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#### Abstract

Let $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ denote the Hardy space of real-valued functions on the unit circle with weak derivatives in the usual real Hardy space $\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. It is shown that when the weak derivative of a locally Lipschitz continuous function $f$ has bounded variation on compact sets the Nemytskii operator $F$, defined by $F(u)=f \circ u$, maps $\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ continuously into itself. A further condition sufficient for the continuous Frechet differentiability of $F$ is then added.


## Introductory remarks

Let $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ denote the Banach space of real-valued Lebesgue integrable 'functions' on the unit circle $\mathbf{T}^{1}=\mathbf{R} / 2 \pi \mathbf{Z}$ and let $L \log ^{+} L$ be the linear space of functions $v$ for which $|v| \log (1+|v|) \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. For $v \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, let $\mathcal{C} v$ denote the Hilbert transform of $v$, also known as the function conjugate to $v$, whose value at $x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}$ is given almost everywhere by the Cauchy principle value integral

$$
\mathcal{C} v(x)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{v(y)}{\tan \left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{v(x-y)}{\tan \left(\frac{1}{2} y\right)} d y
$$

A function $v \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is said to be in the real Hardy space $\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{l}}\right)$ if $\mathcal{C} v \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ and, for $v \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, Zygmund's lemma implies that $|v| \in \mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ if and only if $v \in$ $L \log ^{+} L$. (Zygmund's lemma [6, Vol. I, VII, (2.8) and (2.10)] states that if $u \geq \alpha>$ $-\infty$ and $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ then $u \in L \log ^{+} L$.) The Hardy space $\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}=\|u\|_{L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}+\|\mathcal{C} u\|_{L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}$.

Let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function and define a Nemytskii operator [4] $F$ on spaces of functions $u$ by $F(u)=f \circ u$. (Nemytskii operators are sometimes called superposition operators [1], [3].) The mapping $v \mapsto|v|$ is a Nemytskii operator which maps $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ to itself but does not map $\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ to itself.

Let $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ denote the Banach space of all real-valued absolutely continuous functions $u$ on $\mathbf{T}^{1}$ for which $u^{\prime} \in \mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, where the norm is $\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}=$
$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}+\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}$. In [2, Remark 1, p. 200] Janson used $I H\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ to denote our space $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ and observed that a Nemytskii operator $F$ maps $I H\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ into itself if and only if $f$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. (In fact Janson's proof yields the stronger result that a Nemytskii operator maps $\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ into the space $W^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ of absolutely continuous functions on $\mathbf{T}^{1}$ if and only if $f$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, in which case it maps $\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ into itself.)

Here we are concerned with sufficient conditions for continuity and differentiability of $F$ on $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. Marcus and Mizel [3] have shown that any Nemytskii operator from $W^{1,1}\left(\boldsymbol{T}^{1}\right)$ to itself is continuous. While it is not clear whether such a result holds for $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, we will see that $f^{\prime}$ being locally of bounded variation ensures that $F$ maps $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ continuously into itself. (In particular, $u \mapsto|u|$ maps $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ continuously into itself.) We also show that if $f^{\prime \prime}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous then $F$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable on $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$.

The present remarks arose as a natural extension of observations, motivated by questions about functions on the unit disc, in the case $f(t)=\frac{1}{2} t^{2}$ [5]. Recall that for $v \in \mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ the complex-valued function $v+i \mathcal{C} v$ can be interpreted as the boundary values of a holomorphic function $V$ on the unit disc $\mathcal{D}$ in the complex plane. It is well known [6] that the image of $\mathcal{D}$ under $V$ is a connected set, the boundary of which has bounded variation ( $v+i \mathcal{C} v$ has bounded variation on $\left.\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$ if and only if $v+i \mathcal{C} v$ is absolutely continuous. This in turn is equivalent to the fact that $v^{\prime}$, the weak derivative of $v$, is in $\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ in which case $(v+i \mathcal{C} v)^{\prime}=v^{\prime}+i \mathcal{C}\left(v^{\prime}\right)$.

