

# ON THE DIVERGENCE OF SUBSEQUENCES OF PARTIAL WALSH-FOURIER SUMS

USHANGI GOGINAVA AND GIORGI ONIANI

ABSTRACT. A class of increasing sequences of natural numbers  $(n_k)$  is found for which there exists a function  $f \in L[0, 1)$  such that the subsequence of partial Walsh-Fourier sums  $(S_{n_k}(f))$  diverge everywhere. A condition for the growth order of a function  $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is given fulfilment of which implies an existence of above type function  $f$  in the class  $\varphi(L)[0, 1)$ .

## 1. DEFINITIONS AND NOTATION

Let  $r : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function which is 1-periodic and such that  $r(x) = 1$  if  $x \in [0, 1/2)$  and  $r(x) = -1$  if  $x \in [1/2, 1)$ . The *Rademacher system*  $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is defined as follows:  $r_n(x) = r(2^n x)$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}_0, x \in [0, 1)$ ). Here and below  $\mathbb{N}_0$  denotes the set of all non-negative integers.

The *binary coefficients* of a number  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  will be denoted by  $\varepsilon_j(n)$  ( $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ), i.e.  $\varepsilon_j(n) \in \{0, 1\}$  for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $n = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_j(n) 2^j$ . Note that  $\varepsilon_j(n) = 0$  if  $j$  is sufficiently large.

The *Walsh system*  $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is defined by

$$w_n(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} r_j(x)^{\varepsilon_j(n)} \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0, x \in [0, 1)).$$

The *partial Walsh-Fourier sums* of a function  $f \in L[0, 1)$  are defined as

$$S_n(f) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \widehat{f}(k) w_k \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0),$$

where  $\widehat{f}(k) = \int_{[0,1)} f w_k$ .

The *partial Fourier sums* (i.e. partial sums with respect to the trigonometric system) of a function  $f \in L[0, 2\pi)$  will be denoted by  $\mathbf{S}_n(f)$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ).

Throughout the paper we will use the following convention:  $\log n$  stands for  $\log_2 n$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42C10.

*Key words and phrases.* Walsh-Fourier series, subsequence of partial sums, everywhere divergence.

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  let us denote

$$V(n) = \varepsilon_0(n) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\varepsilon_j(n) - \varepsilon_{j-1}(n)|.$$

The quantity  $V(n)$  is called the *variation of a number  $n$* . It is easy to check that

$$V(n) \leq C \log(2n) \quad (n \in \mathbb{N})$$

and if  $n_k = \sum_{j=0}^k 2^{2j}$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) then

$$c \log(2n_k) \leq V(n_k) \leq C \log(2n_k) \quad (k \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Here  $c$  and  $C$  are absolute constants.

Note that for the Dirichlet kernels with respect to the Walsh system there are valid the following estimations (see, e.g., [1], p. 34)

$$V(n)/8 \leq \|D_n\|_L \leq V(n) \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0).$$

We will say that a sequence of natural numbers  $(n_k)$  has *bounded variation* if  $\sup_k V(n_k) < \infty$ .

Let us define the *spectrum of a number  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$*  as follows

$$\text{Sp}(n) = \{j \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \varepsilon_j(n) = 1\}.$$

Konyagin [2] has considered increasing sequences of natural numbers  $(n_k)$  having the following property:

$$\max \text{Sp}(n_k) < \min \text{Sp}(n_{k+1}) \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We will refer such  $(n_k)$  as a *sequence with separated spectrums*.

It is easy to see that  $n_k = 2^{k^2} \sum_{j=0}^k 2^{2j}$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) is a sequence with separated spectrums which has unbounded variation.

Let  $(n_k)$  be an increasing sequences of natural numbers. We will call  $(n_k)$  a *sequence with nested spectrums* if

$$\text{Sp}(n_{k+1}) \cap [0, \max \text{Sp}(n_k)] = \text{Sp}(n_k) \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is easy to see that  $n_k = \sum_{j=0}^k 2^{2j}$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) is a sequence with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation.

Note that if  $(n_k)$  is a sequence with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation then its each subsequence  $(m_k)$  also has the same properties.

Let  $(n_k)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation. Denote by  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  the function  $\varphi_{(n_k)} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined by the following conditions:

- $\varphi_{(n_k)}(2^{2n_\nu}) = 2^{2n_\nu} V(n_\nu)$  for every  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- $\varphi_{(n_k)}(0) = 0$  and  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  is linear on the segment  $[0, 2^{2n_1}]$ ;
- $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  is linear on the segment  $[2^{2n_\nu}, 2^{2n_{\nu+1}}]$  for every  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Obviously,  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  is a continuous and increasing function. Furthermore, it is easy to check that

$$\varphi_{(n_k)}(u) \leq Cu \log \log u \quad (u \geq 8)$$

and if  $n_k = \sum_{j=0}^k 2^{2j}$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) then

$$cu \log \log u \leq \varphi_{(n_k)}(u) \leq Cu \log \log u \quad (u \geq 8).$$

Here  $c$  and  $C$  are absolute constants.

Let  $(n_k)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers. We will say that a series  $\sum_j a_j$  converge (diverge) along  $(n_k)$  if the subsequence of partial sums  $(S_{n_k})$  converge (diverge).

Let  $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a non-decreasing function and  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable set. By  $\varphi(L)(E)$  it is denoted the class of all measurable functions  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for which  $\int_E \varphi(|f|) < \infty$ .

By  $\Phi$  we will denote the set of all non-decreasing functions  $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  for which  $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(u)/u > 0$ . Note that for every set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  with finite measure and every function  $\varphi \in \Phi$  it is valid the inclusion  $\varphi(L)(E) \subset L(E)$ .

A sequence of positive numbers  $(\alpha_k)$  is called *lacunary* if there is a number  $\lambda > 1$  such that  $\alpha_{k+1}/\alpha_k \geq \lambda$  for every  $k$ .

## 2. RESULTS

Kolmogoroff [3] constructed a famous example of a function  $f \in L[0, 2\pi)$  Fourier trigonometric series of which diverges almost everywhere. After some years in the work [4] he also constructed an example of a function  $f \in L[0, 2\pi)$  for which the divergence takes place everywhere.

