

# ANOTHER LOOK AT THE MATKOWSKI AND WESOŁOWSKI PROBLEM YIELDING A NEW CLASS OF SOLUTIONS

JANUSZ MORAWIEC AND THOMAS ZÜRCHER

**ABSTRACT.** The following MW–problem was posed independently by Janusz Matkowski and Jacek Wesółowski in different forms in 1985 and 2009, respectively: Are there increasing and continuous functions  $\varphi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , distinct from the identity on  $[0, 1]$ , such that  $\varphi(0) = 0$ ,  $\varphi(1) = 1$  and  $\varphi(x) = \varphi(\frac{x}{2}) + \varphi(\frac{x+1}{2}) - \varphi(\frac{1}{2})$  for every  $x \in [0, 1]$ ? By now, it is known that each of the de Rham functions  $R_p$ , where  $p \in (0, 1)$ , is a solution of the MW–problem, and for any Borel probability measure  $\mu$  concentrated on  $(0, 1)$  the formula  $\phi_\mu(x) = \int_{(0,1)} R_p(x) d\mu(p)$  defines a solution  $\phi_\mu: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  of this problem as well. In this paper, we give a new family of solutions of the MW–problem consisting of Cantor-type functions. We also prove that there are strictly increasing solutions of the MW–problem that are not of the above integral form with any Borel probability measure  $\mu$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

During the 47th International Symposium on Functional Equations in 2009, Jacek Wesółowski asked whether the identity on  $[0, 1]$  is the only increasing and continuous solution  $\varphi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  of

$$(1.1) \quad \varphi(x) = \varphi\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) + \varphi\left(\frac{x+1}{2}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$$

satisfying the following boundary conditions

$$(1.2) \quad \varphi(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(1) = 1;$$

here and throughout this paper *increasing* means weakly increasing. This question has been posed in connection with studying probability measures in the plane that are invariant by “winding” (see [17]). It turns out that twenty-four years earlier Janusz Matkowski posed a problem in [16], which is equivalent to Wesółowski’s question.

A negative answer to Wesółowski’s question can be found in [14, Section 5.C], where it is noted that each of the de Rham functions satisfies equation (1.1); recall that the de Rham function  $\varphi_p: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $p \in (0, 1)$ , is the unique bounded solution of the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_p\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) = p\varphi_p(x) & \text{for } x \in [0, 1], \\ \varphi_p\left(\frac{x+1}{2}\right) = (1-p)\varphi_p(x) + p & \text{for } x \in [0, 1] \end{cases}$$

(see [4, Section 2], cf. [14, Section 5.C], see also [8, Theorem 3.3] for a more general system of functional equations). It is well known that  $\varphi_{\frac{1}{2}} = \text{id}_{[0,1]}$ , the identity

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37E05, 39B12; Secondary 44A60, 26A30.

*Key words and phrases.* Singular invariant measures, iterative functional equations, moment problem, Cantor type functions.

function on  $[0, 1]$ , and for each  $p \neq \frac{1}{2}$  the de Rham function  $\varphi_p$  is strictly increasing, singular, and continuous (see p. 106 and p. 102 in [4]); it is even Hölder continuous (see [3, Theorem 2.1]). Moreover, according to [18, Theorem 1.1] or (stated slightly differently) [14, Section 5.C], for any  $p \in (0, 1)$  we have

$$\varphi_p \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_n}{2^n} \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n p^{n - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i} (1-p)^{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i} \quad \text{for } (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

In particular,

$$(1.3) \quad \varphi_p \left( \frac{1}{2^n} \right) = p^n \quad \text{for } p \in (0, 1) \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

From now on, we say that a *solution of the Matkowski and Wesolowski problem* (MW–problem for short) is any increasing and continuous function  $\varphi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying (1.1) and (1.2).

A large family of solutions of the MW–problem containing functions that are not Hölder continuous was constructed in [20] (see Theorem 2.4 and Section 5). To describe this family (in a slightly different way) let us denote by  $\mathcal{B}$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra of all Borel subsets of  $[0, 1]$ , by  $\mathcal{M}$  the family of all probability measures defined on  $\mathcal{B}$ , and by  $\mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  the subfamily of all  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mu(\{0, 1\}) = 0$ . Then define  $\Theta: (0, 1) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$\Theta(p, x) = \varphi_p(x)$$

and note that  $\Theta$  is differentiable with respect to the first variable (see [15, Proposition 3.1]; cf. [9, Theorem 4.6] for the case  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ ) and Hölder continuous with respect to the second variable (see [3, Theorem 2.1]). Finally, making use of Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, we conclude that for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  the formula

$$(1.4) \quad \phi_{\mu}(x) = \int_{(0,1)} \Theta(p, x) d\mu(p)$$

defines a continuous function  $\phi_{\mu}: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (see [5, Satz 5.6]). Since  $\Theta$  is strictly increasing with respect to the second variable, so is  $\phi_{\mu}$ . It is easy to check that  $\phi_{\mu}$  is a solution of the MW–problem. Therefore, we have the following fact.

