

# You have downloaded a document from RE-BUŚ <br> repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice 

Title: The Hahn-Banach theorem almost everywhere

Author: Roman Badora

Citation style: Badora Roman. (2016). The Hahn-Banach theorem almost everywhere. "Aequationes Mathematicae" (Vol. 90, no. 1 (2016), s. 173-179), doi 10.1007/s00010-015-0365-z


Uznanie autorstwa - Licencja ta pozwala na kopiowanie, zmienianie, rozprowadzanie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie pod warunkiem oznaczenia autorstwa.

## Aequationes Mathematicae

## The Hahn-Banach theorem almost everywhere

Roman Badora

Dedicated to Professor Roman Ger on the occasion of his seventieth birthday


#### Abstract

The aim of this work is to present an almost everywhere version of the HahnBanach extension theorem.
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## 1. Introduction

In the year 1960 Erdös [3] raised the following problem: suppose that a function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the equation

$$
f(x+y)=f(x)+f(y)
$$

for almost all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$ (in the sense of the planar Lebesque measure). Does there exists an additive function $a: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ [i.e. $a$ satisfies $a(x+y)=$ $a(x)+a(y)$, for all $\left.(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}\right]$ such that

$$
f(x)=a(x)
$$

almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}$ (in the sense of the linear Lebesque measure)? A positive answer to this question was given by de Bruijn [2] (and, independently, by Jurkat [9]). N. G. de Bruijn has put the Erdös problem into a more general setting.

Let $(G,+)$ be a group. A non-empty family $\mathcal{I}$ of subsets of $G$ is called a proper linearly invariant ideal (briefly p.l.i. ideal) iff it satisfies the following conditions
(i) $G \notin \mathcal{I}$;
(ii) if $U \in \mathcal{I}$ and $V \subset U$, then $V \in \mathcal{I}$;
(iii) if $U, V \in \mathcal{I}$, then $U \cup V \in \mathcal{I}$;
(iv) if $U \in \mathcal{I}$ and $x \in G$, then $x-U \in \mathcal{I}$.

For a p.l.i. ideal $\mathcal{I}$ of subsets of a group $G$ we say that a given condition is satisfied $\mathcal{I}$-almost everywhere in $G$ (written $\mathcal{I}$-a.e.) iff there exists a set $Z \in \mathcal{I}$ such that this condition is satisfied for every $x \in G \backslash Z$.

The set belonging to the set ideal are regarded as, in a certain sense, small sets (see Kuczma [10]). For example, if $G$ is a second category topological commutative group then the family of all first category subsets of $G$ is a p.l.i. ideal. If $G$ is a commutative locally compact topological group equipped with the Haar measure $\mu$ then the family of all subsets of $G$ which have zero measure is a p.l.i. ideal. Moreover, if $G$ is a normed space $(\operatorname{dim} G \geq 1)$ then the family of all bounded subsets of $G$ is a p.l.i. ideal and also, if $G$ is a commutative uncountable group then the family of all countable subsets of $G$ is a p.l.i. ideal.

Let $(G,+)$ be a commutative group. For a p.l.i. ideal $\mathcal{I}$ we may define the following family of subsets of $G \times G$ (Ger [5, 6]):

$$
\Omega(\mathcal{I})=\{N \subset G \times G: N[x] \in \mathcal{I} \text { I-a.e. in } G\},
$$

where

$$
N[x]=\{y \in G:(x, y) \in N\}
$$

a subset $N$ of $G \times G$ belongs to $\Omega(\mathcal{I})$ iff there exists a set $U \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

$$
N[x] \in \mathcal{I}, \quad x \in G \backslash U
$$

(an abstract version of the Fubini theorem)]. The family $\Omega(\mathcal{I})$ is a p.l.i. ideal of subsets of $G \times G$.