Gosselin [5] proved that for every increasing sequence of natural numbers  $(n_k)$  there exists a function  $f \in L[0, 2\pi)$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathbf{S}_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$$

for almost every  $x \in [0, 2\pi)$ . A function  $f \in L[0, 2\pi)$  satisfying (2.1) for every  $x \in [0, 2\pi)$  was constructed by Totik [6].

Thus, there is no increasing sequence of natural numbers  $(n_k)$  along which it is guaranteed almost everywhere convergence of Fourier trigonometric series. The same is not true for Walsh-Fourier series. On the one hand, analogs of the examples of Kolmogoroff were constructed by Stein [7] and Schipp [8, 9]. On the other hand, if a sequence  $(n_k)$  has a bounded variation (for example, if  $n_k = 2^k$ ), then Dirichlet kernels  $D_{n_k}$  are uniformly bounded in the space  $L[0, 1)$ . It by using standard technique implies that the sums  $S_{n_k}(f)$  converge to  $f$  almost everywhere for every function  $f \in L[0, 1)$ . In this connection Konyagin [10] posed the problem:

*Find a necessary and sufficient condition on an increasing sequence  $(n_k)$  of natural numbers under which the partial Walsh-Fourier sums  $(S_{n_k}(f))$  converge to  $f$  almost everywhere for every function  $f \in L[0, 1)$ .*

Konyagin in the work [2] established that the problem cannot be resolved in terms of bounded variation of a sequence  $(n_k)$ . Namely, in [2] it was proved that if  $(n_k)$  is a sequence with separated spectrums then  $(S_{n_k}(f))$  converge to  $f$  almost everywhere for every  $f \in L[0, 1)$ .

The following theorem gives a sufficient condition implying the existence of a Walsh-Fourier series divergent everywhere along a priori given sequence  $(n_k)$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *If  $(n_k)$  is a sequence of natural numbers with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation then there exists a function  $f \in L[0, 1)$  such that  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 1)$ .*

**Remark 2.2.** Let us say that sequences  $(m_k)$  and  $(n_k)$  are *close* if the sequence  $(|m_k - n_k|)$  is bounded.

Let  $f \in L[0, 1)$  and  $x \in [0, 1)$ . If for an increasing sequence of natural numbers  $(n_k)$  there is valid the relation  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  then obviously the same relation is valid for every sequence  $(m_k)$  for which  $(n_k)$  is a subsequence. Furthermore, it is easy to check that the same relation is valid also for every sequence  $(m_k)$  which is close to  $(n_k)$ .

Thus, the analog of Theorem 2.1 is valid for every sequence  $(n_k)$  containing a subsequence with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation or more generally, containing a subsequence close to some sequence with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation.

**Remark 2.3.** From Theorem 2.1 it follows the following corollary: If  $(n_k)$  is a sequence of natural numbers with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation then for each its subsequence  $(m_k)$  there exists a function  $f \in L[0, 1)$  such that  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{m_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 1)$ .

**Remark 2.4.** From the corollary given in above remark it follows that Walsh-Fourier series may diverge everywhere along an arbitrarily sparse sequence, namely, for every sequence of positive numbers  $(\lambda_k)$  there exists a function  $f \in L[0, 1)$  and an increasing sequence of natural numbers  $(n_k)$  such that  $n_{k+1}/n_k \geq \lambda_k$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) and  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 1)$ . By Gát and Goginava [11] it was proved the following particular case of this result: For every sequence of positive numbers  $(\nu_k)$  there exists a function  $f \in L[0, 1)$  and an increasing sequence of natural numbers  $(n_k)$  such that  $n_k \geq \nu_k$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) and  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 1)$ .

**Remark 2.5.** Gát [12] proved that the arithmetic means of lacunary partial Walsh-Fourier sums  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N S_{n_k}(f)$  (distinct from lacunary partial Walsh-Fourier sums) are almost everywhere convergent for every function  $f \in L[0, 1)$ .

Another topic we are interested is the problem on finding the optimal class  $\varphi(L)$  in which partial Walsh-Fourier sums are almost everywhere convergent along an a priori given sequence  $(n_k)$ .

The problems of above type has a rich history. For the "full" sequence  $n_k = k$  fundamental importance have results of Kolmogoroff [3, 4] and Carleson

[13] according to which almost everywhere convergence of Fourier trigonometric series is not guaranteed in  $L[0, 2\pi)$  and is guaranteed in  $L^2[0, 2\pi)$ , respectively. They were improved and extended to other orthonormal systems by various authors (see, e.g., [10] or [14] for the survey of the topic). The strongest results concerning the trigonometric and the Walsh systems known nowadays are the following:

- If  $\varphi \in \Phi$  and  $\varphi(u) = o(u\sqrt{\log u / \log \log u})$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ) then there exists a function  $f \in \varphi(L)[0, 2\pi)$  such that  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathbf{S}_k(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 2\pi)$  (Konyagin [15]);
- If  $f \in L \log^+ L \log^+ \log^+ \log^+ L[0, 2\pi)$  then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{S}_k(f)(x) = f(x)$  for almost every  $x \in [0, 2\pi)$  (Antonov [16]);
- If  $\varphi \in \Phi$  and  $\varphi(u) = o(u\sqrt{\log u})$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ) then there exists a function  $f \in \varphi(L)[0, 1)$  such that  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_k(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 1)$  (Bochkarev [17]);
- If  $f \in L \log^+ L \log^+ \log^+ \log^+ L[0, 1)$  then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_k(f)(x) = f(x)$  for almost every  $x \in [0, 1)$  (Sjölin, Soria [18]).

Regarding the general subsequences of partial Fourier sums Konyagin in [19] proved the following theorem:

Let  $(n_k)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers. Then for every  $\varphi \in \Phi$  with  $\varphi(u) = o(u \log \log u)$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ) there exists a function  $f \in \varphi(L)[0, 2\pi)$  such that  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathbf{S}_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 2\pi)$ .