**Proposition 1.1.** *For every  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  the function  $\phi_{\mu}: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  given by (1.4) is a strictly increasing solution of the MW–problem.*

In 2021, during the talk on the MW–problem, given by the first author at the Probabilistic Seminar at the Faculty of Mathematics and Information Sciences of the Warsaw University of Technology, the following question was asked.

**Problem 1.2.** *Is every solution of the MW–problem of the form (1.4) with some  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ ?*

The goal of this paper is to give a negative answer to **Problem 1.2**. We first prove that there exist solutions of the MW–problem that are constant on some intervals, which in view of **Proposition 1.1** cannot be written in the integral form (1.4) with some  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ . Then, we also prove that there are strictly increasing solutions not of that integral form. Moreover, before formulating the two announced results, we make a comment about a connection between solutions of the MW–problem that are of the integral form (1.4) with some  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  and the moment problem.

## 2. SOLUTIONS OF THE INTEGRAL FORM (1.4)

Note that for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ , we have by (1.3)

$$\left( \phi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2^n} \right) \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} = \left( \int_{(0,1)} p^n d\mu(p) \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}.$$

We first turn our attention towards a characterization of all sequences that can appear on the right-hand side of the above equality.

If  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ , then the sequence  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  given by

$$c_j = \int_{[0,1]} x^j d\mu(x)$$

is said to be the *moment sequence* of  $\mu$ .

The following problem is called the *Hausdorff moment problem*: Given a sequence  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  of real numbers, we ask: when does there exist a  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is the moment sequence of  $\mu$ ? This particular moment problem is one of a large class of general moment problems (see e.g. [21], [7]). Hausdorff's name is added to this particular moment problem because Hausdorff solved it completely (see [12], cf. [10, 11]). To formulate Hausdorff's result, we need one more definition. A sequence  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  of real numbers is said to be *completely monotone*, if

$$\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} c_{k+j} \geq 0 \quad \text{for } k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

**Theorem 2.1** (see [7, VII.3, Theorem 1] or [21, Theorem 3.15]).

- (i) Every moment sequence  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  of  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  is completely monotone with  $c_0 = 1$ .
- (ii) Every completely monotone sequence  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  with  $c_0 = 1$  coincides with the moment sequence of a unique  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ .

The following two observations show a direct connection between solutions of the MW-problem that are of the form (1.4) with a  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  and the Hausdorff moment problem.

**Proposition 2.2.** Assume that  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  and let  $\phi_\mu: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be given by (1.4). Then the sequence  $(\phi_\mu(\frac{1}{2^j}))_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is completely monotone and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \phi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2^j} \right) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . By (1.3), we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \varphi_p \left( \frac{1}{2^{k+j}} \right) = p^k \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} p^j = p^k (1-p)^n$$

for every  $p \in (0, 1)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \phi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2^{j+k}} \right) &= \int_{(0,1)} \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \Phi \left( p, \frac{1}{2^{j+k}} \right) d\mu(p) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} p^k (1-p)^n d\mu(p) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and according to Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \phi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2^j} \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{(0,1)} (1-p)^n d\mu(p) = 0,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.3.** *Assume that  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is a completely monotone sequence with  $c_0 = 1$  that decreases to 0. If*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} c_j = 0,$$

then there exists a unique  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  such that  $\phi_\mu: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  given by (1.4) is a solution of the MW-problem with

$$\phi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2^j} \right) = c_j \quad \text{for } j \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

*Proof.* By assertion (ii) of [Theorem 2.1](#) there exists a unique  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is the moment sequence of  $\mu$ .

We first note that

$$0 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} c_j = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[0,1]} x^j d\mu(x) = \mu(\{1\}).$$

This jointly with Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = c_0 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} c_j = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[0,1]} \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} p^j d\mu(p) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{(0,1)} \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} p^j d\mu(p) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{(0,1)} (1 - (1-p)^n) d\mu(p) \\ &= \int_{(0,1)} 1 d\mu(p) = \mu((0, 1)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ .

From [Proposition 1.1](#) we see that the formula (1.4) defines a solution of the MW-problem. By (1.3), we have

$$c_j = \int_{(0,1)} p^j d\mu(p) = \int_{(0,1)} \varphi_p \left( \frac{1}{2^j} \right) d\mu(p) = \phi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2^j} \right)$$

for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .  $\square$

Let  $\varphi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a solution of the MW-problem.

Assume first that there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  such that  $\varphi = \phi_\mu$ . [Proposition 2.2](#) implies that the sequence  $(\varphi(\frac{1}{2^j}))_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is completely monotone and

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \varphi \left( \frac{1}{2^j} \right) = 0.$$

Assume now that the sequence  $(\varphi(\frac{1}{2^j}))_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is completely monotone and (2.1) holds. [Proposition 2.3](#) yields the existence of  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  such that  $\phi_\mu: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$

given by (1.4) is a solution of the MW-problem and

$$\phi_\mu\left(\frac{1}{2^j}\right) = \varphi\left(\frac{1}{2^j}\right) \quad \text{for } j \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Since both the functions  $\varphi$  and  $\phi_\mu$  are solutions of the MW-problem, we also have  $\phi_\mu(0) = \varphi(0)$ . The question is: Does  $\varphi = \phi_\mu$  hold? This leads to the following question about a possible characterization of solutions of the MW-problem that are of integral form (1.4).

