

# SPACES OF BOUNDED MEASURABLE FUNCTIONS INVARIANT UNDER A GROUP ACTION

SAMUEL A. HOKAMP

ABSTRACT. In this paper we characterize spaces of  $L^\infty$ -functions on a compact Hausdorff space that are invariant under a transitive and continuous group action. This work generalizes the author's 2021 results, found in [1], concerning the specific case of unitarily and Möbius invariant spaces of  $L^\infty$ -functions defined on the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

To understand this paper's place in the literature, we must first understand the relationships between the papers [2] (Nagel and Rudin, 1976), [1] (Hokamp, 2021), and [3] (Hokamp). Brief descriptions are given below.

In [2], Nagel and Rudin determine the closed unitarily invariant spaces of continuous and  $L^p$ -functions on the unit sphere of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . That is, there exists a collection  $C$  of (minimal and invariant) spaces of continuous functions such that each closed unitarily invariant space is the closed direct sum of some subcollection of  $C$ . The same result is not shown for  $L^\infty$ -functions, since for each  $L^\infty$ -function  $f$ , the map  $u \mapsto f \circ u$  from the unitary group into the  $L^\infty$ -functions need not be continuous under the norm topology.

In [1], the author formulates a result for  $L^\infty$ -functions on the unit sphere that is analogous to the results of Nagel and Rudin when the  $L^\infty$ -functions are endowed with the weak\*-topology. The conclusion of this paper is that the same collection of (minimal and invariant) spaces of continuous functions described in [2] serves as the “building blocks” of the weak\*-closed unitarily invariant spaces of  $L^\infty$ -functions via closures of direct sums of subcollections.

In [3], the author generalizes the results of Nagel and Rudin in [2] by considering spaces of complex continuous and  $L^p$ -functions, for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , defined on an arbitrary compact Hausdorff space  $X$ , on which a compact group  $G$  acts continuously and transitively. In particular, when a collection  $\mathcal{G}$  of (minimal and invariant) spaces of continuous functions with certain properties exists, this collection plays the same role in constructing the closed spaces of continuous and  $L^p$ -functions on  $X$  as the collection from [2].

This paper generalizes the results in [1] and acts as an analogue to [3], in that we explore the case of  $L^\infty$ -functions defined on  $X$  endowed with the weak\*-topology. The main result (Theorem 4.1) is that when the same collection  $\mathcal{G}$  of continuous functions on  $X$  from [3] exists (Definition 2.9), all weak\*-closed invariant spaces of  $L^\infty$ -functions can be constructed by closing the direct sum of some subcollection of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

---

*Date:* June 6, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46E30. Secondary 32A70.

*Key words and phrases.* Spaces of continuous functions, group actions, functional analysis.

*Corresponding author.* Samuel A. Hokamp ✉ [samuel.hokamp@sterling.edu](mailto:samuel.hokamp@sterling.edu). ☎ 920-634-7356.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space and  $C(X)$  the space of continuous complex functions with domain  $X$ . Let  $G$  be a compact group (with Haar measure  $m$ ) that acts continuously and transitively on  $X$ . When we wish to be explicit, the map  $\varphi_\alpha : X \rightarrow X$  shall denote the action of  $\alpha$  on  $X$  for each  $\alpha \in G$ ; otherwise,  $\alpha x$  denotes the action of  $\alpha \in G$  on  $x \in X$ .

Let  $\mu$  denote the unique regular Borel probability measure on  $X$  that is invariant under the action of  $G$ . Specifically,

$$(2.1) \quad \int_X f d\mu = \int_X f \circ \varphi_\alpha d\mu,$$

for all  $f \in C(X)$  and  $\alpha \in G$ . The existence of such a measure is a result of André Weil from [4], and a construction of  $\mu$  can be found in [5] (Theorem 6.2). Throughout the paper,  $\mu$  shall refer to this measure.

The notation  $L^p(\mu)$  denotes the usual Lebesgue spaces, for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ . For  $Y \subset C(X)$ , the uniform closure of  $Y$  is denoted  $\overline{Y}$ , and for  $Y \subset L^p(\mu)$ , the norm-closure of  $Y$  in  $L^p(\mu)$  is denoted  $\overline{Y}^p$ . When  $L^\infty(\mu)$  is equipped with the weak\*-topology,  $\overline{Y}^*$  denotes the weak\*-closure of  $Y \subset L^\infty(\mu)$ .

