

Slow, ordinary and rapid points for Gaussian Wavelets Series and application to Fractional Brownian Motions

C. Esser* and L. Loosveldt†

March 11, 2022

Abstract

We study the Hölderian regularity of Gaussian wavelets series and show that they display, almost surely, three types of points: slow, ordinary and rapid. In particular, this fact holds for the Fractional Brownian Motion. We also show that this property is satisfied for a multifractal extension of Gaussian wavelet series. Finally, we remark that the existence of slow points is specific to these functions.

Keywords: Random Wavelets Series, Fractional Brownian motion, modulus of continuity, slow/ordinary/rapid points

2020 MSC: 42C40, 26A16, 60G15, 60G22, 60G17

Introduction

Let B denote the standard Brownian motion on \mathbb{R} . The Khinchin law of the iterated logarithm [23] allows to control the behavior of B at a given point, in the sense that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, it holds

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B(t+r) - B(t)|}{\sqrt{|r| \log \log |r|^{-1}}} = \sqrt{2} \quad (1)$$

on an event of probability one. As a direct application of Fubini's theorem, one obtains that almost surely, the set of points $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (1) holds, called ordinary points, has full Lebesgue measure. This contrasts with the uniform Hölder condition obtained by Paul Lévy in 1937 which states that the uniform modulus of continuity of B is of larger order: almost surely, one has

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|B(t+r) - B(t)|}{\sqrt{|r| \log |r|^{-1}}} = \sqrt{2}.$$

In particular, there exist exceptional points, called fast points, where the law of the iterated logarithm fails. In 1974, Oray and Taylor studied how often this

*Université de Liège, Département de mathématique – zone Polytech 1, 12 allée de la Découverte, Bât. B37, B-4000 Liège. l.loosveldt@uliege.be

†Corresponding author at: Université du Luxembourg, UR en Mathématiques, Maison du nombre, 6 avenue de la Fonte, L-4364, Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg. laurent.loosveldt@uni.lu.

exceptional behavior holds and proved especially that the Hausdorff dimension of the set

$$\left\{ t \in [0, 1] : \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B(t+r) - B(t)|}{\sqrt{|r| \log |r|^{-1}}} \geq \lambda \sqrt{2} \right\}$$

is given almost surely by $1 - \lambda^2$ for every $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, see [35].

In the meanwhile, Kahane proposed in [22] an easy way to study the regularity and irregularity properties of the Brownian motion. Its method relies on the expansion of B on $[0, 1]$ in the so-called Faber-Schauder system. If Λ is the triangular function

$$\Lambda : x \mapsto \begin{cases} x & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq x < 1 \\ 1 - x & \text{if } 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $\xi, \xi_{j,k}$ ($j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}$) are independent $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables then, we have

$$B(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \xi_{j,k} 2^{-j/2} \Lambda(2^j t - k) + \xi t \quad (2)$$

where the convergence is almost surely uniform for $t \in [0, 1]$. Working with this expression, Kahane recovered the law of the iterated logarithm and the estimation of the modulus of continuity of the Brownian motion. Furthermore, Kahane obtained the existence of a third category of points, presenting a slower oscillation. These points, called slow points, satisfy the condition

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B(t+r) - B(t)|}{\sqrt{|r|}} < +\infty.$$

The law of iterated logarithm and the study of the set of fast points has naturally been studied and extended since then for more general classes of gaussian processus such as gaussian processes with stationary increments, see e.g. [29, 34, 9, 30, 33, 24]. In particular, given a fractional Brownian motion B_h of index $h \in (0, 1)$, one has almost surely

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_h(t+r) - B_h(t)|}{r^h \sqrt{\log \log |r|^{-1}}} = \sqrt{2}$$

and

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \frac{|B_h(t+r) - B_h(t)|}{r^h \sqrt{\log |r|^{-1}}} = \sqrt{2}.$$

In 1999, Meyer, Sellan and Taqqu introduced a famous decomposition of the fractional Brownian motion using a Lemarié-Meyer or sufficiently smooth Daubechies wavelet ψ , which decorrelates the high frequencies [32]. More precisely, any fractional Brownian motion B_h of Hurst index $h \in (0, 1)$ can be written as

$$B_h(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-hj} \xi_{j,k} \psi_{h+1/2}(2^j t - k) + R(t) \quad (3)$$

where R is a smooth process, $(\xi_{j,k})_{(j,k) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of independent $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables, and ψ_α is defined by

$$\hat{\psi}_\alpha(\xi) = \frac{1}{|\xi|^\alpha} \hat{\psi}(\xi).$$

Note that such a function leads to a biorthogonal wavelet basis, see Section 1.

Motivated by the study of fractional Brownian motions using this particular decomposition, we develop in this paper a systematic study of the different pointwise behaviors of random wavelets series of the form

$$f_h = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi_{j,k} 2^{-hj} \psi(2^j \cdot -k) \quad (4)$$

where $(\xi_{j,k})_{(j,k) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}}$ denote a sequence of independent $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables, $h \in (0, 1)$ is fixed and ψ is any compactly supported or smooth wavelet, see Section 1 for a precise definition. Note that, even if the expression (4) is very similar to (2), dealing with it requires much more technical arguments. Indeed, due to the symmetry of the function Λ , most of the terms vanish in the expansion of the increments $B(t) - B(s)$ if s and t are closed enough. This fact can not be used anymore while working with an arbitrary wavelet and compensations of different terms may occurs.

Concerning the regularity of the function f_h , one can show, see Proposition 1.3 below, that, for all $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(f_h(t) - f_h(s))^2] \leq C|s - t|^{2h},$$

for some deterministic constant $C > 0$. Applying Kolmogorov continuity Theorem for gaussian processes, one can deduce that almost surely, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, one has

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|f_h(t+r) - f_h(t)|}{r^{h-\varepsilon}} < +\infty$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$. The aim of this paper is to characterize more precisely the pointwise behavior of such a wavelet series, in the spirit of what is known for the Brownian motion. Recently, generalized Hölder spaces has been introduced to address this kind of questions [25, 27] as well as the regularity of solutions of partial differential equations [26]. This article is the continuation of the work done in [2, 4, 22] for the Brownian motion.

As a consequence of our results, we get that almost surely, the Hölder exponent of the random wavelet series f_h is h while it does not belong to the uniform Hölder space of order h . Nevertheless, if t is a slow point, f_h belongs to the **pointwise** Hölder space of order h at t . One can therefore wonder if this feature is common or if it is specific to the functions under study in this paper. To address this question, in Section 6 we recall two commonly used notions of genericity: the prevalence and the Baire category point of view. We obtain that, in both sense, the existence of slow points is a specific property of gaussian random wavelets series.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 1, before stating our main result, we recall the most important tools used in the paper: discrete wavelet transform and modulus of continuity as well as some fundamental inequalities. Section 2 is devoted to exploring the regularity of the gaussian random wavelet

serie (4) by identifying three precise pointwise estimates. In Section 3, we focus on the irregularity that we deduced from the asymptotic behavior of the wavelet coefficients. Then, using the obtain results of regularity and irregularity, we prove our main result concerning the existence of slow, ordinary and rapid points in Section 4. This fact is extended to multifractal gaussian random series in Section 5. Finally, Section 6, focuses on the results of genericity for slow points. In this paper, C stands for a deterministic constant not necessary the same in different lines.

1 Preliminaries and statement of the main result

In this section, we present the notions needed for the statement of the main theorem and the first result concerning the convergence of the wavelets series defined in (4).

Let us first briefly recall some definitions and notations about wavelets and biorthogonal wavelets (for more precisions, see e.g. [15, 31, 28, 13]). Under some general assumptions, there exist two functions ϕ and ψ , called wavelets, which generate two orthonormal bases of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, namely

$$\{\phi(\cdot - k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \cup \{\psi(2^j \cdot - k) : j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

and

$$\{\psi(2^j \cdot - k) : j \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Any function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ can be decomposed as follows,

$$f = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} C_k \phi(\cdot - k) + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_{j,k} \psi(2^j \cdot - k) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_{j,k} \psi(2^j \cdot - k)$$

where

$$c_{j,k} = 2^j \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \psi(2^j x - k) dx$$

and

$$C_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \phi(x - k) dx.$$

Let us remark that we do not choose the $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ normalization for the wavelets, but rather an $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ normalization, which is better fitted to the study of the Hölderian regularity. Among the families of wavelet basis that exist, we are mostly interested in two classes: The Lemarié-Meyer wavlets for which ϕ and ψ belong to the Schwartz class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, or Daubechies wavelets for which ϕ and ψ are compactly supported functions. In both cases, the first moment of the wavelet ψ vanishes.

The setting in which we work is more general than just orthogonal wavelet basis, so that it allows to cover the important example supplied by the fractional Brownian motion. Biorthogonal wavelet bases are a couple of two Riesz wavelet bases of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ generated respectively by ψ and $\tilde{\psi}$ and such that

$$2^{j/2} 2^{j'/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(2^j x - k) \tilde{\psi}(2^{j'} x - k') dx = \delta_{j,j'} \delta_{k,k'}.$$

In that case, any function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ can be decomposed as

$$f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_{j,k} \psi(2^j \cdot -k)$$

where

$$c_{j,k} = 2^j \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \tilde{\psi}(2^j x - k) dx.$$

Wavelet basis and biorthogonal wavelet basis give a powerful tool to study the regularity and irregularity of functions or signals belonging to numerous functional spaces, see e.g. [21, 31, 6, 19, 1, 20, 12, 17, 25, 27]. In this paper, they will be used to get irregularity properties in Section 3.

Let us now present two lemmata that allow to prove the uniform convergence on any compact set of the series defined in (4), where ψ comes from any wavelet basis or biorthogonal wavelet basis. The first one is very classical and the second one gives informations about the asymptotic behavior of a sequence of i.i.d gaussian random variables.

Lemma 1.1. *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{(1 + |x - k|)^4} \leq C_1.$$

Lemma 1.2. [3, 5] *Let $(\xi_{j,k})_{(j,k) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of independent $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables. There are an event Ω^* of probability 1 and a positive random variable C_2 of finite moment of every order such that, for all $\omega \in \Omega^*$ and $(j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the inequality*

$$|\xi_{j,k}(\omega)| \leq C_2(\omega) \sqrt{\log(3 + j + |k|)} \quad (5)$$

holds.