**Problem 2.4.** Is a solution  $\varphi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  of the MW-problem of the form (1.4) with some  $\mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  if and only if the sequence  $(\varphi(\frac{1}{2^j}))_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is completely monotone and (2.1) hold?

Note that if  $\varphi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a solution of the MW-problem, then by its monotonicity we have  $\varphi(\frac{1}{2^k}) \geq \varphi(0) = 0$  as well as  $\varphi(\frac{1}{2^k}) - \varphi(\frac{1}{2^{k+1}}) \geq 0$ , and finally

$$\varphi\left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right) - 2\varphi\left(\frac{1}{2^{k+1}}\right) + \varphi\left(\frac{1}{2^{k+2}}\right) = \varphi\left(\frac{1}{2^{k+1}} + \frac{1}{2}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{1}{2^{k+2}} + \frac{1}{2}\right) \geq 0$$

for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

### 3. ANSWER TO PROBLEM 1.2

In this section we give a negative answer to Problem 1.2 formulating two results. The first one concerns solutions of the MW-problem in the class of Cantor-like functions, whereas the second result is devoted to solutions of the MW-problem that are strictly increasing but not of the form (1.4).

Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we put

$$\mathcal{P}_m = \left\{ (p_0, \dots, p_{2^m-1}) \mid p_0, \dots, p_{2^m-1} \in [0, 1] \text{ with } \sum_{k=0}^{2^m-1} p_k = 1 \right\}$$

and  $K = \{0, 1, \dots, 2^m - 1\}$ . For each  $k \in K$  define  $f_k: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by  $f_k(x) = \frac{x+k}{2^m}$  and set  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_k \mid k \in K\}$ . The pair  $(\mathcal{F}, P)$  is an *iterated function system with probabilities* (IFS<sub>WP</sub> for short). According to [13, Section 4.4] (cf. [6, Theorem 2.8]) there exists the unique  $\mu_P \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad \mu_P(B) = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \mu_P(f_k^{-1}(B)) \quad \text{for } B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1]),$$

where  $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$  denotes the family of all Borel subsets of the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Denote by  $\Phi_P: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  the probability distribution function (pd. function for short) of the unique  $\mu_P \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfying (3.1), i.e.  $\Phi_P$  and  $\mu_P$  are related by the formula

$$(3.2) \quad \Phi_P(x) = \mu_P([0, x]) \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1].$$

From now on, for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}_m$  the symbols  $\mu_P$  and  $\Phi_P$  are fixed for  $\mu_P \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfying (3.1) and its pd. function, respectively.

Note that for  $m = 1$  we have  $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{(p, 1-p) \mid p \in (0, 1)\}$ , and according to [18] we conclude that for every  $p \in (0, 1)$  the de Rham function  $\varphi_p$  coincides with the function  $\Phi_{(p, 1-p)}$ . We put

$$(3.3) \quad MW_1 = \{\varphi_p \mid p \in (0, 1)\}$$

(later in (3.8), we will look at  $WM_m$  for all natural numbers  $m > 1$ ). The family  $MW_1$  consists of strictly increasing solutions of the MW–problem, and it is the base for producing new solutions of the MW–problem, as described in Section 1.

Given  $P = (p_0, \dots, p_{2^m-1}) \in \mathcal{P}_m$  we put  $K_P = \{k \in K \mid p_k \neq 0\}$  and note that  $K_P$  contains at least two elements, then (3.1) is equivalent to

$$(3.4) \quad \mu_P(B) = \sum_{k \in K_P} p_k \mu_P(f_k^{-1}(B)) \quad \text{for } B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1]),$$

and  $K_P = K$  for every  $P \in \mathcal{P}_1$ . Put

$$A_0 = [0, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad A_n = \bigcup_{k \in K_P} f_k(A_{n-1}) \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and define the *attractor* of the considered IFSwP by

$$A_* = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$$

(see [1, Section 3.7, Definition 2]). It is clear that  $A_*$  is a compact set and  $A_* = \bigcup_{k \in K_P} f_k(A_*)$ . By [1, Chapter 9.6, Theorem 2],  $A_*$  is the support of  $\mu_P$ . According to [19, Section 3],  $A_*$  is an uncountable perfect subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and if moreover  $K_P$  is a proper subset of the set  $K$ , then  $A_*$  is a *Cantor-like set*, i.e. uncountable, perfect, nowhere dense (see [22, Part II, Section 1]) and of Lebesgue measure zero. Furthermore, from the above construction we have

$$A_* = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \bigcup_{k_1, \dots, k_n \in K_P} [(f_{k_1} \circ \dots \circ f_{k_n})(0), (f_{k_1} \circ \dots \circ f_{k_n})(1)] \right),$$

and since an easy induction yields  $|(f_{k_1} \circ \dots \circ f_{k_n})(1) - (f_{k_1} \circ \dots \circ f_{k_n})(0)| \leq \frac{1}{2^{nm}}$  for all  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in K_P$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , it follows that  $x \in A_*$  if and only if there exists a sequence  $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in K_P^{\mathbb{N}}$ , called the *address* of  $x$  (see [1, Section 4.2, Theorem 1 and Definition 2]), such that

$$x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{k_1, \dots, k_n}(0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{k_1, \dots, k_n}(1).$$

**3.1. The class of Cantor-like solutions of the MW–problem.** Throughout this subsection we fix a natural number  $m \geq 2$  and  $P \in \mathcal{P}_m$ .

