Haar Coefficient Decay Rates Case 2. This handout analyzes the decay of the Haar coefficients as $j \to \infty$ in the case where f has a jump discontinuity.

Theorem 1. If f is bounded on [0, 1] then $\langle f, h_{j,k} \rangle = \mathcal{O}(2^{-j/2})$ as $j \to \infty$. **Proof.** Let $B = \sup\{ |f(t)| : t \in [0, 1] \}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, h_{j,k} \rangle| &= \left| \int_0^1 f(t) h_{j,k}(t) \, dt \right| \le \int_0^1 |f(t)| |h_{j,k}(t)| \, dt \\ &\le \int_{k/2^j}^{(k+1)/2^j} B 2^{j/2} \, dt = B 2^{j/2} \Big(\frac{k+1}{2^j} - \frac{k}{2^j} \Big) = B 2^{-j/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2. Suppose f is piecewise differentiable with bounded derivative on [0, 1] and has a jump discontinuity at x_0 where x_0 is a dyadic irrational. Then the asymptotic bound in Theorem 1 is sharp.

Before proving Theorem 2 we prove the following lemma:

Lemma. If $x_0 \in [0,1]$ is a dyadic irrational then there is an increasing sequence j_n of natural numbers such that

$$\frac{1}{4} < 2^{j_n} x_0 \mod 1 < \frac{1}{2}$$

Note that $2^{j_n}x_0 \mod 1$ is equal to $2^{j_n}x_0 - \lfloor 2^{j_n}x_0 \rfloor$ where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the greatest integer less than or equal to x.

Proof. Write x_0 using the dyadic expansion

$$x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_i}{2^i}$$
 where $b_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Define

$$J_0 = \{ i : b_i = 0 \}$$
 and $J_1 = \{ i : b_i = 1 \}$

Claim that both J_0 and J_1 are infinite. If not then one must be finite. If J_1 is finite then there is some N such that $b_i = 0$ for all $i \ge N$. Then

$$x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_i}{2^i} = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{b_i}{2^i}$$

would be dyadic rational. If J_0 is finite then there is some N such that $b_i = 1$ for all $i \ge N$. In this case

$$x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_i}{2^i} = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{b_i}{2^i} + \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{b_i}{2^i} + \frac{1}{2^{N-1}}$$

would again be dyadic rational. Therefore J_0 and J_1 must both be infinite.

Since both J_0 and J_1 are infinite, there must be an increasing sequence j_n such that

$$b_{j_n+1} = 0$$
 and $b_{j_n+2} = 1$ for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

Now

$$2^{j_n} x_0 \mod 1 = \sum_{i=1+j_n}^{\infty} 2^{j_n} \frac{b_i}{2^i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_{j_n+i}}{2^i} = \frac{b_{j_n+1}}{2} + \frac{b_{j_n+2}}{4} + \sum_{i=3}^{\infty} \frac{b_{j_n+i}}{2^i} = \frac{1}{4} + \sum_{i=3}^{\infty} \frac{b_{j_n+i}}{2^i} = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_{j_n+i+2}}{2^i} = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} w.$$

Since x_0 is dyadic irrational then w is dyadic irrational. Therefore 0 < w < 1 and consequently $1/4 < 2^{j_n} x_0 \mod 1 < 1/2$. This finishes the proof of the Lemma.

Proof of Theorem 2. Since f is piecewise differentiable there are only finitely many points $E \subseteq [0, 1]$ where f is not differentiable. Define

$$\delta = \min\left\{ \left| x - y \right| : x, y \in E \text{ and } x \neq y \right\}.$$

By Lemma 1 there is an increasing sequence j_n of natural numbers such that

$$\frac{1}{4} < 2^{j_n} x_0 \mod 1 < \frac{1}{2} \qquad \text{for every} \qquad n \in \mathbf{N}.$$

We can assume without loss of generality that $2^{-j_1} < \delta$. For each $n \in \mathbf{N}$ choose k_n so that

$$x_0 \in \left[\frac{k_n}{2^{j_n}}, \frac{k_n+1}{2^{j_n}}\right)$$
 or equivalently $2^{j_n}x_0 \in [k_n, k_n+1).$

By definition $2^{j_n} x_0 \mod 1 = 2^{j_n} x_0 - k_n$. Therefore

$$\frac{1}{4} < 2^{j_n} x_0 - k_n < \frac{1}{2} \qquad \text{or equivalently} \qquad x_0 \in \left(\frac{k_n + \frac{1}{4}}{2^{j_n}}, \frac{k_n + \frac{1}{2}}{2^{j_n}}\right).$$