*Remark 2.1.* For  $Y \subset L^\infty(\mu)$  convex and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , we have

$$\overline{Y}^* \subset \overline{Y}^p \cap L^\infty(\mu).$$

This follows from the local convexity of  $L^p(\mu)$ , and from the fact that the weak\*-topology on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  is *stronger* than the topology which  $L^\infty(\mu)$  inherits from each  $L^p(\mu)$  endowed with the weak topology.

The following is an easy consequence of (2.1):

*Remark 2.2.* Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and let  $p'$  be its conjugate exponent. Then

$$\int_X (f \circ \varphi_\alpha) \cdot g d\mu = \int_X f \cdot (g \circ \varphi_{\alpha^{-1}}) d\mu,$$

for  $f \in L^p(\mu)$ ,  $g \in L^{p'}(\mu)$ , and  $\alpha \in G$ .

The following definition has appeared in several sources, such as [3], [6], or [7], but no attribution is given. The last citation is the specific case of the unitary group acting on the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

**Definition 2.3.** A space of complex functions  $Y$  defined on  $X$  is **invariant under  $G$**  ( **$G$ -invariant**) if  $f \circ \varphi_\alpha \in Y$  for every  $f \in Y$  and every  $\alpha \in G$ .

*Remark 2.4.* Since the action is continuous,  $C(X)$  is  $G$ -invariant. Conversely, if  $C(X)$  is  $G$ -invariant, then each action  $\varphi_\alpha$  must be continuous.

*Remark 2.5.* The invariance property (2.1) means  $\mu(\alpha E) = \mu(E)$  for every Borel set  $E \subset X$  and every  $\alpha \in G$ . Consequently, (2.1) holds for every  $L^p$ -function, and  $L^p(\mu)$  is  $G$ -invariant for all  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ .

Definition 2.6 and Definition 2.7, stated in [3], are generalizations of definitions found in [7] related to the unitary group.

**Definition 2.6** (2.3 [3]). If  $Y$  is  $G$ -invariant and  $T$  is a linear transformation on  $Y$ , we say  **$T$  commutes with  $G$**  if

$$T(f \circ \varphi_\alpha) = (Tf) \circ \varphi_\alpha$$

for every  $f \in Y$  and every  $\alpha \in G$ .

**Definition 2.7** (2.4 [3]). A space  $Y \subset C(X)$  is  **$G$ -minimal** if it is  $G$ -invariant and contains no nontrivial  $G$ -invariant spaces.

The remaining definitions all come from [3].

**Definition 2.8** (4.1 [3]). For each  $x \in X$ , the space  $H(x)$  is the set of all continuous functions that are unchanged by the action of any element of  $G$  which stabilizes  $x$ . That is,

$$H(x) = \{f \in C(X) : f = f \circ \varphi_\alpha, \text{ for all } \alpha \in G \text{ such that } \alpha x = x\}.$$

**Definition 2.9** (4.2 [3]). Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a collection of spaces in  $C(X)$  with these properties:

- (1) Each  $H \in \mathcal{G}$  is a closed  $G$ -minimal space.
- (2) Each pair  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  is orthogonal (in  $L^2(\mu)$ ): If  $f_1 \in H_1$  and  $f_2 \in H_2$ , then

$$\int_X f_1 \bar{f}_2 d\mu = 0.$$

- (3)  $L^2(\mu)$  is the direct sum of the spaces in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

We say  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  **$G$ -collection** if it also possesses the following property:

- (\*)  $\dim(H \cap H(x)) = 1$  for each  $x \in X$  and each  $H \in \mathcal{G}$ .

Throughout the paper,  $\mathcal{G}$  shall denote a  $G$ -collection of  $C(X)$ , indexed by  $I$ , whose elements are denoted  $H_i$ , for  $i \in I$ , and further, *we assume that a  $G$ -collection exists for  $X$ .*

*Remark 2.10.* It should be stressed that we are not implying that a  $G$ -collection *always* exists for any  $X$  and  $G$ . However, a collection of spaces in  $C(X)$  lacking at most only property (\*) of Definition 2.9 always exists, as a consequence of the Peter-Weyl theorem from [8]. This collection is necessarily unique.