Let f_h denote the process defined in (4). For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$f_{h,j} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi_{j,k} 2^{-hj} \psi(2^j \cdot -k).$$

and remark that, if inequality (5) holds then, thanks to Lemma 1.1 and the fast decay of the wavelet and its derivative (or using the compactness of the support of ψ), the sum in the right-hand side converges uniformly on any compact set, as well as the sum

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi_{j,k} 2^{(1-h)j} D\psi(2^j \cdot -k). \quad (6)$$

Therefore, for all j , $f_{h,j}$ is continuously differentiable with derivative $Df_{h,j}$ given by (6). In particular, the process f_h is well defined and bounded on the event Ω^* of probability 1. In the following, we will hence work on this event without mentioning it explicitly.

Using similar arguments, the following Proposition gives us a first information concerning the regularity of the function f_h .

Proposition 1.3. *Let f_h be the random wavelet series defined in (4). If ψ is continuously differentiable, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\mathbb{E}[(f_h(t) - f_h(s))^2] \leq C|s - t|^{2h}.$$

Proof. From the independence of the centered random variables in $(\xi_{j,k})_{(j,k) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(f_h(t) - f_h(s))^2] = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-2hj} (\psi(2^j t - k) - \psi(2^j s - k))^2.$$

Let us fix t and assume that s and $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ are such that

$$2^{-\nu} < |t - s| \leq 2^{-\nu+1}.$$

For all $j \leq \nu$, we set

$$F_{j,t} : x \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-2hj} (\psi(2^j t - k) - \psi(2^j x - k))^2.$$

Let us then remark that $F_{j,t}$ is continuously differentiable on any compact set. If ψ is compactly supported, this is obvious. Otherwise, it comes from the fast decay of ψ and Lemma 1.1. In any case, by the mean value theorem, there exist x_1 between s and t such that

$$\begin{aligned} |F_{j,t}(s) - F_{j,t}(t)| &= \left| (s - t) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{(1-2h)j} 2 (\psi(2^j t - k) - \psi(2^j x_1 - k)) D\psi(2^j x_1 - k) \right| \\ &\leq C \left| (s - t) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{(1-2h)j} (\psi(2^j t - k) - \psi(2^j x_1 - k)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying again the mean-value theorem to the function

$$g_j : x \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{(1-2h)j} \psi(2^j x - k),$$

we get

$$|F_{j,t}(s) - F_{j,t}(t)| \leq C|s - t|^2 2^{(2-2h)j}$$

because

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} D\psi(2^j t - k)$$

can be uniformly bounded, by the fast decay and Lemma 1.1 or using the compact support of ψ . With the same argument, we also get, for all $j > \nu$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-2hj} (\psi(2^j t - k) - \psi(2^j s - k))^2 \right| &\leq 2^{-2hj} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 4((\psi(2^j t - k))^2 + (\psi(2^j s - k))^2) \\ &\leq C 2^{-2hj}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting all of these together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[(f_h(t) - f_h(s))^2] &= \sum_{j \leq \nu} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-2hj} (\psi(2^j t - k) - \psi(2^j s - k))^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{j > \nu} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-2hj} (\psi(2^j t - k) - \psi(2^j s - k))^2 \\
&\leq C(|s - t|^2 \sum_{j \leq \nu} 2^{(2-2h)j} + \sum_{j > \nu} 2^{-2hj}) \\
&\leq C(|s - t|^2 2^{(2-2h)\nu} + 2^{-2h\nu}) \\
&\leq C|s - t|^{2h}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

From the last proposition and Kolmogorov continuity Theorem for gaussian processes, we know that the sample path of f_h are almost surely locally Hölder-continuous of order $h - \varepsilon$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Our aim in this paper is to give more precise information concerning the regularity of f_h . In order to state it, we recall finally that a modulus of continuity is an increasing function $\omega : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying $\omega(0) = 0$ and for which there is $C > 0$ such that $\omega(2x) \leq C\omega(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Wavelet characterizations of regularity require the following additional regularity property for moduli of continuity, see [21]: A modulus of continuity ω is regular if there is $N \geq 0$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} 2^{Nj} \omega(2^{-j}) \leq C 2^{NJ} \omega(2^{-J}) \\ \sum_{j=-\infty}^J 2^{(N+1)j} \omega(2^{-j}) \leq C 2^{(N+1)J} \omega(2^{-J}) \end{array} \right. \quad (7)$$

for all $J \geq 0$. Our main result will use three different regular moduli of continuity:

- the modulus of continuity ω_r of the rapid points is defined by

$$\omega_r^{(h)}(x) = |x|^h \sqrt{\log |x|^{-1}}$$

- the modulus of continuity ω_o of the ordinary points is defined by

$$\omega_o^{(h)}(x) = |x|^h \sqrt{\log \log |x|^{-1}}$$

- the modulus of continuity ω_s of the slow points is defined by

$$\omega_s^{(h)}(x) = |x|^h.$$

Theorem 1.4. *Almost surely, the random wavelets series defined in (4) satisfies the following property for every non-empty interval I of \mathbb{R} :*

- For almost every $t \in I$,

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_o^{(h)}(|s - t|)} < +\infty \quad (8)$$

and if ω is a modulus of continuity such that $\omega = o(\omega_o^{(h)})$, then

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega(|s - t|)} = +\infty, \quad (9)$$

Such points are called ordinary points.

- There exists $t \in I$ such that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_r^{(h)}(|s - t|)} < +\infty \quad (10)$$

and if ω is a modulus of continuity such that $\omega = o(\omega_r^{(h)})$, then

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega(|s - t|)} = +\infty, \quad (11)$$

Such points are called rapid points.

- There exists $t \in I$ such that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_s^{(h)}(|s - t|)} < +\infty. \quad (12)$$

and if ω is a modulus of continuity such that $\omega = o(\omega_s^{(h)})$, then

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega(|s - t|)} = +\infty. \quad (13)$$

Such points are called slow points.

Remark 1.5. Theorem 1.4 is stated in full generality but let us already emphasize that it can be improved while considering compactly supported wavelets. Indeed, in this case, one can show the strict positiveness of the limits in (8), (10) and (12), see Remark 4.2 below.

Theorem 1.4 generalises the famous result of Kahane about the different pointwise behaviors of the Brownian motion, see [22, Theorem 3 in Chapter 16]. Moreover, it can be applied to the random wavelet series in (3), hence it proves the existence of the three types of points for the fractional Brownian motion.

Remark 1.6. A good tool to determine the regularity of a locally bounded function f at a point t is to compute its Hölder exponent $h_f(t)$. If $\alpha > 0$, we say that f belongs to the *pointwise Hölder space* $C^\alpha(t)$ if there exists a polynomial P_t of degree strictly less than α and a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{x \in B(x_0, 2^{-j})} |f(x) - P_t(x)| \leq C 2^{-\alpha j}.$$

It is straightforward to show that, as soon as $\alpha < \beta$, $C^\beta(t) \subseteq C^\alpha(t)$. Therefore, we define the *pointwise Hölder exponent* of f at point t by

$$h_f(t) = \sup\{\alpha > 0 : f \in C^\alpha(t)\}.$$

Theorem 1.4 tells us in particular that, if t is an ordinary or rapid point, then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $f_h \in C^{h-\varepsilon}(t)$ and $f_h \notin C^h(t)$ which gives $h_{f_h}(t) = h$. On the

contrary, if t is a slow point, $f_h \in C^h(t)$ while, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $f_h \notin C^{h+\varepsilon}(t)$ and so, again, $h_{f_h}(t) = h$. In fact, the finiteness of the limits (8), (10) and (12) means that the function f belongs to a generalized pointwise Hölder space [25, 27] associated to the corresponding modulus of continuity.

The next sections are dedicated to the proof of this result. Any open interval in \mathbb{R} can be written as a countable union of dyadic intervals. Then, to prove Theorem 1.4, it is sufficient to show that, for all dyadic interval of the form $\lambda_{j,k} = [k2^{-j}, (k+1)2^{-j}[$ with $j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exist an event $\Omega_{j,k}$ of probability 1 such that, for all $\omega \in \Omega_{j,k}$, almost every $t \in \lambda_{j,k}$ is ordinary and there exist $t_r \in \lambda_{j,k}$ which is rapid and $t_s \in \lambda_{j,k}$ which is slow. For the sake of simpleness in notation, we will only do the proofs in full details for $\lambda_{0,0} = [0, 1)$. In fact, after dilatations and translations, our proofs hold true for any arbitrary dyadic interval. Note also that the proofs will be done in the case where the wavelet ψ is in the Schwartz class; it can easily be adapted and simplified if ψ is compactly supported.

2 Regularity properties

In this section, we establish inequalities (8), (10) and (12). Concerning rapid and ordinary points, the conduct of the proof is similar. First we use Lemma 1.2 to bound the coefficients in (4). Then we use the fast decay of the wavelet to measure the contribution of the coefficients associated to dyadic intervals that are far away from the point of interest t in the difference $|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|$. Concerning the slow points, we take advantage of a procedure initiated by Kahane in [22] to identify points for which we can obtain more precise information concerning the coefficients of the “closest” intervals while we still use Lemma 1.2 and the fast decay for the “furthest” one.

