*$  (direct sum) where  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta^*$  are both infinite subgroups of  $\Gamma$ , then  $H(\Delta)$  and  $H(\Delta^*)$  are both closed subgroups of  $\mathcal{G}$  with Haar measure zero and  $H(\Delta) + H(\Delta^*)$  (direct sum) coincides with  $\mathcal{G}$  (see Rudin [4]).

From the definition of Dirichlet sets, we can find a monotone increasing sequence of integers  $(n_k; k = 1, 2, \dots)$  such that  $w_{n_k}(x) = 1$  for all  $x \in E$  and all  $k$ . We shall generalize the definition of Dirichlet sets. When  $\Theta = (\theta_k; k \in \Delta)$  is a sequence of elements of  $\mathcal{G}$ , set

$$K(\Theta) = \{x; w_k(x) = w_k(\theta_k) \text{ } k \in \Delta\}.$$

**THEOREM 2.1.** *A Walsh series  $\mu$  satisfies (2.1) for  $x \in K(\Theta)$ , if and only if*

$$(2.3) \quad \hat{\mu}(n + k) = \hat{\mu}(n)w_k(\theta_k)$$

for all  $n \in \Gamma$  and  $k \in \Delta$ .

**PROOF.** We shall first consider the case  $K(\Theta) \neq \emptyset$ . Since

$$w_{i+j}(u) = w_i(u)w_j(u) = w_i(\theta_i)w_j(\theta_j) = w_{i+j}(\theta_{i+j})$$

for  $u \in K(\Theta)$ ,  $i$  and  $j \in \Delta$ , the equation

$$(2.4) \quad w_{i+j}(\theta_{i+j}) = w_i(\theta_i)w_j(\theta_j)$$

holds for all  $i$  and  $j \in \Delta$ . On the other hand, we know already [6] that there exist a monotone increasing sequence of integers  $(N_j; j = 1, 2, \dots)$  and a sequence of integers  $(n_j; j = 1, 2, \dots)$  such that  $N_1 < N_2 < \dots$ ,

$$2^{N_j} \leq n_j < 2^{N_{j+1}}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

and

$$(2.5) \quad \Delta = \{\varepsilon_1 n_1 + \varepsilon_2 n_2 + \dots; \varepsilon_i = 0 \text{ or } 1 \text{ and } \varepsilon_n = 0 \text{ for sufficiently large } n\}.$$

From (2.4) and the above just cited,  $\Theta$  is generated by  $(\theta_{n(j)}; j = 1, 2, \dots)$ , where  $n(j) = n_j$ . Hence  $K(\Theta)$  coincides with

$$\{x; w_{n(k)}(x) = w_{n(k)}(\theta_{n(k)}), k = 1, 2, \dots\}.$$

By the same argument as that used in the proof of Theorem 2 in [6], we can find an element  $v_0 \in H(\Delta^*)$  such that

$$K(\Theta) = v_0 + H(\Delta) \equiv \{v_0 + u; u \in H(\Delta)\}.$$

We write, as usual,  $y + E = \{y + x; x \in E\}$ .

To prove the necessity, we need the following:

LEMMA 2.2. *If a Walsh series  $\nu$  satisfies*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\nu}(k) w_k(x) \right| = 0 \text{ everywhere,}$$

then  $\hat{\nu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.2. It is easy to see that the inequality

$$|m_\nu(I_0^0)| \leq |m_\nu(I_1^0)| + |m_\nu(I_1^1)| \leq 2|m_\nu(I_1^{(1)})|,$$

holds, where  $|m_\nu(I_1^{(p)})| = \max\{|m_\nu(I_1^p)|; p = 0, 1\}$ . In the same way we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\nu}(0)| &= |m_\nu(I_0^0)| \leq 2|m_\nu(I_1^{(1)})| \leq 2^2|m_\nu(I_2^{(2)})| \\ &\leq \dots \leq 2^n|m_\nu(I_n^{(n)})| \leq \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where  $I_n^{(n)}$  is a subset of  $I_{n-1}^{(n-1)}$  which satisfies

$$|m_\nu(I_n^{(n)})| = \max\{|m_\nu(I_n^p)|; p = 2p_{n-1}, 2p_{n-1} + 1\}$$

for all  $n$ . Since each  $I_n^{(n)}$  is a closed set, we can set  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n^{(n)} = \{z\}$ . Then we have  $I_n^{(n)} = I_n(z)$  for all  $n$ . From the above inequality, we obtain

$$|\hat{\nu}(0)| \equiv |m_\nu(I_0^0)| \leq \dots \leq 2^n|m_\nu(I_n(z))|.$$

By

$$2^n m_\nu(I_n(z)) = \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\nu}(k) w_k(z)$$

and by assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\nu}(0)| &= |m_\nu(I_0^0)| \leq \dots \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |2^n m_\nu(I_n(z))| \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\nu}(k) w_k(z) \right| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\hat{\nu}(0) = 0$ . A similar argument shows  $\hat{\nu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k$ . The proof is complete.

