DERIVATION OF AN UPPER BOUND OF THE CONSTANT IN THE ERROR BOUND FOR A NEAR BEST M-TERM APPROXIMATION

WOLFGANG KARCHER, HANS-PETER SCHEFFLER, AND EVGENY SPODAREV

ABSTRACT. In [4], Temlyakov provides an error bound for a near best *m*-term approximation of a function $g \in L^p([0,1]^d)$, $1 , <math>d \in \mathbb{N}$, using a basis L^p equivalent to the Haar system \mathcal{H} . The bound includes a constant C(p) that is not given explicitly. The goal of this paper is to find an upper bound of the constant for the Haar system \mathcal{H} , following the proof in [4].

1. Determining the constant in the one-dimensional case

Let $\mathcal{H} := \{H_I\}_I$ be the Haar basis in $L^p[0,1]$ indexed by dyadic intervals $I = [(j-1)2^{-n}, j2^{-n}), j = 1, ..., 2^n, n = 0, 1, ... \text{ and } I = [0,1]$ with

$$H_{[0,1]}(x) = 1 \quad \text{for } x \in [0,1),$$

$$H_{[(j-1)2^{-n}, j2^{-n})}(x) = \begin{cases} 2^{n/2}, & x \in [(j-1)2^{-n}, (j-\frac{1}{2})2^{-n}), \\ -2^{-n/2}, & x \in [(j-\frac{1}{2})2^{-n}, j2^{-n}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let

$$f = \sum_{I} c_{I}(f) H_{I},$$

where

$$c_I(f) := (f, H_I) = \int_0^1 f(x) H_I(x) dx,$$

and denote

$$c_I(f,p) := \|c_I(f)H_I\|_p.$$

Then $c_I(f,p) \to 0$ as $|I| \to 0$.

Date: 7 October 2009.

Key words and phrases. m-term approximation, Haar system.

Denote by Λ_m a set of *m* dyadic intervals *I* such that

$$\min_{I \in \Lambda_m} c_I(f, p) \ge \max_{J \notin \Lambda_m} c_J(f, p).$$

This means that Λ_m contains the *m* largest values of $c_I(f, p)$ where *I* runs through all dyadic intervals. Then we define the Greedy algorithm $G_m^p(\cdot, \mathcal{H})$ as

$$G^p_m(f,\mathcal{H}) := \sum_{I \in \Lambda_m} c_I(f) H_I.$$

The following theorem provides an error bound for the approximation of a function $f \in L^p[0,1]$ by the Greedy algorithm $G^p_m(\cdot, \mathcal{H})$:

Theorem 1.1. Let $1 . Then for any <math>g \in L^p[0,1]$, we have

$$||g - G_m^p(g, \mathcal{H})||_p \le \left(2 + \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right)^2}\right) \cdot \left(\max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1\right)^2 \cdot \sigma_m(g)_p.$$

Proof. The Littlewood-Paley theorem for the Haar system gives for 1

$$C_{3}(p) \left\| \left(\sum_{I} |c_{I}(g)H_{I}|^{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{p} \leq ||g||_{p} \leq C_{4}(p) \left\| \left(\sum_{I} |c_{I}(g)H_{I}|^{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{p}.$$
(1)

In case of g being a martingale, explicit formulas for these constants are known (cf. [1]). In Lemma 1.6, page 8, it is shown that the Haar series

$$g = \sum_{I} c_{I}(g) H_{I}$$

is in fact a (conditionally symmetric) martingale.

Thus, taking the constants in [1], page 87, we have

$$C_3(p) = \frac{1}{\max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1}$$
 and $C_4(p) = \max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1.$

Let T_m be an *m*-term Haar polynomial of best *m*-term approximation to g in $L^p[0, 1]$:

$$T_m = \sum_{I \in \Lambda} a_I H_I, \quad |\Lambda| = m.$$

UPPER BOUND OF THE CONSTANT FOR THE NEAR BEST M-TERM APPROXIMATION 3

For any finite set Q of dyadic intervals we denote by ${\cal S}_Q$ the projector

$$S_Q(f) := \sum_{I \in Q} c_I(f) H_I.$$

With these definitions, one can derive the following inequality:

$$\begin{split} \|g - S_{\Lambda}(g)\|_{p} &= \|g - T_{m} - S_{\Lambda}(g - T_{m})\|_{p} \\ &\leq \|Id - S_{\Lambda}\|_{p \to p} \sigma_{m}(g)_{p} \\ &\leq C_{4}(p)C_{3}(p)^{-1}\sigma_{m}(g)_{p}, \end{split}$$

where Id denotes the identical operator. The last inequality holds since

```
\|g\|_p \le 1
```