The treatment here, which is independent of [2] and [3], is self-contained and elementary.

## Continuity

Suppose that $f$ is a real-valued function on $\mathbf{R}$ which is locally Lipschitz (Lipschitz continuous on every compact interval) and $u$ is an absolutely continuous function on $\mathbf{T}^{1}$. It follows from first principles that the composition $f \circ u$ is absolutely continuous on $\mathbf{T}^{1}$. Therefore, for almost all $x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}$, the classical derivative of $f \circ u$ at $x$ exists. Note also that $f$ is differentiable at $t$ for almost all $t \in \mathbf{R}$. Suppose now that $t \in \mathbf{R}$ is a point at which $f$ is not differentiable and suppose that $u(x)=t$. Then if $u$ is differentiable with non-zero derivative at $x$ it is easily verified that $f \circ u$ is not differentiable at $x$. From these observations it follows that, no matter what finite value is assigned to $f^{\prime}(t)$ at points $t$ where $f$ is not differentiable, the formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
(f \circ u)^{\prime}(x)=f^{\prime}(u(x)) u^{\prime}(x) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for almost all $x \in \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}$, where ' denotes the classical derivative at points where it
exists. This formula also gives the weak derivative of $f \circ u$ almost everywhere on $\mathbf{T}^{1}$. (The example $f(t)=|t|$ and $u \equiv 0$ illustrates the point discussed in this paragraph.)

Now consider the case when $f$ is convex. At each point $t \in \mathbf{R}$, let $f_{+}^{\prime}(t)$ represent the right derivative of $f$ at $t$. The right derivative always exists and is finite because of convexity, and coincides with the classical derivative almost everywhere. Moreover, at points where the classical derivative $f^{\prime}$ exists, $t \mapsto f_{+}^{\prime}(t)$ is continuous.

If, more generally, $f^{\prime}$ has bounded variation on every compact interval $I$, or equivalently if $f$ is the difference of two convex functions on $I$, the right derivative $f_{+}^{\prime}(t)$ is well-defined for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$. In this case we write $f \in D C$ and put $f^{\prime}=f_{+}^{\prime}$ in (1). If $u$ is absolutely continuous and $f \in D C$ we see from the above discussion that, for almost all $x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}$, the function $G(u): \mathbf{T}^{1} \times \mathbf{T}^{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(u)(x, y)=f(u(y))-f(u(x))-f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x))(u(y)-u(x)) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is differentiable with respect to $y$ at $y=x$, and $\left.(\partial / \partial y) G(u)(x, y)\right|_{y=x}$ is zero for almost all values of $x$. The following slight variant of the dominated convergence theorem will be useful.

Lemma 1. Suppose for a sequence $\left\{\left(g_{n}, h_{n}\right)\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right) \times L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, that $\left|g_{n}\right| \leq h_{n}$ almost everywhere. Suppose also that there exists $(g, h) \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \times L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ such that every subsequence $\left\{\left(g_{n_{k}}, h_{n_{k}}\right)\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of $\left\{\left(g_{n}, h_{n}\right)\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has a subsequence (also denoted by $\left.\left\{\left(g_{n_{k}}, h_{n_{k}}\right)\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}\right)$ with $\left(g_{n_{k}}, h_{n_{k}}\right) \rightarrow(g, h)$ pointwise almost everywhere and $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} h_{n_{k}} d x \rightarrow \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} h d x$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then $g_{n} \rightarrow g$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. In particular, if the hypotheses are satisfied with $g_{n}=h_{n}$, then $h_{n} \rightarrow h$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$.