We shall prove the necessity. By Lemma 2.2,  $m_\mu(I_n^p) = 0$  for each dyadic interval  $I_n^p$  such that  $I_n^p \cap K(\Theta) = \emptyset$ . Let  $\{I_N^{(i)}; i = 1, 2, \dots, s\}$  be the family of the dyadic intervals of rank  $N$  such that  $I_N^{(i)} \cap K(\Theta) \neq \emptyset$  and let  $x_i$ , for each  $i$ , be an element of  $I_N^{(i)} \cap K(\Theta)$ . When  $0 \leq n+k < 2^N$ ,  $k \in \Delta$  and  $n \in \Gamma$ , the  $(n+k)$ -th Walsh Fourier coefficient  $\hat{\mu}(n+k)$  of  $\mu$  satisfies the following equation:

$$\hat{\mu}(n+k) = \sum_{p=0}^{2^N-1} m_\mu(I_N^p) w_{n+k}(p/2^N) = \sum_{I_N^p \cap K(\Theta) \neq \emptyset} m_\mu(I_N^p) w_{n+k}(p/2^N)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^s m_{\mu}(I_N(x_i)) w_n(x_i) w_k(x_i) = w_k(\theta_k) \sum_{i=1}^s m_{\mu}(I_N(x_i)) w_n(x_i) \\
&= w_k(\theta_k) \sum_{p=0}^{2^N-1} m_{\mu}(I_N^p) w_n(p/2^n) = w_k(\theta_k) \hat{\mu}(n) .
\end{aligned}$$

Next we shall prove the sufficiency. Set

$$\Delta_n = \Delta \cap \{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_n^* = \Delta^* \cap \{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$$

for all  $n$ . For each element  $x$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ , there exists a unique pair  $(u, v)$  such that  $u \in H(\Delta)$ ,  $v \in H(\Delta^*)$  and  $x = u + v$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) &= \sum_i^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)^*} \hat{\mu}(i+j) w_{i+j}(u+v) = \sum_i^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)^*} \hat{\mu}(j) w_i(\theta_i) w_i(v) w_j(u) \\
&= \left\{ \sum_i^{(n)} w_i(v_0) w_i(v) \right\} \left\{ \sum_j^{(n)^*} \hat{\mu}(j) w_j(u) \right\} \\
&= \left\{ \sum_i^{(n)} w_i(v_0 + v) \right\} \{1/\#\Delta_n^*\} \left\{ \sum_j^{(n)^*} 1 \right\} \left\{ \sum_j^{(n)^*} \hat{\mu}(j) w_j(u) \right\} \\
&= \{1/\#\Delta_n^*\} \left\{ \sum_i^{(n)} w_i(v_0 + v) \right\} \left\{ \sum_j^{(n)^*} w_j(v_0 + v) \right\} \left\{ \sum_j^{(n)^*} \hat{\mu}(j) w_j(u) \right\} \\
&= \{1/\#\Delta_n^*\} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} w_i(v_0 + v) \right\} \left\{ \sum_j^{(n)^*} \hat{\mu}(j) w_j(u) \right\} ,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\sum_i^{(n)}$  and  $\sum_j^{(n)^*}$  denote summations over all  $i \in \Delta_n$  and  $j \in \Delta_n^*$ , respectively, and  $\#S$  is the cardinality of  $S$ . If  $x \notin K(\Theta)$ , then  $v \neq v_0$ . For sufficiently large  $n$ , the expression inside the first bracket is zero. Hence (2.1) holds for all  $x \notin K(\Theta)$ .

When  $K(\Theta) = \emptyset$ , by Lemma 2.2, we have  $\hat{\mu}(n) = 0$  for all  $n$ . Then (2.3) holds.