The de Bruijn result can be formulated as follows:
Theorem 1.1. If $(G,+)$ and $(H,+)$ are commutative groups, $\mathcal{I}$ is a p.l.i. ideal of subsets of $G$ then for every $\Omega(\mathcal{I})$-almost additive function $f: G \rightarrow H$, i.e.

$$
f(x+y)=f(x)+f(y) \quad \Omega(\mathcal{I}) \text {-a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad G \times G
$$

there exists a unique homomorphism $a: G \rightarrow H$ such that

$$
f(x)=a(x) \quad \mathcal{I} \text {-a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad G .
$$

Ger [7] generalized de Bruijn's theorem to the case of non-commutative groups. The notion of p.l.i. ideals and its properties and applications we can find in [10]. One of the most interesting applications is included in the paper of Ger [8] where the author combines the notions of approximately additive and almost additive mappings.

In this paper we proved the following version of the Hahn-Banach extension theorem.

Theorem 1.2. Let $(H,+)$ be a subgroup of a commutative group $(G,+)$, let $\mathcal{I}$ be a p.l.i. ideal of subsets of $G$ and let $H \notin \mathcal{I}$. Assume that $p: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(x+y) \leq p(x)+p(y) \quad \Omega(\mathcal{I}) \text {-a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad G \times G \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for every additive function $a: H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ fulfilling

$$
\begin{equation*}
a(x) \leq p(x) \quad \mathcal{I} \text {-a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad H \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

there exists an additive function $A: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(x)=a(x) \quad \mathcal{I} \text {-a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad H \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(x) \leq p(x) \quad \mathcal{I} \text {-a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad G \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 2. Proof of the theorem

Assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is a p.l.i. ideal of subsets of a commutative group $(G,+)$. For a real function $f$ on $G$ we define $\mathcal{I}_{f}$ to be the family of all sets $Z \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $f$ is bounded on the complement of $Z$. A real function $f$ on $G$ is called $\mathcal{I}$-essentially bounded if and only if the family $\mathcal{I}_{f}$ is non-empty. The space of all $\mathcal{I}$-essentially bounded functions on $G$ will be denoted by $B^{\mathcal{I}}(R, \mathbb{R})$.

For every element $f$ of the space $B^{\mathcal{I}}(G, \mathbb{R})$ the real numbers

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{I} \text {-essinf } \\
& x \in G \\
& f(x) \\
& \mathcal{I} \text {-esssup } \sup _{Z \in G} f(x)=\inf _{Z \in \mathcal{I}_{f}} \inf _{x \in G \backslash Z} f(x), \\
& \sup _{x \in G \backslash Z} f(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

are correctly defined and are referred to as the $\mathcal{I}$-essential infimum and the $\mathcal{I}$-essential supremum of the function $f$, respectively.

From the Gajda theorem (Gajda [4], see also Badora [1]) we can derive the following.

Theorem 2.1. If $\mathcal{I}$ is a p.l.i. ideal of subsets of a commutative group $(G,+)$, then there exists a real linear functional $M^{\mathcal{I}}$ on the space $B^{\mathcal{I}}(G, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{I} \text {-essinf } x_{x \in G} f(x) \leq M^{\mathcal{I}}(f) \leq \mathcal{I} \text { - } \operatorname{esssup}_{x \in G} f(x) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
M^{\mathcal{I}}\left({ }_{z} f\right)=M^{\mathcal{I}}(f) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $f \in B^{\mathcal{I}}(G, \mathbb{R})$ and all $z \in G$, where the function ${ }_{z} f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as follows

$$
{ }_{z} f(x)=f(z+x), \quad x \in G .
$$

Now we prove our result.
Proof of Theorem 1.2. Notice that if $\mathcal{I}$ is a p.l.i. ideal of subsets of $G$, then the family

$$
\mathcal{I} \cap H=\{Z \cap H: Z \in \mathcal{I}\}
$$

is a p.l.i. ideal of subsets of $H$.