By Konyagin in [10] it was conjectured that if  $(n_k)$  is a lacunary sequence then Fourier trigonometric series of every  $f \in L \log^+ \log^+ L[0, 2\pi)$  converge almost everywhere along  $(n_k)$ , i.e. it was conjectured the optimality of the class  $L \log^+ \log^+ L[0, 2\pi)$  for almost everywhere convergence of Fourier trigonometric series along an arbitrary lacunary sequence  $(n_k)$ .

To the study of the problem it was devoted several works. Suppose  $(n_k)$  is an arbitrary lacunary sequence. Do and Lacey [20] have shown that if  $f \in L \log^+ \log^+ L \log^+ \log^+ \log^+ L[0, 1)$  then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_{n_k}(f)(x) = f(x)$  for almost every  $x \in [0, 1)$ . Lie [21] proved an analogous theorem for the subsequences of the partial Fourier sums. Di Plinio [22] generalized this results achieving almost everywhere convergence in the larger class

$L \log^+ \log^+ L \log^+ \log^+ \log^+ \log^+ L$  both for the Fourier and the Walsh-Fourier cases. Finally, Lie [23] established that if  $\varphi \in \Phi$  with and  $\varphi(u) = o(u \log \log u \log \log \log \log u)$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ) then there exists a function  $f \in \varphi(L)[0, 2\pi)$  such that  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathbf{S}_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  for almost every  $x \in [0, 2\pi)$ . Thus, the optimal class  $\varphi(L)$  for the almost everywhere convergence of Fourier trigonometric series along lacunary sequences is  $L \log^+ \log^+ L \log^+ \log^+ \log^+ L[0, 2\pi)$  which is a bit smaller than the one conjectured in [10].

The problem of finding the optimal class  $\varphi(L)$  in which it is guaranteed the almost everywhere convergence of Walsh-Fourier series along every lacunary sequence  $(n_k)$  is still open. Note that similar problem may be posed for individual lacunary sequences as well. In this regard it is true the following analogue of Konyagin's result from [19] formulated above.

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $(n_k)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation. Then for every  $\varphi \in \Phi$  with  $\varphi(u) = o(\varphi_{(n_k)}(u))$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ) there exists a function  $f \in \varphi(L)[0, 1)$  such that  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 1)$ .*

**Remark 2.7.** Let  $n_k = \sum_{j=0}^k 2^{2j}$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ). Clearly, the sequence  $(n_k)$  is lacunary. From Theorem 2.6 it follows that for every  $\varphi \in \Phi$  with  $\varphi(u) = o(u \log \log u)$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ) there exists a function  $f \in \varphi(L)[0, 1)$  such that  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$  for every  $x \in [0, 1)$ . Thus, in classes  $\varphi(L)[0, 1)$  with  $\varphi \in \Phi$  and  $\varphi(u) = o(u \log \log u)$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ) it is not guaranteed the almost everywhere convergence of Walsh-Fourier series along lacunary sequences.

**Remark 2.8.** Obviously, Theorem 2.6 implies Theorem 2.1.

The proof of Theorem 2.6 is based on modifications of methods proposed by Schipp [8, 9] (see also [1], pp. 295-301) and Konyagin [19].

### 3. AUXILIARY PROPOSITIONS

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $j = 1, \dots, 2^n$  by  $\Delta(n, j)$  denote the *dyadic interval*  $[(j-1)/2^n, j/2^n)$ .

Polynomial with respect to the Walsh system we will refer simply as *polynomial*.

The *spectrum* of a polynomial  $P = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j w_j$  will be denoted by  $\text{Sp}(P)$ , i.e.  $\text{Sp}(P) = \{j : a_j \neq 0\}$ .

The *degree* of a polynomial  $P$  will be denoted by  $\text{deg}(P)$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(n_k)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation. Then for every  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a polynomial  $P_\nu = 1 + \sum_{j=\nu}^{l_\nu} a_j^{(\nu)} w_j$  and a set  $E_\nu \subset [0, 1)$  such that*

- $0 \leq P_\nu(x) \leq 2^{2n_\nu}$  for every  $x \in [0, 1)$ ;
- $|E_\nu \cap \Delta(\max \text{Sp}(n_\nu) + 1, j)| \geq |\Delta(\max \text{Sp}(n_\nu) + 1, j)|/4$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, 2^{\max \text{Sp}(n_\nu) + 1}$ ;
- For every  $x \in E_\nu$  there exists a natural number  $k = k(\nu, x) \geq \nu$  such that  $|S_{n_k}(P_\nu)(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/16$ .

*Proof.* By  $g$  denote the function defined as follows

$$g(x) = \text{sgn}(D_{n_\nu}(x)) \quad (x \in [0, 1)).$$

Then we have

$$S_{n_\nu}(g)(0) = \|D_{n_\nu}\|_L \geq V(n_\nu)/8.$$

Denote  $N = \max \text{Sp}(n_\nu) + 1$ . It is clear that  $g$  is a polynomial with  $\text{deg}(g) < 2^N$ . Consequently, for every point  $x \in \Delta(N, 1)$  we have also that

$$S_{n_\nu}(g)(x) = S_{n_\nu}(g)(0) \geq V(n_\nu)/8.$$

Denote  $g_j(x) = g(x \oplus \frac{j-1}{2^N})$  ( $j = 1, \dots, 2^N; x \in [0, 1)$ ). Here and below  $\oplus$  denotes the operation of dyadic addition. Obviously, each  $g_j$  is a polynomial

with  $\deg(g_j) = \deg(g) < 2^N < 2n_\nu$ . For every  $j = 1, \dots, 2^N$  and  $x \in \Delta(N, j)$  we obtain

$$(3.1) \quad |S_{n_\nu}(g_j)(x)| = \left| S_{n_\nu}(g)\left(x \oplus \frac{j-1}{2^N}\right) \right| \geq V(n_\nu)/8.$$

Let us consider a polynomial  $Q$  of the following type

$$Q = \prod_{j=1}^{2^N} (1 + w_{\delta_j} g_j),$$

where natural numbers  $\delta_1 < \delta_2 < \dots < \delta_{2^N}$  will be chosen later.