**Definition 2.11** (4.7 [3]). We define  $\pi_i$  to be the projection of  $L^2(\mu)$  onto  $H_i$ .

*Remark 2.12.* In Theorem 4.5 of [3], it is shown that each  $\pi_i$  commutes with  $G$ , and to each  $x \in X$  there exists a unique  $K_x \in H_i$  such that

$$\pi_i f = \int_X f(x) K_x d\mu(x),$$

for all  $f \in L^2(\mu)$ . The domain of  $\pi_i$  can then be extended to  $L^1(\mu)$  by defining  $\pi_i f$  to be the above integral for all  $f \in L^1(\mu)$ .

**Definition 2.13** (4.8 [3]). For  $\Omega \subset I$ ,  $E_\Omega$  denotes the direct sum of the spaces  $H_i$  for  $i \in \Omega$ .

*Remark 2.14.* The  $G$ -invariance of each  $E_\Omega$  is a natural consequence of the definition.

*Remark 2.15.* Definition 2.9 yields that each  $f \in L^2(\mu)$  has a unique expansion  $f = \sum f_i$ , with each  $f_i \in H_i$ , which converges unconditionally to  $f$  in the  $L^2$ -norm. Since  $\pi_i$  is the identity map on  $H_i$  and the spaces  $H_i$  are pairwise orthogonal, we have  $f_i = \pi_i f$  for  $i \in I$ . Thus,

$$f = \sum \pi_i f.$$

Each  $\pi_i$  is continuous as the orthogonal projection of  $L^2(\mu)$  onto the closed subspace  $H_i$ . Thus,  $\pi_i$  annihilates a subset of  $L^2(\mu)$  if and only if it annihilates its closure. The following is a consequence of this and Remark 2.15:

*Remark 2.16.* For each set  $\Omega \subset I$ , we have

$$\overline{E}_\Omega^2 = \{f \in L^2(\mu) : \pi_i f = 0 \text{ when } i \notin \Omega\}.$$

Finally, the classical results used in this paper can be found in many texts, with the reference given in each instance being just one such place.

### 3. CLOSURES OF $G$ -INVARIANT SETS

In this section, we show that  $G$ -invariance is preserved by closures in the spaces  $C(X)$  and  $L^p(\mu)$  for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  (Corollaries 3.2 and 3.4). In particular,  $G$  induces classes of isometries on  $L^p(\mu)$  and on  $C(X)$  (Theorem 3.1), as well as a class of weak\*-homeomorphisms on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  (Theorem 3.3).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  is any of the spaces  $C(X)$  or  $L^p(\mu)$  for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  and  $\alpha \in G$ . If  $L_\alpha : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is the map given by  $L_\alpha f = f \circ \varphi_\alpha$ , then  $L_\alpha$  is a bijective linear isometry.*

*Proof.* The bijectivity of each  $L_\alpha$  is clear because each has an inverse map  $L_{\alpha^{-1}}$ . The linearity of each  $L_\alpha$  is also clear. Further, the invariance property (2.1) of  $\mu$  yields that each  $L_\alpha$  is an isometry on  $L^p(\mu)$  (the case for  $L^\infty(\mu)$  follows from Remark 2.5).

To show the same on  $C(X)$ , we observe that

$$|(L_\alpha f)(x)| = |f(\alpha x)| \leq \|f\| \quad \text{and} \quad |f(x)| = |(L_\alpha f)(\alpha^{-1}x)| \leq \|L_\alpha f\|$$

for all  $x \in X$ . These inequalities yield that  $\|L_\alpha f\| = \|f\|$ . □

**Corollary 3.2.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  is any of the spaces  $C(X)$  or  $L^p(\mu)$  for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ . If  $Y \subset \mathcal{X}$  is  $G$ -invariant, then the closure of  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $G$ -invariant.*

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $\alpha \in G$ . If  $L_\alpha : L^\infty(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)$  is the map given by  $L_\alpha(f) = f \circ \varphi_\alpha$ , then  $L_\alpha$  is a weak\*-homeomorphism.*

*Proof.* Recall the weak\*-topology on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  is a weak topology induced by the maps on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  of the form

$$\Lambda_g f = \int_X f g d\mu,$$

for some  $g \in L^1(\mu)$ . Thus,  $L_\alpha$  is continuous with respect to the weak\*-topology if and only if  $\Lambda_g \circ L_\alpha$  is continuous for all maps  $\Lambda_g$ .