2.1 Rapid points

To prove the existence of rapid points, we apply Lemma 1.2 and get an uniform modulus of continuity for the function f_h . We deal with the coefficients associated to furthest intervals thanks to the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\sum_{|k| > 2^{j+1}} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^5} \leq C_1$$

Proof. Let us fix $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in (0, 1)$. As $|k| > 2^{j+1}$, obviously, $\frac{k}{2^j} \notin (-2, 2)$ so let $n \notin \{0, \pm 1, -2\}$ be such that $n2^j \leq k < (n+1)2^j$. Now, as $x \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$|2^j x - k| \geq 2^j |x - n| - 1 \geq 2^j (|n| - 1) - 1 \geq \frac{|k|}{2} - 1.$$

Thus, for all such j, k and x , we have

$$\frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)} \leq 2 \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+2|k|)}}{|k|}$$

and we conclude using the boundedness of the function $x \mapsto \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+2x)}}{x}$ on $[1, +\infty[$ and Lemma 1.1. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Almost surely, there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that, for all $t, s \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$|f_h(s) - f_h(t)| \leq C_1 |t - s|^h \sqrt{\log |t - s|^{-1}}.$$

In particular, one has almost surely

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_r^{(h)}(|s - t|)} < +\infty$$

for every $t \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. Let us assume that t, s and $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that

$$2^{-\nu} < |t - s| \leq 2^{-\nu+1}.$$

For all $j \leq \nu$, by the mean value theorem, there exists x between s and t such that

$$|f_{h,j}(t) - f_{h,j}(s)| \leq |t - s| |Df_{h,j}(x)| \tag{14}$$

and, using the fast decay of $D\psi$ and (5), it follows that

$$|Df_{h,j}(x)| \leq CC_2 2^{(1-h)j} \left(\sum_{|k| \leq 2^{j+1}} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4} + \sum_{|k| > 2^{j+1}} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^5} \right).$$

We bound the second sum by Lemma 2.1 while, for the first sum, we have

$$\sum_{|k| \leq 2^{j+1}} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4} \leq C \sum_{|k| \leq 2^{j+1}} \frac{\sqrt{j}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4} \leq C\sqrt{j}$$

by Lemma 1.1. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j \leq \nu} (f_{h,j}(t) - f_{h,j}(s)) \right| &\leq CC_2 |t - s| 2^{(1-h)\nu} \sqrt{\nu} \\ &\leq CC_2(\omega) |t - s|^h \sqrt{\log |t - s|^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if $j > \nu$, by splitting the sums in the same way, we also have

$$|f_{h,j}(t)| \leq CC_2 2^{-hj} \sqrt{j} \text{ and } |f_{h,j}(s)| \leq CC_2 2^{-hj} \sqrt{j}$$

which obviously leads to

$$\left| \sum_{j > \nu} f_{h,j}(t) \right| \leq CC_2 |t - s|^h \sqrt{\log |t - s|^{-1}}$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{j > \nu} f_{h,j}(s) \right| \leq CC_2 |t - s|^h \sqrt{\log |t - s|^{-1}}.$$

The conclusion follows immediately. \square

2.2 Ordinary points

To establish the existence of ordinary points, we need to introduce some notations. If $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $t \in (0, 1)$, we denote by $k_j(t)$ the unique positive integer in $\{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}$ such that $t \in [k_j(t)2^{-j}, (k_j(t) + 1)2^{-j})$. We also define, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the set

$$\kappa_j^t(n) = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} : |k - k_j(t)| \leq n\}$$

The main proof of this section consists in applying Lemma 1.2 to a sequence of independent $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables indexed from $k_j(t)$. Then, Lemmata 2.3 and 2.4 help us to deal with the coefficients associated with the furthest intervals.

Lemma 2.3. *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in (0, 1)$ such that $|t - x| \leq 2^{-j+1}$ we have*

$$\sum_{k \notin \kappa_j^t(j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3 + j + |k - k_j(t)|)}}{(3 + |2^j x - k|)(1 + |2^j x - k|)^4} \leq C_1$$

Proof. Let us fix $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in (0, 1)$ such that $|t - x| \leq 2^{-j+1}$. If $k \notin \kappa_j^t(j)$, we immediately have $|2^j x - k_j(t)| \leq 3$ and thus $|2^j x - k| \geq |k_j(t) - k| - 3$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\sqrt{\log(3 + j + |k - k_j(t)|)}}{(3 + |2^j x - k|)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\log(3 + 2|k - k_j(t)|)}}{|k_j(t) - k|}$$

and the conclusion follows just like in Lemma 2.1. \square

Lemma 2.4. *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in (0, 1)$ and $s \in (0, 1)$ such that $|2^j s - k_j(t)| \leq j$ we have*

$$\sum_{k \notin \kappa_j^t(2j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3 + j + |k - k_j(t)|)}}{(1 + |2^j s - k|)^5} \leq C_1$$

Proof. Let us fix $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in (0, 1)$ and $s \in (0, 1)$ such that $|2^j s - k_j(t)| \leq j$. If $k \notin \kappa_j^t(2j)$, of course, $|2^j s - k_j(t)| < \frac{|k - k_j(t)|}{2}$ and thus $|2^j s - k| \geq \frac{|k - k_j(t)|}{2}$. It follows that

$$\frac{\sqrt{\log(3 + j + |k - k_j(t)|)}}{1 + |2^j s - k|} \leq 2 \frac{\sqrt{\log(3 + 2|k - k_j(t)|)}}{|k - k_j(t)|}$$

and, again, we conclude just like in Lemma 2.1. \square

Proposition 2.5. *Almost surely, for almost every $t \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_o^{(h)}(|t - s|)} < +\infty.$$

Proof. Let us fix $t \in (0, 1)$, and $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and let $0 \leq k_j(t) < 2^j$ be such that $t \in [k_j(t)2^{-j}, (k_j(t) + 1)2^{-j}]$. A simple modification of Lemma 1.2 insure us the

existence of a positive random variable C_t of finite moment of every order such that, almost surely

$$|\xi_{j,k}| \leq C_t \sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}.$$

As previously, if $s \in (0, 1)$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that

$$2^{-\nu} < |t-s| \leq 2^{-\nu+1},$$

we first start by considering, for all $j \leq \nu$, $|Df_{h,j}(x)|$ for a x between s and t . In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Df_{h,j}(x)| &\leq CC_t 2^{(1-h)j} \left(\sum_{k \in \kappa_j^t(j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k \notin \kappa_j^t(j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(3+|2^j x - k|)(1+|2^j x - k|)^4} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and we bound the second sum by Lemma 2.3, while, for the first sum, we have

$$\sum_{k \in \kappa_j^t(j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4} \leq C \sum_{k \in \kappa_j^t(j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(j)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4} \leq C \sqrt{\log(j)}$$

by Lemma 1.1. These inequalities lead to

$$\left| \sum_{j \leq \nu} (f_{h,j}(t) - f_{h,j}(s)) \right| \leq CC_t |t-s|^h \sqrt{\log \log |t-s|^{-1}}. \quad (15)$$

To bound $|f_{h,j}(t)|$, for all $j > \nu$, we use the same techniques and get

$$\left| \sum_{j > \nu} f_{h,j}(t) \right| \leq CC_t |t-s|^h \sqrt{\log \log |t-s|^{-1}}.$$

The bound for $|f_{h,j}(s)|$ is a little bit more tricky. As $|2^j s - k_j(t)| \leq 2^{j-\nu+2}$, we first consider the case when $2^{j-\nu+2} \leq j$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{h,j}(s)| &\leq CC_t 2^{-hj} \left(\sum_{k \in \kappa_j^t(2j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(1+|2^j s - k|)^4} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k \notin \kappa_j^t(2j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(1+|2^j s - k|)^5} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The second sum is this time bounded using Lemma 2.4 while we again use Lemma 1.1 to get

$$\sum_{k \in \kappa_j^t(2j)} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(1+|2^j s - k|)^4} \leq C \sqrt{\log(j)}.$$

Now, if $j < 2^{j-\nu+2}$,

$$|f_{h,j}(s)| \leq CC_t 2^{-hj} \left(\sum_{k \in \kappa_j^s(2^{j-\nu+2})} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(1+|2^j s - k|)^4} + \sum_{k \notin \kappa_j^s(2^{j-\nu+2})} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(1+|2^j s - k|)^5} \right)$$

and, as $|k_j(s) - k_j(t)| \leq 2^{j-\nu+1} + 2$, for all $k \in \kappa_j^s(2^{j-\nu+2})$ we have

$$\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|) \leq \log(3+j+|k_j(s)-k_j(t)|+|k-k_j(s)|) \leq \log(42^{j-\nu+2})$$

while, for all $k \notin \kappa_j^s(2^{j-\nu+2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(1+|2^j s - k|)^5} &\leq \frac{\log(3+j+|k_j(s)-k_j(t)|+|k-k_j(s)|)}{|k-k_j(s)|} \\ &\leq \frac{\log(4|k-k_j(s)|)}{|k-k_j(s)|} \\ &\leq C \end{aligned}$$

which gives us

$$|f_{h,j}(s)| \leq CC_t 2^{-hj} \sqrt{j-\nu}. \quad (16)$$

In total, using (15) and (16), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j>\nu} f_{h,j}(s) \right| &\leq \sum_{j>\nu} CC_t 2^{-hj} \sqrt{j-\nu} \sqrt{\log(j)} \\ &\leq CC_t |t-s|^h \sqrt{\log \log |t-s|^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion comes from Fubini's Theorem. \square

2.3 Slow points

2.3.1 An iterative procedure for slow points

The following procedure is inspired by the one initially described by Kahane in [22] to identify slow points for the Brownian motion. We generalized it here by introducing an extra parameter $m \in \mathbb{N}$ in order to use it for any¹ $h > 0$. Some clarifications are also made.

If $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we note

$$p_l(\mu) = \mathbb{P}(2^l \mu < |\xi| \leq 2^{l+1} \mu).$$

For all $j, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 \leq k < 2^j$, we define

$$S_{j,l}^\mu = \{k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\} : 2^l \mu < |\xi_{j,k}| \leq 2^{l+1} \mu\}$$

and

$$\Lambda_{j,l}(k) = \{k' \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\} : |k - k'| \leq 2^{ml}\}.$$

¹Kahane only considered the case $h = \frac{1}{2}$ and so its construction is made with $m = 3$ which is sufficient to fulfill the condition $h > \frac{1}{m}$ we will need afterward.