From condition (1.1) we infer the existence of the set $U_{1} \in \mathcal{I}$ such that for every $x \in G \backslash U_{1}$ there exists a set $V_{x} \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(x+y) \leq p(x)+p(y), \quad g \in G \backslash V_{x} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (1.2) it follows that there exists a set $U_{0} \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
a(x) \leq p(x), \quad x \in H \backslash U_{0} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $U=U_{1} \cup\left(-U_{1}\right)$. Next we choose arbitrary $x \in G \backslash U$. By (2.4) and (2.3) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
a(z) \leq p(z)=p(x-x+z) \leq p(x)+p(-x+z) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $z \in H \backslash\left(U \cup U_{0} \cup\left(x+V_{x}\right)\right)$. From (iv) with $x=0$ we get $-V_{x} \in \mathcal{I}$. Using again (iv) we infer that $x+V_{x} \in \mathcal{I}$. Moreover $U \in \mathcal{I}$. Therefore (2.5) means that the function

$$
H \ni z \mapsto a(z)-p(-x+z) \in \mathbb{R}
$$

is $\mathcal{I}$-essentially bounded from above. So, we can define the function $\varphi: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows

$$
\varphi(x)= \begin{cases}\mathcal{I}-\operatorname{esssup}_{z \in H}(a(z)-p(-x+z)), & x \in G \backslash U \\ 0, & x \in U\end{cases}
$$

Let $N=(U \times G) \cup(G \times U) \cup\{(x, y) \in G \times G: x+y \in U\}$. For every $x \in G \backslash U$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
N[x] & =\emptyset \cup U \cup\{y \in G: x+y \in U\} \\
& =U \cup\{y \in G: y \in-x+U\}=U \cup(-x+U) \in \mathcal{I} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently $N \in \Omega(\mathcal{I})$.
Let $(x, y) \in G \times G \backslash N$ be fixed. Then $x \notin U, y \notin U$ and $x+y \notin U$. For $z \in G \backslash\left(\left(y+V_{-x}\right) \cup\left(x+y+V_{x}\right)\right)$, by (2.3), we have

$$
p(-x-y+z) \leq p(-x)+p(-y+z)
$$

and

$$
p(-y+z)=p(x-x-y+z) \leq p(x)+p(-x-y+z)
$$

which leads to the following

$$
-p(-x) \leq p(-y+z)-p(-x-y+z) \leq p(x)
$$

From this we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi(x+y) & =\mathcal{I}-\operatorname{esssup}_{z \in H}(a(z)-p(-y-x+z)) \\
& =\mathcal{I}-\operatorname{essssu}_{z \in H}(a(z)-p(-y+z)+p(-y+z)-p(-x-y+z)) \\
& \leq \varphi(y)+p(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi(y) & =\mathcal{I}-\operatorname{esssup}_{z \in H}(a(z)-p(-y+z)) \\
& =\mathcal{I}-\operatorname{esssup}_{z \in H}(a(z)-p(-x-y+z)+p(-x-y+z)-p(-y+z)) \\
& \leq \varphi(x+y)+p(-x)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
-p(-x) \leq \varphi(x+y)-\varphi(y) \leq p(x), \quad(x, y) \in G \times G \backslash N \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last inequalities imply that, for $x \in G \backslash U$, the function

$$
G \backslash(U \cup(-x+U)) \ni y \mapsto \varphi(x+y)-\varphi(y) \in \mathbb{R}
$$

is bounded which yields that the function

$$
G \ni y \mapsto \varphi(x+y)-\varphi(y) \in \mathbb{R}
$$

belongs to the space $B^{\mathcal{I}}(G, \mathbb{R})$.
A function $\alpha: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define by the formula

$$
\alpha(x)= \begin{cases}M_{y}^{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi(x+y)-\varphi(y)), & x \in G \backslash U \\ 0, & x \in U,\end{cases}
$$

where $M^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a linear functional whose existence guarantees Theorem 2.1 and the subscript $y$ indicates that the functional $M^{\mathcal{I}}$ is applied to a function of the variable $y$.

