## HOW COMBINATORICS AND ANALYSIS INTERACT

## 1. LOOMIS-WHITNEY INEQUALITY

Let X be a set of unit cubes in the unit cubical lattice in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and let |X| be its volume. Let  $\Pi_j$  be the projection onto the  $x_j^{\perp}$  hyperplane. The motivating question is: if  $\Pi_j$  is small for all j, what can we say about |X|?

**Theorem 1.1** (Loomis-Whitney 50's). If  $|\Pi_i(X)| \leq A$ , then  $|X| \leq A^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$ .

**Remark.** The sharp constant in the  $\leq$  is 1. The original proof is by using H older's inequality repeatedly.

Define a *column* to be the set of cubes obtained by starting at any cube and taking all cubes along a line in the  $x_j$ -direction.

**Lemma 1.2** (Main lemma). If  $\sum |\Pi_j(X)| \leq B$ , then there exists a column of cubes with between 1 and  $B^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$  cubes of X.

*Proof.* Suppose not, so every column has  $> B^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$  cubes. This means that there are  $> B^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$  cubes in some  $x_1$ -line. Taking the  $x_2$ -lines through those, there are  $> B^{\frac{2}{n-1}}$  cubes in some  $x_1, x_2$ -plane, and so on. Repeating this n-1 times, we get > B cubes in the  $x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}$ -plane, a contradiction.

**Corollary 1.3.** If  $\sum_{j} |\Pi_{j}(X)| \leq B$ , then  $|X| \leq B^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$ .

*Proof.* Let X' be X with its smallest column removed. Then  $\sum |\Pi_j(X')| \leq B - 1$ , so by induction we get  $|X'| \leq (B-1)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$ , hence  $|X| \leq B^{\frac{1}{n-1}} + |X'|$ .

Note that Corollary 1.3 implies Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 1.4** (more general Loomis-Whitney). If U is an open set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $|\Pi_i(U)| \leq A$ , then  $|U| \leq A^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$ .

*Proof.* Take  $U_{\varepsilon} \subset U$  be a union of  $\varepsilon$ -cubes in  $\varepsilon$ -lattice. Then  $|U_{\varepsilon}| \leq A^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$  and  $|U_{\varepsilon}| \to |U|$ .

**Corollary 1.5** (Isoperimetric inequality). If U is a bounded open set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $Vol_n(U) \leq Vol_{n-1}(\partial U)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}.$ 

Date: November 28, 2012.

<sup>1</sup> 

*Proof.* By projection onto translates of each  $x_j$ -hyperplane, we see that  $|\Pi_j(U)| \leq \operatorname{Vol}_{n-1}(\partial U)$ , so we may apply Theorem 1.4.

**Remark.** The fact that U was bounded was used to define the projection of U onto translates of each  $x_j$ -hyperplane.

## 2. Sobolev Inequality

Let  $u \in C^1_{\text{comp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  satisfy  $\int |\nabla u| = 1$ . How big can u be? We would like the find the right notion of size for u that answers this question.

**Theorem 2.1** (Sobolev inequality). If  $u \in C^1_{comp}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , then

$$||u||_{L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \lesssim ||\nabla u||_{L^1}.$$

Here, the  $L^p$ -norm  $||u||_{L^p}$  is given by

$$||u||_{L^p} = \left(\int |u|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

so that  $||h \cdot \chi_A||_p = h \cdot |A|^{1/p}$ . For some context about  $L^p$ -norms, for a function u, let  $S(h) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |u(x)| > h\}.$ 

**Proposition 2.2.** If  $||u||_p \leq M$ , then  $|S(h)| \leq M^p h^{-p}$ .

*Proof.* Just estimate  $M^p = \int |u|^p \ge h^p |S(h)|$ .

We now prove the Sobolev inequality. A first try is the following bound.

Lemma 2.3. If  $u \in C^1_{comp}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $|\Pi_j(S(h))| \le h^{-1} \cdot ||\nabla u||_{L^1}$ .

*Proof.* For  $x \in S(h)$ , take a line  $\ell$  in the  $x_j$ -direction. It eventually reaches a point x' where u = 0, so  $\int_{\ell} |\nabla U| \ge h$  by the fundamental theorem of calculus. This means that

$$||\nabla u||_{L^1} \ge \int_{\Pi_j(S(h)) \times \mathbb{R}} |\nabla u| = \int_{\Pi_j(S(h))} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\nabla u| dx_j dx_{\text{other}} \ge |\Pi_j(S(h))| \cdot h. \quad \Box$$

If we apply Theorem 1.4 to the output of Lemma 2.3, we see that

$$|S(h)| \lesssim h^{-\frac{n}{n-1}} \cdot ||\nabla u||^{\frac{n}{n-1}},$$

which looks like the output of Proposition 2.2. So we would like to establish something like the converse in this case. For this, we require a more detailed analysis.