Obviously,

$$0 \leq Q(x) \leq 2^{2^N} < 2^{2n_\nu} \quad (x \in [0, 1]).$$

Denote  $R_1 = 0$  and

$$R_j = w_{\delta_j} g_j \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} (1 + w_{\delta_i} g_i) - w_{\delta_j} g_j \quad (j = 2, \dots, 2^N).$$

Then it is valid the representation

$$Q = 1 + (w_{\delta_1} g_1 + R_1) + \dots + (w_{\delta_{2^N}} g_{2^N} + R_{2^N}).$$

Let  $M$  be the minimal natural number with the properties:  $M \geq N$  and  $M \notin \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Sp}(n_k)$ . Note that such number exists since  $(n_k)$  is a sequence with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation.

Let us assume that numbers  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{2^N}$  satisfy the following conditions:

$$(3.2) \quad \delta_j \in \{n_k - n_\nu : k > \nu\} \cup \{n_k - n_\nu + 2^M : k > \nu\} \quad (j = 1, \dots, 2^N);$$

$$(3.3) \quad \delta_1 \geq 2^M + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{j+1} \geq 2(\delta_j + 2^M) \quad (j = 2, \dots, 2^N).$$

Below for the briefness we will use the notation  $\lambda = 2^M - n_\nu$ .

Let  $1 \leq j \leq 2^N$ . Assume  $g_j = \sum_{h=0}^{2^N-1} a_h w_h$ . By virtue of (3.3) the numbers from  $\text{Sp}(\delta_j)$  are not less than  $N$ . On the other hand for each  $h < 2^N$  the numbers from  $\text{Sp}(h)$  are less than  $N$ . Consequently,

$$w_{\delta_j} w_h = w_{\delta_j \oplus h} = w_{\delta_j + h} \quad (h = 0, \dots, 2^N - 1)$$

and

$$w_{\delta_j} g_j = \sum_{h=0}^{2^N-1} a_h w_{\delta_j} w_h = \sum_{h=0}^{2^N-1} a_h w_{\delta_j + h}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \text{Sp}(w_{\delta_j} g_j) = \delta_j + \text{Sp}(g_j) \subset [\delta_j, \delta_j + 2^N];$$

$$(3.5) \quad S_{\delta_j - \lambda}(w_{\delta_j} g_j) = 0$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad S_{\delta_j + n_\nu}(w_{\delta_j} g_j) = \sum_{h=0}^{n_\nu-1} a_h w_{\delta_j + h} = w_{\delta_j} \sum_{h=0}^{n_\nu-1} a_h w_h = w_{\delta_j} S_{n_\nu}(g_j).$$

Let us prove that

$$(3.7) \quad \text{Sp}(R_j) \subset (\delta_{j-1} + 2^N, \delta_j - 2^M) \quad (j = 2, \dots, 2^N).$$

Let us consider a product

$$(3.8) \quad (w_{\delta_j} w_h)(w_{\delta_{i(1)}} w_{h(1)}) \dots (w_{\delta_{i(t)}} w_{h(t)}),$$

where  $j \geq 2$ ,  $i(1) < \dots < i(t) < j$  and  $h, h(1), \dots, h(t) \leq \deg(g) < 2^N$ . By virtue of (3.2) and (3.3) we have

$$(3.9) \quad \delta_j \oplus \delta_{i(t)} \leq \delta_j - \delta_{i(t)} + 2^M \leq \delta_j - 2\delta_{i(t-1)} - 2^M.$$

From (3.3) we obtain

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & [\delta_{i(1)} \oplus \dots \oplus \delta_{i(t-1)}] \oplus [h \oplus h(1) \oplus \dots \oplus h(t)] < \\ & < 2^{\max \text{Sp}(\delta_{i(t-1)})+1} \leq 2\delta_{i(t-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \delta_j \oplus [\delta_{i(1)} \oplus \dots \oplus \delta_{i(t)}] \oplus [h \oplus h(1) \oplus \dots \oplus h(t)] \geq \\ & \geq 2^{\max \text{Sp}(\delta_j)} > \delta_j/2 \geq \delta_{j-1} + 2^M \geq \delta_{j-1} + 2^N. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that  $R_j$  is a linear combination of products of the type (3.8) and combining (3.9)-(3.11) we obtain the inclusion (3.7).

From (3.3), (3.4) and (3.7) we conclude that the polynomial  $Q$  is of the type  $1 + \sum_{j=\nu}^{l_\nu} a_j w_j$ .

By virtue of (3.4)-(3.7) for every  $j$  we deduce

$$S_{\delta_j+n_\nu}(Q) - S_{\delta_j-\lambda}(Q) = w_{\delta_j} S_{n_\nu}(g_j).$$

Consequently, by virtue of (3.1) for every  $j$  and  $x \in \Delta(N, j)$  we obtain

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & |S_{\delta_j+n_\nu}(Q)(x) - S_{\delta_j-\lambda}(Q)(x)| = |w_{\delta_j}(x) S_{n_\nu}(g_j)(x)| = \\ & = |S_{n_\nu}(g_j)(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/8. \end{aligned}$$

(3.12) implies that for each  $j$  either

$$(3.13) \quad |\{x \in \Delta(N, j) : |S_{\delta_j+n_\nu}(Q)(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/16\}| \geq |\Delta(N, j)|/2$$

or

$$(3.14) \quad |\{x \in \Delta(N, j) : |S_{\delta_j-\lambda}(Q)(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/16\}| \geq |\Delta(N, j)|/2,$$

but till now we do not know exactly which between (3.13) and (3.14) is valid. We can make it clear by a new step of choosing of numbers  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{2^N}$ . Namely, the new step for each  $j$  will define from which one between the sets  $\{n_k - n_\nu : k > \nu\}$  and  $\{n_k - n_\nu + 2^M : k > \nu\}$  must be chosen a number  $\delta_j$ .

