

HOMEOMORPHISMS AND FOURIER EXPANSION

GADY KOZMA AND ALEXANDER OLEVSKIĪ

ABSTRACT. We survey our recent result that for every continuous function there is an absolutely continuous homeomorphism such that the composition has a uniformly converging Fourier expansion. We mention the history of the problem, originally stated by Luzin, and some details of the proof.

1. INTRODUCTION

Can one improve convergence properties of Fourier series by change of variable? The following theorem was proved by Julius Pál in 1914 [16] in a slightly weaker form, and in the form below by Harald Bohr in 1935 [3]. Salem gave a simplified proof ([18] or [2, §4.12, page 327]). See also [12].

Theorem 1. *For every real function $f \in C(\mathbb{T})$ there exists a homeomorphism $h : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ such that the Fourier series of the superposition $f \circ h$ converges uniformly.*

Proof sketch. Let $f > 0$. Consider the ‘star domain’ $\Omega := \{z = re^{i\theta}, r < f(\theta)\}$ in \mathbb{C} . Let $F(z)$ be the conformal map from D to Ω . Since the boundary of the domain Ω is a Jordan curve, by Caratheodory’s theorem, the map F is a homeomorphism of the boundaries of D and Ω . In other words, $|F(e^{it})| = f(h(t))$ for some homeomorphism h . The essence of the Pál-Bohr Theorem is to show that F belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1/2,2}$ (half a derivative in L^2), and so does $|F|$. Any continuous function in $W^{1/2,2}$ has a uniformly converging Fourier series. \square

The homeomorphism h in this proof is, in general, singular.

Problems (N. N. Luzin).

- (i) Is it possible for any f to find an *absolutely continuous* homeomorphism h such that $f \circ h$ has a uniformly convergent Fourier series?
- (ii) Is it possible to find an h so that the superposition has absolutely convergent Fourier series? Equivalently, $f \circ h$ is in the Wiener Algebra, i.e. in the space of all f whose Fourier coefficients are in $l^1(\mathbb{Z})$?

Both problems first appeared in print in Nina Bari’s book *Trigonometric series* [2, page 330]. The second problem was resolved negatively in 1981 [14].

Theorem 2. *There exist a real function $f \in C(\mathbb{T})$ such that $f \circ h$ is not in the Wiener Algebra whenever h is any homeomorphism of \mathbb{T} .*

Simultaneously, J. P. Kahane and Y. Katznelson [7] proved a complex version of the theorem namely construct a continuous $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which cannot be brought into the Wiener Algebra by a homeomorphism. Equivalently, there are two real functions f and g such that for no homeomorphism h one has that both $f \circ h$ and $g \circ h$ are in the Wiener algebra (thus the complex version is weaker).

Let us sketch the approach of [14]. The main lemma is

Lemma. *Suppose F oscillates from -1 to 1 N times on an interval $[0, \gamma]$. Namely, suppose*

$$F(t) = \sin(Ng(t)) \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq \gamma$$

for some g increasing on $[0, \gamma]$, $g(0) = 0$, $g(\gamma) = 1$. And suppose F vanishes outside $[0, \gamma]$. Then $\|F\|_A > K \log^\alpha N$ where K and $\alpha > 0$ are absolute constants.

Here $\|F\|_A = \sum |\widehat{F}(n)|$. It is instructive to consider the lemma even for g linear. One sees that what makes the A -norm large is that the oscillations ‘end abruptly’. Had they been allowed to reduce gradually to zero, the A norm could have been made constant.

The proof [15, Theorem 3.2] uses an inequality of Davenport. Let us remark that Davenport proved his inequality as part of an improvement of a result of Paul Cohen on Littlewood’s conjecture on trigonometric sums (incidentally, that conjecture was proved at approximately the same time, see [10, 13]).

2. SINGULARITY OF THE HOMEOMORPHISM

The original proof of the Pál-Bohr theorem did not relate directly to the singularity of the homeomorphism, as it came about as the boundary value of a conformal map. It could be regular or singular, depending on the function f (certainly, it is singular in most cases of interest).