implies by the Littlewood-Paley theorem (cf. (1)) that

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{I} |c_{I}(g)H_{I}|^{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{p} \leq C_{3}(p)^{-1},$$

so that by again applying (1) we get

$$\|(Id - S_{\Lambda})(g)\|_{p} = \left\| \sum_{I \notin \Lambda} c_{I}(g) H_{I} \right\|_{p}$$

$$\leq C_{4}(p) \left\| \left(\sum_{I \notin \Lambda} |c_{I}(g) H_{I}|^{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{p}$$

$$\leq C_{4}(p) \left\| \left(\sum_{I} |c_{I}(g) H_{I}|^{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{p}$$

$$\leq C_{4}(p) C_{3}(p)^{-1}.$$

With $C_3(p)$ and $C_4(p)$ given above we have

$$\|g - S_{\Lambda}(g)\|_{p} \leq \left(\max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1\right)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p}.$$
(2)

Since

$$G_m^p(g) = S_{\Lambda_m}(g),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|g - G_m^p(g)\|_p \\ &\leq \|g - S_\Lambda(g)\|_p + \|S_\Lambda(g) - S_{\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \\ &\leq \left(\max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1\right)^2 \cdot \sigma_m(g)_p + \|S_\Lambda(g) - S_{\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p. \end{aligned}$$
(3)

It remains to estimate $||S_{\Lambda}(g) - S_{\Lambda_m}(g)||_p$ appropriately:

$$||S_{\Lambda}(g) - S_{\Lambda_m}(g)||_p = ||S_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_m}(g) - S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)||_p$$

$$\leq ||S_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_m}(g)||_p + ||S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)||_p.$$
(4)

The second term in the last expression can be estimated by

$$||S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)||_p = || (Id - S_{(\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda)^C}) (g) ||_p$$

$$= ||g - T_m - S_{\Lambda \bigcup \Lambda_m^C} (g - T_m) ||_p$$

$$\leq ||Id - S_{\Lambda \bigcup \Lambda_m^C} ||_{p \to p} \sigma_m (g)_p$$

$$\leq \frac{C_4(p)}{C_3(p)} \sigma_m (g)_p$$

$$= \left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1} \right) - 1 \right)^2 \cdot \sigma_m (g)_p.$$
(5)

Furthermore

$$\|S_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \le \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right)^2} \cdot \|S_{\Lambda_m\setminus\Lambda}(g)\|_p \tag{6}$$

which will be derived in the following lemmas (Lemma 1.2 - 1.5).

Combining (3)-(6), we get

$$||g - G_m^p(g)||_p \le \left(2 + \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right)^2}\right) \cdot \left(\max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1\right)^2 \cdot \sigma_m(g)_p.$$

Lemma 1.2. Let $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_s$ be integers and let $E_j \subset [0,1]$ be measurable sets, j = 1, ..., s. Then for any $0 < q < \infty$ we have

$$\int_0^1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^s 2^{n_j/q} \chi_{E_j}(x)\right)^q dx \le \left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/q}}\right)^q \cdot \sum_{j=1}^s 2^{n_j} |E_j|.$$

where $\chi_I(\cdot)$ is the characteristic function of the interval I:

$$\chi_I(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in I, \\ 0, & x \notin I. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Denote

$$F(x) := \sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_j/q} \chi_{E_j}(x)$$

and estimate it on the sets

$$E_l^- := E_l \setminus \bigcup_{k=l+1}^s E_k, \quad l = 1, ..., s - 1; \quad E_s^- := E_s.$$

We have for $x \in E_l^-$

$$F(x) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} 2^{n_j/q}$$

= $2^{n_l/q} \left(\frac{2^{n_1/q}}{2^{n_l/q}} + \dots + 1 \right)$
 $\leq 2^{n_l/q} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^{1/q}} \right)^i$
= $2^{n_l/q} \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/q}}.$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^1 F(x)^q dx \le \left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/q}}\right)^q \sum_{l=1}^s 2^{n_l} |E_l^-| \le \left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/q}}\right)^q \sum_{l=1}^s 2^{n_l} |E_l|,$$

which proves the lemma.