Let  $\delta_1$  be an arbitrary number of the type  $n_k - n_\nu$  where  $k > \nu$  and such that  $\delta_1 \geq 2^M + 1$ . Suppose  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{j-1}$  are already chosen. Taking into account (3.4) and (3.7) we write

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\delta_j-\lambda}(Q) &= (1 + w_{\delta_1} g_1 + R_1 + \dots + w_{\delta_{j-1}} g_{j-1} + R_{j-1}) + R_j = \\ &= (1 + w_{\delta_1} g_1 + R_1 + \dots + w_{\delta_{j-1}} g_{j-1} + R_{j-1}) + w_{\delta_j} R_j^*, \end{aligned}$$



where  $R_j^* = R_j/w_{\delta_j} = g_j \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} (1 + w_{\delta_i} g_i) - g_j$ . On the other hand, using (3.4), (3.6) and (3.7) we write

$$S_{\delta_j+n_\nu}(Q) = (1 + w_{\delta_1} g_1 + R_1 + \cdots + w_{\delta_{j-1}} g_{j-1} + R_{j-1}) + w_{\delta_j} R_j^* + w_{\delta_j} S_{n_\nu}(g_j).$$

Consequently, for every  $x \in \Delta(N, j)$  we have

$$|S_{\delta_j+n_\nu}(Q)(x) - S_{\delta_{j-\lambda}}(Q)(x)| = |(R_j^* + S_{n_\nu}(g_j))(x) - R_j^*(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/8.$$

It implies that

$$(3.15) \quad |\{x \in \Delta(N, j) : |(R_j^* + S_{n_\nu}(g_j))(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/16\}| \geq |\Delta(N, j)|/2$$

or

$$(3.16) \quad |\{x \in \Delta(N, j) : |R_j^*(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/16\}| \geq |\Delta(N, j)|/2.$$

Note that from (3.3) it follows easily the estimations

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \deg(1 + w_{\delta_1} g_1 + R_1 + \cdots + w_{\delta_{j-1}} g_{j-1} + R_{j-1}) &< \\ &< 2^{\max \text{Sp}(\delta_{j-1})+1} \leq 2^{\max \text{Sp}(\delta_j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that (3.15) is valid. From (3.17) we conclude easily that the numbers  $(1 + w_{\delta_1} g_1 + R_1 + \cdots + w_{\delta_{j-1}} g_{j-1} + R_{j-1})(x)$  and  $w_{\delta_j}(x)(R_j^* + S_{n_\nu}(g_j))(x)$  are of one and the same sign for points  $x$  from a set  $E_{\nu, j} \subset \Delta(N, j)$  with  $|E_{\nu, j}| \geq |\Delta(N, j)|/4$ . Consequently, for every  $x \in E_{\nu, j}$  we have

$$|S_{\delta_j+n_\nu}(Q)(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/16.$$

The case, when (3.15) is valid, is analogous to the considered one. In this case we can guarantee that

$$|S_{\delta_{j-\lambda}}(Q)(x)| \geq V(n_\nu)/16,$$

for points  $x$  from a set  $E_{\nu, j} \subset \Delta(N, j)$  with  $|E_{\nu, j}| \geq |\Delta(N, j)|/4$ .

Now let us choose  $\delta_j$  from the set  $\{n_k - n_\nu : k > \nu\}$  if (16) is fulfilled and from the set  $\{n_k - n_\nu + 2^M : k > \nu\}$  if (3.16) is fulfilled. This finishes the process of choosing of numbers  $\delta_j$ .

Clearly, the polynomial  $P_\nu = Q$  and the set  $E_\nu = \bigcup_{j=1}^{2^N} E_{\nu, j}$  satisfy the needed conditions. The lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** It is easy to see that the numbers  $n_k$  from the third condition of Lemma 3.1 can be assumed to be not greater than  $\min\{n_j : j \in \mathbb{N}, n_j \geq \deg(P_\nu)\}$ .

A function  $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is said to satisfy  $\Delta_2$ -condition if there are positive numbers  $c$  and  $u_0$  such that  $\varphi(2u) \leq c\varphi(u)$  when  $u \geq u_0$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $(n_k)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers with nested spectrums which has unbounded variation. Then the function  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  is convex,  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{(n_k)}(u)/u = \infty$  and  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  satisfies  $\Delta_2$ -condition.*

*Proof.* Note that for a convex function  $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  the conditions  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(u)/u = \infty$  and  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} D_r(\varphi)(u) = \infty$  are equivalent. Here and below  $D_r(\varphi)(x)$  denotes the right derivative of a function  $\varphi$  at a point  $x$ .

Denote  $I_0 = [0, 2^{2n_1})$  and  $I_\nu = [2^{2n_\nu}, 2^{2n_{\nu+1}})$  ( $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ ). By  $t_\nu$  ( $\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ) denote the slope of the graph of the function  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  on the interval  $I_\nu$ , i.e.,  $t_0 = V(n_1)$  and

$$t_\nu = \frac{2^{2n_{\nu+1}}V(n_{\nu+1}) - 2^{2n_\nu}V(n_\nu)}{2^{2n_{\nu+1}} - 2^{2n_\nu}} \quad (\nu \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Let us prove that  $(t_\nu)$  is an increasing sequence which tends to infinity as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ . It will imply that  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} D_r(\varphi_{(n_k)})(u) = \infty$  and that  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  is a convex function.

Denote  $\delta_\nu = V(n_{\nu+1}) - V(n_\nu)$  ( $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ ). From the properties of the sequence  $(n_k)$  it follows that  $\delta_\nu \geq 1$  ( $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ ).

For every  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$(3.18) \quad t_\nu = V(n_\nu) + \frac{2^{2n_{\nu+1}}\delta_\nu}{2^{2n_{\nu+1}} - 2^{2n_\nu}}.$$

Consequently,  $t_\nu \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ . From the representation (3.18) it follows directly that  $t_0 < t_1$ . Let us prove that  $t_\nu < t_{\nu+1}$  for every  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ , i.e., we must check the estimation

$$(3.19) \quad V(n_\nu) + \frac{2^{2n_{\nu+1}}\delta_\nu}{2^{2n_{\nu+1}} - 2^{2n_\nu}} < V(n_{\nu+1}) + \frac{2^{2n_{\nu+2}}\delta_{\nu+1}}{2^{2n_{\nu+2}} - 2^{2n_{\nu+1}}}.$$

