

1-1-2015

## Good modulating sequences for the ergodic Hilbert transform

AZER AKHMEDOV

DOĞAN ÇÖMEZ

Follow this and additional works at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math>



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

AKHMEDOV, AZER and ÇÖMEZ, DOĞAN (2015) "Good modulating sequences for the ergodic Hilbert transform," *Turkish Journal of Mathematics*: Vol. 39: No. 1, Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.3906/mat-1311-29>

Available at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math/vol39/iss1/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. It has been accepted for inclusion in Turkish Journal of Mathematics by an authorized editor of TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. For more information, please contact [academic.publications@tubitak.gov.tr](mailto:academic.publications@tubitak.gov.tr).

## Good modulating sequences for the ergodic Hilbert transform

Azer AKHMEDOV, Doğan ÇÖMEZ\*

Department of Mathematics, North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota, USA

Received: 14.11.2013 • Accepted: 09.09.2014 • Published Online: 19.01.2015 • Printed: 13.02.2015

**Abstract:** This article investigates classes of bounded sequences of complex numbers that are universally good for the ergodic Hilbert transform in  $L_p$ -spaces,  $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ . The class of bounded Besicovitch sequences satisfying a rate condition is among such sequence classes.

**Key words:** Hilbert transform, bounded Besicovitch sequences, modulating sequences

### 1. Introduction

Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a probability space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be an invertible measure preserving transformation. For any  $f \in L_p$ , the ergodic Hilbert transform (eHt) of  $f$  is defined as

$$Hf(x) := \lim_n \sum_{k=-n}^n \frac{T^k f(x)}{k}$$

if the limit exists, where  $\sum_{k=-n}^n$  means summation without the term  $k = 0$ . It is well known that the eHt exists

a.e. for  $f \in L_1$  [5,11]. This result has also been extended to various other settings [1,4,6,8,12]. Given a sequence  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}$  of complex numbers, we will define the modulated ergodic Hilbert transform of  $f \in L_p$  (modulated

by  $\mathbf{a}$ ) as  $H_{\mathbf{a}}f(x) := \lim_n \sum_{k=-n}^n \frac{a_k T^k f(x)}{k}$ . If  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$  is a dynamical system, a sequence  $\mathbf{a}$  is called *good*

for the ergodic Hilbert transform in  $L_p(X)$  if the modulated ergodic Hilbert transform exists  $\mu$ -a.e. for every  $f \in L_p(X)$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a class of measure preserving dynamical systems. We will say that the sequence  $\mathbf{a}$  is *universally good for the ergodic Hilbert transform in  $L_p$  for the class  $\mathcal{T}$*  if  $\mathbf{a}$  is good for the ergodic Hilbert transform in  $L_p$  of every dynamical system in  $\mathcal{T}$ . In the case that  $\mathbf{a}$  is good for the ergodic Hilbert transform in  $L_p$  of every dynamical system, we will say that it is *universally good for the ergodic Hilbert transform in  $L_p$* .

In [7], the second author investigated some classes of sequences that are universally good for the eHt. Such sequence classes are rather large; for instance, symmetric sequences of bounded variation and sequences of Fourier coefficients of functions in  $L_p[0, 2\pi]$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ , are universally good for the eHt. Recently, in [10], a Wiener–Wintner type of theorem for the ergodic Hilbert transform was proven, a remarkable result that

\*Correspondence: dogan.comez@ndsu.edu

2010 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 20F16; Secondary 42B20, 40A30.

had eluded mathematicians for 2 decades. A direct consequence of this result is that the sequences of the form  $\{\lambda^k\}$ , with  $|\lambda| = 1$ , are universally good for the eHt in  $L_p$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ . The techniques utilized in [7] fell short of proving that some sequence classes, known to be universally good for the ergodic averages, are universally good for the eHt. There, besides indicating that not all bounded Besicovitch sequences are good modulating for the eHt, it was proven that a proper subset of the set of bounded Besicovitch sequences is good for the eHt in  $L_1(X)$ . In this article, having the Wiener–Wintner theorem for the ergodic Hilbert transform, we will prove that those sequences are universally good for the eHt in  $L_2$ . Since we are in a probability space setting, these results also hold for  $L_p$ -functions for  $2 \leq p < \infty$ . We also obtain other classes of sequences universally good for the eHt. Throughout this article, unless stated otherwise, we will assume  $0 < \beta < 1$  and  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ . Furthermore,  $\mathbb{T}$  will denote the unit circle in complex plane, and  $C$  will always denote a constant, which may not be the same at each occurrence.

**2. Bounded universally good sequences for the eHt**

In this section we will show that some fairly large classes of bounded complex sequences that satisfy a rate condition are universally good for the eHt. Let  $\mathbf{a}$  be a sequence such that

$$(*) \quad \sum_{k=-n}^n |a_k| = O(n^\beta), \quad (n \geq 1).$$

In [7] it was shown that if  $\mathbf{a}$  is a bounded sequence good for the ergodic theorem in  $L_\infty$  and satisfying the condition (\*), then it is universally good for the eHt in  $L_1$ . The class of sequences satisfying (\*) include the sequences of Fourier coefficients of functions belonging to the function spaces  $L_p[0, 2\pi]$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ ,  $L_\alpha[0, 2\pi]$  (the  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz functions in  $L_1[0, 2\pi]$ ), and  $BV_1[0, 2\pi]$  (the functions of bounded variation in  $L_1[0, 2\pi]$ ). The condition (\*) is naturally satisfied by the sequences belonging to these classes; however, the same assertions made there are also valid if one considers sequences satisfying a weaker condition. For instance, define

$$M_\alpha = \left\{ \mathbf{a} : \sum_{k=-n}^n |a_k| = O\left(\frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{\log^\alpha n}\right) \right\}.$$

If  $n$  is large enough and  $\alpha > \beta + 1$ , then  $n^\beta \leq \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{\log^\alpha n}$ ; hence, any sequence satisfying the condition (\*) belongs to  $M_\alpha$ , if  $\alpha > \beta + 1$ .