For notational convenience, given $n \in \mathbf{N}$ fixed, define

$$h = h_{j_n,k_n}, \quad j = j_n, \quad a = \frac{k_n}{2^{j_n}}, \quad b = \frac{k_n + 1}{2^{j_n}} \quad \text{and} \quad c = \frac{a+b}{2}.$$

Since $b - a = 2^{-j} \le 2^{-j_1} < \delta$ then f is differentiable on (a, x_0) and (x_0, b) . For $t \in (a, x_0)$ the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus implies that

$$f(x_0^-) - f(t) = \int_t^{x_0} f'(s) \, ds$$

and for $t \in (x_0, b)$ that

$$f(t) - f(x_0^+) = \int_{x_0}^t f'(s) \, ds.$$

Consequently,

$$\langle f,h \rangle = \int_0^1 f(t)h(t) \, dt = \int_a^b f(t)h(t) \, dt$$

= $\int_a^{x_0} \left(f(x_0^-) - \int_t^{x_0} f'(s) \, ds \right) h(t) \, dt + \int_{x_0}^b \left(f(x_0^+) + \int_{x_0}^t f'(s) \, ds \right) h(t) \, dt$
= $I + J$

where

$$I = \int_{a}^{x_{0}} f(x_{0}^{-})h(t) dt + \int_{x_{0}}^{b} f(x_{0}^{+})h(t) dt$$

and

$$J = -\int_{a}^{x_{0}} \int_{t}^{x_{0}} f'(s)h(t) \, ds \, dt + \int_{x_{0}}^{b} \int_{x_{0}}^{t} f'(s)h(t) \, ds \, dt.$$

Estimate I from below. Recall that

$$h(t) = \begin{cases} 2^{j/2} & \text{for } t \in [a, c) \\ -2^{j/2} & \text{for } t \in [c, b) \end{cases}$$

and that $x_0 \in (a + 2^{-j-2}, c)$. Therefore

$$\int_{a}^{x_{0}} f(x_{0}^{-})h(t) dt = f(x_{0}^{-})2^{j/2}(x_{0}-a)$$

and also

$$\int_{x_0}^{b} f(x_0^+)h(t) dt = \int_{x_0}^{c} f(x_0^+) 2^{j/2} dt - \int_{c}^{b} f(x_0^+) 2^{j/2} dt$$
$$= f(x_0^+) 2^{j/2} (c - x_0 - b + c) = -f(x_0^+) 2^{j/2} (x_0 - a)$$

It follows that

$$I = \left(f(x_0^-) - f(x_0^+)\right)2^{j/2}(x_0 - a)$$

and hence

$$|I| \ge \left| f(x_0^-) - f(x_0^+) \right| 2^{j/2} 2^{-j-2} = \frac{1}{4} \left| f(x_0^-) - f(x_0^+) \right| 2^{-j/2}$$

Now estimate J from above. Since f' is bounded $M = \sup\{ |f'(t)| : t \in [0,1] \setminus E \}$ is finite. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |J| &\leq \int_{a}^{x_{0}} \int_{t}^{x_{0}} M 2^{j/2} \, ds \, dt + \int_{x_{0}}^{b} \int_{x_{0}}^{t} M 2^{j/2} \, ds \, dt \\ &\leq 2M 2^{j/2} \int_{a}^{b} \int_{a}^{b} \, ds \, dt = 2M 2^{j/2} (b-a)^{2} = 2M 2^{-3j/2} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$ we have

$$|\langle f, h_{j_n, k_n} \rangle| = |I + J| \ge |I| - |J| \ge \frac{1}{4} |f(x_0^-) - f(x_0^+)|^{2^{-j_n/2}} - 2M2^{-3j_n/2}$$

Choose N so large that $n \ge N$ implies

$$2M2^{-3j_n/2} < \frac{1}{8} \left| f(x_0^-) - f(x_0^+) \right| 2^{-j_n/2}.$$

Then, for $n \ge N$ it follows that

$$|\langle f, h_{j_n, k_n} \rangle| \ge A 2^{-j_n/2}$$
 where $A = \frac{1}{8} |f(x_0^-) - f(x_0^+)|.$

This shows the bound in Theorem 1 is sharp and finishes the proof of Theorem 2.