Contrariwise, there are proofs of the Pál-Bohr theorem which do not use conformal maps at all, and construct the homeomorphism using the basic idea that a strongly singular homeomorphism can ‘push’ all the problem areas of the function f into an area too small to be noted by the Fourier expansion. We mention two such results, the first due to A. Saakyan [17].

Theorem 3. *Let f be a real function in $C(\mathbb{T})$. Then there is a homeomorphism h such that $\widehat{f \circ h}(n) = o(1/n)$.*

Further, instead of $\{1/n\}$ one can take any decreasing sequence $a(n) > n^{-3/2}$, which is not in l^1 .

Note that the Pál-Bohr theorem follows since a continuous function with Fourier coefficients $o(1/n)$ has a uniformly converging Fourier series. Further, even the $W^{1/2,2}$ formulation follows, since if one takes $a(n) = 1/n \log n$

(which satisfies the requirements of the theorem) then one gets $\widehat{F}(n) = o(1/n \log n)$ which implies $F \in W^{1/2,2}$.

The proof of Saakyan's theorem uses the classical Schauder basis of triangle functions (with dyadic bases) in the space $C(\mathbb{T})$. The core of the proof is showing that for a given f one can construct a homeomorphism h so that the superposition $f \circ h$ has a 'lacunary' Schauder decomposition, in the sense that the support of a triangle of a given dyadic length appears only once. It is easy to see that this property implies the estimate of $\widehat{f \circ h}$.

The second result we mention is due to Kahane and Katznelson [8, Théorème 3].

Theorem 4. *For each compact set $K \subset C(\mathbb{T})$ there is a universal homeomorphism h such that $f \circ h$ has a uniformly convergent Fourier series, whenever f is in K .*

The proof constructs h such that $f \circ h$ is close to being a constant on any interval in the complement of a Cantor set.

It is interesting to note that theorems 3 and 4 cannot be combined. Indeed, a result of Kahane and Katznelson shows that there exists a sequence a not in l^1 such it is not even possible to map two functions simultaneously into the space of functions satisfying $\widehat{f}(n) = o(a(n))$. See [15, Theorem 4.3].

Returning to Luzin's second question, let us mention a result of Kahane and Katznelson [8, Exemple 5] that shows that the homeomorphism in the Pál-Bohr theorem cannot be much better than absolutely continuous.

Theorem 5. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a function f such that for any homeomorphism $h \in C^{1+\varepsilon}$ with $h'(0) \neq 0$ it is not the case that $f \circ h$ has a uniformly converging (or even uniformly bounded) Fourier expansion.*

The example consists in constructing a sequence $a_1 > a_2 > \dots > 0$ decreasing very fast, and taking the function to be on every interval $[a_k, ka_k]$ a sine wave with k peaks. The function is zero outside these intervals (see figure 1). One can then check that a smooth h does not distort the picture (for large k , i.e. small intervals) sufficiently to remove the resonance of the sine wave with the Dirichlet kernel D_r , only to move around the exact r for which this resonance occurs.

We are now ready to present the main new result.

Theorem 6. *For every continuous real function f there exists an absolutely continuous homeomorphism h such that Fourier series of the superposition $f \circ h$ converges uniformly.*

Thus Theorem 6 resolves Luzin's first problem. The full proof appears in [12]. Here we will discuss informally some ideas involved in it.

3. RANDOM HOMEOMORPHISMS

Let us remind the reader our earlier result in the subject [11].




FIGURE 1. The Kahane-Katznelson example.

Theorem 7. *For any $f \in C(\mathbb{T})$ there exists a Hölder homeomorphism h such that $\|S_n(f \circ h)\|_\infty = o(\log \log n)$.*

The proof uses the Dubins-Freedman random homeomorphism [5]. This is a random increasing function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ constructed as follows. Take $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi(1) = 1$. Take $\phi(\frac{1}{2})$ to be uniform between 0 and 1. Then take $\phi(\frac{1}{4})$ to be uniform between 0 and $\phi(\frac{1}{2})$, and $\phi(\frac{3}{4})$ to be uniform between $\phi(\frac{1}{2})$ and 1, and otherwise independent. Continue similarly, taking $\phi(k/2^n)$ to be uniform between $\phi((k-1)/2^n)$ and $\phi((k+1)/2^n)$ for all odd $k \in \{1, 3, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$. Almost surely this can be extended to a Hölder homeomorphism [6]. We may now restate Theorem 7.