In [2] it was shown that, among several other results related to the *one-sided* ergodic Hilbert transform, if  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a sequence of complex numbers satisfying

$$(**) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{|z|=1} \frac{1}{n^{1-\beta}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k z^k \right| = C_{\mathbf{a}} < \infty,$$

then it is universally good for the eHt in  $L_1$ . When the (2-sided) ergodic Hilbert transform is concerned, it turns out that one can consider a larger class of sequences. Let  $A_\alpha$  denote the set of sequences  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of complex numbers satisfying

$$(1) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{|z|=1} \frac{\log^\alpha n}{n^{\alpha-1}} \left| \sum_{k=-n}^n a_k z^k \right| = C_{\mathbf{a}} < \infty.$$

Since  $\frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{\log^\alpha n} \geq n^{1-\beta}$  when  $n$  is sufficiently large and  $\alpha > 2 - \beta$ , all classes  $A_\alpha$  contain sequences satisfying the condition (\*\*).

**Remarks** 1. All the sequence classes mentioned above do not contain constant sequences; on the other hand, constant sequences are trivially universally good for the eHt [5,11].

2.  $M_\alpha \subset A_\alpha$ . In fact,  $A_2$  contains all  $M_\alpha$  for all  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ .

3. If  $\mathbf{a} \in M_\alpha$ , then for all  $f \in L_\infty$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k T^k f = 0$  a.e.

4. If  $\alpha > 1 + \beta$ , then  $\frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{\log^\alpha n} \geq n^\beta$ . Hence, it follows that any sequence satisfying the condition (\*) belongs to  $A_\alpha$ . In particular,  $A_2$  contains all such sequences.

5. There are  $A_\alpha$  sequences that do not belong to any  $M_\alpha$ . For instance, let  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_n\}$  be the special case of the Hardy–Littlewood sequence given by  $a_n = e^{in \log |n|}$ . Clearly,  $\mathbf{a} \notin M_\alpha$  since  $\sum_{k=-n}^n |a_k| = O(n)$ . However,

for any  $|z| = 1$ , it follows that  $|\sum_{k=-n}^n a_k z^k| = O(\sqrt{n})$  (see [13, p. 199]); hence,  $\mathbf{a} \in A_{3/2}$ .

A sequence satisfying (\*) (hence in  $M_\alpha$ ) need not be bounded. For example, let  $a_k = j$  if  $k = \mp 2^j$ , and  $a_k = 0$  otherwise. Then  $\mathbf{a}$  is an unbounded sequence and satisfies (\*) for any  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Having this noted, however, all the sequences considered throughout the rest of this article will be bounded.

Although sequences satisfying the condition (\*) are included in  $A_2$ , and  $M_\alpha \subset A_\alpha$ , for some values of  $\alpha$  we also have the reverse inclusion.

**Proposition 2.1** *Let  $\alpha' + 1/2 < \alpha \leq 2$ ; then  $A_{\alpha'} \subset M_\alpha$ .*

**Proof** By Hölder’s inequality,

$$\sum_{k=-n}^n |a_k| \leq (2n)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{k=-n}^n |a_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} = (2n)^{1/2} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{k=-n}^n \lambda^k a_k \right|^2 d\lambda \right]^{1/2}.$$

Since  $\mathbf{a} \in A_{\alpha'}$ , we have  $\sum_{k=-n}^n |a_k| \leq C \frac{n^{\alpha'-1/2}}{\log^{\alpha'} n}$  for some constant  $C$ . Hence, since  $\alpha' + 1/2 < \alpha \leq 2$ , the assertion follows. □

**Remark 1** It follows from Proposition 2.1 that, if  $\mathbf{a} \in A_\alpha$ ,  $1 < \alpha < 3/2$ , then  $3/2 < 1/2 + \alpha < 2$ , and, hence,

$$\text{for all } f \in L_\infty, \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} a_k T^k f = 0 \text{ a.e.}$$

Next we will prove that  $M_\alpha$  sequences are universally good for the eHt. The proof is essentially the same as the proof of Theorem 2.2 in [7]; hence, we will sketch it here for completeness.

**Theorem 2.2** *Let  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\} \in M_\alpha$ . Then we have the weak (1,1) maximal inequality for  $H_{\mathbf{a}}f$ : for any  $f \in L_1$ ,*

and for any  $\lambda > 0$ , there is a constant  $C$  such that

$$\mu \left( \left\{ x : \sup_{n \geq 1} \left| \sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{a_k T^k f(x)}{k} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \|f\|_1.$$

Furthermore,  $\mathbf{a}$  is universally good for the eHt in  $L_1$ .

**Proof** By Abel's summation by parts formula,

$$\sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{a_k T^k f}{k} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_k - S_{-k}}{k(k+1)} + \frac{1}{n} (S_n - S_{-n}), \text{ where } S_{\mp j} = \sum_{i=1}^j a_{\mp i} T^{\mp i} f.$$

If  $E = \{x : \sup_{n \geq 1} \left| \sum'_{j=-n}^n \frac{a_j T^j f(x)}{j} \right| > \lambda\}$ , then  $E \subset E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ , where  $E_1 = \{x : \sup_n \left| \frac{1}{n} S_n(x) \right| > \frac{\lambda}{3}\}$ ,

$E_2 = \{x : \sup_n \left| \frac{1}{n} S_{-n}(x) \right| > \frac{\lambda}{3}\}$ , and  $E_3 = \{x : \sup_n \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{j(j+1)} [S_j(x) - S_{-j}(x)] \right| > \frac{\lambda}{3}\}$ . Since we always have

a weak (1,1) maximal inequality for the operators  $\frac{1}{n} S_{\mp n}$  when  $\mathbf{a}$  is a bounded sequence,  $\mu(E_1) \leq \frac{C_1}{\lambda} \|f\|_1$  and  $\mu(E_2) \leq \frac{C_2}{\lambda} \|f\|_1$ , for some constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ .

If  $f \in L_1$  and  $\mathbf{a} \in M_\alpha$ , we have, for some constant  $C$ ,

$$\int \left| \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{S_k - S_{-k}}{k(k+1)} \right| \leq \|f\|_1 \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{j=-k}^k |a_j| \leq \|f\|_1 \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{C}{k^{3-\alpha} \log^\alpha k} \leq C \|f\|_1,$$

where  $C = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \infty} \frac{C}{k^{3-\alpha} \log^\alpha k}$ . Since the sequence  $\{h_n\} = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{j=-k}^k |a_j| T^j |f| \right\} \subset L_1$  is monotone

increasing with  $\int h_n \leq C \|f\|_1$ , by the monotone convergence theorem,  $\int h_n \uparrow \int h \leq C \|f\|_1$  where  $h$  is the pointwise limit of the sequence  $h_n$ . Hence, by Chebyshev's inequality, for any  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $\mu(E_3) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \|f\|_1$ .

Hence, the weak (1,1) maximal inequality for  $H_{\mathbf{a}} f$  follows.