Fix  $g \in L^1(\mu)$ . We observe that

$$(\Lambda_g \circ L_\alpha)(f) = \Lambda_g(f \circ \varphi_\alpha) = \int_X (f \circ \varphi_\alpha) \cdot g d\mu = \int_X f \cdot (g \circ \varphi_{\alpha^{-1}}) d\mu = \Lambda_{g \circ \varphi_{\alpha^{-1}}} f,$$

for every  $f \in L^\infty(\mu)$ , by Remark 2.2. We conclude  $L_\alpha$  is continuous on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  with respect to the weak\*-topology.

Finally, the map  $L_{\alpha^{-1}} : L^\infty(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)$  given by  $L_{\alpha^{-1}}(f) = f \circ \varphi_{\alpha^{-1}}$  is the inverse of  $L_\alpha$ . By a similar argument,  $L_{\alpha^{-1}}$  is continuous with respect to the weak\*-topology, and thus  $L_\alpha$  is a weak\*-homeomorphism. □

**Corollary 3.4.** *If  $Y \subset L^\infty(\mu)$  is  $G$ -invariant, then  $\overline{Y}^*$  is  $G$ -invariant.*

*Remark 3.5.* From Remark 2.14 and Corollary 3.4, each  $\overline{E}_\Omega^*$  is a weak\*-closed  $G$ -invariant subspace of  $L^\infty(\mu)$ .

4. CHARACTERIZATION OF WEAK\*-CLOSED  $G$ -INVARIANT SUBSPACES OF  $L^\infty(\mu)$ 

In this section, we state and prove our main result (Theorem 4.1), which shows that the spaces  $\overline{E}_\Omega^*$  are the *only* weak\*-closed  $G$ -invariant subspaces of  $L^\infty(\mu)$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *If  $Y$  is a weak\*-closed  $G$ -invariant subspace of  $L^\infty(\mu)$ , then  $Y = \overline{E}_\Omega^*$  for some  $\Omega \subset I$ .*

This result is an analogue to Theorem 5.1 of [3], which is used in its proof:

**Theorem 4.2** (5.1 [3]). *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be any of the spaces  $C(X)$  or  $L^p(\mu)$  for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . If  $Y$  is a closed  $G$ -invariant subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$ , then  $Y$  is the closure of  $E_\Omega$  for some  $\Omega \subset I$ .*

The set  $\Omega$  from Theorem 4.2 is the set  $\{i \in I : \pi_i Y \neq 0\}$ . The proof of Theorem 4.1 further requires Lemma 4.3, which we prove in Section 5.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $Y \subset L^\infty(\mu)$  be a  $G$ -invariant space. Then for  $g \in L^\infty(\mu)$ , we have that  $g \notin \overline{Y}^2$  whenever  $g \notin \overline{Y}^*$ .*

*Remark 4.4.* From Remark 2.1 and Lemma 4.3, for any  $G$ -invariant space  $Y \subset L^\infty(\mu)$ ,

$$\overline{Y}^* = \overline{Y}^2 \cap L^\infty(\mu).$$

*Remark 4.5.* Remark 4.4 and Remark 2.16 give a description of the sets  $\overline{E}_\Omega^*$ :

$$\overline{E}_\Omega^* = \overline{E}_\Omega^2 \cap L^\infty(\mu) = \{f \in L^\infty(\mu) : \pi_i f = 0 \text{ when } i \notin \Omega\}.$$

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Let  $Y \subset L^\infty(\mu)$  be a weak\*-closed  $G$ -invariant space. Then

$$Y = \overline{Y}^* = \overline{Y}^2 \cap L^\infty(\mu)$$

from Remark 4.4. Since  $Y$  is  $G$ -invariant, so is  $\overline{Y}^2$  from Corollary 3.2. By Theorem 4.2,

$$\overline{Y}^2 = \overline{E}_{\Omega'}^2,$$

where  $\Omega' = \{i \in I : \pi_i \overline{Y}^2 \neq 0\}$ .