Lemma 1.3. Consider

$$f = \sum_{I \in Q} c_I H_I, \quad |Q| = N.$$

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. Assume that

$$\|c_I H_I\|_p \le 1, \quad I \in Q. \tag{7}$$

Then

$$||f||_p \le \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}} N^{1/p}$$

Proof. Denote by $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_s$ all integers such that there is $I \in Q$ with $|I| = 2^{-n_j}$. Introduce the sets

$$E_j := \bigcup_{I \in Q: |I| = 2^{-n_j}} I.$$

Then the number N of elements in Q can be written in the form

$$N = \sum_{j=1}^{s} |E_j| 2^{n_j}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$||c_I H_I||_p = |c_I||I|^{1/p-1/2}.$$

The assumption (7) implies $|c_I| \leq |I|^{1/2-1/p}$. Next, we have

$$||f||_p \le \left\|\sum_{I \in Q} |c_I H_I|\right\|_p \le \left\|\sum_{I \in Q} |I|^{-1/p} \chi_I(x)\right\|_p.$$

The right hand side of this inequality cna be rewritten as

$$Y := \left(\int_0^1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^s 2^{n_j/p} \chi_{E_j}(x) \right)^p dx \right)^{1/p}.$$

Applying Lemma 1.2 with q = p, we get

$$||f||_p \le Y \le \frac{1}{1 - (1/2)^{1/p}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^s |E_j| 2^{n_j}\right)^{1/p} = \frac{1}{1 - (1/2)^{1/p}} N^{1/p}.$$

Lemma 1.4. Consider

$$f = \sum_{I \in Q} c_I H_I, \quad |Q| = N.$$

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. Assume

$$||c_I H_I||_p \ge 1, \quad I \in Q.$$

Then

$$||f||_p \ge \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right) N^{1/p}$$

Proof. Define

$$u := \sum_{I \in Q} \overline{c}_I |c_I|^{-1} |I|^{1/p - 1/2} H_I,$$

where the bar means complex conjugate number. Then for $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$ we have

$$\|\overline{c}_I|c_I|^{-1}|I|^{1/p-1/2}H_I\|_{p'} = 1$$

and, by Lemma 1.3

$$||u||_{p'} \le \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}} N^{1/p'}.$$

Consider (f, u). We have on the one hand

$$(f, u) = \sum_{I \in Q} |c_I| |I|^{1/p - 1/2} = \sum_{I \in Q} ||c_I H_I||_p \ge N,$$

and on the other hand

$$(f, u) \le ||f||_p ||u||_{p'},$$

so that

$$N \le (f, u) \le \|f\|_p \|u\|_{p'} \le \|f\|_p \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}} N^{1/p'}$$

which implies

$$||f||_p \ge \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right) N^{1/p}.$$

Lemma 1.5. Let	$1 .$	Then for any g	$g \in L^p[0,1]$ we have
----------------	-------	----------------	--------------------------

$$\|S_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \leq \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right)^2} \cdot \|S_{\Lambda_m\setminus\Lambda}(g)\|_p.$$

Proof. Denote

$$A := \max_{I \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_m} \|c_I(g)H_I\|_p \text{ and } B := \min_{I \in \Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda} \|c_I(g)H_I\|_p.$$

Then by the definition of Λ_m we have

 $B \ge A$.

Using Lemma 1.3, we get

$$\|S_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \le A \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}} \cdot |\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m|^{1/p} \le B \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}} \cdot |\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m|^{1/p}.$$
 (8)

Using Lemma 1.4, we get

$$\|S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)\|_p \ge B \cdot \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right) \cdot |\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda|^{1/p}$$

so that

$$|\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda|^{1/p} \le \frac{1}{B \cdot \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right)} \|S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)\|_p.$$
(9)

Since $|\Lambda| = |\Lambda_m| = m$, we have $|\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda| = |\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_m|$ and finally get

$$\|S_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} B \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}} \cdot |\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m|^{1/p}$$

$$\stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/p}\right)^2} \|S_{\Lambda_m\setminus\Lambda}(g)\|_p.$$

г		
L		

Lemma 1.6. Let $f \in L^p[0,1]$. Then the Haar series

$$g = \sum_{I} c_{I}(g) H_{I}$$

is a conditionally symmetric martingale.

Proof. First, we give a definition of a conditionally symmetric martingale (cf. [5] and [6]).

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space with a nondecreasing sequence of σ -fields

$$\{\Omega,\phi\}=\mathcal{F}_0\subset\mathcal{F}_1\subset\cdots\subset\mathcal{F}_n\subset\cdots\subset\mathcal{F}.$$

Let H be a real or complex Hilbert space with norm $|\cdot|$. A sequence of H-valued strongly integrable functions $(f_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a martingale if for each $n\geq 1$, f_n is strongly measurable relative to \mathcal{F}_n , and for $n\geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}(d_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = 0 \quad \text{a.e.}$$

8

Here the difference sequence $(d_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is defined by $f_n = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$, $n \geq 1$. In the following, we also call the limit $f = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_n$ martingale if the corresponding sequence $(f_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a martingale.

A martingale is called conditionally symmetric if d_{n+1} and $-d_{n+1}$ have the same conditional distribution given $d_1, ..., d_n$.