Theorem 7'. *For any continuous function f , if ϕ is a Dubins-Freedman random homeomorphism then the Fourier partial sums of the superposition $f \circ \phi$ have norms $o(\log \log n)$ almost surely.*

Certainly, one would not expect a purely random construction to solve Luzin's problem. In fact, the double logarithmic estimate above is sharp (also in [11]). Our hope in 1998 was to solve Luzin's problem using a de Leeuw-Kahane-Katznelson like construction [4], with [11] serving as an element of the construction, but this hope never materialised.

4. RANDOM SIGNS

We shall now define and discuss a 'linearised' version of the problem. For a function f with $\|f\| \leq 1$ consider the partial sums:

$$S_n(f \circ h; x) = \int f(h(t))D_n(x-t) dt,$$

where D_n is the Dirichlet kernel. To make the problem discrete assume that $x = j/n$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

The linearisation we have in mind is to replace the homeomorphism by a multiplication with signs. Instead of $f \circ h$ we replace f in the interval $[k/n, (k+1)/n)$ by $\epsilon_k f$ for some $\epsilon_k = \pm 1$.

Question. Can one find ϵ_k such that

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \epsilon_k \int_{k/n}^{(k+1)/n} f(t) D_n\left(\frac{j}{n} - t\right) dt \right| < C \quad \forall j$$

for a constant C independent of j , n and f ?

The integrals above can be bounded, in absolute value, by $C/(|k-j|+1)$. Hence the following lemma gives the answer.

Lemma 8. *Let $v_{k,j}$ be numbers satisfying $|v_{k,j}| \leq 1/(|k-j|+1)$. Then there are signs ϵ_k such that*

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^n \epsilon_k v_{k,j} \right| < C \quad \forall j.$$

The proof of Theorem 6 in [12] has an analogous linearised lemma (lemma 3.1 in [12]) but its formulation is more complicated due to the need to control partial sums for all n simultaneously.

Nevertheless lemma 8 above captures a significant amount of the difficulty. For example, taking ϵ_k be i.i.d. does not work. The maximum becomes $\approx \log \log n$, which is also the reason for the $\log \log n$ in Theorem 7' above.

For the proof of lemma 8 we use a ‘hierarchical random construction’. By this we mean that we divide the numbers $\{1, \dots, n\}$ to blocks of size K (for some carefully chosen K) and use random signs in each block. In each block it is possible to show that with positive probability one can find signs which give a reasonably good estimate, so we choose these signs. We then take the blocks, divide them into larger scale blocks, and inside each ‘2nd level block’ choose signs randomly to get an improved estimate. Continuing with larger and larger blocks we eventually reach the scale of n . This method is inspired by the ‘renormalisation group’ method in statistical mechanics and field theory. We remark that a similar method was used by B. Kashin [9] in his discrete version of the Menshov correction theorem.

It is interesting to compare Lemma 8 with the the following conjecture of J. Komlos.

Conjecture. *If v_k are vectors in Euclidean space such that $\|v_k\|_2 \leq 1$ for all k then there are signs ϵ_k such that*

$$\left\| \sum_k \epsilon_k v_k \right\|_\infty < C.$$

Had Komlós’ conjecture been known, it would, of course, imply lemma 8. J. Spenser proved that it is true if we allow $\epsilon_k \in [-1, 1]$ and half of them in $\{-1, 1\}$ [19]. See also [1].

5. REMOVING RANDOMNESS

Let us come back to random homeomorphisms. Here we describe the first of the two main ideas involved in the proof of Theorem 6. Starting with a

random homeomorphism of Dubins-Freedman type, we are going to ‘remove randomness’ step by step, keeping the behaviour of the average $\mathbb{E}(f \circ \phi)$ and its partial Fourier sums under control.