We shall prove the converse. Since  $K(\Theta) = \emptyset$ , there exist a pair of integers  $i$  and  $j$  of  $\Delta$  which do not satisfy (2.4). On the other hand, for each  $n$ ,

$$\hat{\mu}(n + i + j) = \hat{\mu}(n) w_{i+j}(\theta_{i+j}) = \hat{\mu}(n + i) w_j(\theta_j) = \hat{\mu}(n) w_i(\theta_i) w_j(\theta_j) .$$

Hence we have  $\hat{\mu}(n) = 0$  for all  $n$ . Therefore, if a Walsh series  $\mu$  satisfies (2.3), then (2.1) holds. Theorem 2.1 is proved.

**COROLLARY 2.3.** *When  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta^*$  are infinite subgroups of  $\Gamma$  and  $\Delta + \Delta^* = \Gamma$  (direct sum), a Walsh series  $\mu$  satisfies (2.1) for  $x \notin H(\Delta)$  if and only if*

$$(2.6) \quad \hat{\mu}(n + k) = \hat{\mu}(n)$$

for each  $k \in \Delta$  and  $n \in \Gamma$ .

Corollary 2.3 is a generalization of Theorem 2.7.1 in [4] for the dyadic

group.

**COROLLARY 2.4.** *The set  $K(\Theta)$  which is defined in Theorem 2.1 is a strong  $U$ -set.*

**PROOF.** It is obvious that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\hat{\mu}(k)| \leq \sup_k |\hat{\mu}(k)| .$$

On the other hand, since  $|w_k(\theta)| = 1$  for all  $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_n |\hat{\mu}(n)| &= \sup_i \sup_j |\hat{\mu}(i + j)| = \sup_i \sup_j |\hat{\mu}(j)w_i(\theta_i)| = \sup_j |\hat{\mu}(j)| \\ &= \limsup_{\substack{i \rightarrow \infty \\ i \in \mathcal{I}}} \sup_j |\hat{\mu}(j)| = \limsup_{\substack{i \rightarrow \infty \\ i \in \mathcal{J}}} \sup_j |\hat{\mu}(i + j)| \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\hat{\mu}(k)| , \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sup_i$  and  $\sup_j$  mean the upper limits in the regions  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{I}^*$ , respectively. Therefore, the equality (2.2) holds.

The proof is complete.

**3. Uniqueness theorems for some classes of Walsh series.** It is known [7] that *any perfect set of Haar measure zero is an  $M$ -set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that*

$$(1/2^n) \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} |\hat{\mu}(k)|^2 = \sum_{p=0}^{2^n-1} |m_\mu(I_n^p)|^2 = o(1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty .$$

Now we can prove the following:

**THEOREM 3.1.** *If  $(\epsilon_n; n = 1, 2, \dots)$  is a sequence of positive numbers such that  $\epsilon_n \downarrow 0$  and  $1/\epsilon_n = o(n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then there exists a Dirichlet set which is an  $M$ -set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that*

$$(1/2^n) \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} |\hat{\mu}(k)|^2 = o(\epsilon_n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty .$$

To prove Theorem 3.1, we need the following:

**LEMMA 3.2.** *When  $(\gamma_n = \gamma(n); n = 0, 1, \dots)$  is a monotone increasing sequence of positive integers such that  $\gamma_n = \gamma_{n+1}$  or  $\gamma_{n+1} = 2\gamma_n$ ,  $\gamma_0 = 1$  and  $\gamma_n = o(2^n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , there exists a Dirichlet set  $H$  which satisfies*

$$(3.1) \quad \#\{p; I_n^p \cap H \neq \emptyset\} = \gamma_n \quad \text{for all } n .$$

**PROOF.** Set  $E_0 = \mathcal{S} \equiv I_0^0$ . Set  $E_1 = I_1^0$  if  $\gamma_1 = 1$ , while  $E_1 = I_1^0 \cup I_1^1 = E_0$  if  $\gamma_1 = 2$ . In general, when

$$E_n = I_n^0 \cup I_n^1 \cup \dots \cup I_n^{\gamma_n(n)} ,$$

we shall define  $E_{n+1}$  as follows:

$$E_{n+1} = \begin{cases} I_{n+1}^0 \cup I_{n+1}^{2^i 1} \cup \dots \cup I_{n+1}^{2^i \gamma(n)}, & \text{if } \gamma_{n+1} = \gamma_n, \\ E_n, & \text{if } \gamma_{n+1} = 2\gamma_n. \end{cases}$$

It is obvious that  $E_n$  is a subgroup of the dyadic group. Set  $H = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} E_n$ . Then  $H$  is a Dirichlet set which satisfies (3.1). The proof is complete.

**PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1.** Let  $(\gamma_n; n = 0, 1, \dots)$  be a sequence of positive integers satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 3.2 and  $1/\gamma(n) = o(\varepsilon_n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . When  $I_n$  is a dyadic interval of rank  $n$ , let  $m_\mu$  be the positive Radon measure which is defined by the following equation:

$$m_\mu(I_n) = \begin{cases} 1/\gamma(n), & \text{if } I_n \cap H \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & \text{if } I_n \cap H = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1/2^n) \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} |\hat{\mu}(k)|^2 &= \sum_{p=0}^{2^n-1} |m_\mu(I_n^p)|^2 \\ &= \sum_{I_n^p \cap H \neq \emptyset} |m_\mu(I_n^p)|^2 = \# \{p: I_n^p \cap H \neq \emptyset\} 1/\gamma(n)^2 \\ &= 1/\gamma(n) = o(\varepsilon_n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that  $\hat{\mu}(0) = 1$  and  $\mu$  satisfies (2.1) except on  $H$ . Hence the proof of Theorem 3.1 is complete.

We can easily modify the argument used to prove Theorem 3.1 and obtain the following result as well.

**COROLLARY 3.3.** *For each  $\alpha > 0$ , any perfect set of Haar measure zero is an  $M$ -set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that*

$$\sum_{p=0}^{2^n-1} |m_\mu(I_n^p)|^{1+\alpha} = o(1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Moreover, if  $(\varepsilon_n; n = 0, 1, \dots)$  is a sequence of positive numbers introduced in Theorem 3.1, then there exists a Dirichlet set which is an  $M$ -set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that*

$$\sum_{p=0}^{2^n-1} |m_\mu(I_n^p)|^{1+\alpha} = o(\varepsilon_n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

**THEOREM 3.4.** *Let  $\psi$  be a non-negative function defined on  $[0, \infty)$  and satisfying  $\psi(0+) = 0$ . Any Dirichlet set is a  $U$ -set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that*

$$\sum_{k=2^n}^{2^{n+1}-1} \psi(|\hat{\mu}(k)|) = O(1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$



PROOF. Let  $E$  be a Dirichlet set. There exists a closed subgroup  $H(\Delta)$  of Haar measure zero such that  $H(\Delta) \supset E$  where  $\Delta$  has the form (2.5). Let a Walsh series  $\mu$  satisfy (2.1) everywhere except on  $E$ . By Corollary 2.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2^{N(s)}}^{2^{N(s)+1}-1} \psi(|\hat{\mu}(k)|) &= \sum_{k=0}^{2^{N(s)}-1} \psi(|\hat{\mu}(n_s + k)|) = \sum_i^{(N(s))} \sum_j^{(N(s))^*} \psi(|\hat{\mu}(n_s + i + j)|) \\ &= \sum_i^{(N(s))} \sum_j^{(N(s))^*} \psi(|\hat{\mu}(j)|) = \# \Delta_{N(s)} \cdot \sum_j^{(N(s))^*} \psi(|\hat{\mu}(j)|), \end{aligned}$$

where  $N(s) = N_s$ . By assumption we have

$$\sum_j^{(N(s))^*} \psi(|\hat{\mu}(j)|) = O(1/\# \Delta_{N(s)}) = o(1) \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow \infty.$$

It follows that

$$\psi(|\hat{\mu}(j)|) = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \in \Delta^*.$$

In particular, we have  $\hat{\mu}(j) = 0$  for all  $j \in \Delta^*$ . Consequently, from (2.6) we can prove that  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k$ . The proof is complete.

An easy computation gives the following corollary.

COROLLARY 3.5. *Any Dirichlet set is a U-set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that*

$$\sum_{k=2^n}^{2^{n+1}-1} |\hat{\mu}(k)|^2 = O(1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

COROLLARY 3.6. *Any Dirichlet set is a U-set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that*

$$\sum_{k=2^n}^{2^{n+1}-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) = O(1) \quad \text{uniformly in } x \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. An easy computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2^n}^{2^{n+1}-1} |\hat{\mu}(k)|^2 &= 2^n \sum_{p=0}^{2^n-1} \left| (1/2^n) \sum_{k=2^n}^{2^{n+1}-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(p/2^n) \right|^2 \\ &= 2^n \sum_{p=0}^{2^n-1} O(1/4^n) = O(1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the class of Walsh series mentioned in this corollary is included in the class mentioned in Corollary 3.5. Then the conclusion follows from Corollary 3.5.