We can write the Haar series as

$$g = (f,\varphi)\varphi + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{2^k \le j \le 2^{k+1}-1} (g,\Psi_{j,k})\Psi_{j,k},$$

where

$$\begin{split} \varphi(x) &= \begin{cases} 1, & x \in [0, 1), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \\ \Psi_{0,0}(x) &= \varphi(2x) - \varphi(2x - 1), \\ \Psi_{j,k}(x) &= 2^{k/2} \cdot \Psi_{0,0}(2^k x - j). \end{split}$$

Consider the probability space $\{\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}\}$ defined by

$$\Omega = [0, 1],$$

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}([0, 1]),$$

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = |A|, \quad A \in \mathcal{F},$$

and the sequence of σ -fields

$$\begin{split} \{\Omega,\phi\} &= \{\Omega,\emptyset\} \\ &\subset \sigma(\varphi) \\ &\subset \sigma(\varphi,\Psi_{0,0}) \\ &\subset \sigma(\varphi,\Psi_{0,0},\Psi_{2,1}) \\ &\subset \sigma(\varphi,\Psi_{0,0},\Psi_{2,1},\Psi_{3,1}) \subset \cdots \\ &\subset \sigma(\varphi,\cdots,\Psi_{2^k,k},\cdots,\Psi_{2^{k+1}-1,k},\Psi_{2^{k+1},k+1}) \subset \cdots \\ &\subset \mathcal{F}. \end{split}$$

We define

$$d_0 = (g, \varphi)\varphi, \quad d_1 = (g, \Psi_{0,0})\Psi_{0,0}, \quad d_2 = (g, \Psi_{2,1})\Psi_{2,1}, \cdots$$

and

10

$$c_0 = (g, \varphi), \quad c_1 = (g, \Psi_{0,0}), \quad c_2 = (g, \Psi_{2,1}), \cdots$$

where the indices of $(f, \Psi_{\cdot,\cdot})\Psi_{\cdot,\cdot}$ and $(f, \Psi_{\cdot,\cdot})$ increase as in the definition of the sequence of σ -fields.

For each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and each $i = 0, \dots, n$, each of the sets $\{x : d_i(x) = c_i\}$, $\{x : d_i(x) = -c_i\}$, and $\{x : d_i(x) = 0\}$ is either a superset of the support of d_{n+1} or each of the sets and the support d_{n+1} are disjoint. This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(d_{n+1} = c_{n+1} | d_i = j_i, \ i \in \{1, ..., n\}), \ j_i \in \{c_i, -c_i, 0\})$$

= $\mathbb{P}(d_{n+1} = -c_{n+1} | d_i = j_i, \ i \in \{1, ..., n\}), \ j_i \in \{c_i, -c_i, 0\})$

so that the conditional distribution of d_{n+1} and $-d_{n+1}$ is the same given $d_1, ..., d_n$. Furthermore, we have $\mathbb{E}(d_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n) = 0$.

2. EXTENSION OF THE CALCULATION TO THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL CASE

A very common way to extend the Haar basis to $[0,1]^d$ is given by the following construction (cf. [2]). Let E denote the collection of nonzero vertices of $[0,1]^d$. For each $e \in E$, we define the multivariate functions

$$\Psi^e(x_1,\cdots,x_d) := \Psi^{e_1}(x_1)\cdots\Psi^{e_d}(x_d),$$

where $\Psi^0(x) = \varphi(x), \ \Psi^1(x) = \Psi_{0,0}(x)$. Furthermore, let

$$\Psi_{j,k}^e(x) = 2^{kd/2} \cdot \Psi^e(2^k x - j), \quad k \ge 0, \quad 2^k \le j_i \le 2^{k+1} - 1, \quad i = 1, ..., d$$

and

$$\Psi^*(x) = 1, \quad x \in [0, 1]^d.$$

Then the collection of functions Ψ^* , $\Psi^e_{j,k}$, $e \in E$, $k \ge 0$, $2^k \le j_i \le 2^{k+1}-1$, $i = 1, \dots, d$ forms a basis for $L^p[0, 1]^d$.

By considering the set \mathcal{D} of dyadic cubes I which form the supports of the functions Ψ^* , $\Psi^e_{j,k}$ and exchanging the notation of Ψ^* , $\Psi^e_{j,k}$ to H_I , we can also write the multivariate Haar basis as

$$\mathcal{H} = \{H_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}.$$

UPPER BOUND OF THE CONSTANT FOR THE NEAR BEST M-TERM APPROXIMATION 11

Lemma 2.1. Consider $f \in L^p[0,1]^d$ with corresponding Haar series

$$f = (f, \Psi^*)\Psi^* + \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^k \le j_i \le 2^{k+1} - 1 \\ i = 1, \cdots, d}} (f, \Psi^e_{j,k})\Psi^e_{j,k}.$$

Then the inner double sum

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^k \le j_i \le 2^{k+1} - 1 \\ i = 1, \cdots, d}} (f, \Psi_{j,k}^e) \Psi_{j,k}^e$$

forms a conditionally symmetric martingale on $[0,1]^d$ for each fixed $e \in E$, but so does not the Haar series itself.