We define  $\Omega = \{i \in I : \pi_i Y \neq 0\}$ . Then, Remark 4.5 yields

$$\overline{E}_\Omega^2 \cap L^\infty(\mu) = \overline{E}_\Omega^*.$$

We have  $\Omega = \Omega'$  by the continuity of each  $\pi_i$ , and thus  $\overline{E}_\Omega^2 = \overline{E}_{\Omega'}^2$ . □

## 5. PROOF OF LEMMA 4.3.

In this section, we prove Lemma 4.3, which we note is an analogue to Lemma 5.4 of [3], as well as a generalization of Lemma 4.2 from [1].

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $g \in L^\infty(\mu)$ . Then the map  $\phi : G \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)$  given by  $\phi(\alpha) = g \circ \varphi_\alpha$  is weak\*-continuous.*

*Proof.* To show that  $\phi$  is weak\*-continuous, we verify each  $\Lambda_h \circ \phi$  is continuous, where  $\Lambda_h$  is the map  $L^\infty(\mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  given by integration against the function  $h \in L^1(\mu)$ .

Observe the map  $\Lambda_h \circ \phi$  is given by

$$(\Lambda_h \circ \phi)(\alpha) = \int_X (g \circ \varphi_\alpha) \cdot h \, d\mu.$$

From Lemma 6.2 of [3], the map  $\alpha \mapsto h \circ \varphi_\alpha$  is continuous from  $G$  into  $L^1(\mu)$ . Thus, the map  $\alpha \mapsto g \cdot (h \circ \varphi_{\alpha^{-1}})$  is continuous. We apply Remark 2.2 to get that

$$\alpha \mapsto \int_X g \cdot (h \circ \varphi_{\alpha^{-1}}) d\mu = \int_X (g \circ \varphi_\alpha) \cdot h d\mu$$

is continuous, as desired.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 4.3.** Suppose  $g \in L^\infty(\mu)$  and  $g \notin \overline{Y}^*$ . Then there exists a weak\*-continuous linear functional  $\Gamma$  on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  such that  $\Gamma f = 0$  for  $f \in Y$ , and  $\Gamma g = 1$ , due to the Hahn-Banach theorem (Theorem 3.5 [9]). Since each weak\*-continuous linear functional on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  is induced by an element of  $L^1(\mu)$ , there exists  $h \in L^1(\mu)$  such that  $\Gamma F = \int_X F h d\mu$  for  $F \in L^\infty(\mu)$ .

From Lemma 5.1, there exists a neighborhood  $N$  of the identity in  $G$  such that

$$\operatorname{Re} \int_X (g \circ \varphi_\alpha) \cdot h d\mu > \frac{1}{2}$$

for  $\alpha \in N$ . We choose a continuous map  $\psi : G \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that  $\int \psi dm = 1$  and the support of  $\psi$  is contained in  $N$  (recall  $m$  denotes the Haar measure on  $G$ ).

We now define a map  $\Lambda$  on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  by

$$\Lambda F = \int_X h(x) \int_G \psi(\alpha) \cdot F(\alpha x) dm(\alpha) d\mu(x), \text{ for } F \in L^\infty(\mu).$$

We fix  $F \in L^\infty(\mu)$  and  $x \in X$  and define the map  $\mathcal{F}_x : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by  $\alpha \mapsto F(\alpha x)$ . Since

$$\int_G |\mathcal{F}_x|^2 dm = \int_G |F(\alpha x)|^2 dm(\alpha) = \int_X |F|^2 d\mu = \|F\|_2^2 < \infty,$$

we get  $\mathcal{F}_x \in L^2(G)$ , and since  $\psi$  is continuous, we have that  $\psi \in L^2(G)$ . Further,

$$\left| \int_G \psi \mathcal{F}_x dm \right| \leq \left( \int_G |\psi|^2 dm \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_G |\mathcal{F}_x|^2 dm \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|\psi\|_2 \cdot \|F\|_2,$$

so that for  $F \in L^\infty(\mu)$ ,

$$|\Lambda F| \leq \|\psi\|_2 \cdot \|F\|_2 \int_X |h| d\mu = \|\psi\|_2 \cdot \|F\|_2 \cdot \|h\|_1.$$