If  $f \in L_\infty$  and  $m < n$  are positive integers, then

$$\left| \sum_{m \leq k \leq n} \frac{S_k - S_{-k}}{k(k+1)} \right| \leq \|f\|_\infty \sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{j=-k}^k |a_j| \leq \|f\|_\infty \sum_{k=m}^n \frac{C}{k^{3-\alpha} \log^\alpha k},$$

which implies that the sequence  $\left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} (S_k - S_{-k})(x) \right\}$  is Cauchy a.e.; hence, it converges. Since

$\lim_n \frac{1}{n} S_{\mp n}(x)$  also converges a.e. for all  $f \in L_\infty$ ,  $\lim_n H_{\mathbf{a}} f(x)$  exists a.e. for all  $f \in L_\infty$ . By the Banach principle, this fact combined with the weak (1,1) maximal inequality in the first part implies that  $\mathbf{a}$  is universally good for the eHt in  $L_1$ .  $\square$

By Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 2.1, any  $\mathbf{a} \in A_\alpha$  is also universally good for the eHt if  $1 < \alpha \leq 3/2$ . For  $3/2 < \alpha \leq 2$  we need different arguments. Indeed, the statement below provides an argument valid for all  $\mathbf{a} \in A_\alpha$ ,  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ .

**Theorem 2.3** *If  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\} \in A_\alpha$ ,  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ , is a sequence good for the ergodic averages, then it is universally good for the eHt in  $L_2$ .*

**Proof** Since  $\lim_n \frac{1}{n} S_{\mp n}$  exists a.e. by assumption, using Abel's partial summation, in order to show that

$\lim_n \sum_{j=-n}^n \frac{a_j T^j f(x)}{j}$  exists a.e. for all  $f \in L_2$ , all we need to show is that  $\lim_n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_j - S_{-j}}{j(j+1)}$  exists a.e., where

$$S_{\mp j} = \sum_{k=1}^j a_{\mp k} T^{\mp k} f(x).$$

Observe that  $\|S_j - S_{-j}\|_2^2 = \langle S_j, S_j \rangle + \langle S_{-j}, S_{-j} \rangle - \langle S_j, S_{-j} \rangle - \langle S_{-j}, S_j \rangle$ , where  $\langle f, g \rangle = \int f \bar{g} d\mu$ . Since

$$\langle S_j, S_j \rangle = \sum_{k,l=1}^j \langle a_k T^k f, a_l T^l f \rangle = \sum_{k,l=1}^j a_k \bar{a}_l \langle T^{k-l} f, f \rangle,$$

by the spectral theorem for unitary operators, we have  $\langle T^{k-l} f, f \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} z^{k-l} d\mu_f(z)$ , where  $\mathbb{T}$  is the unit circle. Therefore,  $\langle S_j, S_j \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left[ \sum_{k,l=1}^j (a_k z^k) (\bar{a}_l z^l) \right] d\mu_f(z)$ ; hence, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j - S_{-j}\|_2^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left[ \sum_{k,l=1}^j (a_k z^k \bar{a}_l z^l - a_k z^k \overline{a_{-l} z^{-l}} - a_{-k} z^{-k} \bar{a}_l z^l + a_{-k} z^{-k} \overline{a_{-l} z^{-l}}) \right] d\mu_f(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq j} a_k z^k \right|^2 d\mu_f(z). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{a} \in A_\alpha$ , it satisfies (1); hence, we have  $\left| \sum_{-j}^j a_k z^k \right| \leq C_{\mathbf{a}} \frac{j^{\alpha-1}}{\log^\alpha j}$ . Thus,  $\|S_j - S_{-j}\|_2 \leq C \frac{j^{\alpha-1}}{\log^\alpha j} \|f\|_2$  for some constant  $C$  that depends on  $\mathbf{a}$ . Therefore, by Hölder's inequality, it follows that

$$\int \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_j - S_{-j}}{j(j+1)} \right| \leq \int \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{|S_j - S_{-j}|}{j(j+1)} \leq C \|f\|_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{j^{3-\alpha} \log^\alpha j}.$$

Now, by the monotone convergence theorem

$$\int \lim_n \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_j - S_{-j}}{j(j+1)} \right| \leq \lim_n \int \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{|S_j - S_{-j}|}{j(j+1)} \leq C \|f\|_2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j^{3-\alpha} \log^\alpha j} < \infty;$$

hence, we deduce that  $\lim_n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_j - S_{-j}}{j(j+1)}$  exists a.e. □

**Remark 2** It should be noted here that the arguments in the theorem above are purely  $L_2$  space arguments.

The class of Besicovitch sequences are known to be universally good for the ergodic averages [2]. In [7] it was proven that the sequences of Fourier coefficients of functions in  $L_p[0, 2\pi]$ ,  $1 < p \leq \infty$ , which are bounded Besicovitch sequences, are universally good for the eHt in  $L_p$ ,  $1 < p \leq \infty$ . There it was also observed that *not every* sequence  $\mathbf{a} \in B$  is good modulating for the eHt where  $B$  denotes the class of bounded Besicovitch sequences (see below for definitions). On the other hand, a smaller subclass  $B_\beta$  of  $B$  produces good modulating sequences for the eHt, where

$$B_\beta = \{\mathbf{a} \in l_\infty : \exists \mathbf{w} \text{ induced by a trigonometric polynomial such that } \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{w} \text{ satisfies } (*)\}.$$

The techniques used in [7], however, fell short of showing that sequences in  $B_\alpha$  are *universally* good for the eHt. In this section, having the Wiener–Wintner theorem for the eHt [10], we will show that not only the sequence class  $B_\alpha$  but rather a subclass of bounded sequences that contains  $B_\alpha$  provides sequences universally good for the eHt.

In [10], it was shown that if  $f \in L_p$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ , then there is a set  $X_f \subset X$  of probability one such that for all  $x \in X_f$

$$\lim_n \sum_{-n}^n \frac{\lambda^k T^k f(x)}{k} \text{ exists for all } |\lambda| = 1.$$

Let  $\mathcal{W}$  denote the class of sequences induced by bounded trigonometric polynomials, which are finite linear combinations of sequences of the form  $\{\lambda^k\}$ ,  $|\lambda| = 1$ . Hence, it follows that the Lacey–Terwilleger Theorem holds for sequences in  $\mathcal{W}$ ; that is, if  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , then it is universally good in  $L_p$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ .

*Two-sided bounded Besicovitch sequences.* First, we will consider 2-sided bounded Besicovitch sequences  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in B$ , which are defined such that, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\mathbf{w}_\epsilon \in \mathcal{W}$  such that

$$(\dagger) \quad \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=-n}^n |a_k - w_\epsilon(k)| < \epsilon.$$

Now we define

$$MB_\alpha = \{\mathbf{a} \in l_\infty : \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \mathbf{w}_\epsilon \in \mathcal{W} \text{ such that } \limsup_n \frac{\log^\alpha n}{n^{\alpha-1}} \sum_{k=-n}^n |a_k - w_\epsilon(k)| < \epsilon\} \text{ and}$$

$$AB_\alpha = \{\mathbf{a} \in l_\infty : \exists \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W} \text{ such that } \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{w} \in A_\alpha\}.$$

**Remarks.** 1.  $MB_\alpha \subset AB_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha$ .

2. If  $\mathbf{a} \in MB_\alpha$ , then  $\mathbf{a}$  is bounded Besicovitch.

3. If  $\mathbf{a} \in B_\beta$ , then  $a_k = w_k + b_k$ , where  $\mathbf{w} = \{w_k\} \in \mathcal{W}$ , and  $\{b_k\}$  satisfies the condition (\*); hence,  $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{w} \in M_\alpha$ . Therefore,  $B_\beta \subset MB_\alpha \subset AB_\alpha$  for all  $0 < \beta < 1$  and  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ .

4. Sequences induced by trigonometric polynomials belong to the sequence space  $MB_\alpha$  and hence to  $AB_\alpha$ .

By [10] and the remarks above, any  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$  is universally good for the eHt in  $L_2$ . Since for  $\mathbf{a} \in AB_\alpha$ ,  $a_k = a_k - w_\epsilon(k) + w_\epsilon(k)$ , where  $\mathbf{w}_\epsilon$  is the appropriate trigonometric polynomial, all we need to prove is that

$\left\{ \sum_{-n}^n \frac{(a_k - w_\epsilon(k))T^k f}{k} \right\}_n$  converges a.e. In that case, using the same techniques as in Theorem 2.3, we obtain the following:

**Corollary 2.4** *If  $\mathbf{a} \in AB_\alpha$ , then it is universally good for the eHt in  $L_2$ .*

**Remark 3** *It follows from Corollary 2.4 that if  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\} \in B_\beta$ ,  $0 < \beta < 1$ , then it is universally good for the eHt in  $L_2$ .*

*Symmetric (one-sided) bounded Besicovitch sequences.* In this section we will consider symmetric bounded Besicovitch sequences, namely *ordinary* bounded Besicovitch sequences  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}$  (with  $a_k = a_{-k}$ ) such that given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\mathbf{w}_\epsilon \in \mathcal{W}$  satisfying

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k - w_\epsilon(k)| < \epsilon.$$

First we make an observation. Let  $T : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  be an irrational rotation, say  $Tz = \phi z$  for some  $|\phi| = 1$ ,  $\phi \neq 1$ . Then for any  $\lambda$  on the unit circle, and for any  $f$  having  $\phi$  as eigenvalue,

$$\sum_{k=-n}^n \frac{\lambda^{|k|} T^k f}{k} = f \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(\phi\lambda)^k - (\bar{\phi}\lambda)^k}{k};$$

hence, if  $\lambda = \bar{\phi}$ , then this series is not convergent. Therefore, symmetric bounded Besicovitch sequences defined by trigonometric polynomials need not be good for irrational rotations, which is different than the 2-sided case.

Consider sequences  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  such that  $\gamma_{\mathbf{a}}(k) := \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{j+k} \bar{a}_j$  exists for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\gamma_{\mathbf{a}}$  is called the *correlation* of  $\mathbf{a}$ , which is extended to negative integers by letting  $\gamma_{\mathbf{a}}(-k) = \gamma_{\mathbf{a}}(k)$ . Sequences  $\{\gamma_{\mathbf{a}}(k)\}$  are positive definite; hence, by the Herglotz–Bochner theorem, there exists a unique Borel probability measure  $\mu_{\mathbf{a}}$  on the unit circle  $\mathbb{T}$  such that

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{a}}(k) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} z^k d\mu_{\mathbf{a}}(z), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The measure  $\mu_{\mathbf{a}}$  is called the *spectral measure* of  $\mathbf{a}$ . Bounded Besicovitch sequences are known to have correlation; indeed, bounded Besicovitch sequences are exactly those complex sequences such that: (i)  $\mu_{\mathbf{a}}$  is discrete, (ii)  $\Gamma(z) := \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^n a_j \bar{z}^j$  exists for every  $z$ , and (iii)  $\mu_{\mathbf{a}}(z) = |\Gamma(z)|^2$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{T}$  [2]. Furthermore, it is also known that  $\Gamma(z) = 0$  for all but at most countably many  $z \in \mathbb{T}$  [9]. The set  $\sigma(\mathbf{a}) = \{z \in \mathbb{T} : \Gamma(z) \neq 0\}$  is called the *spectrum* of  $\mathbf{a}$ . Obviously, if  $a_k = \lambda^k$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ , then  $\sigma(\mathbf{a}) = \{\lambda\}$ .

If  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$  is an ergodic dynamical system, then  $L_2(X) = \kappa \oplus \kappa^\perp$ , where  $\kappa$  is the closed linear subspace spanned by the eigenfunctions of  $T$  (called the Kronecker factor of the system). Consequently, for a nonconstant bounded Besicovitch sequence  $\mathbf{a}$  and a measure-preserving system with  $\{f \in L_2 : Tf = f\} \subset \kappa$



properly, if  $\lambda \in \sigma(\mathbf{a}) \cap \sigma(T)$ , then, as observed above,  $\lim_n \sum_{k=-n}^n \frac{\lambda^{|k|} T^k f}{k}$  need not exist a.e. These arguments also imply that, given any dynamical system  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$  with  $\{f \in L_2 : Tf = f\} \subset \kappa$  properly, there exists a bounded Besicovitch sequence  $\mathbf{a}$  such that  $\lim_n \sum_{k=-n}^n \frac{a_{|k|} T^k f}{k}$  fails to exist a.e. However, as the next result shows, symmetric sequences  $\mathbf{a} \in B_\alpha$  are still universally good in  $L_2$  in a restricted sense. Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  denote the class of weakly mixing measure preserving systems. If  $T \in \mathfrak{S}$ , then it has a continuous spectrum, and hence its Kronecker factor is simple; namely,  $\kappa = \{f \in L_2 : Tf = f\}$ . Therefore, for a weakly mixing  $T$ ,  $\lim_n \sum_{k=-n}^n \frac{\lambda^{|k|} T^k f}{k}$  exists a.e. for any  $f \in \kappa$ . Again, using the same techniques as in Theorem 2.3, we obtain the following:

**Corollary 2.5** *If  $\mathbf{a} \in AB_\alpha$  is a symmetric sequence, then it is universally good for the eHt in  $L_2$  for the class  $\mathfrak{S}$ .*

The following theorem is analogous to Theorem 2.3, albeit with a restriction on the class of transformations. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  denote the class of measure preserving dynamical systems having a Lebesgue spectrum. Hence, the spectral measure of any nonconstant  $f \in L_2$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{T}$ .