Proof. First we show that the Haar series itself does not form a conditionally symmetric martingale.

Let us assume that d = 2 and remark that the proof goes analogously for d > 2. We have

$$\begin{split} \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)}(x_1,x_2) &= \begin{cases} 1, & (x_1,x_2) \in [0,1] \times [0,\frac{1}{2}], \\ -1, & (x_1,x_2) \in [0,1] \times (\frac{1}{2},1], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \\ \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)}(x_1,x_2) &= \begin{cases} 1, & (x_1,x_2) \in [0,\frac{1}{2}] \times [0,1], \\ -1, & (x_1,x_2) \in (\frac{1}{2},1] \times [0,1], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \\ \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)}(x_1,x_2) &= \begin{cases} 1, & (x_1,x_2) \in [0,\frac{1}{2}] \times [0,\frac{1}{2}] \bigcup (\frac{1}{2},1] \times (\frac{1}{2},1], \\ -1, & (x_1,x_2) \in (\frac{1}{2},1] \times [0,\frac{1}{2}] \bigcup (\frac{1}{2},1] \times (\frac{1}{2},1], \\ -1, & (x_1,x_2) \in (\frac{1}{2},1] \times [0,\frac{1}{2}] \bigcup [0,\frac{1}{2}] \times (\frac{1}{2},1], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \end{split}$$

Therefore, the functions $\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)}$, $\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)}$, and $\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)}$ can be represented as in Figure 1.

Thus

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{P}(\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)} &= 1 | \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)} &= 1, \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)} &= 1) &= 1, \\ \mathbb{P}(\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)} &= 1 | \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)} &= 1, \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)} &= 1) &= 1, \\ \mathbb{P}(\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)} &= 1 | \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)} &= 1, \Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)} &= 1) &= 1, \end{split}$$



FIGURE 1. The functions $\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)}$, $\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)}$, and $\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)}$.

which implies that

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{E}\left(\left.\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)}\right|\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)}=1,\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)}=1\right) &= 1, \\ & \mathbb{E}\left(\left.\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)}\right|\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)}=1,\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)}=1\right) &= 1, \\ & \mathbb{E}\left(\left.\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,0)}\right|\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(0,1)}=1,\Psi_{(0,0),0}^{(1,1)}=1\right) &= 1. \end{split}$$

Therefore the multiparameter Haar series cannot a martingale.

Let us now consider the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with

$$\Omega = [0, 1]^d,$$

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}([0, 1]^d),$$

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = |A|, \quad A \subset \mathcal{F},$$

12

UPPER BOUND OF THE CONSTANT FOR THE NEAR BEST M-TERM APPROXIMATION 13 with the sequence of σ -fields

$$\begin{split} \{\Omega,\phi\} &= \sigma(\Psi^e_{(0,0),0}) \\ &\subset \sigma(\Psi^e_{(0,0),0}, \Psi^e_{(2,2),1}) \subset \cdots \\ &\subset \sigma(\Psi^e_{(0,0),0}, \cdots, \Psi^e_{(3,2),1}, \Psi^e_{(2,3),1}, \Psi^e_{(3,3),1}) \subset \cdots \\ &\subset \sigma(\Psi^e_{(0,0),0}, \cdots, \Psi^e_{(3,3),1}, \Psi^e_{(4,4),2}, \Psi^e_{(5,4),2}, \Psi^e_{(6,4),2}, \Psi^e_{(7,4),2}) \subset \cdots \\ &\subset \sigma(\Psi^e_{(0,0),0}, \cdots, \Psi^e_{(7,4),2}, \Psi^e_{(4,5),2}, \Psi^e_{(5,5),2}, \Psi^e_{(6,5),2}) \subset \cdots \\ &\subset \mathcal{F} \end{split}$$

for each vertex $e \in E$. We denote this sequence of σ -fields by

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma(\Psi^e_{(0,0),0}), \quad \mathcal{F}_1 = \sigma(\Psi^e_{(0,0),0}, \Psi^e_{(2,2),1}), \quad \cdots$$

Furthermore, for a fixed $e \in E$, we consider the partial sums of the inner sums of the Haar series

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^k \le j_i \le 2^{k+1} - 1\\i=1,\cdots,d}} (f, \Psi^e_{j,k}) \Psi^e_{j,k}$$
(10)

and show that they form a conditionally symmetric martingale.