Note that $\#\Lambda_{j,l}(k) \leq 2^{ml+1} + 1$. For all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we define a closed set from the dyadic intervals $[k2^{-j}, (k+1)2^{-j}]$ for which k belongs to the set

$$I_j^\mu = \{k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\} : \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_0, \Lambda_{j,l}(k) \cap S_{j,l}^\mu = \emptyset\},$$

namely, we consider

$$F_j^\mu = \bigcup_{k \in I_j^\mu} [k2^{-j}, (k+1)2^{-j}].$$

We want to show that, almost surely, there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$S_{\text{low}}^\mu = \bigcap_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} F_j^\mu \neq \emptyset$$

which is equivalent to the fact that, for all $J \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$S_{\text{low},J}^\mu = \bigcap_{j \leq J} F_j^\mu$$

is non-empty, as $(S_{\text{low},J}^\mu)_{J \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a decreasing sequence of compact sets. In other words, if we denote by N_J^μ the number of subintervals of $S_{\text{low},J}^\mu$, we want to show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{J \in \mathbb{N}_0} \{N_J^\mu \geq 1\}\right) = 1.$$

For this purpose, we will consider sufficiently large μ such that the inequality

$$\sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} (2^{ml+1} + 1)(p_l(\mu) + l\sqrt{p_l(\mu)(1-p_l(\mu))}) < \frac{1}{4} \quad (17)$$

holds. Moreover, if J_1 is fixed, let us remark that the construction of S_{low,J_1}^μ needs to consider at most $\sum_{j=0}^{J_1} 2^j$ i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ random variables and, by increasing μ if necessary, one can choose to remove the intervals $[0, 2^{-J_1}]$ and $[1 - 2^{-J_1}, 1]$ from S_{low,J_1}^μ at this step if necessary while making $\mathbb{P}(N_{J_1}^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^{J_1})$ as close to 1 as we want. This trick helps us to start our construction with an arbitrary close to 1 “initial value” of probability and to make sure that, at the end, the resulting points will differ from 0 and 1.

Lemma 2.6. *For all $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large such that condition (17) holds, the sequence $(N_J^\mu)_{J \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ of random variables satisfies the formula*

$$\mathbb{P}(N_{J+1}^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^{J+1}) \geq (1 - (\frac{2}{3})^J)\mathbb{P}(N_J^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^J), \quad \forall J \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (18)$$

Proof. For all J , we define²

$$\mathcal{I}_J^\mu = \{k \in \{0, \dots, 2^J - 1\} : [k2^{-J}, (k+1)2^{-J}] \subseteq S_{\text{low},J}^\mu\},$$

and remark that \mathcal{I}_{J+1}^μ is obtained by removing from $2\mathcal{I}_J^\mu \cup 2\mathcal{I}_J^\mu + 1$ the elements $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^{J+1} - 1\}$ such that $\Lambda_{J+1,l}(k) \cap S_{J+1,l}^\mu \neq \emptyset$ for a $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. But now, if $N_J^\mu = N$, for all such a l ,

$$\#\{S_{J+1,l}^\mu \cap (2\mathcal{I}_J^\mu \cup 2\mathcal{I}_J^\mu + 1)\} \sim \mathcal{B}(2N, p_l(\mu))$$

²We obviously have $N_J^\mu = \#\mathcal{I}_J^\mu$.

so we have, by Tchebycheff's inequality, that

$$\#(S_{J+1,l}^\mu \cap (2\mathcal{I}_J^\mu \cup 2\mathcal{I}_J^\mu + 1)) \leq 2N(p_l(\mu) + (l+1)\sqrt{p_l(\mu)(1-p_l(\mu))})$$

with probability greater than $1 - (l+1)^{-2}N^{-1}$. Thus the number of removed k is bounded by

$$2N \sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} (2^{m_l+1} + 1)(p_l(\mu) + l\sqrt{p_l(\mu)(1-p_l(\mu))})$$

with probability greater than $1 - N^{-1}$. Now, with condition (17), we get, for all J ,

$$\mathbb{P}(N_{J+1}^\mu \geq \frac{3}{2}N_J | N_J^\mu = N) \geq 1 - N^{-1}$$

which gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N_{J+1}^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^{J+1}) &\geq \mathbb{P}((N_{J+1}^\mu \geq \frac{3}{2}N_J) \cap (N_J^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^J)) \\ &= \sum_{N \geq (\frac{3}{2})^J} \mathbb{P}(N_{J+1}^\mu \geq \frac{3}{2}N_J | N_J^\mu = N) \mathbb{P}(N_J^\mu = N) \\ &\geq \sum_{N \geq (\frac{3}{2})^J} (1 - N^{-1}) \mathbb{P}(N_J^\mu = N) \\ &\geq (1 - (\frac{2}{3})^J) \sum_{N \geq (\frac{3}{2})^J} \mathbb{P}(N_J^\mu = N) \\ &= (1 - (\frac{2}{3})^J) \mathbb{P}(N_J^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^J). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.7. *Almost surely, there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(0, 1) \cap S_{low}^\mu \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. From formula (18), if μ is large enough we deduce by induction that for all J_1, J with $J_1 \leq J$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N_J^\mu \geq 1) &\geq \mathbb{P}(N_J^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^J) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(N_{J_1}^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^{J_1}) \left(\prod_{j=J_1}^J (1 - (\frac{2}{3})^j) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us remark that, as $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\frac{2}{3})^j < \infty$, the infinite product $\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - (\frac{2}{3})^j)$ converges to a non-zero limit and

$$\lim_{J_1 \rightarrow +\infty} \prod_{j=J_1}^{+\infty} (1 - (\frac{2}{3})^j) = 1.$$

Now, for all $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, one can choose J_1 such that

$$\prod_{j=J_1}^{+\infty} (1 - (\frac{2}{3})^j) > 1 - \varepsilon$$

and, by increasing μ if necessary, we can choose to remove the intervals $[0, 2^{-J_1}]$ and $[1 - 2^{-J_1}, 1]$ from S_{low, J_1}^μ , if necessary and assume

$$\mathbb{P}(N_{J_1}^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^{J_1}) > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, as the sequence of events $(\{N_J^\mu \geq 1\})_{J \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is decreasing, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{J \in \mathbb{N}_0} (N_J^\mu \geq 1)\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(N_{J_1}^\mu \geq (\frac{3}{2})^{J_1}) \left(\prod_{j=J_1}^{\infty} (1 - (\frac{2}{3})^j)\right) > (1 - \varepsilon)^2.$$

In total, we showed that, for all $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{J \in \mathbb{N}_0} (N_J^\mu \geq 1)\right) > (1 - \varepsilon)^2$$

and the conclusion follows immediately. \square

2.3.2 Existence of slow points

Now, using this iterative procedure, we establish the existence of points satisfying inequality (12). In this section, it will be convenient to write

$$f_{h,j} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_{h,j}^{[n]} \tag{19}$$

where, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$f_{h,j}^{[n]} = \sum_{k=n2^j}^{(n+1)2^j-1} \xi_{j,k} 2^{-hj} \psi(2^j \cdot -k)$$

is the partial sum involving the k for which the corresponding dyadic interval $[k2^{-j}, (k+1)2^{-j}[$ is included in $[n, n+1[$.

Proposition 2.8. *Almost surely, there exists $t \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_s^{(h)}(|t-s|)} < +\infty.$$

Proof. Let us fix $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $h \geq 1/m$. The iterative procedure with m gives that almost surely, $(0, 1) \cap S_{\text{low}}^\mu \neq \emptyset$. Now let $t \in (0, 1) \cap S_{\text{low}}^\mu$. There exists $r > 0$ such that $[t-r, t+r] \subset (0, 1)$ and so, let us take $s \in [t-r, t+r]$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$2^{-\nu} < |t-s| \leq 2^{-\nu+1}.$$

We are going to estimate from above $|f_h(t) - f_h(s)|$.

For all $j \leq \nu$, once again, by the Mean Value Theorem, there exists x between s and t such that

$$|f_{h,j}(t) - f_{h,j}(s)| \leq |s-t| |Df_{h,j}(x)|.$$

To bound $|Df_{h,j}(x)|$, we will use the decomposition (19). For $n = 0$, if $0 \leq l \leq \lceil j/m \rceil$, $0 \leq k < 2^j$ and $|k_j(t) - k| \leq 2^{ml}$, then necessarily $|\xi_{j,k}| \leq 2^l \mu$. Thus, if we set

$$\Lambda_j^0(t) = \{0 \leq k < 2^j : |k_j(t) - k| \leq 1\}$$

and, for all $1 \leq l \leq \lceil j/m \rceil$

$$\Lambda_j^l(t) = \{0 \leq k < 2^j : 2^{m(l-1)} < |k_j(t) - k| \leq 2^{ml}\},$$

we have, using the fast decay of $D\psi$,

$$|Df_{h,j}^{[0]}(x)| \leq 2^{(1-h)j} \sum_{l=0}^{\lceil j/m \rceil} \sum_{k \in \Lambda_j^l(t)} |\xi_{j,k}| |D\psi(2^j x - k)| \quad (20)$$

$$\leq C 2^{(1-h)j} \sum_{l=0}^{\lceil j/m \rceil} \sum_{k \in \Lambda_j^l(t)} 2^l \mu \frac{1}{(3 + |2^j x - k|)(1 + |2^j x - k|)^4}. \quad (21)$$

As, for $l \geq 1$ and $k \in \Lambda_j^l(t)$, $|2^j x - k| \geq |k_j(t) - k| - 3 > 2^{m(l-1)} - 3$, we obtain

$$|Df_{h,j}^{[0]}(x)| \leq C \mu 2^{(1-h)j} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \frac{1}{(1 + |2^j x - k|)^4}.$$

Now, there exists³ $C_t > 0$, such that, for all $n \neq 0$ and $n 2^j \leq k < (n+1)2^j - 1$, we have $|2^j x - k| \geq C_t |n| 2^j$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} |Df_{h,j}^{[n]}(x)| &\leq C C_2 2^{(1-h)j} \sum_{k=n 2^j}^{(n+1)2^j-1} \frac{1}{(1 + |2^j x - k|)^4} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3 + j + |k|)}}{C_t |n| 2^j} \\ &\leq C C_2 2^{(1-h)j} \sum_{k=n 2^j}^{(n+1)2^j-1} \frac{1}{(1 + |2^j x - k|)^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define the random variable $C_\mu = \max(C_2, \mu)$. By Lemma 1.1, we obtain, for all $j \leq \nu$,

$$|f_{h,j}(t) - f_{h,j}(s)| \leq C_\mu 2^{(1-h)j} |s - t|$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j \leq \nu} (f_{h,j}(t) - f_{h,j}(s)) \right| &\leq C C_\mu 2^{(1-h)\nu} |s - t| \\ &\leq C C_\mu^* |s - t|^h. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Now, we consider the terms for $j > \nu$ and we will bound separately $|f_{h,j}(t)|$ and $|f_{h,j}(s)|$. For $|f_{h,j}(t)|$, we just have to repeat the same procedure, using the set $\Lambda_j^l(t)$ to estimate $|f_{h,j}^{[0]}(t)|$ and Lemma 1.2 for $|f_{h,j}^{[n]}(t)|$ with $n \neq 0$. We then