Fix a number q , $0 < q < 1$. The first step is to define a variation of the Dubins-Freedman random homeomorphism ψ_q . The only difference from Dubins-Freedman is as follows. Given a dyadic interval $I = [(k-1)/2^n, (k+1)/2^n]$, the image of the point $d = k/2^n$ is defined uniformly distributed on the interval concentric to $\psi(I)$ and of length $q|\psi(I)|$.

Unlike the Dubins-Freedman homeomorphism which was Hölder almost surely, the homeomorphism ψ_q is Hölder *deterministically*, and for small q the smoothness is close to 1. It is indeed rather unusual in probabilistic constructions that the difference between almost sure and deterministic behaviour makes any difference at all, but here it does, as will be clear in a few paragraphs.

Assume a function f is given with $\|f\| = 1$. For dyadic points $d = k/2^n$ with k odd we call n the rank of d . Let n be fixed. Assume that we have a modification of ψ_q (denote it by ϕ), satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) For all dyadic points d of rank $< n$ we have that $\phi(d)$ is not random.
- (ii) For all d of rank n we have that $\phi(d)$ is uniformly distributed over some interval $J(d)$ of length $q2^{-\ell}|\phi(I)|$, concentric to $\phi(I)$. Here ℓ is some parameter independent of d .
- (iii) For all d of higher rank the conditional distributions of $\phi(d)$ remains as it was at the beginning, namely uniform on an interval of length $q|\phi(I)|$, concentric to $\phi(I)$.

We now make the next modification (denote it by ϕ'), changing only the condition (ii). It is replaced by

- (ii') For all d of rank n the image $\phi'(d)$ is uniformly distributed over a half of $J(d)$, upper or lower.

The choice of the half, depending on f , is based on the linearised lemma (Lemma 8, or to be more precise, its variation in [12] which we have not presented). To get a feeling of which matrix we use lemma 8 with, consider the matrix $(v_{k,j})$ (a $2^{n-1} \times 2^{n-1}$ matrix) where the (k,j) entry is the effect of the choice of which half of $J(k2^{-n})$ we take on $\mathbb{E} \int f(\phi'(t)) D_{2^n}(j2^{-n} - t)$.

Note carefully how the problem was linearised. For each odd k we choose only between having $\phi'(k2^{-n})$ uniform in the upper half of $J(k2^{-n})$ and uniform in the lower half of $J(k2^{-n})$. In ϕ the value of $\phi(k2^{-n})$ is uniform on the whole of $J(k2^{-n})$. Thus the distribution of $f \circ \phi$ is exactly the average of the distributions of the two possibilities choices for $f \circ \phi'$. Thus the two possible values of $\mathbb{E} \int (f \circ \phi') D$ average to $\mathbb{E} \int (f \circ \phi) D$. Of course, there are two choices for each k , but the different intervals $[(k-1)2^{-n}, (k+1)2^{-n}]$ behave independently. Thus

$$\int (f \circ \phi) D - \int (f \circ \phi') D = \sum \varepsilon_k v_k$$

where ε_k take the values ± 1 , with $\varepsilon_k = 1$ meaning we took the upper half of $J(k2^{-n})$ and $\varepsilon_k = -1$ meaning we took the lower half of $J(k2^{-n})$. The v_k depend also on the translation of the Dirichlet kernel i.e. on the j in $D_{2^n}(j2^{-n} - t)$ — above when we wrote D we actually meant $D_{2^n}(j2^{-n} - t)$. Thus we get a matrix $(v_{k,j})$ and we are in a position to apply lemma 8.

In the full proof in [12] we need to control D_r for all r so we need many more rows — the k still take only 2^{n-1} values but we need to add to the rows that correspond to $D_{2^n}(j2^{-n} - t)$ also rows that correspond to D_r for $r \neq 2^n$. We get a $2^{n-1} \times \infty$ matrix but with the values decaying as the rows increase.