Proof. Suppose that $g_{n} \nrightarrow g$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then there is a number $\alpha$ and a subsequence with $\left\|g_{n_{k}}-g\right\|_{L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)} \geq \alpha>0$ for all $k$. From the hypothesis we may assume that $\left(g_{n_{k}}, h_{n_{k}}\right) \rightarrow(g, h)$ pointwise almost everywhere. Hence, by Fatou's lemma,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} 2 h d x & \leq \liminf _{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left(h+h_{n_{k}}-\left|g_{n_{k}}-g\right|\right) d x \\
& =\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} 2 h d x+\liminf _{k \rightarrow \infty}-\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|g_{n_{k}}-g\right| d x
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that $0 \leq-\lim \sup _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|g_{n_{k}}-g\right\|_{L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)} \leq-\alpha<0$, which contradiction proves the claim.

Recall the properties of $\mathcal{C}$ and of integrability- $B$, which is defined in Zygmund [6].
(i) That $v_{n} \rightarrow v$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ implies that a subsequence $\mathcal{C} v_{n_{k}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} v$ pointwise almost everywhere.
(ii) For $v \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right),|\mathcal{C} v|^{[p]} \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ for all $p \in(0.1)$, where $t^{[p]}=\min \left\{t, t^{p}\right\}$ for $t \geq 0$.
(iii) If $u \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ then $u$ is integrable- B and the two integrals coincide. (We write this as $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u d x=(B) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u d x$.)
(iv) If $u \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$ then $\mathcal{C} u$ is integrable-B and (B) $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathcal{C} u d x=0$.
(v) If $u$ and $v$ are integrable- B , then $u+v$ is integrable- B and

$$
(B) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u d x+(B) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} v d x=(B) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}(u+v) d x
$$

The key is the following observation.
Proposition 2. For $v \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right), v \in \mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ if and only if the positive part of $\mathcal{C} v$ is in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$.

Proof. The 'only if' part is clear from the definition of $\mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$. Suppose that $v \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ and that $u=(\mathcal{C} v)^{+} \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, where $w^{+}(x) \equiv \max \{w(x), 0\}$ for any function $w$. Then $u-\mathcal{C} v \geq 0$ almost everywhere. Therefore, for all $p \in(0,1)$, (ii) $-(\mathrm{v})$ give that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}(u-\mathcal{C} v)^{[p]} d x & =(B) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}(u-\mathcal{C} v)^{[p]} d x \\
& \leq(B) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}(u-\mathcal{C} v) d x=(B) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u d x=\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u d x
\end{aligned}
$$

When $p \nearrow 1$ we learn from Fatou's lemma that $u-\mathcal{C} v \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. Since $u \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, the result follows.

Remark. A trivial consequence of this observation and Zygmund's lemma is that if $u \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ and $\mathcal{C} u \geq \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, then $\mathcal{C} u \in L \log ^{+} L$.

For any absolutely continuous function $u$ and $f \in D C$, let $\mathcal{F}(u)$ be defined for almost all $x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{F}(u)(x) \equiv f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x)) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}(x)-\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)(x) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 3. Suppose that $f$ is convex on $\mathbf{R}$ and $u$ is absolutely continuous on $\mathbf{T}^{1}$. Then $\mathcal{F}(u)(x) \geq 0$ for almost all $x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}$.

Proof. Let $x$ be a point at which the partial derivative of $G(u)(x, y)$ with respect to $y$ at $y=x$ exists and is zero. From (2) and the convexity of $f, G(u)(x, y) \geq 0$ for
all $y \in \mathbf{R}$. Therefore, by definition,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x)) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}(x)-\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)(x) & =\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x))-f_{+}^{\prime}(u(y))\right) u^{\prime}(y)}{\tan \left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y \\
& =-\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{(\partial / \partial y) G(u)(x, y)}{\tan \left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y \\
& =\frac{1}{4 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{G(u)(x, y)}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 4. Suppose $f \in D C$. Then $f \circ u \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$.
Proof. Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. Then there is a compact interval $I$ such that $u(x) \in I$ for all $x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}$. Since $f \in D C$ it suffices to restrict attention to the case when $f$ is convex on $\mathbf{R}$. Since $u^{\prime} \in \mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$ and

$$
\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)=f_{+}^{\prime}(u) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}-\mathcal{F}(u)
$$

we find, from Proposition 3, that $\left(\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)\right)^{+} \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. Hence $f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime} \in \mathcal{H}^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, by Proposition 2. However $f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}$ is the weak derivative of $f(u)$. Hence $f(u) \in$ $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$.