³We can make this constant only dependant of t . Note that, as t is random, C_t is a random variable as well.

conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j>\nu} f_{h,j}(t) \right| &\leq C \sum_{j>\nu} C_\mu 2^{-hj} \\ &\leq CC_\mu 2^{-h\nu} \\ &\leq CC_\mu |t-s|^h \end{aligned}$$

For $|f_{h,j}(s)|$, the strategy remains the same: nothing changes to bound $|f_{h,j}^{[n]}(s)|$ with $n \neq 0$ while, for $n = 0$, if l is the greatest integer such that $|s-t| \geq 2^{ml} 2^{-j}$, the construction insures that, for all $1 \leq l' \leq \lceil j/m \rceil$ and $k \in \Lambda_j^{l'}(s)$,

$$|\xi_{j,k}| \leq 2^l 2^{l'} \mu$$

and we get

$$|f_{h,j}^{[0]}(s)| \leq C 2^l \mu 2^{-hj} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \frac{1}{(1+|2^j s - k|)^4}.$$

But as $|t-s| \leq 2^{-\nu+1}$, we have $l \leq \frac{1}{m}(j+1-\nu)$ and thus

$$2^l \mu 2^{-hj} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{m}} \mu 2^{(\frac{1}{m}-h)(j-\nu)} 2^{-h\nu}.$$

It gives, as we took $\frac{1}{m} < h$, combined with Lemma 1.1,

$$\left| \sum_{j>\nu} f_{h,j}(s) \right| \leq CC_\mu |t-s|^h. \quad (23)$$

Finally, combining (22) with (23) allows to obtain

$$|f_h(t) - f_h(s)| \leq CC_\mu |t-s|^h$$

as desired. \square

3 Asymptotic behavior of wavelet coefficients

In this section we study the asymptotic behavior of the wavelet coefficients of the Gaussian wavelet series. It will allow to get irregularity properties for the random wavelets series f_h , i.e. to prove that the three corrections obtained in the previous section characterize exactly three possible pointwise behaviors. Let us start by recalling the following result from [2, Lemma A.27].

Lemma 3.1. [2] *Almost surely, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, one has*

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} |\xi_{j,k_j(t)}| \geq 2^{-3/2} \sqrt{\pi}.$$

Before stating the next lemma, let us recall that if $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, then one has

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(|\xi| > x)}{(2\pi^{-1})^{1/2} x^{-1} e^{-x^2/2}} = 1. \quad (24)$$

The following result follows the lines of [4].

Lemma 3.2. *Almost surely, for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, one has*

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|\xi_{j,k_j(t)}|}{\sqrt{\log j}} > 0. \quad (25)$$

Proof. By Fubini theorem, it is enough to prove that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, (25) holds almost surely. Let us fix $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the event

$$A_m(t) = \left\{ \max_{2^m \leq j < 2^{m+1}} |\xi_{2^j, k_j(t)}| \geq \sqrt{m \log 2} \right\}.$$

Using the independance of the random variables $\xi_{j,k}$, $(j, k) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A_m(t)) &= 1 - \prod_{2^m \leq j < 2^{m+1}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\xi_{2^j, k_j(t)}| < \sqrt{m \log 2}\right) \\ &= 1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(|\xi| > \sqrt{m \log 2})\right)^{2^m} \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Using (24) and the fact that $\log(1-x) \leq -x$ if $x \in (0, 1)$, we obtain for m large enough

$$\mathbb{P}(A_m(t)) \geq 1 - \left(1 - C \frac{2^{-\frac{m}{2}}}{\sqrt{m \log 2}}\right)^{2^m} \geq 1 - \exp\left(-C \frac{2^{\frac{m}{2}}}{\sqrt{m \log 2}}\right)$$

where $C = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}$. Hence, it follows that

$$\sum_{m=0}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_m(t)) = +\infty$$

and since that the events $A_m(t)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, are independents, the Borel-Cantelli lemma implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{m \geq M} A_m(t)\right) = 1.$$

It gives that almost surely, for infinitely many $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $j \in \{2^m, \dots, 2^{m+1} - 1\}$ such that

$$|\xi_{2^j, k_j(t)}| \geq \sqrt{m \log 2} \geq \sqrt{\log j - \log 2}.$$

The conclusions follows. \square

The last lemma we need is proved in [4]. Note that in this paper, the authors works in a more general context. Indeed, it is only required that the sequence of standard Gaussian random variables satisfy the following condition: there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $(j_1, k_1), (j_2, k_2) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying

$$\left(\frac{k_1 - N}{2^{j_1}}, \frac{k_1 + N}{2^{j_1}}\right) \cap \left(\frac{k_2 - N}{2^{j_2}}, \frac{k_2 + N}{2^{j_2}}\right) = \emptyset,$$

the random variables ξ_{j_1, k_1} and ξ_{j_2, k_2} are independant.

Lemma 3.3. [4] *Almost surely, for every non-empty open interval I of \mathbb{R} , there is $t \in I$ such that*

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \left\{ \frac{|\xi_{j,k_j(t)}|}{\sqrt{j}} \right\} > 0.$$

4 Proof of the main result

Putting together Propositions 2.2, 2.5, 2.8 and Lemmata 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, we can summarize the results obtained in the previous sections as follows.

Corollary 4.1. *Almost surely,*

- *there exists $t \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_r^{(h)}(|t - s|)} < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|c_{j, [2^j t]}|}{\omega_r^{(h)}(2^{-j})} > 0,$$

- *for almost every $t \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_o^{(h)}(|t - s|)} < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|c_{j, [2^j t]}|}{\omega_o^{(h)}(2^{-j})} > 0,$$

- *there exists $t \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_s^{(h)}(|t - s|)} < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|c_{j, [2^j t]}|}{\omega_s^{(h)}(2^{-j})} > 0.$$

We are now ready to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Using Corollary 4.1, it suffices to prove the second part of the result. Let us consider $t \in (0, 1)$ for which there is $v \in \{r, o, s\}$ such that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega_v^{(h)}(|t - s|)} < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|c_{j, [2^j t]}|}{\omega_v^{(h)}(2^{-j})} > 0. \quad (26)$$

Let us fix a modulus of continuity ω such that $\omega = o(\omega_v^{(h)})$. Assume by contradiction that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{\omega(|s - t|)} < +\infty. \quad (27)$$

Given an arbitrary fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $k = [2^j t]$. The first vanishing moment of the wavelet allows to write

$$\begin{aligned} |c_{j, k}| &= \left| 2^j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(2^j x - k) (f_h(x) - f_h(t)) dx \right| \\ &\leq 2^j \int_{B(t, 2^{-j})} |\psi(2^j x - k)| |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| dx \\ &\quad + 2^j \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \int_{B_l} |\psi(2^j x - k)| |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| dx \\ &\quad + 2^j \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B(t, 1)} |\psi(2^j x - k)| |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| dx \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where for every $l \in \{0, \dots, j-1\}$, B_l denotes the set $B(t, 2^{-l}) \setminus B(t, 2^{-l-1})$. The first term can be controlled by using the modulus of continuity ω in the following way

$$2^j \int_{B(t, 2^{-j})} |\psi(2^j x - k)| |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| dx \leq C\omega(2^{-j}) \quad (29)$$

for some positive constant C by assumption (27). In order to deal with the second term, we use in addition the fast decay of the wavelet to get the existence of a natural number N and a constant C such that

$$2^j \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \int_{B_l} |\psi(2^j x - k)| |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| dx \leq C \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \omega(2^{-l}) \int_{B_l} \frac{2^j}{(1 + |2^j x - k|)^{2N}} dx.$$

Notice then that if $x \in B_l$, then

$$1 + |2^j x - k| \geq 1 + 2^j |x - t| - |2^j t - k| \geq 2^{j-l-1}.$$

It implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 2^j \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \int_{B_l} |\psi(2^j x - k)| |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| dx &\leq C \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \omega(2^{-l}) 2^{-N(j-l-1)} \int_{B_l} \frac{2^j}{(1 + |2^j x - k|)^N} dx \\ &\leq C \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \omega(2^{-l}) 2^{-N(j-l-1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(1 + |y|)^N} dy \\ &= C' 2^{-Nj} \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \omega(2^{-l}) 2^{Nl} \\ &\leq C'' \omega(2^{-j}) \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

for some constants C', C'' and using (7). It remains to bound the last term. Again, the fast decay of the wavelet together with the boundedness of the random wavelets series f_h leads to

$$\begin{aligned} 2^j \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B(t,1)} |\psi(2^j x - k)| |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| dx &\leq 2 \|f_h\|_{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B(t,1)} \frac{2^j}{(1 + |2^j x - k|)^{2N}} dx \\ &\leq 2 \|f_h\|_{\infty} 2^{-Nj} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{2^j}{(1 + |y|)^N} dy \\ &\leq C 2^{-Nj} \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

for some positive constant C , since $|2^j x - k| \geq 2^j$ if $|t - x| \geq 1$. Putting (28), (29), (30) and (31) together, we finally obtain

$$|c_{j,k}| \leq C(\omega(2^{-j}) + 2^{-Nj})$$

for some positive constant C , so that

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|c_{j,k}|}{\omega(2^{-j})} < +\infty$$

if N is chosen large enough. This contradicts the second part of (26) since $\omega = o(\omega_v^{(h)})$. \square

Remark 4.2. As mentionned earlier, let us notice that if the wavelet ψ is compactly supported, and if t is a rapid, ordinary or slow point, then ω_v gives the exact pointwise behavior of f at t , meaning that

$$0 < \limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f(s) - f(t)|}{\omega_v^{(h)}(|t - s|)} < +\infty$$

where $v = r$, $v = o$ or $v = s$ respectively. Indeed, in this case, one has directly

$$\begin{aligned} |c_{j,k}| &\leq 2^j \int_{B(t, R2^{-j})} |\psi(2^j x - k)| |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| dx \\ &\leq C \sup_{x: |x-t| < R2^{-j}} |f_h(x) - f_h(t)| \end{aligned}$$

where R can be computed via the support of the wavelet and C is a positive constant.