THEOREM 3.7. *When  $(\eta_n; n = 1, 2, \dots)$  is a monotone increasing sequence of positive numbers tending to infinity, there exists a Dirichlet set which is an M-set for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that*

$$\sum_{k=2^n}^{2^{n+1}-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = o(\eta_n) \quad \text{uniformly in } x \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty .$$

PROOF. Let  $(\varepsilon_k; k = 1, 2, \dots)$  be a monotone decreasing sequence of positive numbers tending to zero such that  $\eta_k \varepsilon_k \uparrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $(N(n); n = 1, 2, \dots)$  be a monotone increasing sequence of positive integers tending to infinity and satisfying

$$2^{N(n+1)-n} < \eta_n \varepsilon_n \quad \text{and} \quad 2^{N(n+1)-n} \uparrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty .$$

Let  $\xi_n \in I_{N(n)}^1$  for each  $n$  and set

$$H(\Delta) = \{\alpha_1 \xi_1 + \alpha_2 \xi_2 + \dots; \alpha_i = 0 \text{ or } 1\} .$$

We shall construct a positive dyadic measure  $m_\mu$ . To begin with, set  $m_\mu(I_0^0) \equiv m_\mu(\mathcal{S}) = 1$ . Next, when  $0 < N < N(1)$  and  $I_N$  is a dyadic interval of rank  $N$ , set

$$m_\mu(I_N) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } I_N \cap H(\Delta) \neq \emptyset , \\ 0, & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

In general, set

$$m_\mu(I_N) = \begin{cases} 1/\lambda(N), & \text{if } I_N \cap H(\Delta) \neq \emptyset , \\ 0, & \text{otherwise ,} \end{cases}$$

where  $\lambda(N) = \# \{p; I_N^p \cap H(\Delta) \neq \emptyset\}$ . When  $N(n) \leq N < N(n+1)$ , we have

$$m_\mu(I_N(x)) = (1/2^N) \sum_{k=0}^{2^N-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = \begin{cases} 1/2^n, & \text{if } x \in H(\Delta) , \\ 0, & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{k=2^N}^{2^{N+1}-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } N = N(1), N(2), \dots ,$$

and for  $N(n) < N < N(n+1)$

$$\sum_{k=2^N}^{2^{N+1}-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = \begin{cases} 1/2^n, & \text{if } x \in H(\Delta) , \\ 0, & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Therefore for  $N(n) \leq N < N(n+1)$ ,  $m_\mu$  satisfies

$$\sum_{k=2^N}^{2^{N+1}-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = O(2^N/2^n) = O(2^{N(n+1)-n}) = O(\eta_n \varepsilon_n) = o(\eta_n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty .$$

The proof is complete.

**4. Uniqueness problem for some special Walsh series.** Throughout this chapter,  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta^*$  denote infinite subgroups of  $\Gamma$  such that  $\Delta + \Delta^* = \Gamma$  (direct sum).

**THEOREM 4.1.** *If a Walsh series satisfies  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for  $k \notin \Delta$  and*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad \text{everywhere in } H(\Delta^*),$$

*then  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k$ .*

**PROOF.** For each element  $x$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ , set  $x = u + v$  (uniquely) where  $u \in H(\Delta)$  and  $v \in H(\Delta^*)$ . Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) = \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(x) = \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(u + v) = \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(v),$$

where  $\sum_{\dagger}^{(n)}$  is the summation over all  $i \in \Delta_n$ . By assumption, we obtain that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) \right| = 0 \quad \text{everywhere.}$$

By Lemma 2.2 we have  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k$ . The proof is complete.

