

**23. The dual space of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .**

Let  $1 < p < \infty$  (we exclude  $p = 1$  for this exercise). The Banach space  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  has the norm

$$\|\cdot\| : L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f \mapsto \|f\|_p = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|^p d\mu \right)^{1/p}.$$

We will show that for  $q$  with  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$  the map

$$j : L^q(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)' = \mathcal{L}(L^p(\mathbb{R}^n), \mathbb{R}), \quad g \mapsto j(g) \text{ with } j(g)(f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} fg d\mu$$

is a linear isometry, i.e.  $\|g\|_q = \|j(g)\|$  holds. One can then show that for  $1 \leq p < \infty$  the dual space of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is isometrically isomorphic to  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

- (a) Show, with the help of the Hölders inequality that  $j : L^q(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)'$  is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant  $L \leq 1$ .
- (b) Given a function  $g$ , find a function  $f_g$  such that  $|j(g)(f_g)| = \|f_g\|_p \cdot \|g\|_q$ .
- (c) Show that  $j$  is an isometry.
- (d) Optional: Use the Radon-Nikodym theorem to prove that  $j$  is surjective.
- (e) Finish the proof that  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)'$  and  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$  are isometrically isomorphic.
- (f) Optional: Extend this result to the case  $p = 1$  and  $q = \infty$ .
- (g) What is the connection to distributions and Proposition 3.22?

**Solution.**

- (a) Hölder's inequality is  $\|fg\|_1 \leq \|f\|_p \|g\|_q$  for such  $p$  and  $q$ . Since  $j$  and  $j(g)$  are linear we compute

$$\|j\|_{op} = \sup_{\|g\|_q=1} \|j(g)\|_{op} = \sup_{\|g\|_q=1} \sup_{\|f\|_p=1} |j(g)(f)| \leq \sup_{\|g\|_q=1} \sup_{\|f\|_p=1} \|fg\|_1 \leq 1.$$

This shows that  $j$  is Lipschitz with constant  $\leq 1$ .

- (b)

$$f_g(x) = \begin{cases} \|g\|_q^{1-q} |g(x)|^q g(x)^{-1} & \text{for } g(x) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } g(x) = 0 \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} f_g g \right| = \left| \int_{g \neq 0} \|g\|_q^{1-q} |g(x)|^q \right| = \|g\|_q^{1-q} \int_{g \neq 0} |g(x)|^q = \|g\|_q$$

and

$$\|f_g\|_p^p = \int_{g \neq 0} \|g\|_q^{p(1-q)} |g(x)|^{p(q-1)} = \int_{g \neq 0} \|g\|_q^{-q} |g(x)|^q = 1.$$

- (c) As in part (a), we have that

$$\|j(g)\|_{op} = \sup_{\|f\|_p=1} |j(g)(f)| \leq \|g\|_q.$$

Conversely, part (b) shows that equality is obtained and  $\|j(g)\|_{op} = \|g\|_q$ .

- (d) Take an element  $\kappa \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)'$ . This defines a measure  $\tilde{\kappa}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  via  $A \mapsto \kappa(\chi_A)$ . If  $A$  is a Lebesgue null set, then  $\chi_A = 0$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , so  $\tilde{\kappa}(A) = 0$ . This shows that  $\tilde{\kappa}$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The Radon-Nikodym theorem then gives us a measurable function  $g$  with

$$\tilde{\kappa}(A) = \int_A g \, d\mu.$$

In other words

$$\kappa(\chi_A) = \int \chi_A g \, d\mu.$$

Using simple functions (linear combinations of indicator functions) and their limits, this relationship extends to all measurable functions. It remains to show that  $g \in L^q$ . But this follows using the function  $f = |g(x)|^q g(x)^{-1}$  similar to part (b), since then  $\infty > \kappa(f) = \|g\|_q^q$ . In summary, for any  $\kappa \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)'$  we have found a  $g \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $j(g) = \kappa$ .

- (e) The isometry property shows that  $j$  is injective. Part (c) proved that  $j$  was surjective. Part (a) showed that it was continuous. Hence it is an isomorphism of Banach spaces.
- (f) Hölder's inequality also holds in this case, so part (a) is unchanged.

Part (b) doesn't work at all. Instead look to the definition of the essential supremum  $\|g\|_\infty = \sup\{a \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mu(g^{-1}[(a, \infty)]) \neq 0\}$ . Take an increasing sequence  $a_n$  converging to the supremum. Take a nonzero but finite measure subset  $A_n$  of  $g^{-1}[(a_n, \infty)]$ . Finally take a sequence of functions  $f_{g,n} = \chi_{A_n}$ . The equality of part (b) holds in the limit, which is enough to show that  $j$  is an isometry in part (c).

The modification for part (d) is probably similar, but I haven't thought about it.