The last Remark applies in particular to the fractional Brownian motion thanks to the representation (3). Indeed, as R is a smooth process, it does not modify the pointwise regularity and irregularity properties.

Corollary 4.3. *Almost surely, the fractional Brownian motion satisfies the following property for every non-empty interval I of \mathbb{R} :*

- *almost every $t \in I$ is ordinary:*

$$0 < \limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{|t - s|^h \sqrt{\log \log |t - s|^{-1}}} < +\infty,$$

- *there exists $t \in I$ which is fast:*

$$0 < \limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{|t - s|^h \sqrt{\log |t - s|^{-1}}} < +\infty,$$

- *there exists $t \in I$ which is slow:*

$$0 < \limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_h(s) - f_h(t)|}{|t - s|^h} < +\infty.$$

5 Extension to the multifractal case

Let us now consider a multifractal version of the previously introduced Gaussian wavelets series. This is in the spirit of the multifractional Brownian motion introduced in [36, 8] by replacing the constant Hurst exponent h in the stochastic integral defining this process by a continuous function $H(\cdot)$. In this paper, we adopt the strategy of [7] which takes advantage of wavelets series expansion. It consists in substituting the exponent h at level (j, k) in (4) by $H(k2^{-j})$. In [3], the authors showed that, under some Hölderian regularity assumptions for the function H , both generalizations are equivalent in the sense that the multifractional Brownian Motion $B_{H(\cdot)}$ and the Gaussian wavelets series associated to $H(\cdot)$ only differs by a smooth process, similarly to (3).

Here, we just need a weaker regularity condition to obtain a generalized version of Theorem 1.4. Namely, we consider a compact set $K \subseteq (0, 1)$ and a function $H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow K$, for which there exists a constant $C_H > 0$ such that

$$|H(x) - H(y)| \leq \frac{C_H}{|\log |x - y||} \quad (32)$$

for all x, y with $|x - y| < 1$. Of course, such a function H is necessarily continuous and any Hölder-continuous function satisfies (32).

This function allows to define the multifractal random wavelet series

$$f_H = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi_{j,k} 2^{-H(k2^{-j})j} \psi(2^j \cdot -k). \quad (33)$$

Our goal is to show that, the function $t \mapsto H(t)$ maps any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ to its Hölder exponent and that, even in this generalized setting, slow, ordinary and rapid points can still be highlighted. Note that, in [14], it is proved that, if H is the function ‘‘Hölder exponent’’ of a continuous function then there exists a sequence $(P_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ of polynomials such that

$$\begin{cases} H(t) = \liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} P_j(t) \\ \|DP_j\|_\infty \leq j, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

In the situation of deterministic wavelet series with coefficients $(2^{-jH(k2^{-j})})_{j,k}$, conditions (34) are also sufficient to recover the irregularity from the function H [12]. Because of condition (32), our function H is not as general, but if a function H checks conditions (34) and if we assume the existence of a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$|H(t) - P_j(t)| \leq Cj^{-1}$$

then, (32) is satisfied.

Theorem 5.1. *Let I denote any non-empty interval of \mathbb{R} . Almost surely, the random wavelets series defined in (33) satisfies the following property:*

- For almost every $t \in I$,

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_H(s) - f_H(t)|}{\omega_o^{(H(t))}(|s - t|)} < +\infty \quad (35)$$

and if ω is a modulus of continuity such that $\omega = o(\omega_o^{(H(t))})$, then

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_H(s) - f_H(t)|}{\omega(|s - t|)} = +\infty, \quad (36)$$

- There exists $t \in I$ such that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_H(s) - f_H(t)|}{\omega_r^{(H(t))}(|t - s|)} < +\infty, \quad (37)$$

and if ω is a modulus of continuity such that $\omega = o(\omega_r^{(H(t))})$, then

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_H(s) - f_H(t)|}{\omega(|s - t|)} = +\infty, \quad (38)$$

- There exists $t \in I$ such that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_H(s) - f_H(t)|}{\omega_s^{(H(t))}} < +\infty \quad (39)$$

and if ω is a modulus of continuity such that $\omega = o(\omega_s^{(H(t))})$, then

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f_H(s) - f_H(t)|}{\omega(|s - t|)} = +\infty. \quad (40)$$

Proof. The part concerning the irregularity can easily be adapted from the constant case $H(t) = h$. It suffices to notice that the three superior limits appearing in Corollary 4.1 and that concerns the wavelet coefficients are still strictly positive, using (32).

The idea and techniques for the regularity are similar to the ones of Propositions 2.2, 2.5 and 2.8 except that, in addition to “control” the randoms coefficients with the help of the fast decay of the wavelets, we also need to “control” the variation of the function $2^{H(\cdot)j}$, with $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Again, we will do so using the fast decay of the wavelets.

Let us list how to modify the proofs of Propositions 2.2, 2.5 and 2.8 in order to find the expected inequalities

Rapid points:

To bound $|Df_{H,j}(x)|$ in (14), the idea consists to split the sum over $|k| \leq 2^{j+1}$ in two and provides additional information for the sum over $|k| > 2^{j+1}$:

- (i) If k is such that $|k| < 2^{j+1}$ and $|2^j t - k| \leq 2^{j/2}$ then $|H(t) - H(k2^{-j})| \leq 2C_H j^{-1}$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{(1-H(k2^{-j}))j} |\xi_{j,k}| |D\psi(2^j x - k)| &\leq 2^{2C_H} 2^{(1-H(t))j} |\xi_{j,k}| |D\psi(2^j x - k)| \\ &\leq C 2^{2C_H} 2^{(1-H(t))j} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4}. \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) If k is such that $|k| < 2^{j+1}$ and $|2^j t - k| > 2^{j/2}$, we have

$$|2^j x - k| > 2^{j/2} - 2$$

and thus, if $\beta > 2(\sup K - \inf K)$, we get, using the fast decay of $D\psi$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{(1-H(k2^{-j}))j} |\xi_{j,k}| |D\psi(2^j x - k)| &\leq C \frac{2^{(1-H(t))j} 2^{(\sup K - \inf K)j} |\xi_{j,k}|}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4 (2+|2^j x - k|)^\beta} \\ &\leq C 2^{(1-H(t))j} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^4}. \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) For $|k| > 2^{j+1}$ of course $|2^j x - k| > 2^j$ and one can use the same trick to get

$$2^{(1-H(k2^{-j}))j} |\xi_{j,k}| |D\psi(2^j x - k)| \leq C 2^{2C_H} 2^{(1-H(t))j} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k|)}}{(1+|2^j x - k|)^5}.$$

From this, the bound

$$\left| \sum_{j \leq \nu} (f_{H,j}(t) - f_{H,j}(s)) \right| \leq CC_2 |t - s|^{H(t)} \sqrt{\log |t - s|^{-1}}$$

is obtained.

The same method applied on $|f_j(t)|$ ($j > \nu$) leads to

$$\left| \sum_{j > \nu} f_{H,j}(t) \right| \leq CC_2 |t - s|^{H(t)} \sqrt{\log |t - s|^{-1}}$$

while, for $|f_{H,j}(s)|$, replacing t by s in the reasoning, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j>\nu} f_{H,j}(s) \right| &\leq CC_2 2^{-H(s)\nu} \sqrt{\nu} \\ &\leq CCC_2 2^{-H(t)\nu} \sqrt{\nu} 2^{(H(t)-H(s))\nu} \\ &\leq CC_2 |t-s|^{H(t)} \sqrt{\log|t-s|^{-1}} \end{aligned}$$

as $|H(t) - H(s)| \leq (\nu - 1)^{-1}$.

Ordinary points

In this case, to bound $|Df_{H,j}(x)|$ (with $j \leq \nu$), the sum for $k \in \kappa_j^t(j)$ remains untouched as, for all such k , we have $|t - k2^{-j}| \leq 2^{-j}(j+1)$ and thus we get $|H(t) - H(2^{-j})| \leq CC_H j^{-1}$.

This time, this is the sum for $k \notin \kappa_j^t(j)$ that we need to split:

- (i) If $k \in \kappa_j^t(2^{j/2}) \setminus \kappa_j^t(j)$, $|k2^{-j} - t| \leq 22^{-j/2}$ and, similarly to the point (i) in the rapid points, we have

$$2^{(1-H(k2^{-j}))j} |\xi_{j,k}| |D\psi(2^j x - k)| \leq C 2^{2C_H} 2^{(1-H(t))j} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(3+|2^j x - k|)(1+|2^j x - k|)^4}.$$

- (ii) If $k \notin \kappa_j^t(2^{j/2})$ then $|2^j x - k| \geq 2^{j/2} - 3$ and we proceed just like in the point (ii) for the rapid points to get

$$2^{(1-H(k2^{-j}))j} |\xi_{j,k}| |D\psi(2^j x - k)| \leq C 2^{2C_H} 2^{(1-H(t))j} \frac{\sqrt{\log(3+j+|k-k_j(t)|)}}{(3+|2^j x - k|)(1+|2^j x - k|)^4}$$

again.

To bound $|f_{H,j}(t)|$ (with $j > \nu$) the strategy remains the same while to bound $|f_{H,j}(s)|$, like in the proof of Proposition 2.2 we need to consider separately the case where $j \geq 2^{j-\nu+2}$ and when $j < 2^{j-\nu+2}$.

If $j \geq 2^{j-\nu+2}$, we take into account the three sums:

- (i) the sum over $k \in \kappa_j^t(2j)$ where $|H(t) - H(2^{-j})| \leq CC_H j^{-1}$ and thus which remains untouched,
- (ii) the sum over $k \in \kappa_j^t(2^{j/2}) \setminus \kappa_j^t(2j)$ where we use $|H(t) - H(2^{-j})| \leq CC_H j^{-1}$ to deal with the exponent,
- (iii) the sum over $k \notin \kappa_j^t(2^{j/2})$ where we deal with the exponent just like in (ii) and (iii) for the rapid points.