The first result is a consequence of [19, Lemma 4.3]. We do not repeat the proof but only point out that the statement is a consequence of the fact that  $A_*$  is the support of  $\mu_P$  (see [1, Chapter 9.6, Theorem 2]) and the points in  $A_*$  have addresses.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For any  $x \in [0, 1]$  we have  $\mu_P(\{x\}) = 0$ . In particular,  $\mu_P \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  and its pd. function  $\Phi_P$  is continuous.*

Before formulating the main result of this subsection, we need the following fact.

**Proposition 3.2.** *The pd. function  $\Phi_P$  is constant on each component of the set  $[0, 1] \setminus A_*$ , and*

$$(3.5) \quad \Phi_P(x) = \sum_{k \in K} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+k}{2^m} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^m} \right) \right] \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1].$$

*Proof.* Using the properties of  $A_*$  that we have already listed (cf. [19, Theorem 4.6]), we deduce that  $\Phi_P$  is constant on each component of the set  $[0, 1] \setminus A_*$ . To show that (3.5) holds, we first observe that arguing analogously to the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [18], we have

$$(3.6) \quad \Phi_P(x) = \sum_{k \in K_P} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+k}{2^m} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^m} \right) \right] \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1].$$

If  $k \in K \setminus K_P$ , then (3.4) and Lemma 3.1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_P \left( \frac{k+1}{2^m} \right) &= \mu_P \left( \left[ 0, \frac{k}{2^m} \right] \right) + \mu_P \left( \left( \frac{k}{2^m}, \frac{k+1}{2^m} \right) \right) + \mu_P \left( \left\{ \frac{k+1}{2^m} \right\} \right) \\ &= \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^m} \right) + \sum_{l \in K_P} p_l \mu_P(\emptyset) = \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^m} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.6) gives (3.5).  $\square$

The main result of this subsection together with Proposition 1.1 gives a negative answer to Problem 1.2 and reads as follows.

**Theorem 3.3.** *The function  $\varphi_P: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  defined by*

$$(3.7) \quad \varphi_P(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+k}{2^i} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^i} \right) \right]$$

*is a solution of the MW-problem.*

*Moreover, if  $K_P \neq K$ , then  $\varphi_P$  is not strictly increasing.*

*Proof.* Obviously,  $\varphi_P(0) = 0$ . To see that  $\varphi_P(1) = 1$  it suffices to note that  $\mu_P \in \mathcal{M}$  implies  $\Phi_P(1) = 1$ . Since  $\Phi_P$  is increasing, so is  $\varphi_P$ . The continuity of  $\varphi_P$  follows from Lemma 3.1. To see that  $\varphi_P$  satisfies (1.1) we fix  $x \in [0, 1]$  and observe that applying (3.5), which holds by Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_P(x) &= \frac{1}{m} \left( \Phi_P(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+k}{2^i} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^i} \right) \right] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+k}{2^i} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^i} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^{i+1}-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+k}{2^{i+1}} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^{i+1}} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+2k}{2^{i+1}} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{2k}{2^{i+1}} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+2k+1}{2^{i+1}} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{2k+1}{2^{i+1}} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x}{2} + \frac{k}{2^i} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^i} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+1}{2^i} + k \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{2k+1}{2^{i+1}} \right) \right] \\
& = \varphi_P \left( \frac{x}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+1}{2^i} + k \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^i} \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P \left( \frac{k}{2^i} \right) - \Phi_P \left( \frac{1+2k}{2^{i+1}} \right) \right] \\
& = \varphi_P \left( \frac{x}{2} \right) + \varphi_P \left( \frac{x+1}{2} \right) - \varphi_P \left( \frac{1}{2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, observe that if  $K_P \neq K$ , then  $A_*$  is a Cantor-like set, and hence the set

$$A = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^i-1} 2^i \left( A_* - \frac{k}{2^i} \right)$$

is closed and of Lebesgue measure zero. Therefore, by [Proposition 3.2](#) we conclude that  $\varphi_P$  is constant on each component of the set  $[0, 1] \setminus A$ , which means that it is not strictly increasing.  $\square$

For each  $P \in \mathcal{P}_m$ , we denote by  $\varphi_P$  the solution of the MW–problem given by [\(3.7\)](#) and put

$$(3.8) \quad MW_m = \{\varphi_P \mid P \in \mathcal{P}_m\}.$$

Let us recall that the family  $MW_1$  was defined in [\(3.3\)](#) and each of its member can be written in the form [\(1.4\)](#). However, [Theorem 3.3](#) says that the family  $MW_m$  (recall that  $m \geq 2$ ) contains solutions of the MW–problem that are not strictly increasing and, in view of [Proposition 1.1](#), cannot have the form [\(1.4\)](#) with any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ .

**3.2. The class of strictly increasing solutions of the MW–problem that are not of the form (1.4).** The aim of this subsection is to show that for each integer number  $m \geq 2$  the family  $MW_m$  contains solutions of the MW–problem that are strictly increasing but not of the form [\(1.4\)](#) with any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ .

The first assertion of the next lemma can be found as Lemma 3.1 in [\[20\]](#). The second assertion is a consequence of the first one and the fact that if  $\varphi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a solution of the MW–problem, then so is the function  $\psi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  defined by  $\psi(x) = 1 - \varphi(1 - x)$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\varphi$  be a solution of the MW–problem.*

- (i) *If  $\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi(x)}{x} = 0$ , then  $\varphi$  is singular.*
- (ii) *If  $\liminf_{x \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{\varphi(1) - \varphi(x)}{1 - x} = 0$ , then  $\varphi$  is singular.*

**Theorem 3.5.** *For each integer number  $m \geq 2$  there exists  $\varphi_P \in MW_m$  that is strictly increasing but not of the form (1.4) with any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix an integer number  $m \geq 2$ . Fix also  $P \in \mathcal{P}_m$  such that  $\varphi_P$  is not strictly increasing; this is possible in view of [Theorem 3.3](#). According to [Proposition 1.1](#) we deduce that  $\varphi_P$  is not of the form [\(1.4\)](#) with any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ , and since any solution of the MW–problem is a convex combination of the identity function on  $[0, 1]$  and a singular solution of the MW–problem (see [\[18, Theorem 1.1 \(i\) and Remark 2.2\]](#)),

we conclude that  $\varphi_P$  is singular. Fix also  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and define  $\psi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  putting

$$\psi(x) = \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)\varphi_P(x).$$

Clearly,  $\psi$  is a solution of the MW-problem. We will show that there is no  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  such that  $\psi = \phi_\mu$ , where  $\phi_\mu$  is given by (1.4).

Assume by contradiction that there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$  such that  $\psi = \phi_\mu$ .

Define  $f, g: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$f(x) = \int_{(0, \frac{1}{2})} \Phi(p, x) d\mu(p) \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) = \int_{(\frac{1}{2}, 1)} \Phi(p, x) d\mu(p).$$

Then for every  $x \in [0, 1]$  we have

$$(3.9) \quad \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)\varphi_P(x) = f(x) + \mu\left(\left\{\frac{1}{2}\right\}\right)x + g(x).$$

Assume for a moment that  $f$  and  $g$  are singular functions. Then, differentiating equality (3.9), we get  $\alpha = \mu\left(\left\{\frac{1}{2}\right\}\right)$ , which implies that

$$\varphi_P(x) = \frac{f(x) + g(x)}{1 - \alpha} = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \int_{(0,1) \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}} \Phi(p, x) d\mu(p).$$

Since the formula

$$\nu(B) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \mu\left(B \setminus \left\{\frac{1}{2}\right\}\right) \quad \text{for every } B \in \mathcal{B},$$

defines a measure belonging to  $\mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}$ , we obtain

$$\varphi_P(x) = \int_{(0,1)} \Phi(p, x) d\nu(p),$$

a contradiction.

To complete the proof, it suffices to show that  $f$  and  $g$  are singular functions.

If  $\mu((0, \frac{1}{2})) = 0$ , then  $f = 0$  and it is singular. Let  $\mu((0, \frac{1}{2})) > 0$ . Then the function  $F = \frac{1}{\mu((0, \frac{1}{2}))} f$  is a solution of the MW-problem as it is of the form (1.4).

Applying (1.3) and the Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F\left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right) - F(0)}{\frac{1}{2^n}} &= \frac{1}{\mu((0, \frac{1}{2}))} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2^n \int_{(0, \frac{1}{2})} \Phi\left(p, \frac{1}{2^n}\right) d\mu(p) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu((0, \frac{1}{2}))} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2^n \int_{(0, \frac{1}{2})} p^n d\mu(p) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu((0, \frac{1}{2}))} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{(0, \frac{1}{2})} (2p)^n d\mu(p) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, assertion (i) of Lemma 3.4 yields the singularity of  $F$  and, therefore,  $f$ .

Similarly, if  $\mu((\frac{1}{2}, 1)) = 0$ , then  $g = 0$  and it is singular. Let  $\mu((\frac{1}{2}, 1)) > 0$ . Then the function  $G = \frac{1}{\mu((\frac{1}{2}, 1))} g$  is a solution of the MW-problem. Applying (1.3), the fact that  $\Phi(p, x) = 1 - \Phi(1 - p, 1 - x)$  for all  $p \in (0, 1)$  and  $x \in [0, 1]$  (see [2, Proposition

2.3]), and the Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(1) - G\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^n}\right)}{\frac{1}{2^n}} &= \frac{1}{\mu\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)\right)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)} 2^n \left[1 - \Phi\left(p, 1 - \frac{1}{2^n}\right)\right] d\mu(p) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\mu\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)\right)} \int_{\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)} 2^n \Phi\left(1 - p, \frac{1}{2^n}\right) d\mu(p) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)\right)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)} (2(1-p))^n d\mu(p) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by (ii) of Lemma 3.4, we obtain the singularity of  $G$  and thus  $g$ .  $\square$

#### 4. MORE NEW SOLUTIONS OF THE MW-PROBLEM

In this section, we will provide a way to define new solutions of the MW-problem. However, we start with two observations.