- (g)  $j(g)$  is very similar to the distribution  $F_g$ ; they have the same formula but are defined on different spaces,  $L^p$  and  $C_0^\infty$  respectively. We know from Proposition 3.19 (or more generally Proposition 3.24) that test functions are dense in  $L^p$ . So when the associated distribution  $F_g$  is bounded with respect to the operator norm on  $\mathcal{L}(L^p, \mathbb{R})$  then it extends to a continuous operator on  $L^p$ . The condition on Proposition 3.22 uses the  $L^q$  norm instead of the operator norm, but we have just seen that these are isometric.

## 24. Sobolev Functions.

- (a) Write the definition of a Sobolev space using distributions.
- (b) Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function

$$x \mapsto \begin{cases} 1+x & \text{für } -1 \leq x \leq 0 \\ 1-x & \text{für } 0 \leq x \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (i) Describe the first derivative of the distribution  $F : C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\phi \mapsto F(\phi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\phi(x)dx$ .

- (ii) Show that the second derivative of the distribution  $F(\phi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\phi(x)dx$  is a linear combination of Dirac distributions.
- (iii) Show:  $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ , but  $f \notin W^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ .
- (c) Let  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  so that  $\partial^\alpha u = 0$  for all  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = 2$  in the weak sense. Show that  $u$  is affine, i.e.  $u(x) = a \cdot x + b$  a.e. with  $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ .  
[Hint. Proposition 3.22.]
- (d) Let  $\Omega = B(0, 0.5) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $u(x) = \left(\ln \frac{1}{\|x\|}\right)^{1/4}$ . Show that  $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$  but that it is not continuous.

**Solution.**

- (a) The definition given in the script is

$$W^{k,p}(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in L^p(\Omega) \mid \forall |\gamma| \leq k \exists u_\gamma \in L^p(\Omega) \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} u_\gamma \varphi = (-1)^\gamma \int_{\Omega} u \partial^\gamma \varphi \right\}.$$

We can recognise that

$$\int_{\Omega} u_\gamma \varphi = F_{u_\gamma}(\varphi), \quad (-1)^\gamma \int_{\Omega} u \partial^\gamma \varphi = (-1)^\gamma F_u(\partial^\gamma \varphi) = \partial^\gamma F_u(\varphi).$$

So the definition becomes

$$W^{k,p}(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in L^p(\Omega) \mid \forall |\gamma| \leq k \exists u_\gamma \in L^p(\Omega) : F_{u_\gamma} = \partial^\gamma F_u \right\}.$$

In other words, we require that the  $\gamma$ -derivative of the distribution corresponding to  $u$  corresponds to some  $L^p$  function, for all  $\gamma$  up to and including order  $k$ .

- (b) (i)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial F(\phi) &= - \int_{-1}^0 (1+x)\partial\phi - \int_0^1 (1-x)\partial\phi \\ &= - [(1+x)\phi]_{-1}^0 + \int_{-1}^0 \phi - [(1-x)\phi]_0^1 + \int_0^1 (-1)\phi \\ &= -\phi(0) + \int_{-1}^0 \phi + \phi(0) - \int_0^1 \phi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\chi_{[-1,0]} - \chi_{[0,1]})\phi \end{aligned}$$

- (ii)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2 F(\phi) &= - \int_{-1}^0 \partial\phi + \int_0^1 \partial\phi = -\phi(0) + \phi(-1) + \phi(1) - \phi(0) \\ &= \phi(-1) - 2\phi(0) + \phi(1) \end{aligned}$$

- (iii)  $f$  and  $\chi_{[-1,0]} - \chi_{[0,1]}$  are both  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$  functions so  $f \in W^{1,1}$ . However we know that there is no  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$  function  $g$  with  $F_g = \delta_{-1} - 2\delta_0 + \delta_1$  so  $f \notin W^{2,1}$ .

- (c) Consider  $u_{e_i}$ . By assumption,  $\nabla u_{e_i} = 0$  and so using Proposition 3.23 we know that  $u_{e_i} = a_i$ , a constant. Consider the function  $v(x) = a \cdot x$ . Now we see that  $\partial^i(u - v) = a_i - a_i = 0$ . So we can again apply Proposition 3.23 to get that  $u = v + b = a \cdot x + b$ .
- (d) It is not continuous because as  $x \rightarrow 0$  we have  $u \rightarrow (\infty)^{0.25}$ .

$$\|u\|_2^2 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{0.5} (-\ln r)^{0.5} r \, dr \, d\theta$$

Observe that  $r^2 \ln r \rightarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$  so the integrand is a continuous function and the integral is therefore finite.