To sum up, we get that there exists a choice of a corresponding half of $J(d)$ for each d so that all Fourier sums of the function

$$F = \mathbb{E}(f \circ \phi') - \mathbb{E}(f \circ \phi)$$

will be small. More precisely,

$$\|S_r(F)(x)\|_\infty < \exp(-c(\ell + |n - \log_2 r|))$$

(recall that ℓ appeared in requirement (ii), where we had $|J(d)| = q2^{-\ell}|\phi(I)|$).

Now by induction over ℓ (for a fixed n) we get a random homeomorphism ϕ_n , for which all points of rank n become non-random. Then another induction, over n provides a deterministic homeomorphism h .

Summing all the deviations, we get a weaker version of Theorem 6.

Theorem 9. *There is a Hölder homeomorphism h (of any pre-given order < 1) such that $f \circ h$ has bounded Fourier sums.*

At this point the reader might be able to appreciate why it was important that ψ_q , the random homeomorphism we started the process with, was Hölder deterministically and not just almost everywhere. Our process of moving from ϕ to ϕ' in a double induction over ℓ and n reduced the support of the homeomorphism gradually, in a complicated and f -dependent manner. Thus the resulting homeomorphism, h , is not a ψ_q -typical homeomorphism and it is impossible to conclude from the fact that ψ_q satisfies some property with probability 1 anything about h . But *all* homeomorphisms in the support of ψ_q are Hölder, and thus so is h .

We remark also that h^{-1} (the inverse here is as homeomorphisms) is also Hölder, again for any pre-given order < 1 . This is for the same reason: the random homeomorphism we started with, ψ_q , had this property deterministically.

6. ABSOLUTELY CONTINUOUS HOMEOMORPHISMS

The scheme above, started with ψ_q , where q is a constant, allows us to get a Hölder homeomorphism, but not an absolutely continuous one.

To get an absolutely continuous homeomorphism we cannot have our random homeomorphism fluctuate at each scale identically. We need it to fluctuate only where we really need it. For this purpose, we make q not a constant

number but a function of dyadic rationals d , such that the local ‘amount of randomness’ would correspond to local oscillations of f .

Roughly, if f is ‘flat’ on a dyadic interval centered at d , then we do not need much randomness there and we can take the value of $q(d)$ to be small. This makes the homeomorphism smoother which allows us to hope eventually for to get it to be absolutely continuous.

The problem, however, is whether any f has enough ‘flatness’. On the other hand, if $q(d)$ is too small then it provides not enough randomness to kill resonances with the Dirichlet kernel. The Haar decomposition of f plays an important role in our construction. Recall that the Haar functions are

$$1, \mathbb{1}_{[0,1/2]} - \mathbb{1}_{[1/2,1]}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbb{1}_{[0,1/4]} - \mathbb{1}_{[1/4,1/2]}), \dots$$

In other words, other than the function 1, each Haar function is supported on some dyadic interval I of order n and takes the value $|I|^{-1/2}$ on its left half and $-|I|^{-1/2}$ on its right half. We denote this function by χ_I .

Let now I be some dyadic interval and let d by its middle. We define

$$q_f(d) := \frac{1}{|I|^{3/2}} \sum_{J \subseteq I} \langle f, \chi_J \rangle^2 |J|^{1/2}.$$

To get a feeling for the function q , examine it for the case that f is a Radamacher function (a square wave, if you prefer) with 2^n jumps, namely $f(x) = \text{sign}(\sin(2^n \pi x))$. In this case $\langle f, \chi_J \rangle$ is zero unless $|J| = 2^{1-n}$, and in this case $\langle f, \chi_J \rangle = |J|^{1/2}$. Inserting into the formula above we see that $q(\frac{1}{2})$ is quite small ($2^{-(n-1)/2}$ to be precise) and then increases as the rank of d increases, until d with rank n where $q(d) = 1$. For d of higher rank, $q(d) = 0$. This corresponds with the following intuitive understanding how the homeomorphism ψ should be constructed. There’s no reason to let $\psi(\frac{1}{2})$ fluctuate too much (and indeed $q(\frac{1}{2})$ is small). But when reaching points of rank n we certainly want ψ to have the possibility to fluctuate, and indeed there q is large. (Of course, the square wave does not have any resonance with the Dirichlet kernel to start with, because of its regular structure, but the same considerations would hold for a perturbed square wave. For example, take the lengths of all waves, not 2^{-n} like above, but some arbitrary numbers between 2^{-n+1} and 2^{-n-1} . The Haar coefficients will be similar, and so will be q).