**THEOREM 4.2.** *A Walsh series  $\mu$  satisfies the assumption of Theorem 4.1 if and only if the dyadic measure  $m_\mu$  satisfies*

$$(4.1) \quad m_\mu(y + I_n^p) = m_\mu(I_n^p)$$

*for each dyadic interval  $I_n^p$  and  $y \in H(\Delta)$ .*

**PROOF.** It is already known that

$$m_\mu(I_n(x)) = (1/2^n) \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(x).$$

Since  $y + I_n(x) = I_n(y + x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_\mu(y + I_n(x)) &= (1/2^n) \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(y + x) = (1/2^n) \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(x) w_i(y) \\ &= (1/2^n) \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(x) = m_\mu(I_n(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we shall prove the converse. Since  $\mathcal{S} = H(\Delta) + H(\Delta^*)$  (direct sum), for each  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ , we can write  $x = u + v$ ,  $u \in H(\Delta)$  and  $v \in H(\Delta^*)$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) &= \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)*} \hat{\mu}(i + j) w_{i+j}(u + v) = \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)*} \hat{\mu}(i + j) w_i(v) w_j(u) \\ &= 2^n m_\mu(I_n(x)) = 2^n m_\mu(I_n(y + x)) = \sum_{\dagger}^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)*} \hat{\mu}(i + j) w_i(v) w_j(u) w_j(y). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it is easy to see that  $\{w_j(u); j \in \Delta^*\}$  forms the character functions of  $H(\Delta^*)$ , which is a topological group. Let  $dy_\Delta$  denote the

Haar measure on  $H(\Delta)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) &= \sum_i^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)*} \hat{\mu}(i+j)w_i(v)w_j(u) \int_{H(\Delta)} w_j(y)dy_{\Delta} \\ &= \sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i+0)w_i(v)w_0(u) = \sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i)w_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have proved that  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for  $k \notin \Delta$ . The proof is complete.

Now, we shall consider a uniqueness problem on  $H(\Delta^*)$  for the class of Walsh series  $\mu$  such that  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for  $k \notin \Delta$ . A subset  $E$  of  $H(\Delta^*)$  is called a  $U$ -set on  $H(\Delta^*)$ , if the following two conditions,  $\hat{\mu}(k) = o(1)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in  $\Delta$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i)w_i(x) = 0 \quad \text{everywhere in } H(\Delta^*) \text{ except on } E,$$

imply that  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k$ .

**THEOREM 4.3.** *When a subset  $E$  of  $H(\Delta^*)$  is closed, a set  $E \dagger H(\Delta)$  is a  $U$ -set in the ordinary sense if and only if  $E$  is a  $U$ -set on  $H(\Delta^*)$ .*

**PROOF.** Assume that  $E$  is a  $U$ -set on  $H(\Delta^*)$ . Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = \sum_i^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)*} \hat{\mu}(i+j)w_{i+j}(x) = \sum_i^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)*} \hat{\mu}(i+j)w_j(u)w_i(v),$$

where  $x = u \dagger v$ ,  $u \in H(\Delta)$  and  $v \in H(\Delta^*)$ . Since  $E$  is a closed set,  $E^c \dagger H(\Delta)$  is an open set where  $E^c = H(\Delta^*) \setminus E$ . Set

$$E^c \dagger H(\Delta) = \bigcup_j I_{N(j)}^{p(j)},$$

where  $N(1) < N(2) < \dots$ . Let  $I_N^p$  be one of the above dyadic intervals. By assumption,  $m_{\mu}(I') = 0$  for each dyadic interval  $I' \subset I_N^p$ . Thus we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } I_N^p.$$

Set  $J = I_N^p \cap H(\Delta^*)$ . Then  $I_N^p = J \dagger H(\Delta^*)$ . Let  $du_{\Delta}$  be the Haar measure on  $H(\Delta)$ . For each  $v \in J$ , we can prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(x) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } v \dagger H(\Delta),$$

since  $v \dagger H(\Delta) \subset J \dagger H(\Delta) = I_N^p$ . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{H(\Delta)} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \hat{\mu}(k)w_k(u \dagger v) du_{\Delta} \\ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i^{(n)} \sum_j^{(n)*} \hat{\mu}(i+j)w_i(v) \int_{H(\Delta)} w_j(u) du_{\Delta} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i)w_i(v) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We have proved that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(v) = 0 \text{ everywhere in } H(\Delta^*) \text{ except on } E.$$

Since  $E$  is a  $U$ -set on  $H(\Delta^*)$ , it follows that  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k \in \Delta$ . Similarly, if we consider for each  $s \in \Delta^*$  the Walsh series

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(k) w_k(x) w_s(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(k + s) w_k(x),$$

then we can prove that  $\hat{\mu}(k + s) = 0$  for all  $k \in \Delta$ . Since  $s \in \Delta^*$ , we obtain  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k$ .