**Theorem 2.6** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathbf{a}$  be a symmetric bounded sequence of complex numbers such that  $\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k T^k g(x)$  exists a.e. for every  $g \in L_2$ . Then  $\mathbf{a}$  is universally good for the eHt in  $L_2$  for the class  $\mathcal{L}$ .*

**Proof** First we observe that  $L_2 = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}$ , where  $\mathcal{H} = \{g \in L_2 : \mu_g = h dz \text{ for some } 0 \leq h \leq 1\}$ . Since constants are trivially good for the eHt, it is enough to prove the assertion for  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ . Again, we will follow the proof of Theorem 2.3, and hence it is enough to show that  $\|S_n - S_{-n}\|_2 = O(n^\beta)$ , for some  $0 < \beta < 1$ , where

$S_{\mp j} = \sum_{i=1}^j a_i T^{\mp i} f$ . Using the spectral theorem, we obtain that

$$\|S_n - S_{-n}\|_2^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n (a_k z^k - a_k \bar{z}^k) \right|^2 d\mu_f(z),$$

and hence

$$\|S_n - S_{-n}\|_2 \leq 2 \left[ \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k z^k \right|^2 d\mu_f(z) \right]^{1/2} + 2 \left[ \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \bar{z}^k \right|^2 d\mu_f(z) \right]^{1/2}.$$

Since  $\mathbf{a} \in l_\infty$ , and  $T$  has a continuous spectrum, we have

$$\left[ \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k z^k \right|^2 d\mu_f(z) \right]^{1/2} \leq \left[ \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k z^k \right|^2 dz \right]^{1/2} = \left[ \|f\|_2^2 \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|^2 \right]^{1/2} = O(n^{1/2} \|f\|_2),$$

and, similarly,  $\left[ \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \bar{z}^k \right|^2 d\mu_f(z) \right]^{1/2} = O(n^{1/2} \|f\|_2)$ . This implies that  $\|S_n - S_{-n}\|_2 = O(n^{1/2} \|f\|_2)$ .  $\square$

At this point, one might ask if some other subclasses of bounded Besicovitch sequences are universally good for the eHt. One such candidate is the class of uniform sequences [3]. However, as the following example shows, they are not the right choice. Let  $Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\sigma : Y \rightarrow Y$  be a cyclic shift, and  $\mu$  be the uniform  $\sigma$ -invariant probability measure on  $Y$  (i.e.  $\mu(\{i\}) = \frac{1}{3}$ ). Then  $(Y, \mu, \sigma)$  is a strictly L-stable system; hence, for each measurable  $U \subset Y$  and  $y \in Y$ , the sequence  $\{a_n\} = \{a_n(y, U)\}$  where

$$a_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \geq 0 \text{ and } \sigma^n(y) \in U, \\ -1 & \text{if } n < 0 \text{ and } a_{-n} = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $U = \{2\}$  and  $y = 1$ , and then

$$a_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 3m + 1 \text{ and } m \geq 0, \\ -1 & \text{if } n = 3m - 1 \text{ and } m \leq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now, given a measure-preserving dynamical system  $(X, \Sigma, \nu, \tau)$ , let  $X$  be divided into 3 sets,  $A$ ,  $\tau A$ , and  $\tau^2 A$ , with each set having measure  $\frac{1}{3}$ . Define

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in A \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in \tau A \\ -1 & \text{if } x \in \tau^2 A. \end{cases}$$

Then, for  $x \in A$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\tau^{3k}x) &= 0, & f(\tau^{-3k}x) &= 0 \\ f(\tau^{3k+1}x) &= 1, & f(\tau^{-3k-1}x) &= -1 \\ f(\tau^{3k+2}x) &= -1, & f(\tau^{-3k-2}x) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $f \in L_2$  with  $\|f\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ . Hence,

$$\sum_{i=-(3n+1)}^{3n+1} \frac{a_i f(\tau^i x)}{i} = \sum_{i=1}^{3n+1} \frac{a_i (f(\tau^i x) - f(\tau^{-i} x))}{i},$$

and for  $x \in A$  we have,

$$\sum_{m=1}^n \frac{a_{3m+1} (f(\tau^{3m+1}x) - f(\tau^{-3m-1}x))}{3m+1} = \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{1 - (-1)}{3m+1} = 2 \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{1}{3m+1}.$$

Thus,  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \left| \sum_{i=-(3n+1)}^{3n+1} \frac{a_i f(\tau^i x)}{i} \right| = \infty$ , and hence  $\lim_n \sum_{i=-n}^n \frac{a_i f(\tau^i x)}{i}$  does not exist.

**Remark 4** *The system  $(X, \Sigma, \nu, \tau)$  is not weakly mixing, and the sequence  $\{a_n\}$  has positive density.*

*Fourier coefficients of  $L_1$  functions.* In this section we would like to point out that, contrary to the  $L_p$  case ([7]), Fourier coefficients of a function  $g \in L_1[0, 2\pi]$  need not be universally good for the ergodic Hilbert transform. In fact, a much stronger claim holds: there exists a function  $g \in L_1[0, 2\pi]$  such that for any dynamical system  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$ , the Fourier coefficients of  $g$  is not good for the ergodic Hilbert transform in  $L_p$  for any  $p \geq 1$ .

We will make use of the fact that Fourier coefficients of the functions from  $L_1[0, 2\pi]$  may converge to zero arbitrarily slowly. Examples of such functions are well known (a somewhat implicit example can be found in [13], combining the results in Chapter V, pp. 183–184 and Chapter III, p. 93). We construct a more direct and somewhat different example (with a not necessarily convex sequence of Fourier coefficients).