Once $q_f(d)$ is defined for all dyadic d in $[0, 1]$, we define the ‘starting’ homeomorphism ψ_q as above. (For technical reasons, it is in fact the inverse homeomorphism ψ_q^{-1} that has a Dubins-Freedman structure. In other words, $q_f(d)$ does not determine how much ψ will fluctuate at d but at $\psi^{-1}(d)$. The reader is referred to the end of section 4 in [12] for a detailed discussion of this point).

We prove:

- (i) The random homeomorphism ψ_f is absolutely continuous deterministically.

- (ii) It admits a process of ‘removing of randomness’, similar to one described in section 5, which finally gives a deterministic homeomorphism h , as required in Theorem 2.

The first claim requires q to be ‘small enough’, while the second requires q to be ‘large enough’. Thus the choice of q is a delicate point in the proof. In particular, in the proof of the first claim, the *John-Nirenberg inequality* for dyadic BMO functions is used to control q .

7. SOME OPEN PROBLEMS

1) Can one get a Lipschitz homeomorphism in Theorem 6? We remind the reader that this is impossible with a $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ homeomorphism, see Theorem 5 above. It might also be worth noting that in Theorem 6 it is possible to require in addition that $h' \in L^p$ for any $p < \infty$, given in advance. Further, the inverse homeomorphism h^{-1} is also absolutely continuous and also has $(h')^{-1} \in L^p$ for any $p < \infty$ (these generalisations are also proved in [12]). But Lipschitz would not follow from the same construction.

2) Is it possible to find for any $f \in C(\mathbb{T})$ a Hölder homeomorphism h such that $f \circ h$ is in \widehat{l}_p , the space of functions whose Fourier transform is in $l_p(\mathbb{Z})$, for some $p > 1$? There are two strengthenings of this question which are known to be false and one weakening which is known to be true. First, it is not possible to have $f \circ h \in \widehat{l}_1$, even without the requirement that h be Hölder (see Theorem 2 above). Next, it is not possible to have $f \circ h \in \widehat{l}_p$ with h an absolutely continuous homeomorphism [15, Theorem 5.1]. Finally, it is possible to have $f \circ h \in \widehat{l}_p$ if one does not care about the smoothness of h , see Theorem 3 above.

Finally, it is interesting to see what the Pál-Bohr approach gives. On the one hand it gives $f \circ h \in W^{1/2,2} \subset \widehat{l}_p$ for all $p > 1$. On the other hand, the homeomorphism h does enjoy some smoothness. It satisfies

$$h(x) - h(y) \leq \frac{C}{|\log(x - y)|} \quad \forall x \neq y.$$

Interestingly, the inverse homeomorphism h^{-1} does not enjoy any smoothness. For any ω with $\omega(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow 0$ it is possible to construct a continuous function f such that the h one gets from the Pál-Bohr theorem does not satisfy $|h^{-1}(x) - h^{-1}(y)| \leq C\omega(|x - y|)$. We will not prove these two claims but we promise the readers that they are relatively standard facts on the behaviour of the harmonic measure.

REFERENCES

- [1] Wojciech Banaszczyk, *Balancing vectors and Gaussian measures of n -dimensional convex bodies*. Random Structures Algorithms 12:4 (1998), 351–360. Available from: wiley.com/3.0.CO;2-S
- [2] Nina K. Bari, *A treatise on trigonometric series*. Vols. I, II. Authorized translation by Margaret F. Mullins. A Pergamon Press Book. The Macmillan Co., New York 1964.