Remark. Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. Then it follows from elementary calculus that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|u(x)-\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u(x) d x\right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|u^{\prime}(x)\right| d x \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore

$$
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u \mathcal{C} u^{\prime} d x \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}^{2}, \quad u \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)
$$

Corollary 5. For $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \frac{1}{8 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left(\frac{u(x)-u(y)}{\sin \left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)}\right)^{2} d y d x=\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u \mathcal{C} u^{\prime} d x \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}^{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. This follows from taking $f(t)=\frac{1}{2} t^{2}$ in the proof of Proposition 3 and integrating over $[-\pi, \pi]$, using Proposition 4 and the preceding remark.

Next we have the following result.

Corollary 6. $\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$ is an algebra in which multiplication is continuous.
Proof. Let $f(t)=\frac{1}{2} t^{2}, t \in \mathbf{R}$, in Proposition 3. For $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ let

$$
0 \leq \mathcal{Q} u(x)=u(x) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}(x)-\mathcal{C}\left(u u^{\prime}\right)(x), \quad x \in \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}
$$

Hence $\left(\mathcal{C}\left(u u^{\prime}\right)\right)^{+} \leq\left|u \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}\right|$ and that $\left\|\left(\mathcal{C}\left(u u^{\prime}\right)\right)^{+}\right\|_{L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}^{2}$ follows. Since $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathcal{C}\left(u u^{\prime}\right) d x=0$ it follows that $\left\|\mathcal{C}\left(\left(u^{2}\right)^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)} \leq 2\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}^{2}$. The result follows.

Let $W^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ denote the Banach space of real-valued absolutely continuous functions on $\mathbf{T}^{1}$ with norm $\|u\|_{W^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}=\|u\|_{L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}+\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}$.

Remark. When $f$ is locally Lipschitz, the Nemytskii operator $F$ maps $W^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ continuously into itself [3], but a simpler result is sufficient here; for completeness we include the proof.

Lemma 7. Suppose that $f \in D C$. Then $F: W^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \rightarrow W^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is continuous.

Proof. Since $f \in D C$ it suffices to consider the case when $f$ is convex on $\mathbf{R}$. In this case, by our earlier discussion, $(F(u))^{\prime}=f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}$ almost everywhere. Let $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $W^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. It suffices to show that $f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{\prime} \rightarrow f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. Since $u_{n}^{\prime} \rightarrow u^{\prime}$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ and $f_{+}^{\prime}$ is bounded on bounded sets, it is enough, using Lemma 1 , to show that every subsequence $\left\{f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n_{k}}\right) u_{n_{k}}^{\prime}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of $\left\{f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{\prime}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has a subsequence which converges pointwise almost everywhere to $f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}$.

Every subsequence of $\left\{u_{n_{k}}^{\prime}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ has a subsequence (also denoted by $\left\{u_{n_{k}}^{\prime}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ ) which converges to $u^{\prime}$ on a set $U$ of full measure. Let $E \subset U$ denote the set on which $u^{\prime}$ exists, let $E_{0}=\left\{x \in E: u^{\prime}(x)=0\right\}$ and let $E_{1}=E \backslash E_{0}$. Clearly $f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n_{k}}(x)\right) u_{n_{k}}^{\prime}(x) \rightarrow$ $0=f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x)) u^{\prime}(x)$ for $x \in E_{0}$. Moreover, the earlier discussion ensures that $f^{\prime}(u(x))$ exists for almost all $x \in E_{1}$. Therefore, for almost all $x \in E_{1}$, the function $t \mapsto f_{+}^{\prime}(t)$ is continuous at $t=u(x)$. Hence $f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n_{k}}(x)\right) u_{n_{k}}^{\prime}(x) \rightarrow f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x)) u^{\prime}(x)$ at all such points. We have shown that $f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n_{k}}(x)\right) u_{n_{k}}^{\prime}(x) \rightarrow f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x)) u^{\prime}(x)$ for almost all $x \in E$. Since $E$ has full measure this completes the proof.