Let us rewrite (3.19) as follows

$$(3.20) \quad \left( \frac{2^{2n_{\nu+1}}}{2^{2n_{\nu+1}} - 2^{2n_\nu}} - 1 \right) \delta_\nu < \frac{2^{2n_{\nu+2}}\delta_{\nu+1}}{2^{2n_{\nu+2}} - 2^{2n_{\nu+1}}}$$

From the condition  $\text{Sp}(n_{\nu+1}) \cap [0, \max \text{Sp}(n_\nu)] = \text{Sp}(n_\nu)$  it follows easily that  $n_{\nu+1} \geq n_\nu + 2^{\max \text{Sp}(n_\nu) + \delta_\nu} \geq n_\nu + \delta_\nu$ . Consequently,

$$\left( \frac{2^{2n_{\nu+1}}}{2^{2n_{\nu+1}} - 2^{2n_\nu}} - 1 \right) \delta_\nu \leq \frac{\delta_\nu}{2^{2\delta_\nu} - 1} < 1.$$

Now taking into account that right part of (3.20) is greater than 1, we conclude the validity of the needed estimation.

Since  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  is linear on each interval  $I_\nu$ , then we easily can check the validity of the estimation  $\varphi_{(n_k)}(2^{m+1}) \leq 2\varphi_{(n_k)}(2^m)$  for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, by monotonicity of  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  we conclude that  $\varphi_{(n_k)}$  satisfies  $\Delta_2$ -condition. The lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\alpha : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be an increasing convex function with  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(u)/u = \infty$  and let  $\alpha$  satisfies  $\Delta_2$ -condition. Then for every function  $\beta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  with  $\beta(u) = o(\alpha(u))$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ) there exists a function  $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that: 1)  $\gamma(0) = 0$  and  $\gamma$  is an increasing convex function; 2)  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(u)/u = \infty$ ; 3)  $\gamma$  satisfies  $\Delta_2$ -condition; 4) there exists  $u_0 > 0$  such that  $\gamma(u) \geq \beta(u)$  when  $u \geq u_0$ ; 5)  $\gamma(u) = o(\alpha(u))$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ).*

**Remark 3.5.** Lemma 3.4 for the case  $\alpha(u) = u \log^+ \log^+ u$  was proved in [19] (see Lemma 3).

*Proof.* Let us proceed the scheme used in [19] (see the proof of Lemma 3 in [19]).

Denote by  $\alpha_j$  ( $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ) the function  $\alpha/2^j$ . Taking into account the properties of the functions  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , it is possible to choose an increasing sequence of positive numbers  $(u_j)$  so that:

$$\beta(u) \leq \alpha_j(u) \quad (j \in \mathbb{N}, u \geq u_j);$$

$$\alpha_j(u_j) + D_r(\alpha_j)(u_j)(u_{j+1} - u_j) \leq \alpha_{j+1}(u_{j+1}) \quad (j \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Further for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  we can choose numbers  $v_j \in [u_j, u_{j+1})$  and  $M_j \in [D_r(\alpha_j)(v_j - 0), D_r(\alpha_j)(v_j)]$  for which

$$\alpha_j(v_j) + M_j(u_{j+1} - v_j) = \alpha_{j+1}(u_{j+1}).$$

Let us define a function  $\gamma$  as follows:  $\gamma(u) = 2u\alpha_1(u_1)/u_1$  ( $0 \leq u < u_1$ );  $\gamma(u) = 2\alpha_j(u)$  ( $j \in \mathbb{N}, u_j \leq u < v_j$ ); and  $\gamma(u) = 2(\alpha_j(v_j) + M_j(u - v_j))$  ( $j \in \mathbb{N}, v_j \leq u < u_{j+1}$ ). It is easy to see that  $\gamma$  is an increasing convex function and  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} D_r(\gamma)(u) = \infty$ . The rest three properties of  $\gamma$  follow from the estimations

$$\frac{1}{2^j} \leq \frac{\gamma(u)}{\alpha(u)} \leq \frac{1}{2^{j-1}} \quad (j \in \mathbb{N}, u_j \leq u < u_{j+1}).$$

The lemma is proved.  $\square$

A function  $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is called *N-function* if  $\varphi(0) = 0$ ,  $\varphi$  is increasing and convex,  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi(u)/u = 0$  and  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(u)/u = \infty$ .

Let us call functions  $\alpha : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and  $\beta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  *equivalent* if there exist positive numbers  $u_0, c$  and  $C$  such that  $c\beta(u) \leq \alpha(u) \leq C\beta(u)$  when  $u \geq u_0$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\alpha : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be an increasing convex function such that  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(u)/u = \infty$ . Then there exists an N-function  $\beta$  which is equivalent to  $\alpha$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  by  $\alpha_\varepsilon$  denote the function on  $[0, \infty)$  defined as follows:  $\alpha_\varepsilon(u) = \varepsilon u^2$  when  $0 \leq u \leq 1$  and  $\alpha_\varepsilon(u) = \alpha(u) - \alpha(1) + \varepsilon$  when  $u > 1$ . It is easy to see that for any small enough  $\varepsilon$  the function  $\beta = \alpha_\varepsilon$  satisfy the needed conditions. The lemma is proved.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.6

By Lemmas 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6 we can assume that  $\varphi$  is an *N-function* satisfying  $\Delta_2$ -condition.

Taking into account that  $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} V(n_\nu) = \infty$  and  $\varphi(u) = o(\varphi(n_k)(u))$  ( $u \rightarrow \infty$ ), we can choose the sequences  $(M_j)$  and  $(n_{\nu(j)})$  with the properties:

$$(4.1) \quad M_j > 0 \quad (j \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} M_j = \infty;$$

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{M_j}{V(n_{\nu(j)})} \frac{\varphi(2^{n_{\nu(j)}})}{2^{n_{\nu(j)}}} < \infty.$$

