

# DECOMPOSITION AS THE SUM OF INVARIANT FUNCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO COMMUTING TRANSFORMATIONS

BÁLINT FARKAS AND SZILÁRD GY. RÉVÉSZ

**ABSTRACT.** As a natural generalization of various investigations in different function spaces, we study the following problem. Let  $A$  be an arbitrary set, and  $T_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) be arbitrary commuting mappings – transformations – from  $A$  into  $A$ . Under what conditions can we state that a function  $f : A \rightarrow A$  is the sum of “periodic”, that is,  $T_j$ -invariant functions  $f_j$ ? (A function  $g$  is periodic, i.e., invariant mod  $T_j$ , if  $g \circ T_j = g$ .) An obvious necessary condition is that the corresponding multiple difference operator annihilates  $f$ , i.e.,  $\Delta_{T_1} \dots \Delta_{T_n} f = 0$ , where  $\Delta_{T_j} := T_j - I$ , with  $T_j(f) := f \circ T_j$  interpreted as the usual shift operator. However, in general this condition is not sufficient, and our goal is to complement this basic condition with others, so that the set of conditions will be both necessary and sufficient.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function which is a sum of finitely many periodic functions

$$(1) \quad f = f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_n, \quad f_i(x + \alpha_i) = f_i(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n$$

with some fixed numbers  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  let  $\Delta_\alpha$  denote the (forward) difference operator

$$\Delta_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{R}, \quad \Delta_\alpha g(x) := g(x + \alpha) - g(x).$$

Then the  $\alpha_i$ -periodicity of  $f_i$  above means  $\Delta_{\alpha_i} f_i = 0$ , and because the difference operators are commuting, we also have that

$$(2) \quad \Delta_{\alpha_1} \Delta_{\alpha_2} \dots \Delta_{\alpha_n} f = 0.$$

The starting point of this work is the problem, if the converse of the above statement is also true, i.e., does (2) imply the periodic decomposition (1)?

Naturally, this question can be posed in any given function class  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{R}$ , when we have  $f \in X$  and (2) and want a decomposition (1) within the class, i.e., we require also  $f_i \in X$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ). If the answer is affirmative, the class  $X$  is said to have the decomposition property. In particular, for the class  $C(\mathbb{R})$  and  $BC(\mathbb{R})$  (continuous and bounded, continuous functions) the above decomposition problem originated from I. Z. Ruzsa, and it was answered for  $n = 2$  by M. Wierdl [9] and for general  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  by M. Laczkovich and Sz. Gy. Révész [7]. Moreover, Laczkovich and Révész generalized the problem to many other function classes in fact considering the derived problem in topological vector spaces [8]. Later Z. Gajda [1] gave an alternative proof of the case of  $B(\mathbb{R})$  (bounded functions) and also of  $UCB(\mathbb{R})$  (uniformly continuous and bounded functions) based on Banach limits. Recently, interesting results and examples were found by V. M. Kadets and S. B. Shumyatskiy [2, 3] about the decomposition problem in various Banach spaces. In a different direction, T. Keleti [4, 5, 6] studied related problems and was led to a negative answer regarding the existence of a continuous periodic decomposition (or even quasi-decomposition) of continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  provided only that a measurable decomposition exists on  $\mathbb{R}$ , see [4, Theorem 4.8].

---

*Date:* 28 December 2004.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 39A10. Secondary 39B52, 39B72.

*Key words and phrases.* periodic function, almost periodic function, periodic decomposition, difference equation, commuting transformations, transformation invariant functions, shift operator, difference operator, decomposition property.

Support of this work was rejected by Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research, project # T-047074.

In the present paper we do not restrict to any particular function class, and we neither assume any particular structural properties like smoothness etc of the transformations. The present work attacks the decomposition problem in the whole space of functions  $\mathbb{R}^A$  with respect to arbitrary commuting operators of  $A^A$ .

Note that already M. Wierdl observed that in the space of arbitrary real-valued functions the difference equation (2) implies (1) if the steps  $\alpha_i$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q}$  (see [9, Lemma, p. 109]). We extend this result in Corollary 12 to the case when the shifts  $\alpha_i$  are only assumed to be pairwise incommensurable. On the other hand even for  $n = 2$  and  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$ , the identity function  $f(x) := x$  satisfies  $\Delta_\alpha \Delta_\alpha f = 0$ , but  $f(x) = x$  fails to be the sum of two  $\alpha$ -periodic functions (as then  $f$  would be periodic itself). That is, even for  $A = \mathbb{R}$  and  $n = 2$ , the implication (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) fails without assuming further conditions either on the transformations or on the functions.

Throughout this note  $A$  will denote a fixed nonempty set. We will consider various self maps  $T : A \rightarrow A$ , called *transformations*, and to such a transformation we associate the corresponding *shift operator*  $T$  (denoted by the same symbol) as  $T(f) := f \circ T$  and the  *$T$ -difference operator*  $\Delta_T : \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A$  defined as

$$(\Delta_T f) := Tf - If = f \circ T - f, \quad (\Delta_T f)(x) = f(Tx) - f(x).$$

A function  $f$  satisfying  $\Delta_T f = 0$  is called  *$T$ -invariant*.