Proposition 8. For $f \in D C$, the Nemytskii operator $F: \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is continuous.

Proof. As with the proof of Proposition 4 and Lemma 7, it suffices to prove the result for convex $f$. Also, by Lemma 7 , it is now enough to show that $\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow$ $\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a subsequence of a sequence converging to $u$ in $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. Let $g_{n}=\left(\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right)^{+}$and let $0 \leq M=\sup \left\{f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}(x)\right)\right.$ : $\left.x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}, n \in \mathbf{N}\right\}<\infty$. Then by Proposition 3,

$$
0 \leq g_{n}=\left(\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right)^{+} \leq\left|f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \mathcal{C} u_{n}^{\prime}\right| \leq M\left|\mathcal{C} u_{n}^{\prime}\right|
$$

almost everywhere, for all $n$. By Lemma 7 and (i), every subsequence of $\left\{g_{n}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has a subsequence which converges almost everywhere to $g=\left(\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)\right)^{+}$. Let subsequences be indexed by $n$ and let $h_{n}=M\left|\mathcal{C} u_{n}^{\prime}\right|$. Then $h_{n} \rightarrow h$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, where $h=M\left|\mathcal{C} u^{\prime}\right|$. Now an application of Lemma 1 shows that $g_{n} \rightarrow g$ in $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$. By Proposition $4, \mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{\prime}\right) \in L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ and has zero integral (by (iii) and (iv)). Therefore for a subsequence of the negative parts, $\left(\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{-} \rightarrow\left(\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)^{-}\right.\right.$almost everywhere and $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left(\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{-} d x \rightarrow \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left(\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)^{-} d x\right.\right.$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The result now follows from the last statement in Lemma 1.

Remark. From the preceding proof it follows that if $f$ is convex,

$$
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)(x)\right| d x \leq 2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x)) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}(x)\right| d x
$$

and therefore that $F$ maps bounded sets into bounded sets in $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ when $f^{\prime}$ is locally of bounded variation.

By contrast with the mapping $u \mapsto f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}$, which is continuous from $W^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ to $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, we now show that $u \mapsto f_{+}^{\prime}(u) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}$ need not be continuous from $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ to $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. (As a consequence of this remark and Proposition $8, \mathcal{F}: \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \rightarrow$ $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is well defined but not necessarily continuous when $f \in D C$. If, in addition, $f^{\prime}$ is continuous then it follows from Proposition 8 and the dominated convergence theorem that $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \rightarrow L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is continuous.) First a simple observation.

Lemma 9. Let $u: \mathbf{T}^{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a non-negative smooth function which is zero on an open interval $I$, but not identically zero. Then for all $x, y \in I$ with $x>y$, $\mathcal{C} u(x)-\mathcal{C} u(y)<0$. In particular, $\mathcal{C} u^{\prime} \not \equiv 0$ on $I$.

Proof. Let $x>y, x, y \in I$. Then, since $u \equiv 0$ on $I$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C} u(x)-\mathcal{C} u(y) & =\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{u(x-z)-u(y-z)}{\tan \left(\frac{1}{2} z\right)} d z=-\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{(\partial / \partial z) \int_{y-z}^{x-z} u(t) d t}{\tan \left(\frac{1}{2} z\right)} d z \\
& =-\frac{1}{4 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\int_{y-z}^{x-z} u(t) d t}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} z\right)} d z<0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 10. Suppose that $f(t)=|t|, t \in \mathbf{R}$. Then $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \rightarrow L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is not continuous.