Let us denote the difference sequence $(d_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of (10) by

$$d_0 = (f, \Psi^e_{(0,0),0}) \Psi^e_{(0,0),0}, \quad d_1 = (f, \Psi^e_{(2,2),1}) \Psi^e_{(2,2),1}, \quad \cdots$$

The corresponding coefficients are denoted by

$$c_0 = (f, \Psi^e_{(0,0),0}), \quad c_1 = (f, \Psi^e_{(2,2),1}), \quad \cdots$$

For a fixed k and $e \in E$, the support of the functions $\Psi_{j,k}^e$ is disjoint. Furthermore, for l < k and $e \in E$, each of the sets $\{x : \Psi_{j,l}^e(x) = 1\}$, $\{x : \Psi_{j,l}^e(x) = -1\}$, and $\{x : \Psi_{j,l}^e(x) = 0\}$ is either a superset of the support of $\Psi_{j,k}^e$ or each of the sets and the support of $\Psi_{j,k}^e$ are disjoint.

This implies that $-d_{n+1}$ and d_{n+1} have the same conditional distribution given $d_1, ..., d_n$ and therefore

$$E(d_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = 0.$$

Thus, the partial sums of

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^k \leq j_i \leq 2^{k+1}-1 \\ i=1,\cdots,d}} (f, \Psi_{j,k}^e) \Psi_{j,k}^e$$

form a conditionally symmetric martingale.

It is clear that the series $(f, \Psi^*)\Psi^* + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^k \leq j_i \leq 2^{k+1}-1 \\ i=1,\cdots,d}} (f, \Psi^e_{j,k})\Psi^e_{j,k}$ is also a martingale.

Theorem 2.2. Let $1 . Then for any <math>g \in L^p[0,1]^d$ we have

$$\|g - G_m^p(g, \mathcal{H})\|_p$$

$$\leq \left(2 + \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right)^2}\right) \left(\left(2^d - 1\right) \left(\max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1\right)\right)^2 \sigma_m(g)_p$$

Proof. Using Lemma 2.1, we get an estimate for the upper bound in the Littlewood-Paley inequality by additionally applying the triangle inequality. Let $e^* \in E$. Then

$$\left\| (g, \Psi^{*})\Psi^{*} + \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1} - 1 \\ i = 1, \cdots, d}} (g, \Psi^{e}_{j,k})\Psi^{e}_{j,k} \right\|_{p} \\
\leq \left\| (g, \Psi^{*})\Psi^{*} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1} - 1 \\ i = 1, \cdots, d}} (g, \Psi^{e}_{j,k})\Psi^{e}_{j,k} \right\|_{p} \\
+ \sum_{e \in E \setminus \{e^{*}\}} \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1} - 1 \\ i = 1, \cdots, d}} (g, \Psi^{e}_{j,k})\Psi^{e}_{j,k} \right\|_{p} \\
\leq \sum_{e \in E} C_{4}(p) \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |c_{I}(g)H_{I}|^{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{p} \\
= \left(2^{d} - 1 \right) C_{4}(p) \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |c_{I}(g)H_{I}|^{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{p}.$$
(11)

UPPER BOUND OF THE CONSTANT FOR THE NEAR BEST M-TERM APPROXIMATION 15

We now apply the method of duality (cf. [3]) in order to determine the lower bound of the Littlewood-Paley inequality. The idea is to consider

$$S(g) := \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |c_I(g)H_I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p$$

as an element of $L^p_{l^2(\mathcal{D})}$, that is

$$\varphi = \left\{ \sqrt{|c_I(g)H_I|^2} : I \in \mathcal{D} \right\}$$

is considered as a *p*-integrable function taking values in $l^2(\mathcal{D})$. Due to the Hahn-Banach theorem, the dual function $\gamma = \{\gamma_I(x) : I \in \mathcal{D}\} \in L^{p'}_{l^2(\mathcal{D})}$ is of norm one and satisfies

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^p_{l^2}} = (\varphi, \gamma) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \sqrt{|c_I(g)H_I|^2} \int_I \gamma_I dy,$$

where p' is the conjugate index, i. e. 1/p + 1/p' = 1. This implies that we can assume that γ_I is supported on I and constant on I since in the above formula, only the mean value of γ_I over I is important.