In total, we get

$$|f_{H,j}(s)| \leq CC_t 2^{-jH(t)} \sqrt{\log(j)}$$

Now if $2^{j-\nu+2} < j$ we consider:

- (i) the sum over $\kappa_j^s(2^{j/2})$ for which we deal similarly to the sum over $\kappa_j^t(2^{j/2})$ above

- (ii) the sum over $\kappa_j^s(2^{j-\nu+2}) \setminus \kappa_j^s(2^{j/2})$ where the exponent is treated like in (ii) and (iii) for the rapid points.
- (iii) the sum for $k \notin \kappa_j^s(2^{j-\nu+2})$ where, again, we treat the exponent like in (ii) and (iii) for the rapid points.

In total, in this case, we get

$$|f_{H,j}(s)| \leq CC_t 2^{-jH(s)} \sqrt{j-\nu}.$$

The conclusion follows from the same arguments as for the rapid points.

Slow points

First, we note that the natural m in Kahane procedure must be chosen such that

$$1/m < \inf K.$$

To bound $|Df_{H,j}^{[0]}(x)|$ (with $j \leq \nu$), we split the sum (20) in two:

- (i) for $0 \leq l \leq \lfloor j/2m \rfloor$, then for all $k \in \Lambda_j^l(t)$, we have $|x - k2^{-j}| \leq C2^{-j/2}$ and thus one uses $|H(x) - H(k2^{-j})| \leq CC_H j^{-1}$ to deal with the exponent.
- (ii) for $\lfloor j/2m \rfloor < l \leq \lceil j/m \rceil$, then for all $k \in \Lambda_j^l(t)$, $|2^j x - k| \geq 2^{j/2} - 3$ and we treat the exponent like for the rapid points in (ii).

To bound $|Df_{H,j}^{[n]}(x)|$ with $n \neq 0$, we use $|2^j x - k| \geq C_t |n| 2^j$ to treat the exponent like in the rapid points in (iii).

With this, we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{j \leq \nu} (f_{H,j}(t) - f_{H,j}(s)) \right| \leq CC^* |s - t|^\alpha.$$

We can use the same method to have

$$\left| \sum_{j > \nu} f_{H,j}(t) \right| \leq CC_\mu 2^{-H(t)\nu}$$

and, using the same arguments as in the end of Proposition 2.8, with the fact that $1/m < \inf K \leq H(s)$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{j > \nu} f_{H,j}(t) \right| \leq CC_\mu 2^{-H(s)\nu} \leq CC_\mu 2^{-H(t)\nu}$$

just as in the conclusion for the rapid points.

□

6 Genericity of the non-existence of slow points

The aim of this section is to prove that the results obtained in the previous section are specific to these Gaussian random wavelet series. On this purpose, let us define the Fréchet space

$$C^{\nearrow h} := \bigcap_{\alpha < h} C^\alpha([0, 1]),$$

where for every $\alpha \in (0, h)$, $C^\alpha([0, 1])$ denote the Hölder space of order α . This space and its topology can be equivalently defined using sequence of wavelet coefficients as follows: If we consider $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$, then for any $f \in C^\alpha([0, 1])$, one has

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}} 2^{\alpha j} |c_{j,k}| < +\infty \quad (41)$$

where $(c_{j,k})_{j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}}$ denotes the sequence of wavelet coefficients of f on $[0, 1]$. It allows to identify (algebraically and topologically) the Hölder space $C^\alpha([0, 1])$ with the space of complex sequences $(c_{j,k})_{j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}}$ satisfying (41), see [31]. When $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, we will also denote by $C^\alpha([0, 1])$ the space of functions satisfying the condition (41).

We will prove that in $C^{\wedge h}$, “most of” the functions do not present a slow pointwise behavior as the one exhibited for Gaussian wavelet series, i.e. does not belong to the space $C^h(t)$ formed by the functions f such that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{|f(s) - f(t)|}{|s - t|^h} < +\infty.$$

We will use in this purpose two notions of genericity: the prevalence and the Baire category points of view.

The notion of prevalence supplies an extension of the notion of “almost everywhere” (for the Lebesgue measure) in infinite dimensional spaces. In a metric infinite dimensional vector space, no measure is both σ -finite and translation invariant. However, one can consider a natural extension of the notion of “almost everywhere” which is translation invariant, see [10, 18].

Definition 6.1. Let E be a complete metric vector space. A Borel set $A \subset E$ is Haar-null if there exists a compactly supported probability measure μ such that

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \mu(x + A) = 0. \quad (42)$$

If this property holds, the measure μ is said to be transverse to A . A subset of E is called Haar-null if it is contained in a Haar-null Borel set. The complement of a Haar-null set is called a prevalent set.

In order to prove that a set is Haar-null in a functional space E , one can often use for transverse measure the law of a stochastic process, see [11, 16] for some applications of this method. If \mathcal{P} is a property that can be satisfied by points of E , one can prove that \mathcal{P} holds only on a Haar-null set by exhibiting a stochastic process X whose sample paths lies in a compact subset of E and such that for all $f \in E$ almost surely the property \mathcal{P} does not hold for $X + f$.

In our setting, the stochastic process that will be used is a random wavelet series. The following result allows to get that the sample paths of this series are almost surely in a compact set of $C^{\wedge h}$. Let us first describe this subset.

Lemma 6.2. Let $h > 0$ and let $(\alpha_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a non-decreasing sequence of $(0, h)$ with tends to h . The subset

$$K = \left\{ f \in C^{\wedge h} : \max_{k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}} |c_{j,k}| \leq 2^{-\alpha_j j} \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is compact in $C^{\wedge h}$, where $(c_{j,k})_{j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}}$ denotes the sequence of wavelet coefficients of f .

Proof. Clearly, K is closed in $C^{\nearrow h}$. Since this last space is a Fréchet space, it suffices now to prove that K is totally bounded. Let us fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\alpha < h$. Then there exists $J \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{-\alpha j} < \varepsilon 2^{-\alpha j}$ for every $j \geq J$, which implies that

$$\sup_{j \geq J, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}} 2^{\alpha j} |c_{j,k}| < \varepsilon$$

for the sequence of wavelet coefficients $(c_{j,k})_{j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}}$ of any $f \in K$. Moreover, since the product

$$P = \prod_{j=0}^{J-1} \prod_{k=0}^{2^j-1} [-2^{-\alpha_{j,k} j}, 2^{\alpha_{j,k} j}]$$

where we have set $\alpha_{j,k} = \alpha_j$ for every $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}$, is compact, one can find a finite number of sequences c^1, \dots, c^L with support included in $\{(j, k) : j \leq J - 1, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}\}$ such that

$$P \subseteq \bigcup_{l=1}^L \prod_{j=0}^{J-1} \prod_{k=0}^{2^j-1} (c_{j,k}^l - \delta, c_{j,k}^l + \delta),$$

where $\delta < 2^{-\alpha J} \varepsilon$. For every l , we define $f^l = \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} c_{j,k}^l \psi(2^j \cdot -k)$. In order to conclude, let us show that

$$K \subseteq \bigcup_{l=1}^L \{f \in C^{\nearrow h} : \|f - f^l\|_{\alpha} < \varepsilon\}.$$

If $f \in K$, its truncated sequence $(c_{j,k})_{j \leq J-1, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}}$ of wavelet coefficients belongs to P . Hence, for a $l \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, one has

$$2^{\alpha j} |c_{j,k} - c_{j,k}^l| \leq \delta 2^{\alpha j} < \varepsilon$$

if $j \leq J - 1$, and

$$2^{\alpha j} |c_{j,k} - c_{j,k}^l| = 2^{\alpha j} |c_{j,k}| < \varepsilon$$

if $j \geq J$. □

Before stating our result, we need to recall the following wavelet ‘‘almost characterization’’ of the pointwise Hölder regularity. It relies on alternative quantities, namely the wavelet leaders. In order to define them, we need to introduce the notation c_{λ} to denote the wavelet coefficient $c_{j,k}$, where λ is the dyadic interval

$$\lambda = \lambda(j, k) = \left[\frac{k}{2^j}, \frac{k+1}{2^j} \right)$$

Then, if 3λ denote the interval with the same center as λ but three times larger, the wavelet leader d_{λ} is defined by

$$d_{\lambda} = \sup_{\lambda' \subset 3\lambda} |c_{\lambda'}|. \quad (43)$$

Note that this supremum is finite as soon as f is locally bounded. In [20], the author proved that if $f \in C^h(t)$ for some $h > 0$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$d_{\lambda(j, k_j(t))} \leq C 2^{-\alpha j}. \quad (44)$$

This inequality will allow us to construct wavelet series which do not belong to $C^h(t)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $h > 0$. The set of functions f such that $f \notin C^h(t)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$ is prevalent in $C^\wedge h$.*

Proof. Let us consider a sequence $(j_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $j_{n+1} > j_n + \lfloor \log_2 j_n^2 \rfloor + 1$ and let us set $\alpha_n = h - \frac{1}{\sqrt{j_n}}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us define the random wavelets series

$$f = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j=j_n}^{j_{n+1}-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} 2^{-\alpha_n j} \varepsilon_{j,k} \psi_{j,k}$$

where $(\varepsilon_{j,k})_{j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j-1\}}$ is a sequence of independent $\mathcal{U}([-1, 1])$ random variables. Clearly, for every $\alpha < h$, one has

$$2^{-\alpha_n j} \leq 2^{-\alpha j}$$

if $j \in \{j_n, \dots, j_{n+1}-1\}$ for n large enough. Using the characterization given in (41), it follows that $f \in C^\alpha([0, 1])$. Moreover, from Lemma 6.2, we know that the process f takes its values in a compact subset of $C^\wedge h$.