A  $(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ -invariant decomposition of some function  $f$  is a representation

$$(3) \quad f = f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_n, \quad \text{where} \quad \Delta_{T_j} f_j = 0 \quad (j = 1, \dots, n).$$

We do not assume any structural properties such as smoothness, boundedness, injectivity or surjectivity etc, neither on the transformations nor on the functions, except that all the occurring transformations and functions are defined all over the set  $A$  and that the occurring transformations must commute pairwise. For pairwise commuting transformations  $T_i$  the functional equation

$$(4) \quad \Delta_{T_1} \dots \Delta_{T_n} f = 0$$

evidently implies for every  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$  (where also  $0 \in \mathbb{N}$  in our present terminology) the equation

$$(5) \quad \Delta_{T_1^{k_1}} \dots \Delta_{T_n^{k_n}} f = 0.$$

Now in this general setting our basic question sounds: Does the functional equation (4) imply the existence of some  $(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ -invariant decomposition (3)? As mentioned above, in general this is not the case. Therefore, we look for further conditions, which, together with (4), are not only necessary, but also sufficient to ensure that such an invariant decomposition exists. More precisely, in the next section we focus on complementary conditions – functional equations – on the functions, which they must satisfy in case of existence of an invariant decomposition (3) and which equations may also imply existence of such a decomposition. In the third section we define a further, still quite general property of transformations, implying that the difference equation (4) also suffices for the existence of an invariant decomposition (3).

With this general setting the pure combinatorial nature of the problem is quite apparent. Since similar questions arise quite often in various settings, the present formulation may help understanding some related problems as well. To emphasize the combinatorial structure, one may reformulate the whole problem so as to consider  $A$  as the vertices of a directed and colored graph, with  $T_j$  being the set of directed edges, colored by the  $j^{\text{th}}$  color. Transformations are defined uniquely on  $A$ , which means that the out-degree of any color is exactly 1 at all points of  $A$ . The pairwise commutativity assumption then means that starting out from a given point and traveling along one blue and one red edge, we arrive at the same point independently of the order we chose of these colors. Looking for (color-) invariant functions is the search of  $f_j$  which assume equal values on points connected by a directed path of  $j^{\text{th}}$  color. Mentioning this interpretation may reveal the combinatorial nature of the question, although we do not emphasize this language any longer.

## 2. RESULTS FOR ARBITRARY TRANSFORMATIONS

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $A$  be a nonempty set and  $S, T : A \rightarrow A$  commuting transformations,  $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ . The following are equivalent*

- i) *There exists a decomposition  $f = g + h$ , with  $g$  and  $h$  being  $S$ - and  $T$ -invariant, respectively.*
- ii)  *$\Delta_S \Delta_T f = 0$ , and if for some  $x \in A$  and  $k, n, k', n' \in \mathbb{N}$  the equality*

$$(6) \quad T^k S^n x = T^{k'} S^{n'} x$$

*holds, then*

$$(7) \quad f(T^k x) = f(T^{k'} x)$$

*should also be satisfied.*

*Proof.* i)  $\Rightarrow$  ii): The first part is obvious. Indeed, as  $T$  and  $S$  commute,

$$\Delta_S \Delta_T f = \Delta_S \Delta_T g + \Delta_S \Delta_T h = \Delta_T \Delta_S g + \Delta_S \Delta_T h = 0 + 0 = 0 .$$

Suppose now that (6) holds for some  $x \in A$  and  $k, n, k', n' \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then using the  $S$ -invariance of  $g$  and the  $T$ -invariance of  $h$

$$\begin{aligned} f(T^k x) &= g(T^k x) + h(T^k x) = g(S^n T^k x) + h(x) = \\ &= g(S^{n'} T^{k'} x) + h(T^{k'} x) = g(T^{k'} x) + h(T^{k'} x) = f(T^{k'} x) \end{aligned}$$

follows.

ii)  $\Rightarrow$  i): Before we can give the decomposition of  $f$  we partition the set  $A$ . We say that two elements  $x, y \in A$  are equivalent, if for some  $k, n, k', n'$  the equality

$$(8) \quad T^k S^n x = T^{k'} S^{n'} y$$

holds. Needless to say that we really defined an equivalence relation  $\sim$ , hence the set  $A$  splits into equivalence classes  $A/\sim$ , from which by the axiom of choice we chose a representation system. Obviously it is enough to define  $g$  and  $h$  on each of the equivalence classes. Indeed, for  $x \in A$  the elements  $x, Tx$  and  $Sx$  are all equivalent, so the invariance of the desired functions  $g, h$  is decided already in the common equivalence class. So our task is now reduced to defining the functions  $g$  and  $h$  on a fixed, but arbitrary equivalence class  $B$ . Let  $x \in B$  and  $x_0$  be the representative of  $B$ . By definition,  $x \in B$  means  $x \sim x_0$ , hence the existence of  $k, n, k', n' \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying (8) with  $x_0$  in place of  $y$ . Set now

$$(9) \quad G(n, k, n', k', x) := f(T^{k'} x_0) - f(T^k x) + f(x) .$$

First, we wish to show that whenever  $l, m, l', m' \in \mathbb{N}$  provide an alternative relation

$$(10) \quad T^l S^m x = T^{l'} S^{m'} x_0 ,$$

then

$$(11) \quad G(n, k, n', k', x) = G(m, l, m', l', x) .$$

By assumption

$$(12) \quad T^{k+l'} S^{n+m'} x = T^{k'+l'} S^{n'+m'} x_0 = T^{k'+l} S^{n'+m} x$$

holds so using ii) we obtain  $f(T^{k+l'} x) = f(T^{k'+l} x)$ . This, together with the two sides of (12), substituted into the definition (9) of  $G$ , yield

$$\begin{aligned} G(n + m', k + l', n' + m', k' + l', x) &= f(T^{k'+l'} x_0) - f(T^{k+l'} x) + f(x) = \\ (13) \quad &= f(T^{k'+l'} x_0) - f(T^{k'+l} x) + f(x) = G(n' + m, k' + l, n' + m', k' + l', x) . \end{aligned}$$