**Proposition 2.7** *Let  $h : \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(n) = 0$ . Then there exists a sequence  $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  such that  $a_n \geq h(n)$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ; moreover, for all  $x \in [0, 2\pi]$ , the series*

$$\frac{1}{2}a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \cos(nx) (\star) \text{ converges to } g(x), \text{ where } g \in L^1[0, 2\pi], \text{ and } (\star) \text{ is the Fourier series of } g.$$

For the proof of this proposition we will use the following common notations:

1. Given a sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ , we will write  $\Delta x_n = x_n - x_{n+1}$ , and  $\Delta^2 x_n = \Delta x_n - \Delta x_{n+1}$ , for all  $n \geq 0$ .
2. For a function  $g \in L^1[0, 2\pi]$ , we will write  $g^+ = g\chi_{\{x:g(x) \geq 0\}}$ , and  $g^- = g\chi_{\{x:g(x) \leq 0\}}$ . Thus,  $g^+$  and  $g^-$  denote the positive part and the negative part of  $g$ , respectively. Notice that  $g(x) = g^+(x) + g^-(x)$ , a.e.  $x \in [0, 2\pi]$ .

3. For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in [0, 2\pi]$  we will write  $D_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^n \cos(kx)$  and  $F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^n D_n(x)$ .

Notice that for all  $x \in (0, 2\pi)$ ,

$$D_n(x) = \frac{\sin(n + \frac{1}{2})x}{2\sin(\frac{1}{2}x)} \text{ and } F_n(x) = \frac{2}{n+1} \left( \frac{\sin\frac{1}{2}(n + \frac{1}{2})x}{2\sin(\frac{1}{2}x)} \right)^2.$$

**Proof** Let  $M = 2\max\{h(n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$ . Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(n) = 0$ , we can choose a piecewise linear function

$a : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (i)  $a(n) > h(n), \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (ii)  $a$  is strictly decreasing;
- (iii)  $a(0) = M$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a(x) = 0$ ;
- (iv)  $a$  is differentiable on  $(0, \infty)$  except at countably many points  $n_1, n_2, \dots$ , where (assuming  $n_0 = 0$ ), for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n_k$  is an integer and  $n_k \geq n_{k-1} + 3$ ;
- (v) there exists  $\lambda > 1$  such that for all  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ,  $n_{k+1} \leq \lambda(n_{k+1} - n_k)$ ;
- (vi) if  $s_k$  denotes the slope of  $a$  on the interval  $(n_{k-1}, n_k)$  [i.e.  $a'(x) = s_k, \forall x \in (n_{k-1}, n_k)$ ], then for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $s_k < s_{k+1} - s_k < -s_k$ .

We then define our sequence  $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  by letting  $a_n = a(n), \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ .

By definition of the sequence, if  $n_{k-1} \leq n \leq n_k - 2$ , then  $\Delta^2 a_n = 0$ , and if  $n = n_k - 1$ , then  $|\Delta^2 a_n| = |s_k - s_{k+1}|$ .

Then, by conditions (i)–(vi), we obtain that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (n+1)|\Delta^2 a_n| < \infty$  ( $\star_1$ ).

Indeed, by conditions (ii), (iii), and (iv), we have  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (-s_i)(n_i - n_{i-1}) = M$ . Notice that  $s_i < 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Then, by condition (v), we obtain that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (-s_i)n_i \leq \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (-s_i)(n_i - n_{i-1}) < \infty$ . This, combined with condition (vi), implies that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |s_i - s_{i+1}|n_i < \infty$ ; thus, we obtain ( $\star_1$ ).

Now let  $s_n(x) = \frac{1}{2}a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \cos(kx)$  for all  $n \geq 0, x \in [0, 2\pi]$ . Since the sequence  $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is positive and decreasing, by Abel's summation formula, the limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n(x)$  exists for all  $x \in (0, 2\pi)$ .

Also, if  $x \in (0, 2\pi)$  and  $n \geq 1$ , by Abel's summation formula, we obtain that

$$s_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Delta a_k D_k(x) + a_n D_n(x).$$

Applying Abel's summation formula again, for  $n \geq 2$ , we get

$$s_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} (k+1)\Delta^2 a_k F_k(x) + nF_{n-1}(x)\Delta a_{n-1} + a_n D_n(x).$$

Notice that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n D_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} nF_{n-1}(x)\Delta a_{n-1} = 0$ . Hence,  $g(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} (k+1)\Delta^2 a_k F_k(x)$ .

Let us now show that  $g$  belongs to  $L^1[0, 2\pi]$ . For all  $n \geq 2$ , let

$$g_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} (k+1)\Delta^2 a_k F_k(x),$$

$$S_+(n) = \{k : 0 \leq k \leq n, \Delta^2 a_n > 0\}, S_-(n) = \{k : 0 \leq k \leq n, \Delta^2 a_k < 0\},$$

$$\phi_n(x) = \sum_{k \in S_+(n)} (k+1)\Delta^2 a_k F_k(x), \psi_n(x) = \sum_{k \in S_-(n)} (k+1)\Delta^2 a_k F_k(x).$$

Notice that  $F_n(x) \geq 0, \forall x \in [0, 2\pi]$ . Then for all  $x \in [0, 2\pi]$  we have  $g_n(x) = \phi_n(x) + \psi_n(x)$ , where  $\phi_n(x) \geq 0$  and  $\psi_n(x) \leq 0$ . Then  $\phi_n(x) \geq g_n^+(x) \geq g_n(x), \forall x \in [0, 2\pi]$ . By Fatou's lemma, we have  $\int_0^{2\pi} g^+ = \int_0^{2\pi} \liminf_n g_n^+ \leq \int_0^{2\pi} \liminf_n \phi_n \leq \liminf_n \int_0^{2\pi} \phi_n$ . On the other hand,  $\int_0^{2\pi} F_k(x) dx = \pi$ , for all  $k \geq 1$ . Then by the condition ( $\star_1$ ) we obtain that  $\liminf_n \int_0^{2\pi} \phi_n < \infty$ . Hence,  $g^+ \in L^1[0, 2\pi]$ . Similarly, we obtain that  $g^- \in L^1[0, 2\pi]$ . Thus,  $g \in L^1[0, 2\pi]$ .

After establishing integrability of  $g$ , it follows from claim **1-8** ([13], p. 184]) that the series  $\frac{1}{2}a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \cos(nx)$  is indeed a Fourier series of  $g$ . □

Now let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$  be a dynamical system, and  $g \in L^1[0, 2\pi]$  be a function with Fourier coefficients satisfying the following conditions:  $a_n = 0, \forall n \leq 0$ , and  $a_n \geq \frac{1}{\log(n)}, \forall n > 0$ . Let also  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $f(x) = 1, \forall x \in X$ . Then  $H_{\mathbf{a}}f(x) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \log(n)} = \infty$ , for all  $x \in X$ . Thus, for any dynamical system  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$ , the sequence  $\{a_n\}$  is not good for eHt in  $L_p$  for any  $p \geq 1$ .