By defining the function

$$h := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\gamma_I \sqrt{|I|} \right) H_I,$$

we have on the one hand

$$S(h) = \|\gamma\|_{l^2(\mathcal{D})}$$

and on the other hand

$$\begin{split} \|S(g)\|_{p} &= \|\varphi\|_{L^{p}_{l^{2}}} &= (\varphi, \gamma) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} c_{I}(g)\gamma_{I}\sqrt{|I|} \\ &= (g, h) \\ &\leq \|g\|_{p}\|h\|_{p'} \\ \stackrel{(11)}{\leq} \|g\|_{p} \left(2^{d} - 1\right) C_{4}(p)\|S(h)\|_{p'} \\ &= \|g\|_{p} \left(2^{d} - 1\right) C_{4}(p) \left\|\|\gamma\|_{l^{2}(\mathcal{D})}\right\|_{p'} \\ &= \|g\|_{p} \left(2^{d} - 1\right) C_{4}(p). \end{split}$$

so that in the multidimensional case, the Littlewood-Paley inequality reads

$$\frac{1}{C_4^*(p,d)} \left\| \left(\sum_I |c_I(g)H_I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \le ||g||_p \le C_4^*(p,d) \left\| \left(\sum_I |c_I(g)H_I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p, \quad (12)$$

where $C_4^*(p,d) = (2^d - 1) C_4(p) = (2^d - 1) \left(\max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1 \right).$

Now, the remainder of the proof goes as for the univariate case. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g - S_{\Lambda}(g)\|_{p} &\leq C_{4}^{*}(p,d)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p}, \\ \|S_{\Lambda_{m} \setminus \Lambda}(g)\|_{p} &\leq C_{4}^{*}(p,d)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|S_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \le \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right)^2} \|S_{\Lambda_m\setminus\Lambda}(g)\|_p$$

which will be derived in the following lemmas.

Combining the last three inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|g - G_m^p(g)\|_p \\ &\leq \|g - S_{\Lambda}(g)\|_p + \|S_{\Lambda}(g) - S_{\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \\ &= \|g - S_{\Lambda}(g)\|_p + \|S_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_m}(g) - S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)\|_p \\ &\leq \|g - S_{\Lambda}(g)\|_p + \|S_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_m}(g)\|_p + \|S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)\|_p \\ &\leq \left(2 + \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right)^2}\right) \left(\left(2^d - 1\right) \left(\max\left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right) - 1\right)\right)^2 \sigma_m(g)_p. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.3. Let $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_s$ be integers and let $E_j \subset [0,1]^d$ be measurable sets, j = 1, ..., s. Then for any $0 < q < \infty$ we have

$$\int_{[0,1]^d} \left(\sum_{j=1}^s 2^{n_j d/q} \chi_{E_j}(x) \right)^q dx \le \left(\frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/q}} \right)^q \cdot \sum_{j=1}^s 2^{n_j d} |E_j|.$$

Proof. Denote

$$F(x) := \sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_j d/q} \chi_{E_j}(x)$$

and estimate it on the sets

$$E_l^- := E_l \setminus \bigcup_{k=l+1}^s E_k, \quad l = 1, ..., s - 1; \quad E_s^- := E_s.$$

~

We have for $x \in E_l^-$

$$F(x) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} 2^{n_j d/q} = 2^{n_l d/q} \left(\frac{2^{n_1 d/q}}{2^{n_l d/q}} + \dots + 1 \right)$$

$$\leq 2^{n_l d/q} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^{d/q}} \right)^i = 2^{n_l d/q} \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/q}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^1 F(x)^q dx \le \left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/q}}\right)^q \sum_{l=1}^s 2^{n_l d} |E_l^-| \le \left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/q}}\right)^q \sum_{l=1}^s 2^{n_l d} |E_l|,$$

which proves the lemma.

Lemma 2.4. Consider

$$f = \sum_{I \in Q} c_I H_I, \quad |Q| = N.$$

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. Assume that

$$\|c_I H_I\|_p \le 1, \quad I \in Q.$$

$$\tag{13}$$

Then

$$||f||_p \le \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}} N^{1/p}.$$

Proof. Denote by $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_s$ all integers such that there is $I \in Q$ with $|I| = 2^{-dn_j}$. Introduce the sets

$$E_j := \bigcup_{I \in Q: |I| = 2^{-dn_j}} I.$$

Then the number N of elements in Q can be written in the form

$$N = \sum_{j=1}^{s} |E_j| 2^{dn_j}.$$

Furthermore, we have for $|I| = 2^{-kd}, k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$

$$||c_i H_I||_p = |c_I| \left(\int_I |2^{dk/2}|^p dx \right)^{1/p} = |c_I| \cdot 2^{dk/2} \cdot 2^{-kd/p} = |c_I||I|^{1/p-1/2}.$$

The assumption (13) implies

$$|c_I| \le |I|^{1/2 - 1/p}.$$

Next, we have

$$||f||_p \le \left\|\sum_{I \in Q} |c_I H_I|\right\|_p \le \left\|\sum_{I \in Q} |I|^{-1/p} \chi_I(x)\right\|_p.$$