The linearity of  $\Lambda$  on  $L^\infty(\mu)$  is clear. Thus,  $\Lambda$  defines an  $L^2$ -continuous linear functional on  $L^\infty(\mu)$ , and hence extends to an  $L^2$ -continuous linear functional  $\Lambda_1$  on  $L^2(\mu)$  by the Hahn-Banach theorem (Theorem 3.6 [9]). By interchanging the integrals in the definition of  $\Lambda$ , we see that  $\Lambda_1$  annihilates  $Y$ , since  $Y$  is  $G$ -invariant. Further,

$$\operatorname{Re} \Lambda_1 g = \int_G \psi(\alpha) \left( \operatorname{Re} \int_X g(\alpha x) \cdot h(x) d\mu(x) \right) dm(\alpha) > \int_N \psi(\alpha) \cdot \frac{1}{2} dm(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

We conclude that  $g \notin \overline{Y}^2$ .  $\square$

## 6. FUTURE QUESTIONS

- (1) Does a  $G$ -collection exist for all groups  $G$  acting continuously and transitively on  $X$ ? What conditions might exist on  $G$  or  $X$  that yield a collection lacking  $(*)$ ?
- (2) Under what conditions can the restrictions on  $X$ ,  $G$ , and the action of  $G$  on  $X$  be loosened? Can the compactness of  $X$  and  $G$  be substituted with local compactness? Can the continuity of the action be substituted with separate continuity?

- (3) Suppose  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  is a collection of closed  $H$ -minimal spaces satisfying the same conditions as  $\mathcal{G}$ . What is the relationship between  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$ ? What if  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  lack  $(*)$ ? The uniqueness of  $\mu$  shows that  $H$  does not induce a new  $H$ -invariant measure on  $X$ . Further,  $G$ -invariance implies  $H$ -invariance (of a space).

We note that (3) is prompted from the study of  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant and  $\mathcal{U}$ -invariant spaces of continuous functions on the unit sphere of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  from [2], in which it is shown that there are infinitely many  $\mathcal{U}$ -invariant spaces and only six  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant spaces. These six  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant spaces are found by combining the  $\mathcal{U}$ -minimal spaces in a specific way (see Lemma 13.1.2 of [7]), and we are curious if this method can be generalized.

- (4) Under what conditions can a  $G$ -collection characterize the closed  $G$ -invariant *algebras* of continuous functions? We note that the case for the unitary group acting on the unit sphere of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is discussed in [10] and is also summarized in [7].

### 7. DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Samuel A. Hokamp. Certain invariant spaces of bounded measurable functions on a sphere. *Positivity*, 25(5):2081–2098, Nov 2021.
- [2] Alexander Nagel and Walter Rudin. Moebius-invariant function spaces on balls and spheres. *Duke Math. J.*, 43(4):841–865, 1976.
- [3] Samuel A. Hokamp. Spaces of continuous and measurable functions invariant under a group action. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.12060>, October 2021.
- [4] André. Weil. L'intégration dans les groupes topologiques et ses applications. *Actual. Sci. Ind.*, no. 869, 1940.
- [5] Joe Diestel and Angela Spalsbury. *The Joys of Haar Measure*. American Mathematical Society, April 2014.
- [6] Alexander J. Izzo. Uniform Algebras Invariant under Transitive Group Actions. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 59(2):417–426, 2010.
- [7] Walter Rudin. *Function theory in the unit ball of  $\mathbb{C}^n$* . Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008. Reprint of the 1980 edition.
- [8] F. Peter and H. Weyl. Die Vollständigkeit der primitiven Darstellungen einer geschlossenen kontinuierlichen Gruppe. *Math. Ann.*, 97(1):737–755, December 1927.
- [9] Walter Rudin. *Functional Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- [10] Walter Rudin. Unitarily invariant algebras of continuous functions on spheres. *Houston J. Math.*, 5(2):253–265, 1979.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STERLING COLLEGE, STERLING, KANSAS, 67579

*Email address:* samuel.hokamp@sterling.edu