Conversely, assume that  $E$  is an  $M$ -set on  $H(\Delta^*)$ . There exists a Walsh series  $\mu$  such that  $\hat{\mu}(k) = 0$  for all  $k \notin \Delta$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(v) = 0 \text{ everywhere in } H(\Delta^*) \text{ except on } E,$$

$\hat{\mu}(k) = o(1)$  for  $k \in \Delta$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\hat{\mu}(0) \neq 0$ . It is obvious that  $w_k(u + v) = w_k(v)$  for each  $u \in H(\Delta)$  and  $k \in \Delta$ . When  $x = u + v$  for  $u \in H(\Delta)$  and  $v \in H(\Delta^*)$ , then

$$\sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(x) = \sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(v).$$

Hence we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i^{(n)} \hat{\mu}(i) w_i(x) = 0 \text{ everywhere except on } E + H(\Delta).$$

It follows that  $E + H(\Delta)$  is an  $M$ -set in the ordinary sense. The proof is complete.

**5. An extension of Dirichlet sets.** It is already known that when  $\Delta + \Delta^* = \Gamma$  (direct sum) for infinite subgroups  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta^*$  of  $\Gamma$ , the dyadic group  $\mathcal{G}$  coincides with  $H(\Delta) + H(\Delta^*)$  (direct sum), where  $H(\Delta)$  and  $H(\Delta^*)$  are both Dirichlet sets. When  $T(u)$  is a function which is defined on  $H(\Delta)$  and takes values in  $H(\Delta^*)$ , set

$$S_T = \{u + T(u); u \in H(\Delta)\}.$$

**THEOREM 5.1.** *If a continuous function  $T$  satisfies*

$$T(u + u') = T(u) + T(u')$$

*for  $u, u' \in H(\Delta)$ , then  $S_T$  is a Dirichlet set.*

**PROOF.** For  $x$  and  $y \in S_T$ , there exist  $u$  and  $w \in H(\Delta)$  such that  $x = u + T(u)$  and  $y = w + T(w)$ . Since

$$x + y = (u + w) + (T(u) + T(w)) = (u + w) + T(u + w),$$

we have  $x + y \in S_T$ . That is,  $S_T$  is a subgroup of the dyadic group. Let  $(x_n; n = 1, 2, \dots)$  be a sequence of elements of  $S_T$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x = u + v$  with  $u \in H(\Delta)$  and  $v \in H(\Delta^*)$ . We shall prove that  $x \in S_T$ . Set  $x_n = u_n + T(u_n)$ , where  $u_n \in H(\Delta^*)$ . It suffices to show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = u$ .

By assumption, the sequence  $(u_n; n = 1, 2, \dots)$  is bounded. Hence there exist a subsequence  $(u_{n(k)}; k = 1, 2, \dots)$  of this sequence and  $u_0 \in H(\Delta)$  such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_{n(k)} = u_0$ . Then we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{u_{n(k)} + T(u_{n(k)})\} = u_0 + T(u_0) = u + v.$$

Hence  $u_0 + u = T(u_0) + v$ . It is obvious that  $H(\Delta) \cap H(\Delta^*) = \{0\}$ . Since  $u_0 + u \in H(\Delta)$  and  $T(u_0) + v \in H(\Delta^*)$ , we see that  $u_0 + u = T(u_0) + v = 0$ , that is,  $u_0 = u$  and  $v = T(u_0) = T(u)$ . We proved that  $u \in H(\Delta)$  and  $x = u + T(u)$ . The proof is complete.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] N. J. FINE, On Walsh functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 65 (1949), 372-414.
- [2] N. J. FINE, The generalized Walsh functions, *ibid.* 69 (1950), 66-77.
- [3] J. P. KAHANE, A metric condition for a closed circular set to be a set of uniqueness, *J. Approximation theory* 2 (1969), 233-246.
- [4] W. RUDIN, *Fourier analysis on groups*, Interscience Publishers, New York-London, 1962.
- [5] W. R. WADE AND K. YONEDA, Uniqueness and quasi-measures on the group of integers of a  $p$ -series field, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 84 (1982), 202-206.
- [6] K. YONEDA, Perfect sets of uniqueness on the group 2, *Canad. J. Math.* 34 (1982), 759-764.
- [7] K. YONEDA, Sets of multiplicity on the dyadic group, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* 41 (1983), 195-200.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
 UNIVERSITY OF OSAKA PREFECTURE  
 SAKAI, OSAKA, 591  
 JAPAN