Let us now show that almost surely $f \notin C^h(t)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. Let us fix $M \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if one considers the subintervals of scale $j' = j_n + \lfloor \log_2 j_n^2 \rfloor + 1$ in the supremum appearing in the definition (43) of the wavelet leaders, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{k \in \{0, \dots, 2^{j_n}-1\}} d_{j_n, k} \leq M 2^{-h j_n} \right) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_n}-1} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\lambda' \subseteq \lambda_{j_n, k}} |2^{-\alpha_n j'} \varepsilon_{\lambda'}| \leq M 2^{-h j_n} \right) \\ &\leq 2^{j_n} \left(2^{\alpha_n j'} M 2^{-h j_n} \right)^{2^{j'-j_n}} \\ &\leq 2^{j_n + j_n^2 h} j_n^{2h j_n^2} 2^{-j_n^{5/2}} M^{j_n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The Borel-Cantelli Lemma implies that almost surely, one has

$$d_{j_n, k} > M 2^{-h j_n}$$

for every n large enough and every $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^{j_n}-1\}$. Since $M \in \mathbb{N}$ is arbitrary, (44) gives the announced result. In order to conclude, it suffices to prove that the previous result is still valid if we replace the wavelet series f by

$$\tilde{f} = f + g$$

for a function $g \in C^\wedge h$. In this case, the wavelet coefficients $2^{-\alpha_n j}$ of f are replaced by

$$2^{-\alpha_n j} \varepsilon_{j,k} + c_{j,k} = 2^{-\alpha_n j} (\varepsilon_{j,k} + 2^{\alpha_n j} c_{j,k}).$$

It implies that the random variables defining the wavelets series are still independent but no more centered since they are shifted by a deterministic quantity. Clearly, the probabilities computed before can only become smaller, hence the Borel-Cantelli lemma still holds. \square

To end the paper, we show that the same result holds true if one replaces the notion of prevalence by the genericity in the sense supplied by the Baire category theorem. Let us recall that a subset A of a Baire space X is of first category (or meager) if it is included in a countable union of closed sets of X with empty interior. The complement of a set of first category is Baire-residual; it contains a countable union of dense open sets of X .

Proposition 6.4. *Let $h > 0$. The set of functions f such that $f \notin C^h(t)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$ is Baire-residual in $C^{\nearrow h}$.*

Proof. Let us consider the non-decreasing sequence $(\alpha_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $(0, h)$ with converges to h defined by $\alpha_j = h - \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}$. For every $J \in \mathbb{N}$, the set \mathcal{C}_J is formed by the functions $f \in C^{\nearrow h}$ whose sequence of wavelet coefficients $(c_{j,k})_{j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}}$ satisfies

$$2^{\alpha_j j} |c_{j,k}| \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \quad \forall j \geq J, \forall k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}.$$

Finally, we define the open sets U_J by

$$U_J = \bigcup_{j \geq J} \left\{ g \in C^{\nearrow h} : \exists f \in \mathcal{C}_j \text{ such that } \|f - g\|_{\alpha_j} < \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

Notice that if $g \in U_J$ with wavelet coefficients $(e_{j,k})_{j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}}$, then there is $f \in \mathcal{C}_{j_0}$ for a $j_0 \geq J$, with wavelet coefficients $(c_{j_0,k})_{j_0 \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{0, \dots, 2^{j_0} - 1\}}$ such that

$$|e_{j_0,k}| \geq |c_{j_0,k}| - |e_{j_0,k} - c_{j_0,k}| \geq 2^{-\alpha_{j_0} j_0} - \frac{1}{2} 2^{-\alpha_{j_0} j_0} = \frac{1}{2} 2^{-\alpha_{j_0} j_0}$$

for every $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^{j_0} - 1\}$. Now, assume that g belongs to the set \mathcal{R} defined by

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcap_{J \in \mathbb{N}} U_J.$$

If there exists $t \in [0, 1]$ such that $g \in C^h(t)$, (44) gives the existence of a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$d_{j,k_j(t)} \leq C 2^{-hj}.$$

Since $g \in \mathcal{R}$, one gets

$$\frac{1}{2} 2^{-\alpha_j j} = \frac{1}{2} 2^{-hj + \sqrt{j}} \leq C 2^{-hj}$$

for infinitely many j , which is impossible. Consequently, $g \notin C^h(t)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$.

To conclude, it suffices to prove that the open sets U_J are dense in $C^{\nearrow h}$. Let us fix $J \in \mathbb{N}$, $g \in C^{\nearrow h}$, $\alpha < h$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $J_0 \geq J$ be large enough to ensure that both $\alpha < \alpha_{J_0}$ and $2^{(\alpha - \alpha_{J_0})J_0} < \varepsilon$ are satisfied. We construct the function f via its sequence of wavelet coefficients by setting

$$c_{j,k} = \begin{cases} e_{j,k} & \text{if } j < J_0 \\ 2^{-\alpha_j j} [2^{\alpha_j j} e_{j,k}] & \text{if } j \geq J_0 \text{ and } 2^{\alpha_j j} |e_{j,k}| \geq 2, \\ 2^{-\alpha_j j} & \text{if } j \geq J_0 \text{ and } 2^{\alpha_j j} |e_{j,k}| < 2, \end{cases}$$

so that $f \in \mathcal{C}_{J_0} \subseteq U_J$ and $|2^{\alpha_j j} c_{j,k} - 2^{\alpha_j j} e_{j,k}| \leq 1$ for every $j \geq J_0$. Hence one has

$$2^{\alpha_j j} |e_{j,k} - c_{j,k}| \leq 2^{(\alpha - \alpha_j)j} \leq 2^{(\alpha - \alpha_{J_0})J_0} < \varepsilon$$

for every $j \geq J_0$, which allows to conclude. \square

References

- [1] J.-M. Aubry and F. Bastin. A walk from multifractal analysis to functional analysis with S^ν spaces, and back. In *Recent developments in fractals and related fields*, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., pages 93–106. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2010.
- [2] A. Ayache. *Multifractional stochastic fields*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2019. Wavelet strategies in multifractional frameworks.
- [3] A. Ayache and P. Bertrand. A process very similar to multifractional Brownian motion. In *Recent developments in fractals and related fields*, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., pages 311–326. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2010.
- [4] A. Ayache, C. Esser, and T. Kleynssens. Different possible behaviors of wavelet leaders of the Brownian motion. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 150:54–60, 2019.
- [5] A. Ayache and M. S. Taqqu. Rate optimality of wavelet series approximations of fractional Brownian motion. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 9(5):451–471, 2003.
- [6] F. Bastin, C. Esser, and S. Jaffard. Large deviation spectra based on wavelet leaders. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 32(3):859–890, 2016.
- [7] A. Benassi, P. Bertrand, S. Cohen, and J. Istas. Identification of the Hurst index of a step fractional Brownian motion. volume 3, pages 101–111. 2000. 19th “Rencontres Franco-Belges de Statisticiens” (Marseille, 1998).
- [8] A. Benassi, S. Jaffard, and D. Roux. Elliptic Gaussian random processes. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 13(1):19–90, 1997.
- [9] N. H. Bingham. Variants on the law of the iterated logarithm. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 18(5):433–467, 1986.
- [10] J.P.R. Christensen. *Topology and Borel structure*. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1974.
- [11] M. Clausel and S. Nicolay. Some prevalent results about strongly monohölder functions. *Nonlinearity*, 23(9):2101–2116, 2010.
- [12] M. Clausel and S. Nicolay. Wavelets techniques for pointwise anti-Hölderian irregularity. *Constr. Approx.*, 33:41–75, 2011.
- [13] A. Cohen, I. Daubechies, and J.-C. Feauveau. Biorthogonal bases of compactly supported wavelets. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 45(5):485–560, 1992.
- [14] K. Daoudi, J. Lévy Véhel, and Y. Meyer. Construction of continuous functions with prescribed local regularity. *Constr. Approx.*, 14(3):349–385, 1998.
- [15] I. Daubechies. *Ten lectures on wavelets*. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, 1992.

- [16] C. Esser and S. Jaffard. Divergence of wavelet series: a multifractal analysis. *Adv. Math.*, 328:928–958, 2018.
- [17] C. Esser, T. Kleyntssens, and S. Nicolay. A multifractal formalism for non-concave and non-increasing spectra: the leaders profile method. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 43(2):269–291, 2017.
- [18] B.R. Hunt, T. Sauer, and J.A. Yorke. Prevalence: a translation-invariant “almost every” on infinite-dimensional spaces. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 27(2):217–238, 1992.
- [19] S. Jaffard. Beyond Besov spaces part 1: Distributions of wavelet coefficients. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 10:221–246, 2004.
- [20] S. Jaffard. Wavelet techniques in multifractal analysis, fractal geometry and applications: A jubilee of Benoit Mandelbrot. *Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics*, 72:91–151, 2004.
- [21] S. Jaffard and Y. Meyer. Wavelet methods for pointwise regularity and local oscillations of functions. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 123(587):x+110, 1996.
- [22] J.-P. Kahane. *Some random series of functions*, volume 5 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1985.
- [23] A. Khinchin. Über eine Satz der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. *Fund. Math.*, 6:9–20, 1924.
- [24] D. Khoshnevisan and Z. Shi. Fast sets and points for fractional Brownian motion. In *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXIV*, volume 1729 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 393–416. Springer, Berlin, 2000.
- [25] D. Kreit and S. Nicolay. Generalized pointwise Hölder spaces defined via admissible sequences. *J. Funct. Spaces*, ID 8276258:11, 2018.
- [26] L. Loosveldt and S. Nicolay. Generalized T_u^p spaces: On the trail of Calderón and Zygmund. *Diss. Math.*, 554:64, 2020.
- [27] L. Loosveldt and S. Nicolay. Generalized spaces of pointwise regularity: Toward a general framework for the WLM. *Nonlinearity*, 34:6561–6586, 2021.
- [28] S. Mallat. *A Wavelet Tour of Signal Processing*. Academic Press, 1999.
- [29] M. B. Marcus. Hölder conditions for Gaussian processes with stationary increments. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 134:29–52, 1968.
- [30] M. B. Marcus and J. Rosen. Moduli of continuity of local times of strongly symmetric Markov processes via Gaussian processes. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 5(4):791–825, 1992.
- [31] Y. Meyer and D. Salinger. *Wavelets and operators*, volume 1. Cambridge university press, 1995.

- [32] Y. Meyer, F. Sellan, and M. S. Taqqu. Wavelets, generalized white noise and fractional integration: the synthesis of fractional Brownian motion. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 5(5):465–494, 1999.
- [33] D. Monrad and H. Rootzén. Small values of Gaussian processes and functional laws of the iterated logarithm. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 101(2):173–192, 1995.
- [34] S. Orey. Growth rate of certain Gaussian processes. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability (Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970/1971), Vol. II: Probability theory*, pages 443–451, 1972.
- [35] S. Orey and S. J. Taylor. How often on a Brownian path does the law of iterated logarithm fail? *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 28:174–192, 1974.
- [36] R. F. Peltier and J. Lévy Véhel. Multifractional brownian motion : definition and preliminary results. *Rapport de recherche de l'INRIA*, 2645, 1995.