Again using (9), (12) and the assumption  $\Delta_T \Delta_S f = 0$  (in the form that  $\Delta_{T^a} f(z) = \Delta_{T^a} f(S^b z)$  for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ ) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G(n + m', k + l', n' + m', k' + l', x) - G(n, k, n', k', x) &= \\ &= \left( f(T^{k'+l'} x_0) - f(T^{k+l'} x) + f(x) \right) - \left( f(T^{k'} x_0) - f(T^k x) + f(x) \right) = \\ &= \Delta_{T^{l'}} f(T^{k'} x_0) - \Delta_{T^{l'}} f(T^k x) = \Delta_{T^{l'}} f(T^{k'} S^{n'} x_0) - \Delta_{T^{l'}} f(T^k S^n x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows  $G(n + m', k + l', n' + m', k' + l', x) = G(n, k, n', k', x)$ , while the same way also  $G(n' + m, k' + l, n' + m', k' + l', x) = G(m, l, m', l', x)$  follows, so now (13) implies (11).

All in all, the function

$$g(x) := G(n, k, n', k', x)$$

is well defined on  $B$  (whence on the whole of  $A$ ). Now  $h$  can not be else than  $h := f - g$ . To complete the proof, we show that  $g$  and  $h$  have all necessary properties. Let  $x \in A$  and  $x_0$  be the representative of the class  $B$  of  $x$ : for some  $n, n', k, k' \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $T^k S^n x = T^{k'} S^{n'} x_0$  and hence also

$$T^k S^n (Tx) = T^{k'+1} S^{n'} x_0 \quad \text{and equivalently} \quad T^{k+1} S^n x = T^{k'+1} S^{n'} x_0$$

so we can write

$$\Delta_T g(x) = (f(T^{k'+1} x_0) - f(T^k (Tx)) + f(Tx)) - (f(T^{k'+1} x_0) - f(T^{k+1} x) + f(x)) = \Delta_T f(x).$$

As  $h := f - g$ ,  $\Delta_T h = 0$  is immediate. Finally, we prove that  $\Delta_S g = 0$ . For  $x \in B$  we have by (8) with  $x_0 = y$ , similarly to the above that

$$\Delta_S g(x) = (f(T^{k'} x_0) - f(T^k Sx) + f(Sx)) - (f(T^{k'} x_0) - f(T^k x) + f(x)) = -\Delta_{T^k} \Delta_S f(x) = 0$$

in view of ii).  $\square$

**Remark 2.** If  $TS \neq ST$  then i) does not imply  $\Delta_S \Delta_T f = 0$  in general.

**Remark 3.** Condition i) is symmetric with respect to the pairs  $g, S$  and  $h, T$ . This gives the further equivalent assertion

iii)  $\Delta_S \Delta_T f = 0$ , and if for some  $x \in A$  and  $k, n, k', n' \in \mathbb{N}$  (6) holds, then

$$f(S^n x) = f(S^{n'} x)$$

should also be satisfied.

**Theorem 4.** Let  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  be commuting transformations of  $A$  and let  $f$  be a real function on  $A$ . In order to have a  $(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ -invariant decomposition (3) of  $f$ , the following condition (\*) is necessary.

For every disjoint partition of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  into three parts  $\{h\}$ ,  $\{j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_m\}$  and  $\{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{n-m-1}\}$  (where  $0 \leq m < n$ ), and for every  $z \in A$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ ,  $k' \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $l_1, l'_1, \dots, l_m, l'_m \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying the  $m$  conditions

$$(14) \quad T_h^{k+k'} T_{j_r}^{l_r} z = T_h^{k'} T_{j_r}^{l'_r} z \quad (r = 1, 2, \dots, m),$$

(\*) also the equation

$$(15) \quad \Delta_{T_{i_1}} \dots \Delta_{T_{i_{n-m-1}}} \Delta_{T_h^k} f(T_h^{k'} z) = 0$$

holds true.

**Remark 5.** In case  $m = 0$  (14) is the empty condition, satisfied by all points  $z \in A$  and  $k, k' \in \mathbb{N}$ , hence we obtain (4). Therefore, Condition (\*) contains (4).

*Proof.* We argue by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 1$  the assertion is trivial and for  $n = 2$  we refer to Theorem 1 and Remark 3. Let  $n > 2$  and suppose that the statement of the theorem is true for all  $n' < n$ . If  $m < n - 1$ , then we apply the inductive hypothesis for  $n' = m + 1$  and  $m' = m$  to the function  $f' := \Delta_{T_{i_1}} \dots \Delta_{T_{i_{n-m-1}}} f$ .