Obviously, (4.2) implies that  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} M_j/V(n_{\nu(j)}) < \infty$ . Let us consider a non-negative function  $f^*$  defined as follows:

$$f^*(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{M_j}{V(n_{\nu(j)})} P_{\nu(j)}(x) \quad (x \in [0, 1]),$$

where  $P_{\nu}$  ( $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ ) are polynomials from the Lemma 3.1. Let us show that  $f^* \in \varphi(L)[0, 1)$ . Denote by  $\psi$  the function conjugate to  $\varphi$  in Young sense. Suppose,  $g$  is an arbitrary function from the class  $\psi(L)[0, 1)$ . Using Young inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} |f^*g| &\leq \int_{[0,1]} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{M_j}{V(n_{\nu(j)})} |P_{\nu(j)}g| \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{M_j}{V(n_{\nu(j)})} \int_{[0,1]} \varphi(|P_{\nu(j)}|) \int_{[0,1]} \psi(|g|). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varphi$  is a convex function then  $\varphi(u) \leq (\varphi(2^{2n_{\nu(j)}})/2^{2n_{\nu(j)}})u$  when  $0 \leq u \leq 2^{2n_{\nu(j)}}$ . On the other hand  $0 \leq P_{\nu} \leq 2^{2n_{\nu}}$  ( $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ ). Consequently, for every  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$  we obtain

$$\int_{[0,1]} \varphi(|P_{\nu(j)}|) \leq \int_{[0,1]} \frac{\varphi(2^{2n_{\nu(j)}})}{2^{2n_{\nu(j)}}} P_{\nu(j)} = \frac{\varphi(2^{2n_{\nu(j)}})}{2^{2n_{\nu(j)}}}.$$

Therefore by (4.2) we write

$$(4.3) \quad \int_{[0,1]} |f^*g| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{M_j}{V(n_{\nu(j)})} \frac{\varphi(2^{2n_{\nu(j)}})}{2^{2n_{\nu(j)}}} \int_{[0,1]} \psi(|g|) < \infty.$$

Taking into account that  $g$  is an arbitrary function of the class  $\psi(L)[0, 1)$  from (4.3), we conclude that  $f^*$  belongs to the Orlicz space  $L^{\varphi}[0, 1)$  generated by the function  $\varphi$  (see, e.g., [23], Ch. II). Since  $\varphi$  satisfies  $\Delta_2$ -condition then the class  $\varphi(L)[0, 1)$  coincides with  $L^{\varphi}[0, 1)$ . Thus, we proved that  $f^* \in \varphi(L)[0, 1)$ .

Denote  $N_{\nu} = \min\{n_j : j \in \mathbb{N}, n_j \geq \deg(P_{\nu})\}$  ( $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ ). Let us assume that the sequences  $(M_j)$  and  $(n_{\nu(j)})$  together with the conditions (4.1) and (4.2) also satisfy the following one: For every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  the number  $\nu(j+1)$  is greater than  $N_{\nu(j)}$  and

$$(4.4) \quad \text{card}\left((N_{\nu(j)}, \nu(j+1)) \cap \{n_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}\right) \geq 2.$$

For every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  let us choose two natural numbers  $\alpha(j) < \beta(j)$  for which  $n_{\alpha(j)}$  and  $n_{\beta(j)}$  belong to the intersection given in (4.4).

Let us prove that

$$(4.5) \quad \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{k: \nu(j+1) \leq n_k \leq N_{\nu(j+1)}} |S_{n_k}(f^*)(x) - S_{n_{\beta(j)}}(f^*)(x)| = \infty$$

for almost every  $x \in [0, 1)$ , and

$$(4.6) \quad S_{n_{\beta(j)}}(f^*)(x) - S_{n_{\alpha(j)}}(f^*)(x) = 0$$

for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in [0, 1)$ .

Let  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x \in E_{\nu(j+1)}$  and  $k = k(\nu(j+1), x)$ , where  $E_{\nu(j+1)}$  and  $k(\nu(j+1), x)$  are parameters from Lemma 3.1. Note that for every  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in [0, 1)$ ,

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & S_n(f^*)(x) - S_m(f^*)(x) = \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{M_i}{V(n_{\nu(i)})} (S_n(P_{\nu(i)})(x) - S_m(P_{\nu(i)})(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by virtue of (4.4) and Lemma 3.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |S_{n_k}(f^*)(x) - S_{n_{\beta(j)}}(f^*)(x)| = \\ &= \frac{M_{j+1}}{V(n_{\nu(j+1)})} |S_{n_k}(P_{\nu(j+1)})(x) - S_{n_{\beta(j)}}(P_{\nu(j+1)})(x)| \geq \\ &\geq \frac{M_{j+1}}{V(n_{\nu(j+1)})} \left( \frac{V(n_{\nu(j+1)})}{16} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, taking into account (4.1) and (4.2), we conclude that (4.5) holds for every point  $x$  which belongs to infinite number of sets  $E_{\nu(j+1)}$  ( $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ). Using the uniform lower estimation for measures of portions of sets  $E_{\nu}$  in dyadic intervals (see the second estimation in Lemma 3.1) it is easy to see that  $\bigcup_{j=N}^{\infty} E_{\nu(j+1)}$  is a set of full measure for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, the upper limit of the sequence  $(E_{\nu(j+1)})$  is a set of full measure. Thus, (4.5) holds for almost every  $x \in [0, 1)$ .

The equality (4.6) follows directly from (4.4) and (4.7).

Let  $A$  be a set of all points  $x \in [0, 1)$  for which (4.5) does not hold. We have that  $|A| = 0$ . Let us consider polynomials  $Q_r$  ( $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ) with the properties:

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \|Q_r\|_{L^2} < \infty;$$

$$(4.9) \quad \sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} |Q_r(x)| = \infty \text{ for every } x \in A.$$

Such polynomials are constructed for example in [24] (see the proof of Theorem 3).

For every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  let us find a number  $j(r) \in \mathbb{N}$  for which  $\deg(Q_r) \leq n_{\alpha(j(r))}$  and denote  $\delta(r) = n_{\beta(j(r))} - n_{\alpha(j(r))}$  and  $Q_r^* = w_{\delta(r)} Q_r$ .

Since,  $|Q_r^*| = |Q_r|$  then by (4.8),  $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \|Q_r^*\|_{L^2} < \infty$ . Hence, we can introduce the function  $f_*$  which is the sum of the series  $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} Q_r^*$  in the space  $L^2[0, 1)$ .