- [3] Harald Bohr, *Über einen Satz von J. Pál*. [German] Acta Math. Sci. Szeged 7:3 (1935), 129–135. Available at: acta.hu/id=5469
- [4] Karel de Leeuw, Yitzhak Katznelson and Jean-Pierre Kahane, *Sur les coefficients de Fourier des fonctions continues*. [French] C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 285 (1977), no. 16, A1001–A1003.
- [5] Lester E. Dubins and David A. Freedman, *Random distribution functions*. 1967 Proc. Fifth Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Probability (Berkeley, Calif., 1965/66) Vol. II: Contributions to Probability Theory, Part 1, pp. 183–214 Univ. California Press, Berkeley, Calif.
- [6] Siegfried Graf, Daniel R. Mauldin and Stanley C. Williams, *Random homeomorphisms*. Adv. Math. 60:3 (1986), 239–359. [sciencedirect/S0001-8708\(86\)80001-9](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870886800019)
- [7] Jean-Pierre Kahane and Yitzhak Katznelson, *Homéomorphismes du cercle et séries de Fourier absolument convergentes*. [French] C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 292:4 (1981), 271–273. Available at: gallica.bnf.fr/f331
- [8] ———, *Séries de Fourier des fonctions bornées*. [French] With an appendix by L. Carleson. Studies in pure mathematics, 395–413, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983. Available at: [springer.com/9783764312886](https://www.springer.com/9783764312886)
- [9] Boris S. Kashin, *О некоторых свойствах пространства тригонометрических многочленов, связанных с равномерной сходимостью*. [Russian: *Some properties of a space of trigonometric polynomials connected with uniform convergence*]. Soobshch. Akad. Nauk Gruzin. SSR 93:2 (1979), 281–284.
- [10] Sergei V. Konyagin, *О проблеме Литтлвуда* [Russian: *On the Littlewood problem*]. Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. 45:2 (1981), 243–265, 463. Available at: mathnet.ru/im1556. English translation in: Math. USSR—Izv. 18:2 (1982), 205–225. Available at: iop.org/H001386
- [11] Gady Kozma and Alexander Olevskii, *Random homeomorphisms and Fourier expansions*. Geometric And Functional Analysis 8:6 (1998), 1016–1042. Available at: [springerlink.com](https://www.springerlink.com)
- [12] ———, *Luzin's problem on Fourier convergence and homeomorphisms*. Proc. Steklov Math. Inst. 319:1 (2022), 124–168. Available at: [springer.com/20511X](https://www.springer.com/20511X), [arXiv:2112.00078](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.00078)
- [13] O. Carruth McGehee, Louis Pigno and Brent Smith, *Hardy's inequality and the L^1 norm of exponential sums*. Ann. of Math. (2) 113:3 (1981), 613–618. Available at: [jstor.org/2007000](https://www.jstor.org/2007000)
- [14] Alexander M. Olevskii, *Замена переменной и абсолютная сходимость ряда Фурье* [Russian: *Change of variable and absolute convergence of the Fourier series*]. Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 256:2 (1981), 284–287. Available at: mathnet.ru/dan44161
- [15] ———, *Модификация функций и ряды Фурье* [Russian: *Modifications of functions and Fourier series*]. Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 40:3(243) (1985), 157–193, 240. Available at: mathnet.ru/umn2650. English: Russian Math. Surveys 40:3 (1985), 181–224. Available at: iop.org/003592
- [16] Julius F. Pál, *Sur les transformations des fonctions qui font converger leurs séries de Fourier*. [French] C. R. Hebdo. Acad. Sci. Paris 158 (1914), 101–103. Available at: bnf.fr/bpt6k3111d
- [17] Artur A. Saakyan, *Интегральные модули гладкости и коэффициенты Фурье у суперпозиции функций* [Russian: *Integral moduli of smoothness and Fourier coefficients of the superposition of functions*]. Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 110(152):4 (1979), 597–608. Available at: mathnet.ru/msb2514. English translation in: Math. USSR Sbornik, 38:4 (1981), 549–561. Available at: iop.org/a04ABEH001462
- [18] Raphaël Salem, *On a theorem of Bohr and Pál*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 50 (1944), 579–580. Available at: [ams.org/08193-7](https://www.ams.org/08193-7)
- [19] Joel Spencer, *Six standard deviations suffice*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 289:2 (1985), 679–706. Available at: [ams.org/0784009-0](https://www.ams.org/0784009-0)