If  $m = n - 1$  we can suppose without loss of generality that  $h = n$  and so (14) becomes

$$T_n^{k+k'} T_j^{l_j} z = T_n^{k'} T_j^{l'_j} z \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1) .$$

By the condition of decomposability, i.e., the validity of (3), it suffices to show only that

$$f_j(T_n^{k+k'} z) = f_j(T_n^{k'} z) \quad \text{if} \quad \Delta_{T_j} f_j = 0 .$$

But this holds indeed by

$$f_j(T_n^{k+k'} z) = f_j(T_n^{k+k'} T_j^{l_j} z) = f_j(T_n^{k'} T_j^{l'_j} z) = f_j(T_n^{k'} z) .$$

□

We saw in Theorem 1 that Condition  $(*)$  – or even a subset of the conditions listed in it – provides also a sufficient condition if  $n = 2$ . We push this further next.

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose that  $T_1 = T$ ,  $T_2 = S$  and  $T_3 = U$  commute and the function  $f$  satisfies Condition  $(*)$ . Then  $f$  has a  $(T, S, U)$ -invariant decomposition.*

The proof will be based on the following series of lemmas.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $g \in \mathbb{R}^A$  be a function and  $T$  be a transformation of the set  $A$ . The following statements are equivalent.*

- i) *There exists a function  $h$  for which  $\Delta_T h = g$ .*
- ii)  *$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} g(T^i x) = 0$  whenever  $T^k x = x$ ,  $x \in A$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* If i) holds and  $T^k x = x$  is satisfied for some  $x \in A$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} g(T^i x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left( h(T^{i+1} x) - h(T^i x) \right) = h(T^k x) - h(x) = 0 .$$

Suppose now that ii) holds. We define the equivalence relation:  $x \sim y$  iff  $T^k x = T^l y$  with some  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ . By the axiom of choice, we select a representative of each equivalence class. Then it suffices to give a proper construction of  $h$  on an arbitrarily given equivalence class  $B$  with selected representative  $x_0$ , say.

If both

$$(16) \quad T^m x = T^n x_0 \quad \text{and} \quad T^{m'} x = T^{n'} x_0 ,$$

then also

$$(17) \quad T^{m+n'} x = T^{n+n'} x_0 = T^{n+m'} x .$$

First suppose that  $m' \geq m$  and  $n' \geq n$ , and compute with  $z := T^m x = T^n x_0$  and  $M := \min(n' - n, m' - m)$  and  $N := \max(n' - n, m' - m)$  the relations

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^{n'-1} g(T^i x_0) - \sum_{j=0}^{m'-1} g(T^j x) - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} g(T^i x_0) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} g(T^j x) = \\ & = \sum_{i=n}^{n'-1} g(T^i x_0) - \sum_{j=m}^{m'-1} g(T^j x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n'-n-1} g(T^i z) - \sum_{j=0}^{m'-m-1} g(T^j z) = \pm \sum_{l=M}^{N-1} g(T^l z) . \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose, e.g., that  $N = n' - n \geq M = m' - m$  (the opposite case being similar). In view of (16) we have

$$T^M z = T^{m'-m} z = T^{m'} x = T^{n'} x_0 = T^{n'-n} z = T^N z ,$$

which, in view of ii), immediately gives vanishing of (18).

In case we do not have both the conditions  $m' > m$  and  $n' > n$  let us take  $m'' := m + m' + n'$ ,  $n'' := n + n' + m'$ , and apply, taking also (17) into account, the known case to  $n, m$  and  $n'', m''$

as well as to  $n', m'$  and  $n'', m''$  separately. These considerations then tell us that (18) is always 0 and so

$$(19) \quad h(x) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} g(T^i x_0) - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} g(T^j x) , \quad \text{whenever } T^m x = T^n x_0$$

is a correct definition of a function  $h$ . From (19), property i), whence the assertion, follows easily.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *If  $G : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an arbitrary function and  $T : A \rightarrow A$  is an arbitrary transformation, then there is a function  $g$  and a  $T$ -invariant function  $\gamma$  such that*

$$\Delta_T g = G + \gamma .$$

*Proof.* First of all we define an equivalence relation  $\sim$ . We say that  $x$  and  $y$  are equivalent,  $x \sim y$ , if there exists  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $T^n y = T^m x$ . Of course this is indeed an equivalence relation, and the equivalence class of an element  $x \in A$  is denoted by  $B_x$ . In view of Lemma 7 we are looking for some  $T$ -invariant  $\gamma$  satisfying

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma(T^i x) = - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} G(T^i x) , \quad \text{whenever } T^k x = x, \ k \in \mathbb{N} .$$

By  $\Delta_T \gamma = 0$  this is equivalent to the assertion that for every equivalence class  $B_z$  there is a constant  $\gamma = \gamma(B_z)$  such that

$$-\gamma = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} G(T^i x) , \quad \text{if } T^k x = x, \ k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \ x \in B_z .$$