The right hand side of this inequality can be rewritten as

$$Y := \left(\int_{[0,1]^d} \left(\sum_{j=1}^s 2^{dn_j/p} \chi_{E_j}(x) \right)^p dx \right)^{1/p}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 with q = p, we get

$$||f||_p \le Y \le \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^s |E_j| 2^{dn_j}\right)^{1/p} = \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}} N^{1/p}.$$

Lemma 2.5. Consider

$$f = \sum_{I \in Q} c_I H_I, \quad |Q| = N.$$

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. Assume that

$$\|c_I H_I\|_p \ge 1, \quad I \in Q. \tag{14}$$

Then

$$||f||_p \ge \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right) N^{1/p}.$$

Proof. Define

$$u := \sum_{I \in Q} \overline{c}_I |c_I|^{-1} |I|^{1/p - 1/2} H_I,$$

where the bar means complex conjugate number. Then for $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$ we have

$$\|\overline{c}_I|c_I|^{-1}|I|^{1/p-1/2}H_I\|_{p'} = 1$$

and, by Lemma 2.3

$$|u||_{p'} \le \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}} N^{1/p'}$$

Consider (f, u). We have on the one hand

$$(f, u) = \sum_{I \in Q} |c_I| |I|^{1/p - 1/2} = \sum_{I \in Q} ||c_I H_I||_p \ge N,$$

and on the other hand

$$(f, u) \le ||f||_p ||u||_{p'},$$

so that

$$N \le (f, u) \le \|f\|_p \|u\|_{p'} \le \|f\|_p \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}} N^{1/p'}$$

which implies

$$||f||_p \ge \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right) N^{1/p}.$$

Lemma 2.6.	Let $1 .$	Then for any g	$\in L^p[0,1]^d$ we have
------------	-----------	------------------	--------------------------

$$\|S_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \leq \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right)^2} \cdot \|S_{\Lambda_m\setminus\Lambda}(g)\|_p.$$

Proof. Denote

$$A := \max_{I \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_m} \|c_I(g)H_I\|_p \quad \text{and} \quad B := \min_{I \in \Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda} \|c_I(g)H_I\|_p$$

Then by the definition of Λ_m we have

 $B \ge A$.

Using Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\|S_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \le A \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}} \cdot |\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m|^{1/p} \le B \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}} \cdot |\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m|^{1/p}.$$
 (15)

Using Lemma 2.4, we get

$$\|S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)\|_p \ge B \cdot \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right) \cdot |\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda|^{1/p}$$

so that

20

$$|\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda|^{1/p} \le \frac{1}{B \cdot \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right)} \|S_{\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda}(g)\|_p.$$
(16)

Taking into account that $|\Lambda_m \setminus \Lambda| = |\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_m|$, we get

$$\|S_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m}(g)\|_p \stackrel{(15)}{\leq} B \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}} \cdot |\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_m|^{1/p} \stackrel{(16)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d/p}\right)^2} \|S_{\Lambda_m\setminus\Lambda}(g)\|_p.$$

References

- [1] Burkholder, D. L., Sharp inequalities for martingales and stochastic integrals, *Astérisque*, 157-158: 75-94, 1988.
- [2] DeVore, R. A., Nonlinear approximation, Acta Numerica: 51-150, 1998.
- [3] Lacey, M. T., Some Topics in Dyadic Harmonic Analysis, Preprint, via Email.
- [4] Temlyakov, V. N., The best *m*-term approximation and greedy algorithms, *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 8: 249-265, 1998.
- [5], Wang, G., Sharp inequalities for the conditional square function of a martingale, *The Annals of Probability*, 19(4): 1679-1688, 1991.
- [6] Wang, G., Sharp square-function inequalities for conditionally symmetric martingales, *Trans.* Amer. Math. Soc., 328(1): 393-419, 1991.

WOLFGANG KARCHER, ULM UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE OF STOCHASTICS, HELMHOLTZSTR. 18, 89081 ULM, GERMANY

E-mail address: wolfgang.karcher@uni-ulm.de

HANS-PETER SCHEFFLER, UNIVERSITY OF SIEGEN, FACHBEREICH 6, MATHEMATIK, EMMY-NOETHER-CAMPUS, WALTER-FLEX-STR. 3, 57068 SIEGEN, GERMANY

 $E\text{-}mail\ address: \ \texttt{schefflerQmathematik.uni-siegen.de}$

EVGENY SPODAREV, ULM UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE OF STOCHASTICS, HELMHOLTZSTR. 18, 89081 ULM, GERMANY

E-mail address: evgeny.spodarev@uni-ulm.de