For the derivative, we try to see if the distributional derivative comes from a  $L^1_{loc}$  function, and then if that function is  $L^2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} u \partial_1 \phi &= \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon} + \int_{\Omega \setminus B_\varepsilon} \right) u \partial_1 \phi = \int_{B_\varepsilon} u \partial_1 \phi + \int_{\Omega \setminus B_\varepsilon} \nabla \cdot \begin{pmatrix} u\phi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} - \partial_1 u \phi \\ &= \int_{B_\varepsilon} u \partial_1 \phi - \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon} u \phi \frac{x}{r} \, d\sigma - \int_{\Omega \setminus B_\varepsilon} \partial_1 u \phi \end{aligned}$$

We have three integrals to consider. The first integral vanishes by Hölder's inequality  $\|u \partial_1 \phi\|_{L^1(B_\varepsilon)} \leq \|u\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} \|\partial_1 \phi\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} \rightarrow 0$ . The second integral self-cancels, but would vanish for power reasons even if it didn't:

$$\int_{\partial B_\varepsilon} u \phi \frac{x}{r} \, d\sigma = (-\ln \varepsilon)^{0.25} \varepsilon \int_0^{2\pi} \cos \theta \, d\theta = 0.$$

And the final integral shows us that the distributional derivative of  $u$  is associated to the function  $\partial_1 u$  for  $x \neq 0$ , provided this function is locally integrable. Since  $\partial_1 u = 0.25(-\ln \|x\|)^{-0.75} x \|x\|^{-1}$  and

$$\|\partial_1 u\|_2^2 \leq 0.0625 \times 2\pi \int_0^{0.5} (-\ln r)^{-1.5} r \, dr < \infty$$

we see that  $\partial_1 u \in L^2$ . The same clearly holds for  $\partial_2 u$  as well.

Note that the criterion in Proposition 3.22 is not so useful, because you have to do all the same analysis, including showing that  $\partial_1 u \in L^2$ . Then you can apply Hölder's inequality to get

$$|\partial^1 F(\phi)| \leq \|\partial_1 u\|_p \|\phi\|_q,$$

and set  $M = \|\partial_1 u\|_p$ .

## 25. Another “fundamental lemma” for $L^1_{loc}$ -functions

Let  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be open and connected. Show that for  $u \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$  if

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x) \nabla \phi(x) \, dx = 0 \text{ for all } \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),$$

then  $u$  is constant on  $\Omega$ . [Hint. Modify the proof of Proposition 3.23.]

**Solution.** Consider the ball  $B(x_0, 2\rho) \subset \Omega$ . For  $\varepsilon < \rho$  the mollification  $u_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon * u$  is a smooth function on  $B(x_0, \rho)$  and especially  $y \mapsto \lambda_\varepsilon(x - y) \in C_0^\infty(B(x_0, 2\rho)) \subset C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  for all  $x \in B(x_0, \rho)$ . Therefore

$$\nabla u_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{\Omega} \nabla \lambda_\varepsilon(x - y) u(y) dy = 0,$$

showing that  $u_\varepsilon$  is a constant for each  $\varepsilon$ . We know that  $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$  in  $L_{loc}^1$  (Proposition 3.18) so  $u$  is a constant on  $B(x_0, \rho)$ . A locally constant functions on a connected set is constant.

The lesson here was that we didn't really need to know that  $u \in W_{loc}^{1,1}$  in Proposition 3.18, only that  $u \in L_{loc}^1$  and that its distributional derivatives are zero.

## 26. An integration by parts.

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be open and  $u \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ ,  $v \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ . Prove

$$\int_{\Omega} u_{e_i} v_{e_j} d\mu = \int_{\Omega} u_{e_j} v_{e_i} d\mu$$

[Hint. Approximate  $u$  with functions from  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ .]

**Solution.** The choice of  $p = 2$  guarantees that the integrals exist with Hölder's inequality.  $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$  is by definition the closure of  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  in  $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ . So let  $u_n \rightarrow u$  for smooth compactly supported functions. But then

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} u_{e_i} v_{e_j} - \int_{\Omega} \partial_i u_n v_{e_j} \right| \leq \int_{\Omega} |u_{e_i} - \partial_i u_n| |v_{e_j}| \leq \|u_{e_i} - \partial_i u_n\|_2 \|v_{e_j}\|_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

So we can approximate the integral with  $u_{e_i}$  by one with  $\partial_i u_n$ . Since these are test functions and  $v$  is Sobolev

$$\int_{\Omega} \partial_i u_n v_{e_j} = - \int_{\Omega} \partial_j \partial_i u_n v = \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_n v_{e_i}.$$

Putting it all together for clarity

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} u_{e_i} v_{e_j} - \int_{\Omega} u_{e_j} v_{e_i} \right| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} u_{e_i} v_{e_j} - \int_{\Omega} \partial_i u_n v_{e_j} + \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_n v_{e_i} - \int_{\Omega} u_{e_j} v_{e_i} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\Omega} u_{e_i} v_{e_j} - \int_{\Omega} \partial_i u_n v_{e_j} \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_n v_{e_i} - \int_{\Omega} u_{e_j} v_{e_i} \right| \\ &\rightarrow 0 + 0. \end{aligned}$$