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1, \mathbf{1}}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ be as described in Lemma 9 and let $v \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathbf{1 , 1}}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$ be a non-negative, smooth function which is non-zero and has compact support in $I$. Now for $x$ in the support of $v$ and $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
\left[f_{+}^{\prime}(u+\varepsilon v) \mathcal{C}(u+\varepsilon v)^{\prime}\right]_{x}=\operatorname{sgn}(\varepsilon)\left(\mathcal{C} u^{\prime}(x)+\varepsilon \mathcal{C} v^{\prime}(x)\right)
$$

The result now follows since $\mathcal{C} u^{\prime} \not \equiv 0$ on the support of $v$, by Lemma 9 . This shows that $w \mapsto f_{+}^{\prime}(w) \mathcal{C} w^{\prime}$ is not continuous from $\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ into $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ which, by Proposition 8 , is equivalent to the required result.

Remark. We finish this section with a useful inequality. Suppose that $f$ is convex and that there exists $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta$ such that $\alpha(a-b)^{2} \leq(a-b)\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(a)-f_{+}^{\prime}(b)\right) \leq$ $\beta(a-b)^{2}$ for all $a, b \in I=\left\{u(x): x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}\right\}$, where $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. Then

$$
0 \leq \alpha \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u \mathcal{C} u^{\prime} d x \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_{+}^{\prime}(u) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime} d x \leq \beta \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u \mathcal{C} u^{\prime} d x
$$

To see this simply note by symmetry and the proof of Proposition 3 that, for all $x \in \mathbf{T}^{1}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x)) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}(x) d x & =\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left[f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x)) \mathcal{C} u(x)-\mathcal{C}\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)(x)\right] d x \\
& =\frac{1}{4 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{G(u)(x, y)}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y d x \\
& =\frac{1}{8 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{G(u)(x, y)+G(u)(y, x)}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y d x \\
& =\frac{1}{8 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\left(f_{+}^{\prime}(u(x))-f_{+}^{\prime}(u(y))\right)(u(x)-u(y))}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y d x
\end{aligned}
$$

This identity in the special case when $f(u)=\frac{1}{2} u^{2}$ (see (5)), and the general case when $f_{+}^{\prime}$ satisfy the hypotheses of this remark, combine to give the required result.

## Fréchet differentiability

Suppose now that $f^{\prime \prime}$ is locally Lipschitz. We will show that the Nemytskii operator $F$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable on $\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$. For $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, the obvious candidate for the Fréchet derivative of $F$ at $u$ is the linear operator $L_{u}$ defined by the product

$$
L_{u} v=v f^{\prime}(u), \quad v \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)
$$

Proposition 11. When $f^{\prime \prime}$ is locally Lipschitz the operator $F$ on $\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable and $L_{u}$ is the derivative of $F$ at $u$.

Proof. For $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right), f^{\prime} \circ u \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ depends continuously on $u$, by Proposition 8. Hence, for $v \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, the product $v f^{\prime}(u) \in \mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ depends continuously on $u, v \in \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$, by Corollary 6 . It remains only to show that $L_{u}$ is
the Fréchet derivative of $F$ at $u$. In other words we have to show that when $\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)} \rightarrow 0$,

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left\|F\left(u+v_{n}\right)-F(u)-L_{u} v_{n}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}}{\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1.1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)}}=0
$$

It is easy to see, from the intermediate value theorem and the hypothesis on $f$, that the mappings

$$
u \longmapsto f(u), \quad u \longmapsto f^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}, \quad u \longmapsto f^{\prime}(u) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}
$$

are Fréchet differentiable from $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ into $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ with derivatives

$$
\begin{equation*}
v \longmapsto f^{\prime}(u) v, \quad v \longmapsto f^{\prime \prime}(u) u^{\prime} v+f^{\prime}(u) v^{\prime}, \quad v \longmapsto\left(f^{\prime \prime}(u) \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}\right) v+f^{\prime}(u) \mathcal{C} v^{\prime} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore it suffices to show that the mapping $u \mapsto \mathcal{C}\left(f^{\prime}(u) u^{\prime}\right)$ is Fréchet differentiable from $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ to $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ with derivative

$$
v \longmapsto \mathcal{C}\left(\left(f^{\prime \prime}(u) u^{\prime} v+f^{\prime}(u) v^{\prime}\right)\right.
$$