**Remark 5** For the convenience of the reader, we quote claim **1-8** from [13]: *If  $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a sequence of real numbers decreasing to zero and the function  $g(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \cos(nx)$  is integrable, then the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \cos(nx)$  is a Fourier series of  $g$ .*

**Remark 6** It is indeed easy to construct a function  $a(x)$  with the desired properties (i)–(vi). For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $m_k = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : h(x) \leq \frac{M}{2^{k+1}}, \forall x \geq n\}$ . Then let  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  be a sequence of nonnegative integers such that  $n_0 = 0, n_k \geq m_k$ , and  $n_{k+1} \geq 2n_k + 3$ , for all  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ . We define the function  $a(x)$  as follows: we let  $a(n_k) = \frac{M}{2^k}, \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and we affinely extend the function to the interval  $[n_k, n_{k+1}]$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ . Then, by taking  $\lambda = 2$ , it is clear that all of the conditions (i)–(vi) hold. Notice that the function  $a(x)$  constructed in this way will be convex. In general, though, conditions (i)–(vi) allow plenty of nonconvex functions, as well.

### 3. Extension to admissible processes

Given a sequence  $\mathbf{a} \in l_{\infty}$ , let

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\alpha} := \limsup_{n \geq 1} \frac{\log^{\alpha} n}{n^{\alpha-1}} \sum_{-n}^n |a_k| < \infty.$$

Then  $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha}$  defines a seminorm on  $M_{\alpha}$ ; that is,  $(M_{\alpha}, \|\cdot\|_{\alpha})$  is a seminormed subspace of  $l_{\infty}$ . Now we turn to obtaining some properties of convergence with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha}$ -seminorm, which will be instrumental in enlarging the scope of some family of good modulating sequences.

**Definition 3.1** *A sequence  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$  of complex numbers is called a Hilbert sequence if  $\lim_n \sum_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} a_k$  exists.*

**Remark 7** For any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}, |\lambda| = 1$ , the sequence  $\{\lambda^k\}$  is a Hilbert sequence, and, hence, every sequence induced by a trigonometric polynomial is a (bounded) Hilbert sequence.

**Proposition 3.2** *a) If  $\{\mathbf{a}^r\}$  is a Hilbert sequence for each  $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and if  $\|\mathbf{a}^r - \mathbf{a}\|_{\alpha} \rightarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}$  is a Hilbert sequence.*

b) If  $\mathbf{a}^r, \mathbf{a} \in M_\alpha$  with  $\|\mathbf{a}^r - \mathbf{a}\|_\alpha \rightarrow 0$  and  $\mathbf{a}^r \mathbf{b}$  is a bounded Hilbert sequence for all  $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , for some  $\mathbf{b} \in l_\infty$ , then  $\mathbf{a} \mathbf{b}$  is a bounded Hilbert sequence.

**Proof** Since

$$\sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} a_k = \sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) + \sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} a_k^r,$$

and since  $\{\sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} a_k^r\}_n$  converges, in order to prove (a) it is enough to show that  $\{\sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r)\}_n$  converges.

Now, by Abel's summation by parts formula, if  $S_{\mp k}^r = \sum_{i=1}^k (a_{\mp i} - a_{\mp i}^r)$ , then, for  $1 \leq m < n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) - \sum'_{k=-m}^m \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) \right| &\leq \sum_{m < |k| \leq n} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} |S_k^r| \\ &+ \left| \frac{1}{n} S_n^r - \frac{1}{m+1} S_m^r \right| + \left| \frac{1}{n} S_{-n}^r - \frac{1}{m+1} S_{-m}^r \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis,  $\|\mathbf{a}^r - \mathbf{a}\|_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ ; therefore, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can pick  $N$  large enough such that whenever  $n, r > N$ ,

we have  $\|\mathbf{a}^r - \mathbf{a}\|_\alpha < 1$  and  $\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{3-\alpha} \log^\alpha k} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ .

Then  $|\frac{1}{n} S_n^r| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum'_{i=-n}^n |a_i - a_i^r| \leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{\log^\alpha n} \leq \frac{1}{n^{2-\alpha} \log^\alpha n}$ ; hence, we have  $\lim_n \frac{1}{n} S_n^r \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore, as

$m, n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $|\frac{1}{n} S_n^r - \frac{1}{m+1} S_m^r| \rightarrow 0$ , and similarly,  $|\frac{1}{n} S_{-n}^r - \frac{1}{m+1} S_{-m}^r| \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, for  $m, n, r > N$  (by choosing even larger  $N$ , if necessary),

$$\sum_{m < |k| \leq n} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} |S_k^r| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} S_n^r - \frac{1}{m+1} S_m^r \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} S_{-n}^r - \frac{1}{m+1} S_{-m}^r \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{4}.$$

Then it follows that, for  $m, n > N$ ,

$$\left| \sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) - \sum'_{k=-m}^m \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} < \epsilon,$$

and hence  $\{\sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r)\}_n$  is Cauchy, and hence it converges.

Since

$$\sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} a_k b_k = \sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) b_k + \sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} a_k^r b_k,$$

to prove (b) it is enough to show that  $|\sum'_{k=-n}^n \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) b_k - \sum'_{k=-m}^m \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) b_k| \rightarrow 0$  as  $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, letting

$n > m$ , by the inequality

$$\left| \sum_{m < |k| \leq n} \frac{1}{k} (a_k - a_k^r) b_k \right| \leq \|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty \sum_{m < |k| \leq n} \frac{1}{k} |a_k - a_k^r|,$$

the same method used in part (a) proves the assertion. □

**Remark 8** Since for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $|\lambda| = 1$ , the sequence  $\{\lambda^k\}$  is a Hilbert sequence, for any  $\mathbf{a} \in M_\alpha$  and for any  $|\lambda| = 1$  the sequence  $\{\lambda^k a_k\}$  belongs to  $M_\alpha$  and is a Hilbert sequence.