Suppose that  $y \sim x$ ,  $T^k x = x$  and  $T^l y = y$ ,  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}^+$ . By  $x, y \in B_z$  we have  $T^a x = T^b y$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ , and for  $K = kl$  the equations  $T^K x = x$ ,  $T^K y = y$  hold. Now

$$(20) \quad \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} G(T^i y) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} G(T^i y) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=b}^{K-1+b} G(T^i y) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} G(T^i T^a x) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} G(T^i x) ,$$

which means that this quantity is constant for  $x, y$  with the above properties. Define

$$\gamma(x) := \frac{1}{k-l} \sum_{i=l}^{k-1} G(T^i x) , \quad \text{if } T^k x = T^l x, \ k, l \in \mathbb{N}, \ k > l ,$$

and  $\gamma(x)$  arbitrary if there are no such  $k, l$ . By the above this definition is independent of the particular choice of  $k, l$ . If  $x \sim y$  and for  $x$  there are no  $k, l$  satisfying  $T^k x = T^l x$ , neither can exist such  $k, l$  for  $y$ . Thus we see that  $\gamma$  can be chosen to be constant on  $B_z$ . The proof is hence complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $T$  and  $S$  be commuting transformations of the set  $A$ , and let  $G$  be an  $S$ -invariant function. Then there exist functions  $\gamma$  and  $g$  such that  $\Delta_S \gamma = \Delta_S g = 0$ ,  $\Delta_T \gamma = 0$  and*

$$\Delta_T g = G + \gamma .$$

*Proof.* Again we define an equivalence relation,  $x \sim y$  if  $S^n x = S^m y$  for some  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Because of commutativity  $Tx \sim Ty$  whenever  $x \sim y$ . Let us consider  $\tilde{A} := A/\sim$  and define  $\tilde{T}(B_x) := B_{Tx}$ , where, in general,  $B_z$  stands for the equivalence class of  $z$ . By the above the transformation  $\tilde{T}$  is well-defined. Since  $G$  is  $S$ -invariant, it is constant on each equivalence class  $B_x$ , so  $\tilde{G}(B_x) := G(x)$  is a correct definition of a real-valued function on  $\tilde{A}$ . Applying Lemma 8 to  $\tilde{A}$ ,  $\tilde{T}$ ,  $\tilde{G}$  we obtain the functions  $\tilde{\gamma}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  with  $\Delta_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{g} = \tilde{G} + \tilde{\gamma}$  and  $\Delta_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{\gamma} = 0$ . Defining  $g$  and  $\gamma$  to be constant on each equivalence class of  $\sim$ :

$$g(x) := \tilde{g}(B_x), \quad \gamma(x) = \tilde{\gamma}(B_x)$$

we see immediately that  $\Delta_S \gamma = \Delta_S g = 0$ . Obviously  $\Delta_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{g} = \tilde{G} + \tilde{\gamma}$  implies  $\Delta_T g = G + \gamma$  and  $\Delta_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{\gamma} = 0$  implies  $\Delta_T \gamma = 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $T, S$  be commuting transformations of  $A$  and let  $G$  be a function satisfying  $\Delta_S G = 0$ . Then there exists a function  $g : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying both  $\Delta_S g = 0$  and  $\Delta_T g = G$  if and only if*

$$(21) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} G(T^i x) = 0 \quad \text{whenever} \quad T^k S^l x = S^{l'} x, x \in A, k, l, l' \in \mathbb{N}.$$

*Proof.* It is obvious that existence of a function  $g$  with the above requirements implies (21) (cf Lemma 7), hence we are to prove sufficiency of this condition only.

We can argue similarly as in the proof of Lemma 9, but using Lemma 7 in place of Lemma 8.

Namely, as  $G$  is  $S$ -invariant, we can consider the equivalence relation  $x \sim y$  iff  $S^n x \sim S^m y$  for some  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and define  $\tilde{G}$  on the set of equivalence classes  $\tilde{A} := A/\sim$  as the common value  $G(x)$  of the function  $G$  on the whole class  $B_x$ . Also, by commutativity,  $T$  generates a well-defined transformation  $\tilde{T}$  of  $\tilde{A}$ . With this definition, Lemma 7 applies to  $\tilde{G}$  and  $\tilde{T}$ ; note that in  $\tilde{A}$  two classes are related with respect to  $\tilde{T}$  as  $\tilde{T}^{k'}(B_x) = B_x$  iff the condition in (21) holds. Therefore, (21) is equivalent to condition ii) of Lemma 7 when applied to the function  $\tilde{G}$  on the set  $\tilde{A}$  and the transformation  $\tilde{T}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 11.** Combining the last two lemmas, one can see that  $\Delta_T g = G$  is equivalent to the requirement that  $\gamma(x) = 0$  whenever  $T^k S^l x = S^{l'} x$ ,  $x \in A$ ,  $k, l, l' \in \mathbb{N}$ ; moreover, any proper  $\gamma$  in Lemma 9 must satisfy

$$(22) \quad \gamma(x) = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} G(T^i x) \quad \text{whenever} \quad T^k S^l x = S^{l'} x, x \in A, k \in \mathbb{N}^+, l, l' \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In particular,

$$(23) \quad \gamma(x) = -\frac{1}{k-k'} \sum_{i=k'}^{k-1} G(T^i x) \quad \text{if} \quad T^k S^l x = T^{k'} S^{l'} x, k, k', l, l' \in \mathbb{N}, k - k' > 0.$$