However, because of the definition of $\mathcal{F}(u)$, given in (3), it suffices to show that $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \rightarrow L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is Fréchet differentiable at $u$ where, as in the proof of Proposition 3,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{F}(u)(x)=\frac{1}{4 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{G(u)(x, y)}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note first that $G(u)(x, y)=H(u(x), u(y))$ where, by Taylor's theorem,

$$
H(a, b)=f(b)-f(a)-f^{\prime}(a)(b-a)=\frac{1}{2} f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)(b-a)^{2}
$$

for some $\xi$ between $a$ and $b$. Let

$$
h(a, b)= \begin{cases}\frac{H(a, b)}{(b-a)^{2}}, & \text { if } a \neq b \\ \frac{1}{2} f^{\prime \prime}(a), & \text { if } a=b\end{cases}
$$

Then $h$ is continuous on $\mathbf{R}^{2}$, and continuously differentiable on the open set where $a \neq b$. At such points

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left.\frac{\partial h}{\partial b}\right|_{(a, b)}=\frac{H(a, b)-H(b, a)}{(a-b)^{3}}=\frac{1}{2} \frac{f^{\prime \prime}(\chi)-f^{\prime \prime}(\zeta)}{a-b}, & \chi, \zeta \in[a, b] \\
\left.\frac{\partial h}{\partial a}\right|_{(a, b)}=2 \frac{H(a, b)-\frac{1}{2} f^{\prime \prime}(a)(b-a)^{2}}{(b-a)^{3}}=\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)-f^{\prime \prime}(a)}{b-a}, & \xi \in[a, b]
\end{array}
$$

(Here $[a, b]$ denotes the closed interval with end-points $a, b$, whether $a \leq b$ or not.) Since $f^{\prime \prime}$ is locally Lipschitz, it follows that $\nabla h$ is uniformly bounded on bounded sets of points $(a, b)$ with $a \neq b$. Note that for $a \neq b$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial h}{\partial b}=\frac{h(a, b)-h(b, a)}{a-b} \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial a}=\frac{2}{b-a}(h(a, b)-h(a, a)) . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For definiteness in formulae later we use the convention that $\nabla h(a, a)=(0,0)$. Now

$$
\begin{align*}
& H\left(a+a^{\prime}, b+b^{\prime}\right)-H(a, b)-2(a-b)\left(a^{\prime}-b^{\prime}\right) h(a, b)-(a-b)^{2} \nabla h(a, b) \cdot\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right) \\
&=(a-b)^{2}\left[h\left(a+a^{\prime}, b+b^{\prime}\right)-h(a, b)-\nabla h(a, b) \cdot\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right)\right]  \tag{9}\\
& \quad+2(a-b)\left(a^{\prime}-b^{\prime}\right)\left[h\left(a+a^{\prime}, b+b^{\prime}\right)-h(a, b)\right]+\left(a^{\prime}-b^{\prime}\right)^{2} h\left(a+a^{\prime}, b+b^{\prime}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

When $a=b$ and $\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right) \in \mathbf{R}^{2}$, then

$$
H\left(a+a^{\prime}, b+b^{\prime}\right)-H(a, b)=\left(a^{\prime}-b^{\prime}\right)^{2} h\left(a+a^{\prime}, b+b^{\prime}\right)
$$

Now for $a \neq b$ and $\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right) \in \mathbf{R}^{2}$ let

$$
k(t)=h\left(a+t a^{\prime}, b+t b^{\prime}\right)-h(a, b)-t \nabla h(a, b) \cdot\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right), \quad t \in[0,1] .
$$