If we choose $(x, y) \in G \times G \backslash N$ then, by the linearity of $M^{\mathcal{I}}$ and (2.2), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha(x)+\alpha(y) & =M_{z}^{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi(x+z)-\varphi(z))+M_{z}^{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi(y+z)-\varphi(z)) \\
& =M_{z}^{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi(x+y+z)-\varphi(y+z))+M_{z}^{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi(y+z)-\varphi(z)) \\
& =M_{z}^{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi(x+y+z)-\varphi(z))=\alpha(x+y) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The function $\alpha$ is $\Omega(\mathcal{I})$-almost additive and from Theorem 1.1 we obtain the existence of an additive function $A: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(x)=\alpha(x) \quad \mathcal{I} \text {-a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad G . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, let $x \in H \backslash U$ be fixed and let $y \in G \backslash(U \cup(-x+U) \cup N[x])$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi(x+y) & =\mathcal{I} \text {-esssup }_{z \in H}(a(z)-p(-y-x+z)) \\
& =\inf _{Z \in \mathcal{I}} \sup _{z \in H \backslash Z}(a(z)-p(-y-x+z)) \\
& =\inf _{Z \in \mathcal{I}} \sup _{z \in H \backslash(-x+Z)}(a(x+z)-p(-y+z)) \\
& =\inf _{Z \in \mathcal{I}} \sup _{z \in H \backslash(-x+Z)}(a(x)+a(z)-p(-y+z)) \\
& =a(x)+\varphi(y)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, for $x \in H \backslash U$, using (2.1) we have

$$
\alpha(x)=M_{y}^{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi(x+y)-\varphi(y))=M_{y}^{\mathcal{I}}(a(x))=a(x)
$$

which jointly with (2.7) gives (1.3) . Finally, from the definition of $\alpha,(2.1),(2.6)$ and (2.7) we infer that condition (1.4) is satisfied which ends the proof.

## 3. Ending comments

Remark 3.1. Note that we can strengthen Theorem 1.2 assuming that the function $a$ is $\mathcal{I}$-almost additive. Then we start the proof from Theorem 1.1.

Remark 3.2. If, in Theorem 1.2, additionally we assume that the functional $p$ is positively homogeneous then we can prove that the function $A$ is linear.

Indeed, for a fixed $x \in G$ let us observe that condition (1.4) implies that

$$
A(t x) \leq p(t x)=t p(x), \quad t \in(0,+\infty)
$$

which means that the real additive function

$$
\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto A(t x) \in \mathbb{R}
$$

is bounded from above, for example, on the interval $(0,1)$. Whence this function is linear (continuous), i. e.

$$
A(t x)=t \cdot c_{x}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}
$$

for some constant $c_{x} \in \mathbb{R}$. Putting $t=1$ we get $c_{x}=A(x)$ and

$$
A(t x)=t A(x), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}
$$

Hence $A$ is a linear map.
Remark 3.3. We will show that the assumption (iv) imposed on the family $\mathcal{I}$ (symmetry with respect to zero) is essential in our theorem.

Let $G=\mathbb{R}$ and let $H=\mathbb{Z}$. The family $\mathcal{I}$ of subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ we define as follows: $A \in \mathcal{I}$ iff $A$ is a countable subset of the interval $(c,+\infty)$, for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then $H \notin \mathcal{I}$, the family $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies conditions (i)-(iii) of the definition of a p.l.i. ideal [but the condition (iv) is not fulfilled].

Taking $p: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $p(x)=|x|$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $a: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ as $a(x)=2 x$, for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that $p$ satisfies (1.1) and $a, p$ fulfill (1.2) [because $\mathbb{Z} \cap(0,+\infty) \in$ $\mathcal{I}]$.

If $A: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an additive function satisfying (1.4), then it is bounded from above on some interval ( $p$ is bounded from above on each bounded interval). Therefore $A$ is a linear map. So, $A(x)=c x, x \in \mathbb{R}$, for some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover $\mathbb{Z} \notin \mathcal{I}$ and if the function $A$ fulfills (1.3), then $A(x)=2 x$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, which is impossible because $A, p$ satisfy (1.4) and $(0,+\infty) \notin \mathcal{I}$.
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