Furthermore, looking at the proof of Lemma 8, we see that if no such conditions as in (23) are satisfied for  $x$ , then  $\gamma(x)$  can be chosen to be an arbitrary constant on each equivalence class of  $\sim_{TS}$ , where  $x \sim_{TS} y$  if  $S^a T^b x = S^{a'} T^{b'} y$ , for some  $a, b, a', b' \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 6.* Take  $\Delta_T f = F$ . By Condition (\*) we have

$$(24) \quad \Delta_T \Delta_U \Delta_S f = 0, \quad \text{that is} \quad \Delta_U \Delta_S F = 0.$$

Further, also by Condition (\*), if  $U^{k+k'} S^n x = U^{k'} S^{n'} x$ , then

$$(25) \quad \Delta_T \Delta_U f(U^{k'} x) = 0, \quad \text{that is} \quad F(U^{k+k'} x) = F(U^{k'} x).$$

The equations (24) and (25) show that ii) of Theorem 1 is fulfilled. This implies the existence of  $S$ - and  $U$ -invariant functions  $H$  and  $L$  respectively with

$$F = H + L.$$

We apply Lemma 9 to obtain the real-valued functions  $h, l, \chi, \lambda$  with

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_T h &= H + \chi, & \Delta_S h &= \Delta_S \chi = \Delta_T \chi = 0, \\ \Delta_T l &= L + \lambda, & \Delta_U l &= \Delta_U \lambda = \Delta_T \lambda = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $g := f - h - l$ , then  $f = g + h + l$  and  $\Delta_S h = \Delta_U l = 0$ , while  $\Delta_T g = \Delta_T(f - h - l) = F - \Delta_T h - \Delta_T l$ . So using now the decomposition  $F = H + L$  and (26), we arrive at  $\Delta_T g = (H + L) - (H + \chi) - (L + \lambda) = -\chi - \lambda$ .

To illustrate the merit of the next argument, let us assume first that  $T^k x = x$  for some  $x \in A$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ . Then we can refer to Lemma 7 again. We have seen that the function  $\gamma := -(\chi + \lambda) = \Delta_T g$ , hence condition i) of the lemma is satisfied and  $\gamma$  must satisfy the equivalent condition ii). On the other hand,  $\gamma$  is also  $T$ -invariant by construction (see (26)), hence ii) of Lemma 7 can be satisfied if only  $\gamma(T^i x) = 0$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, k$ . Therefore, in case

$T^k x = x$  for some  $x \in A$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ , we already have  $\Delta_T g(x) = \gamma(x) = 0$ . Note also that, because of the  $T$ -invariance of  $\gamma$ , for any  $y \in A$  with  $T^n x = T^m y$  for some  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  one must have  $\Delta_T g(y) = \Delta_T g(x)$ , in particular  $\Delta_T g(y) = 0$  if  $x$  is as before.

Our aim is to obtain the same thing in general, for all over  $A$ . In the definition of  $\chi$  and  $\lambda$  we may have certain flexibility. Exploiting this and choosing both functions carefully we will have  $\gamma = -(\chi + \lambda) = 0$ . For this purpose, we define an equivalence relation

$$(27) \quad x \sim y \quad \text{iff} \quad T^a S^b U^c x = T^{a'} S^{b'} U^{c'} y \quad \text{for some } a, b, c, a', b', c' \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It suffices to restrict considerations to one equivalence class  $B_z = \{y \in A : z \sim y\}$ , so without loss of generality we can work only on  $B_z$  assuming tacitly  $A = B_z$ .

By Remark 11, we can not choose  $\chi(x)$  for some  $x$  arbitrarily if some relation of the type

$$(28) \quad T^k S^l x = T^{k'} S^{l'} x, \quad k, k', l, l' \in \mathbb{N}, k > k'$$

holds true. Let us call such points  $x$   $(S, T)$ -prescribed. Suppose first that there are neither  $(S, T)$ -prescribed nor  $(U, T)$ -prescribed points. In this case we can choose both  $\chi$  and  $\lambda$  to be, e.g., constant 0 on  $A$ .

By symmetry, we can assume that there are  $(S, T)$ -prescribed points. We will show that in this case  $\chi$  can be also chosen to be a constant. So let now  $x \in A$  be fixed and satisfying (28). Then

$$(29) \quad \chi(x) = -\frac{1}{k - k'} \sum_{i=k'}^{k-1} H(T^i x)$$

must hold by Remark 11. Moreover relations as in (28) hold for all  $y \in A$ ,  $y \sim_{TS} x$  (where  $x \sim_{TS} y$  iff  $S^a T^b x = S^{a'} T^{b'} y$  for some  $a, b, a', b' \in \mathbb{N}$ , as in Remark 11). Conversely if  $y$  is not  $(S, T)$ -prescribed, then  $y$  can not be in  $\sim_{TS}$  relation with the above  $x$ , and by Remark 11, the value of  $\chi$  can be chosen to be an arbitrary constant on the whole  $\sim_{TS}$ -class of  $y$ . So let this constant be  $\gamma(x)$  ( $x$  is the above fixed element). Now, as there might exist elements  $y \in A$  having (28), we show that  $\chi(y) = \chi(x)$  for all such  $y$  (regardless whether  $y \sim_{TS} x$  holds or not). To this end, notice first that the relation  $T^k S^l Ux = T^{k'} S^{l'} Ux$  is also valid. So using  $\Delta_U L = 0$  and thus  $\Delta_U H = \Delta_U F = \Delta_T \Delta_U f$ , we compute