Then $k$ is Lipschitz on $[0,1]$ and is continuously differentiable except possibly at one point $t \in[0,1]$. Therefore for $\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right) \in \mathbf{R}^{2}$ and $a \neq b$

$$
\begin{align*}
K_{1}\left(a, b, a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right) & : \equiv h\left(a+a^{\prime}, b+b^{\prime}\right)-h(a, b)-\nabla h(a, b) \cdot\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right)=k(1)-k(0) \\
& =\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right) \cdot \int_{0}^{1}\left(\nabla h\left(a+t a^{\prime}, b+t b^{\prime}\right)-\nabla h(a, b)\right) d t, \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\left|\int_{0}^{1}\left(\nabla h\left(a+t a^{\prime}, b+t b^{\prime}\right)-\nabla h(a, b)\right) d t\right|
$$

is bounded for ( $a, b, a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}$ ) in bounded sets in $\mathbf{R}^{4}$, and. by the dominated convergence theorem, converges to 0 , as $\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow(0,0)$, for fixed $a \neq b$. Let $K_{1}\left(a, b, a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right)=0$ when $a=b$ and let

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{2}\left(a, b, a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right) \equiv h\left(a+a^{\prime}, b+b^{\prime}\right)-h(a, b) \rightarrow 0 . \quad \text { as }\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right), \rightarrow(0,0) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

uniformly for $(a, b)$ in bounded sets.

Therefore, by (9), for all $u, v \in \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ and $x, y \in \mathbf{T}^{1}$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
H(u(x)+v(x), u(y)+v(y))-H(u(x), u(y))-2(u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y)) h(u(x), u(y)) \\
-(u(x)-u(y))^{2} \nabla h(u(x), u(y)) \cdot(v(x), v(y)) \\
=(u(x)-u(y))^{2} K_{1}(u(x), u(y) \cdot v(x), v(y)) \\
\quad+2(u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y)) K_{2}(u(x), u(y), v(x), v(y)) \\
+(v(x)-v(y))^{2} h(u(x)+v(x), u(y)+v(y)) .
\end{gathered}
$$

It now follows, from Corollary 5 , with (7), (8), (10), (11) and the dominated convergence theorem, followed by an integration by parts, that $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{H}^{\mathbf{1 . 1}}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \rightarrow$ $L^{1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right)$ is Fréchet differentiable at $u$ with derivative

$$
\begin{aligned}
v \mapsto & \frac{1}{4 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{2(u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y)) h(u(x), u(y))}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y \\
+ & \frac{1}{4 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{(u(x)-u(y))(h(u(x), u(y))-h(u(y), u(x)))}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} v(y) d y \\
- & \frac{1}{2 \pi} v(x) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{(u(x)-u(y))(h(u(x), u(y))-h(u(x), u(x)))}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y \\
& =\frac{1}{4 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{(u(x)-u(y)) v(x) f^{\prime \prime}(u(x))+v(y)\left(f^{\prime}(u(y))-f^{\prime}(u(x))\right)}{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y \\
& =\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\left(f^{\prime \prime}(u(x)) v(x)-f^{\prime \prime}(u(y)) v(y)\right) u^{\prime}(y)+\left(f^{\prime}(u(x))-f^{\prime}(u(y))\right) v^{\prime}(y)}{\tan \left(\frac{1}{2}(x-y)\right)} d y \\
& =\left[f^{\prime \prime}(u) v \mathcal{C} u^{\prime}+f^{\prime}(u) \mathcal{C} v^{\prime}\right](x)-\left[\mathcal{C}\left(f^{\prime \prime}(u) v u^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{C}\left(f^{\prime}(u) v^{\prime}\right)\right](x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In the light of (6), this is what is needed to conclude that $F: \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{1}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{1,1}\left(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{1}}\right)$ is Fréchet differentiable at $u$ with derivative $L_{u}$.
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