By the condition  $\text{Sp}(n_{\beta(j(r))}) \cap [0, \max \text{Sp}(n_{\alpha(j(r))})] = \text{Sp}(n_{\alpha(j(r))})$  we conclude that  $n_{\alpha(j(r))} < \delta(r)$  and that each number  $h \leq n_{\alpha(j(r))}$  has the spectrum disjoint with the spectrum of  $\delta(r)$ . Consequently, we have

$$(4.10) \quad \text{Sp}(Q_r^*) \subset (n_{\alpha(j(r))}, n_{\beta(j(r))});$$

$$(4.11) \quad S_{n_{\beta(j(r))}}(Q_r^*) = w_{\delta(r)} Q_r;$$

$$(4.12) \quad S_{n_{\alpha(j(r))}}(Q_r^*) = 0.$$

For every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in [0, 1)$  by (4.10)-(4.12) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_{n_{\beta(j(r))}}(f_*)(x) - S_{n_{\alpha(j(r))}}(f_*)(x) &= S_{n_{\beta(j(r))}}(Q_r^*)(x) - S_{n_{\alpha(j(r))}}(Q_r^*)(x) = \\ &= w_{\delta(r)}(x) Q_r(x). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by virtue of (4.9) we conclude

$$(4.13) \quad \sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{n_{\beta(j(r))}}(f_*)(x) - S_{n_{\alpha(j(r))}}(f_*)(x)| = \infty$$

for every  $x \in A$ .

Note that for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $m, n \in [n_{\beta(j)}, N_{\nu(j+1)}]$  and  $x \in [0, 1)$  by (4.10) and (4.4) we have:

$$(4.14) \quad S_n(f_*)(x) - S_m(f_*)(x) = 0.$$

Set  $f = f^* + f_*$ . Obviously,  $f \in \varphi(L)[0, 1)$ . By virtue of (4.5), (4.6), (4.13) and (4.14) we easily see that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |S_{n_k}(f)(x)| = \infty$$

for every point  $x \in [0, 1)$ . The theorem is proved.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] F. Schipp, W. R. Wade and P. Simon, *Walsh series: An introduction to dyadic harmonic analysis*. Adam Hilger, Bristol, New York, 1990.
- [2] S. V. Konyagin, *The Fourier-Walsh subsequence of partial sums*, Math. Notes, 54 (1993), 1026-1030.
- [3] A. N. Kolmogoroff, *Une s erie de Fourier-Lebesgue divergente presque partout*, Fund. Math. 4 (1923), 324-328.
- [4] A. N. Kolmogoroff, *Une s erie de Fourier-Lebesgue divergente partout*, C.R. acad. Sci. Paris 183 (1926), 1327-1329.
- [5] R. P. Gosselin, *On the divergence of Fourier series*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 9 (1958), 278-282.
- [6] V. Totik, *On the divergence of Fourier series*, Publ. Math. (Debrecen) 29 (1982), 251-264.
- [7] E. M. Stein, *On limits of sequences of operators*, Ann. of Math., 74 (1961), 140-170.
- [8] F. Schipp, *Uber die Grobenordnung der Partialsummen der Entwicklung integrierbarer Funktionen nach W-systemen*. Acta Sci. math., 28 (1967), 123-134.
- [9] F. Schipp, *Uber die Divergenz der Walsh-Fourierreihen*, Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest, 12 (1969), 49-62.

- [10] S. V. Konyagin, *Almost everywhere convergence and divergence of Fourier series*, International congress of mathematicians, Vol. II, Eur. Math. Soc., Zurich, 2006, 1393-1403.
- [11] G. Gát and U. Goginava, *Almost everywhere convergence and divergence of Cesaro means with varying parameters of Walsh-Fourier series*, Submitted.
- [12] G. Gát, *Almost everywhere convergence of Fejer and logarithmic means of subsequences of partial sums of the Walsh-Fourier series of integrable functions*, J. of Approx. Theory 162 (2010), 687-708.
- [13] L. Carleson, *On convergence and growth of partial sums of Fourier series*, Acta Math. 116 (1966), 135-167.
- [14] V. Lie, *The pointwise convergence of the Fourier Series (I); On a conjecture of Konyagin*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 19 (2017), 1655-1728.
- [15] S. V. Konyagin, *On everywhere divergence of trigonometric Fourier series*, Sb. Math. 191 (2000), 97-120.
- [16] N. Yu. Antonov, *Convergence of Fourier series*, East J. Approx. 2 (1996), 187-196.
- [17] S. V. Bochkarev, *Everywhere divergent Fourier series with respect to the Walsh system and with respect to multiplicative systems*, Russian Math. Surveys, 2004, 59 (2004), 103-124.
- [18] P. Sjölin and F. Soria, *Remarks on a theorem of N. Yu. Antonov*, Studia Math., 158 (2003), 79-97.
- [19] S. V. Konyagin, *Divergence everywhere of subsequences of partial sums of trigonometric Fourier series*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math., Suppl. 2 (2005), 167-175.
- [20] Y. Do and M. Lacey, *On the convergence of lacunary Walsh-Fourier series*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 44 (2012), 857-878.
- [21] V. Lie, *On the pointwise convergence of the sequences of partial Fourier sums along lacunary subsequences*, J. Funct. Anal. 263 (2012), 3391-3411.
- [22] F. Di Plinio, *Lacunary Fourier and Walsh-Fourier series near  $L^1$* , Collect. Math. 65 (2014), 219-232.
- [23] M. A. Krasnoselskii and Ya. B. Rutickii, *Convex Functions and Orlicz Spaces*. Noordhoff, Groningen, 1961.
- [24] Sh. Heladze, *divergence everywhere of Fourier series in bounded Vilenkin systems*, Tr. Tbilis. Mat. Inst. Razmadze 58 (1978), 224-242.

I. VEKUA INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND FACULTY OF EXACT AND NATURAL SCIENCES OF I. JAVAKHISHVILI TBILISI STATE UNIVERSITY, TBILISI 0186, 2 UNIVERSITY STR., GEORGIA

*E-mail address:* zazagoginava@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AKAKI TSERETELI STATE UNIVERSITY, 59 TAMAR MEPE ST., KUTAISI 4600, GEORGIA

*E-mail address:* oniani@atsu.edu.ge