$$(30) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_U \chi(x) &= \chi(Ux) - \chi(x) = -\frac{1}{k - k'} \sum_{i=k'}^{k-1} H(T^i Ux) + \frac{1}{k - k'} \sum_{i=k'}^{k-1} H(T^i x) = \\ &= -\frac{1}{k - k'} \sum_{i=k'}^{k-1} \Delta_U H(T^i x) = -\frac{1}{k - k'} \sum_{i=k'}^{k-1} \Delta_U F(T^i x) = \Delta_U \Delta_{T^{k-k'}} f(T^{k'} x) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

the last step being an application of Condition (\*) for the  $m = 1$  equation  $T^k S^l x = T^{k'} S^{l'} x$  (remember the same argument works for  $y$ , too). Because by assumption  $T^a S^b U^c x = T^{a'} S^{b'} U^{c'} y$  holds for some  $a, b, c, a', b', c' \in \mathbb{N}$ , we obtain (using also  $\chi(Ux) = \chi(x)$ ,  $\chi(Uy) = \chi(y)$ , as proved above, and the  $S$ - and  $T$ -invariance of  $\chi$ ) that

$$\chi(x) = \chi(T^a S^b U^c x) = \chi(T^{a'} S^{b'} U^{c'} y) = \chi(y),$$

which shows that  $\chi$  is indeed constant on the whole of  $A$ . Now, if there is no  $(U, T)$ -prescribed point, then there is absolute freedom in choosing  $\lambda$ , so we can define it to be the negative of the constant value of  $\chi$ . We obtain  $\gamma = -(\chi + \lambda) = 0$  as required.

To complete the proof, suppose that there exists an  $y \in A$  which is both  $(S, T)$ - and  $(U, T)$ -prescribed. That is (28) holds with  $y$  replacing  $x$  and

$$(31) \quad T^m U^n y = T^{m'} U^{n'} y \quad \text{for some } m, m', n, n' \in \mathbb{N}^+, m > m'.$$

From this and (28) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} T^{(m-m')(k-k')} U^{n(k-k')} T^{m'+k'} y &= U^{n'(k-k')} T^{m'+k'} y, \quad \text{and} \\ T^{(m-m')(k-k')} S^{l(m-m')} T^{m'+k'} y &= S^{l'(m-m')} T^{m'+k'} y, \end{aligned}$$



so writing  $y' = T^{m'+k'}y$ , we arrive at  $T^K U^N y' = U^{N'} y'$  and  $T^K S^L T y' = S^{L'} y'$ , with appropriate  $K, L, N, L', N' \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $K > 0$ . Thus, by Remark 11, we must have

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} \chi(y') &= -\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} H(T^i y') , \quad \text{since } T^K S^L y' = U^{L'} y' , \quad \text{and} \\ \lambda(y') &= -\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} L(T^i y') , \quad \text{since } T^K U^N y' = U^{N'} y' . \end{aligned}$$

Summing and using the decomposition of  $F$  we obtain

$$(33) \quad \gamma(y') = -(\chi(y') + \lambda(y')) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} F(T^i y') = \frac{1}{K} \Delta_{T^K} f(y') = 0 ,$$

in view of the  $m = 2$  equations on the right of (32) and the application of Condition (\*). Moreover, by the  $T$  invariance of  $\chi$  and  $\lambda$  (hence of  $\gamma$ ), we have  $\gamma(y) = \gamma(T^{m'+k'}y) = \gamma(y') = 0$ . Suppose that  $x$  and  $y$  are  $(S, T)$ - resp.  $(U, T)$ -prescribed, i.e., that (28) and (31) hold. Since  $x \sim y$ , by definition ( $z := T^a S^b U^c x = T^{a'} S^{b'} U^{c'} y$ , for some  $a, b, c, a', b', c' \in \mathbb{N}$ ). But then  $z$  is both  $(S, T)$ - and  $(U, T)$ -prescribed, thus by the above, we obtain

$$\chi(x) = \chi(T^a S^b U^c x) = \chi(z) = -\lambda(z) = -\lambda(T^{a'} S^{b'} U^{c'} y) = -\lambda(y) .$$

This shows that  $\lambda(y)$  is just the constant value of  $-\chi$ . Of course on the the not  $(U, T)$ -prescribed points we can define  $\lambda$  to be the negative of the  $\chi$ . Thus  $\gamma = 0$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

We close this section by the natural question if Condition (\*) is equivalent to (3) for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

### 3. FURTHER RESULTS FOR UNRELATED TRANSFORMATIONS

We call two commuting transformations  $S, T$  on  $A$  *unrelated*, iff  $T^n S^k x = T^m S^l x$  can occur only if  $n = m$  and  $k = l$ . In particular, then neither of the two transformations can have any cycles in their orbits, nor do their joint orbits have any recurrence.

If all pairs from among the transformations  $T_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) are unrelated, then Condition (\*) degenerates, as in (14) we necessarily have  $k = 0$ , and (15) becomes obvious in view of  $T^k = I$  and  $\Delta_I = \mathbf{0}$ , the zero operator. Therefore, in this degenerate, but important case only the  $m = 0$  part of Condition (\*) remains in effect. We saw in Remark 5 that it is exactly the difference equation (4).