**Proposition 4.1.** *For every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $MW_m \subset MW_{2m}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $P = (p_0, \dots, p_{2^m-1}) \in \mathcal{P}_m$  and consider the IFSwP  $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{P})$ , where  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \{f_k \circ f_l \mid k, l \in K\}$  and  $\tilde{P} = (p_k p_l)_{k, l \in K}$ . Using (3.1), for every  $B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ , we get

$$\mu_P(B) = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \sum_{l \in K} p_l \mu_P(f_l^{-1}(f_k^{-1}(B))) = \sum_{k, l \in K} p_k p_l \mu_P((f_k \circ f_l)^{-1}(B)).$$

By the uniqueness of the invariant measure  $\mu_{\tilde{P}}$  for  $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{P})$ , we have  $\mu_P = \mu_{\tilde{P}}$ , and hence  $\Phi_P = \Phi_{\tilde{P}}$ . Then, making use of (3.5), for every  $x \in [0, 1]$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_P(x) &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+k}{2^i}\right) - \Phi_P\left(\frac{k}{2^i}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \sum_{l=0}^{2^{m-i}-1} \left[ \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+k+2^i l}{2^{m+i}}\right) - \Phi_P\left(\frac{k+2^i l}{2^{m+i}}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^{m+i}-1} \left[ \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+k}{2^{m+i}}\right) - \Phi_P\left(\frac{k}{2^{m+i}}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=m}^{2m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+k}{2^i}\right) - \Phi_P\left(\frac{k}{2^i}\right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

and hence, remembering that  $\Phi_P = \Phi_{\tilde{P}}$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_P(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \varphi_P(x) + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_P(x) = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+k}{2^i}\right) - \Phi_P\left(\frac{k}{2^i}\right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=m}^{2m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+k}{2^i}\right) - \Phi_P\left(\frac{k}{2^i}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=0}^{2m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+k}{2^i}\right) - \Phi_P\left(\frac{k}{2^i}\right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{i=0}^{2^m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^i-1} \left[ \Phi_{\tilde{P}} \left( \frac{x+k}{2^i} \right) - \Phi_{\tilde{P}} \left( \frac{k}{2^i} \right) \right] = \varphi_{\tilde{P}}(x).$$

In consequence,  $\varphi_P = \varphi_{\tilde{P}} \in MW_{2^m}$ .  $\square$

To formulate the next lemma, we adopt the convention that  $\sum_{k=0}^{-1} p_k = 0$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $P \in \mathcal{P}_m$ . Then*

$$\Phi_P \left( \frac{x+l}{2^m} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} p_k + p_l \Phi_P(x)$$

for all  $l \in K$  and  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $l \in K$  and  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_P \left( \frac{x+l}{2^m} \right) &= \mu_P \left( \left[ 0, \frac{x+l}{2^m} \right] \right) = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \mu_P \left( f_k^{-1} \left( \left[ 0, \frac{x+l}{2^m} \right] \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} p_k \mu_P([0, 1]) + p_l \mu_P([0, x]) + \sum_{k=l+1}^{2^m-1} p_k \mu_P(\emptyset) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} p_k + p_l \Phi_P(x), \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3.** *For all distinct  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $MW_m \neq MW_n$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . To get the required assertion we fix  $P = (0, \dots, 0, p, 1-p) \in \mathcal{P}_m$  and note that it is sufficient to prove that

$$(4.1) \quad \varphi_P(x) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x \in \left[ 0, \frac{2^m - 2^{m-1} - 1}{2^m - 1} \right].$$

Define recursively two sequences  $(x_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  and  $(y_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  putting

$$x_0 = \frac{2^m - 2}{2^m}, \quad y_0 = \frac{2^m - 1}{2^m}$$

and

$$x_q = \frac{x_{q-1} + 2^m - 2}{2^m}, \quad y_q = \frac{y_{q-1} + 2^m - 2}{2^m} \quad \text{for every } m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is easy to check that  $(x_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is strictly increasing,  $(y_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is strictly decreasing and  $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} x_q = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} y_q = \frac{2^m - 2}{2^m - 1}$ .

We begin with proving that

$$(4.2) \quad \Phi_P(x) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x \in \left[ 0, \frac{2^m - 2}{2^m - 1} \right].$$