**Lemma 2.4** (Revised version of Lemma 2.3). Let  $S_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 2^{k-1} \leq |u(x)| \leq 2^k\}$ . If  $u \in C^1_{comp}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , then we have

$$|\Pi_j S_k| \lesssim 2^{-k} \int_{S_{k-1}} |\nabla u|.$$

*Proof.* For  $x \in S_k$ , draw a line  $\ell$  in the  $x_j$ -direction through x. There is a point x' on  $\ell$  with u(x') = 0. Between x and x', there is some region on  $\ell$  where |u| is between  $2^{k-2}$  and  $2^{k-1}$ . Then we see that along each such  $\ell$ , we have

$$\int_{S_{k-1}\cap\ell} |\nabla u| \ge \frac{1}{4} 2^k.$$

Summing this along all  $\ell$  perpendicular to a translate of the  $x_j$ -hyperplane yields the result.

Corollary 2.5. 
$$|S_k| \lesssim 2^{-k\frac{n}{n-1}} \left( \int_{S_{k-1}} |\nabla u| \right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$$

Proof. Put Lemma 2.4 into Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Take the estimate

$$\int |u|^{\frac{n}{n-1}} \sim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |S_k| 2^{k\frac{n}{n-1}} \lesssim \sum_k \left( \int_{S_{k-1}} |\nabla u| \right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}} \le \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u| \right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$$

where in the last step we move the sum inside the  $\frac{n}{n-1}$ -power.

**Remark.** The sharp constant in Theorem 2.1 is provided by a smooth approximation to a step function where the width of the region of smoothing is very small.

## 3. $L^p$ estimates for linear operators

If  $f, g: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ , define the *convolution* to be

$$(f\star g)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y)g(x-y)dy$$

We can explain this definition by the following story. Suppose there is a factory at 0 which generates a cloud of pollution centered at 0 described by g(-y). If the density of factories at x is f(x), then the final observed pollution is  $f \star g$ .

We would like to study linear operators like  $T_{\alpha}f := f \star |x|^{-\alpha}$ , which means explicitly that

$$T_{\alpha}f(x) = \int f(y)|x-y|^{-\alpha}dy.$$

We will take  $\alpha$  in the range  $0 < \alpha < n$ , so that if  $f \in C^0_{\text{comp}}$  then the integral converges for each x. Operators like these occur frequently in PDE. Another example is the initial value problem for the wave equation.

**Example.** Let us first see how  $T_{\alpha}$  behaves on some examples for f.

1.  $\chi_{B_1}$ , where  $B_r$  is the ball of radius r. We see that

$$|T_{\alpha}\chi_{B_1}(x)| \sim \begin{cases} 1 & |x| \le 1\\ |x|^{-\alpha} & |x| > 1. \end{cases}$$

2.  $\chi_{B_r}$ . We see that

$$|T_{\alpha}\chi_{B_r}(x)| \sim \begin{cases} r^n \cdot r^{-\alpha} & |x| \le r\\ r^n \cdot |x|^{-\alpha} & |x| > r. \end{cases}$$

2.1  $\delta$ , the delta function. Morally, this is given by  $\lim_{n\to\infty} r^{-n}\chi_{B_r}$ .

A question we would like to ask about  $T_{\alpha}$  is the following. Fix  $\alpha$  and n. For which p, q is there an inequality

(1) 
$$||T_{\alpha}f||_q \lesssim ||f||_p$$

for all choices of f?

In some sense, this measures how much bigger  $T_{\alpha}$  can make f. First, we determine the answer in Examples 1 and 2. For Example 1,  $||\chi_{B_1}||_p \sim 1$ , and

$$||T_{\alpha}\chi_{B_1}||_1^1 \sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1+|x|)^{-\alpha q} dx$$

which is finite if and only if  $\alpha q > n$ . So (1) holds in Example 1 if and only if  $\alpha q > n$ . Let us assume this from now on.

For Example 2,  $||\chi_{B_r}||_p \sim r^{n/p}$ . For  $||T_{\alpha}\chi_{B_r}||_q$ , the value is given by two terms, one coming from the ball  $|x| \leq r$  and the outside tail. The condition  $\alpha q > n$  says that the contribution of the tail is finite, so we get the estimate

$$||T_{\alpha}\chi_{B_r}||_q \sim ||r^{n-\alpha}\chi_{B_r}||_q \sim r^{n-\alpha+n/q}.$$

Thus, we conclude that (1) holds in Example 2 if and only if  $\alpha \cdot q > n$  and  $r^{n/p} \lesssim r^{n-\alpha+n/q}$  for all r > 0. The latter condition is equivalent to  $n/p = n - \alpha + n/q$ .

For a general linear operator T, we would like to ask whether

 $||Tf||_q \lesssim ||f||_p$ 

under the conditions that  $\alpha \cdot q > n$  and  $n/p = n - \alpha + n/q$ . If the answer is yes, we conclude that the characteristic functions of balls are in some sense typical for the action of T; otherwise, we would like to understand which functions f this fails for.

18.S997 The Polynomial Method Fall 2012

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: http://ocw.mit.edu/terms.