As an application in a special situation, consider now the case when the set  $A := \mathbb{R}$  and the transformations are just shifts by real numbers. It is easy to see that  $T_\alpha$  and  $T_\beta$ , the shift operators by  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , are unrelated iff  $\alpha/\beta$  is irrational. Therefore, for  $n = 3$  we obtain the following special case from Theorem 6.

**Corollary 12.** *Let  $\alpha_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) be nonzero real numbers so that  $\alpha_i/\alpha_j$  are irrational whenever  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ . Then the conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent.*

We stated the above corollary for general  $n$  since for unrelated transformations it can be proved for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In fact, the following more general form holds.

**Theorem 13.** *If the transformations  $T_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) are pairwise (commuting and) unrelated, then the difference equation (4) is equivalent to the existence of some invariant decomposition (3).*

*Proof.* The cases for low  $n$  being obvious, we argue by induction. Existence of an invariant decomposition (3) clearly implies the difference equation (4) for any set of pairwise commuting transformations, unrelated or not, hence it suffices to deal with the converse direction.

Let then  $F := \Delta_{T_{n+1}} f$ . As the  $n + 1$ -level difference equation of  $f$  is inherited by  $F$  as an  $n$ -level one, by the inductive hypothesis we can find an invariant decomposition of  $F$  in the form

$$(34) \quad F = F_1 + \dots + F_n , \quad \text{where} \quad \Delta_{T_j} F_j = 0 \quad (j = 1, \dots, n) .$$

Since  $T_{n+1}$  and  $T_j$  are unrelated for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , the condition (21) in Lemma 10 is void, and therefore the "lift ups"  $f_j$  with  $\Delta_{T_j} f_j = 0$ ,  $\Delta_{T_{n+1}} f_j = F_j$  exist for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Therefore,  $f_{n+1} := f - f_1 - \dots - f_n$  provides a function satisfying  $\Delta_{T_{n+1}} f_{n+1} = F - F_1 - \dots - F_n = 0$ , whence a decomposition of  $f$  is established.  $\square$

#### 4. ON INVARIANT DECOMPOSITIONS OF BOUNDED FUNCTIONS

Finally, let us mention a complementary result, which concerns bounded functions, thus is not fully in scope here, but is similar in nature regarding the absolutely unrestricted structural framework of transformations and functions.

**Proposition 14.** *Let  $A$  be any set,  $T, S : A \rightarrow A$  arbitrary commuting transformations, and let  $G : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be any function satisfying  $\Delta_S G = 0$ . Then the following two assertions are equivalent.*

i)  $\exists H : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded function such that  $\Delta_T H = G$  and  $\Delta_S H = 0$ .

ii)  $\exists C < \infty$  constant such that  $\left| \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} G(T^i x) \right| \leq C$  whenever  $x \in A$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Moreover,  $\|H\|_\infty \leq 2C$  and  $C \leq \|H\|_\infty$  hold in these implications.

*Proof.* The implication i)  $\Rightarrow$  ii) is immediate with  $C := 2\|H\|_\infty$ , since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} G(T^i x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Delta_T H(T^i x) = H(T^m x) - H(x).$$

The proof of the converse direction ii)  $\Rightarrow$  i) goes along similar lines to the above, hence we skip the details.  $\square$

We mention this as an example of the case when the class of functions on  $A$  we deal with is  $B(A)$ , the set of all bounded functions. It is known that  $B(A)$  has the decomposition property, see [8] and also [1], but the exact norm inequalities are not known and very likely depend on the transformations, in particular properties like unrelated and alike. On the other hand it is remarkable, that if  $f$  is bounded, then no further conditions, neither on the transformations nor on  $f$  are involved: (4) itself implies (3). It would be interesting, but perhaps difficult, to determine the best general bound for the norms of individual terms in (3) once  $\|f\|$  is given.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Z. GAJDA: Note on decomposition of bounded functions into the sum of periodic terms, *Acta Math. Hung.* **59**(1992), no. 1-2, 103–106.
- [2] V.M. KADETS, S.B. SHUMYATSKIY: Averaging Technique in the Periodic Decomposition problem, *Mat. Fiz. Anal. Geom.* **7**(2000), no. 2, 184–195.
- [3] V.M. KADETS, S.B. SHUMYATSKIY: Additions to the Periodic decomposition theorem, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **90**(2001), no. 4, 293–305.
- [4] T. KELETI: Difference functions of periodic measurable functions, PhD dissertation, ELTE, Budapest, 1996.
- [5] T. KELETI: On the differences and sums of periodic measurable functions, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **75**(1997), no. 4, 279–286.
- [6] T. KELETI: Difference functions of periodic measurable functions, *Fund. Math.* **157**(1998), 15–32.
- [7] M. LACZKOVICH, SZ.GY. RÉVÉSZ: Periodic decompositions of continuous functions *Acta Math. Hungar.* **54**(1989), no. 3-4, 329–341.
- [8] M. LACZKOVICH, SZ.GY. RÉVÉSZ: Decompositions into periodic functions belonging to a given Banach space *Acta Math. Hung.* **55** (3-4) (1990), 353–363.
- [9] M. WIERDL: Continuous functions that can be represented as the sum of finitely many periodic functions, *Mat. Lapok* **32** (1984) 107–113 (in Hungarian).

ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE  
 HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
 REÁLTANODA U. 13–15  
 H-1053, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY  
 E-mail address: farkasb@renyi.hu  
 E-mail address: revesz@renyi.hu