First, we will show that  $\Phi_P(x) = 0$  for every  $x \in [0, \frac{2^m - 2}{2^m - 1}]$ . Since  $\Phi_P$  is increasing and continuous, and  $(x_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is increasing with  $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} x_q = \frac{2^m - 2}{2^m - 1}$ , it suffices to show that  $\Phi_P(x_q) = 0$  for every  $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . We will do it by induction. For  $q = 0$ , [Lemma 4.2](#) gives

$$\Phi_P(x_0) = \Phi_P \left( \frac{2^m - 2}{2^m} \right) = p \Phi_P(0) = 0.$$

If  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Phi_P(x_{q-1}) = 0$ , then applying again [Lemma 4.2](#) we get

$$\Phi_P(x_q) = p\Phi_P(x_{q-1}) = 0.$$

It remains to show that  $\Phi_P(x) > 0$  for every  $x \in (\frac{2^m-2}{2^m-1}, 1]$ . Again, since  $\Phi_P$  is increasing and  $(y_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is decreasing with  $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} y_q = \frac{2^m-2}{2^m-1}$ , it suffices to show that  $\Phi_P(y_q) > 0$  for every  $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . As before we will proceed by induction. For  $q = 0$ , [Lemma 4.2](#) gives

$$\Phi_P(y_0) = \Phi_P\left(\frac{2^m-1}{2^m}\right) = p + (1-p)\Phi_P(0) = p > 0.$$

If  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Phi_P(y_{q-1}) > 0$ , then applying again [Lemma 4.2](#) we get

$$\Phi_P(y_q) = p\Phi_P(y_{q-1}) > 0.$$

and the proof of [\(4.2\)](#) is complete.

Now, we pass to the proof of [\(4.1\)](#).

Fix  $x \in [0, \frac{2^m-2^{m-1}-1}{2^m-1}]$ . If  $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$  and  $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^i-1\}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \frac{x+k}{2^i} &\leq \frac{x+2^i-1}{2^i} \leq \frac{x+2^{m-1}-1}{2^{m-1}} \leq \frac{\frac{2^m-2^{m-1}-1}{2^m-1} + 2^{m-1}-1}{2^{m-1}} \\ &= \frac{2^m-2}{2^m-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and [\(4.2\)](#) implies  $\varphi_P(x) = 0$ .

Fix now  $x \in (\frac{2^m-2^{m-1}-1}{2^m-1}, \frac{2^m-2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}]$ . If  $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$  and  $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^i-1\}$ , then  $\frac{x+k}{2^i} \leq 1$  and

$$\frac{2^m-2}{2^m-1} < \frac{x+k}{2^i} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad i = m-1 \text{ and } k = 2^{m-1}-1.$$

This together with [\(4.2\)](#) yields

$$\begin{aligned} (4.3) \quad \varphi_P(x) &= \frac{1}{m} \left[ \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+2^{m-1}-1}{2^{m-1}}\right) - \Phi_P\left(\frac{2^{m-1}-1}{2^{m-1}}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \Phi_P\left(\frac{x+2^{m-1}-1}{2^{m-1}}\right) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and since  $\varphi_P$  is increasing, we conclude that [\(4.1\)](#) holds.  $\square$

*Remark 4.4.* Let  $m \geq 2$  be an integer number. If  $P = (0, \dots, 0, p, 1-p) \in \mathcal{P}_m$ , then  $\varphi_P(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{p}{m}$  and  $\varphi_P(\frac{1}{2^{j+1}}) = 0$  for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $P = (0, \dots, 0, p, 1-p) \in \mathcal{P}_m$ . From the proof of [Proposition 4.3](#) we know that [\(4.1\)](#) and [\(4.2\)](#) hold. Since

$$\frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{2^m-2^{m-1}-1}{2^m-1} < \frac{1}{2} < \frac{2^m-2^{m-1}}{2^m-1},$$

[\(4.1\)](#) yields  $\varphi_P(\frac{1}{2^{j+1}}) = 0$  for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using [\(4.3\)](#),

$$\varphi_P\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{m} \Phi_P\left(\frac{\frac{1}{2} + 2^{m-1} - 1}{2^{m-1}}\right) = \frac{1}{m} \Phi_P\left(\frac{2^m-1}{2^m}\right) = \frac{p}{m},$$

ending the proof.  $\square$

If  $\varphi_P$  is the solution of the MW-problem from [Remark 4.4](#), then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \varphi_P \left( \frac{1}{2^j} \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \varphi_P(1) - n \varphi_P \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] = -\infty.$$

In particular,  $\varphi_P$  does not satisfy the Hausdorff moment problem. Recall (see [Proposition 1.1](#)), that  $\varphi_P$  is also not of the integral form (1.4). This sheds some light on [Problem 2.4](#).

Let us also note that [Remark 4.4](#) implies that for all integer numbers  $n > m \geq 2$  there are  $\varphi_P \in MW_m$  and  $\varphi_{P'} \in MW_n$  such that  $\varphi_P(\frac{1}{2^j}) = \varphi_{P'}(\frac{1}{2^j})$  for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , but  $\varphi_P \neq \varphi_{P'}$ .