As an application of Proposition 3.1 we will extend the assertion of Theorem 2.3 to  $T$ -admissible processes. Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$  be a measure-preserving system. A family of functions  $F = \{f_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset L_p(X)$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , is called a  $T$ -admissible process on  $\mathbb{Z}$  if  $T^{\pm 1} f_{\pm i} \leq f_{\pm(i+1)}$  for  $i \geq 0$ . When the equality holds,  $F$  is called a  $T$ -additive process and is necessarily of the form  $F = \{T^i f\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , for some  $f \in L_p(X)$ . A process  $F = \{f_i\} \subset L_p$  is called strongly bounded when  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_n\|_p < \infty$ , and it is called symmetric if  $T^{2i} f_{-i} = f_i$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Given a process  $F = \{f_i\}$ , define the Hilbert transform of  $F$  by  $\lim_n H_n F(x)$ , where  $H_n F(x) = \sum_{i=-n}^n \frac{1}{i} f_i(x)$ . The eHt of a symmetric strongly bounded  $T$ -admissible process  $F$  exists a.e. for all  $F \subset L_1$  [6]. There it is also shown that if  $F = \{f_n\} \subset L_p$  is a positive symmetric strongly bounded  $T$ -admissible process, then there exists a monotone increasing sequence  $\{v_r\} \in L_p^+$  and  $v_r \uparrow \delta \in L_p$  such that  $f_n = T^n v_{|n|}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $f_n \leq T^n \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $\|\delta\|_p = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_n\|_p$ .

For  $r \geq 1$ , define  $g_i^r(x) = f_i(x)$  for  $0 \leq |i| \leq r$  and

$$g_i^r(x) = \begin{cases} T^{i-r} f_r(x) & \text{for } i > r \\ T^{-i+r} f_{-r}(x) & \text{for } -i > r. \end{cases}$$

Thus,  $g_i^r(x) \leq f_i(x)$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and for each  $r \geq 1$ , and

$$0 \leq f_i(x) - g_i^r(x) \leq T^i(\delta - v_r)(x) \text{ if } |i| > r, \text{ and } 0 \text{ if } |i| \leq r.$$

Observe that  $\|\delta - v_r\|_p \downarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore, ignoring the first  $r$  terms, the process  $\{g_k^r\}_k$  is  $T$ -additive.

It follows that, if  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C} \oplus A_\alpha$ , then, for each  $r \geq 1$ ,  $\lim_n \sum_{-n}^n \frac{a_i g_i^r}{i}$  exists a.e. by Theorem 2.3. Therefore, for each  $r \geq 1$ , for a.e.  $x \in X$ , the sequence  $\{a_i g_i^r(x)\}$  is a Hilbert sequence.

**Theorem 3.3** Let  $F \subset L_2$  be a symmetric, strongly bounded  $T$ -admissible process. If  $\mathbf{a} \in M_\alpha$ , then

$$\lim_n \sum_{-n}^n \frac{a_i f_i(x)}{i} \text{ exists a.e.}$$

**Proof** Let  $\mathbf{u}^r$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  be defined by  $\mathbf{u}^r = \{a_i g_i^r\}$  and  $\mathbf{u} = \{a_i f_i\}$ ,  $r \geq 1$ , respectively. By the assumptions, for each  $r$ , the sequence  $\mathbf{u}^r$  is a Hilbert sequence a.e.  $x \in X$ . Since,

$$0 \leq \frac{\log^\alpha n}{n^{\alpha-1}} \sum_{i=-n}^n |a_i g_i^r - a_i f_i| \leq \frac{\log^\alpha n}{n^{\alpha-1}} \sum_{i=-n}^n |a_i| T^i(\delta - v_r),$$

it follows that

$$0 \leq \int \left[ \frac{\log^\alpha n}{n^{\alpha-1}} \sum_{i=-n}^n |a_i| |T^i(\delta - v_r)| \right] d\mu \leq \frac{\log^\alpha n}{n^{\alpha-1}} \sum_{i=-n}^n |a_i| \|\delta - v_r\|_2 \leq C_{\mathbf{a}} \|\delta - v_r\|_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, by Proposition 3.1 (a), it follows that  $\mathbf{u} = \{a_i f_i(x)\}$  is Hilbert sequence for a.e., which proves that

$$\lim_n \sum_{-n}^n \frac{a_i f_i(x)}{i} \text{ exists a.e.} \quad \square$$

**Corollary 3.4** *Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$  be a measure-preserving system and  $\mathbf{a} \in MB_\alpha$  be a 2-sided sequence. Then*

$$\lim_n \sum_{-n}^n \frac{a_i f_i(x)}{i} \text{ exists a.e.}$$

*for any symmetric, strongly bounded  $T$ -admissible process  $F = \{f_k\} \subset L_2(X)$ . If  $\mathbf{a} \in MB_\alpha$  is a one-sided sequence, then the assertion holds if  $(X, \Sigma, \mu, T)$  is a weakly mixing system.*

## References

- [1] Assani I. A Wiener-Wintner property for the helical transform. *Ergod Theor Dyn Syst* 1992; 12: 185–194.
- [2] Bellow A, Losert V. The weighted pointwise ergodic theorem and the individual ergodic theorem along subsequences. *T Am Math Soc* 1985; 288: 307–345.
- [3] Brunel A, Keane M. Ergodic theorems for operator sequences. *Z Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung Verw Gebiete* 1969; 12: 231–240.
- [4] Campbell J, Petersen K. The spectral measure and Hilbert transform of a measure-preserving transformation. *T Am Math Soc* 1989; 313: 121–129.
- [5] Cotlar M. A unified theory of Hilbert transforms and ergodic theorem. *Rev Mat Cuyana* 1955; 1: 105–167.
- [6] Çömez D. Existence of discrete ergodic singular transforms for admissible processes. *Colloq Math* 2008; 112: 335–343.
- [7] Çömez D. The modulated ergodic Hilbert transform. *Discrete Cont Dyn S Series S* 2009; 2: 325–336.
- [8] Jajte R. On the existence of the ergodic Hilbert transform. *Ann Probab* 1987; 15: 831–835.
- [9] Kahane JP. Sur les coefficients de Fourier-Bohr. *Stud Math* 1961; 21: 103106 (in French).
- [10] Lacey M, Terwilliger E. A Wiener-Wintner theorem for the Hilbert transform. *Ark Mat* 2008; 46: 315–336.
- [11] Petersen K. Another proof of the existence of the ergodic Hilbert transform. *P Am Math Soc* 1983; 88: 39–43.
- [12] Sato R. A remark on the ergodic Hilbert transform. *Math. J Okayama Univ* 1986; 28: 159–163.
- [13] Zygmund A. *Trigonometric Series*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1959.