Let us finish this section by showing how to produce more new solutions of the MW-problem. For this purpose we put  $\Delta_m = \{P \in \mathcal{P}_m \mid K_P = K\}$ . Clearly,  $\Delta_m \subset [0, 1]^{2^m}$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{B}([0, 1]^{2^m})$  the family of all Borel subsets of the cube  $[0, 1]^{2^m}$  and by  $\mathcal{M}_{\Delta_m}$  the family of all probability measure defined on  $\mathcal{B}([0, 1]^{2^m})$  supported on  $\Delta_m$ , hence  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\Delta_m}$  if  $\nu(\Delta_m) = 1$ . Following the idea of [[20](#)], explained in the paragraph just before [Proposition 1.1](#) in [Section 1](#), we define  $\Psi: \Delta_m \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$\Psi(P, x) = \varphi_P(x)$$

and note that  $\Psi$  is increasing and continuous with respect to the second variable. Then for every  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\Delta_m}$  the formula

$$\psi_\nu(x) = \int_{\Delta_m} \Psi(P, x) d\nu(P)$$

defines a solution of the MW-problem. Next given a sequences  $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of nonnegative real numbers such that  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_n = 1$  and a sequence  $(\nu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}_{\Delta_n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we put

$$(4.4) \quad \psi = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_n \psi_{\nu_n}.$$

It is clear that  $\psi$  is an increasing function,  $\psi(0) = 0$ ,  $\psi(1) = 1$ , and  $\psi(x) = \psi(\frac{x}{2}) + \psi(\frac{x+1}{2}) - \psi(\frac{1}{2})$  for every  $x \in [0, 1]$ . By the Weierstrass M-test,  $\psi$  is continuous, hence  $\psi$  is a solution of the MW-problem. In this manner we can produce a large family of solutions of the MW-problem. However, we still do not know if we can describe all solutions of the MW-problem by using the above procedure. This leads to the following question.

**Problem 4.5.** Can every solution of the MW-problem be obtained as described above, i.e. is of the form (4.4)?

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research was supported by the University of Silesia Mathematics Department (Iterative Functional Equations and Real Analysis program).

**Author contributions.** All work regarding this manuscript was carried out by a joint effort of the two authors.

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

## DECLARATIONS

**Conflict of interest.** The authors declare no competing interests.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Michael Barnsley. *Fractals everywhere*. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [2] L. Berg and M. Krüppel. De Rham's singular function and related functions. *Z. Anal. Anwendungen*, 19(1):227–237, 2000.
- [3] L. Berg and M. Krüppel. De Rham's singular function, two-scale difference equations and Appell polynomials. *Results Math.*, 38(1-2):18–47, 2000.
- [4] Georges de Rham. Sur quelques courbes définies par des equations fonctionnelles. *Univ. e Politec. Torino. Rend. Sem. Mat.*, 16:101–113, 1956/1957.
- [5] Jürgen Elstrodt. *Maß- und Integrationstheorie*. Springer-Lehrbuch. [Springer Textbook]. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, fourth edition, 2005. Grundwissen Mathematik. [Basic Knowledge in Mathematics].
- [6] Kenneth Falconer. *Techniques in fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997.
- [7] William Feller. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. II*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, 1966.
- [8] Masayoshi Hata. On the functional equation  $(1/p)\{f(x/p) + \dots + f((x+p-1)/p)\} = \lambda f(\mu x)$ . *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 25(2):357–364, 1985.
- [9] Masayoshi Hata and Masaya Yamaguti. The Takagi function and its generalization. *Japan J. Appl. Math.*, 1(1):183–199, 1984.
- [10] Felix Hausdorff. Summationsmethoden und Momentfolgen. I. *Math. Z.*, 9(1-2):74–109, 1921.
- [11] Felix Hausdorff. Summationsmethoden und Momentfolgen. II. *Math. Z.*, 9(3-4):280–299, 1921.
- [12] Felix Hausdorff. Momentprobleme für ein endliches Intervall. *Math. Z.*, 16(1):220–248, 1923.
- [13] John E. Hutchinson. Fractals and self-similarity. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 30(5):713–747, 1981.
- [14] Hans-Heinrich Kairies. Functional equations for peculiar functions. *Aequationes Math.*, 53(3):207–241, 1997.
- [15] Manfred Krüppel. De Rham's singular function, its partial derivatives with respect to the parameter and binary digital sums. *Rostock. Math. Kolloq.*, (64):57–74, 2009.
- [16] Janusz Matkowski. Remark on BV-solutions of a functional equation connected with invariant measures. *Aequationes Math.*, 29(2-3):210–213, 1985.
- [17] Jolanta Misiewicz and Jacek Wośowski. Winding planar probabilities. *Metrika*, 75(4):507–519, 2012.
- [18] Janusz Morawiec and Thomas Zürcher. On a problem of Janusz Matkowski and Jacek Wośowski. *Aequationes Math.*, 92(4):601–615, 2018.
- [19] Janusz Morawiec and Thomas Zürcher. On a problem of Janusz Matkowski and Jacek Wośowski, II. *Aequationes Math.*, 93(1):91–108, 2019.
- [20] Janusz Morawiec and Thomas Zürcher. A new approach with new solutions to the Matkowski and Wośowski problem. *Aequationes Math.*, 95(4):761–776, 2021.
- [21] Konrad Schmüdgen. *The moment problem*, volume 277 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [22] Gary L. Wise and Eric B. Hall. *Counterexamples in probability and real analysis*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1993.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA, BANKOWA 14, PL-40-007 KATOWICE,  
POLAND

*Email address:* morawiec@math.us.edu.pl

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA, BANKOWA 14, PL-40-007 KATOWICE,  
POLAND

*Email address:* thomas.zurcher@us.edu.pl