

# Optimal data recovery and forecasting with dummy long-horizon forecasts

Nikolai Dokuchaev

**Abstract**—The paper suggests a method of recovering missing values for sequences, including sequences with a multidimensional index, based on optimal approximation by processes featuring spectrum degeneracy. The problem is considered in the pathwise setting, without using probabilistic assumptions on the ensemble. The method requires to solve a closed linear equation connecting the available observations of the underlying process with the values of the approximating process with degenerate spectrum outside the observation range. Some robustness with respect to noise contamination is established for the suggested recovering algorithm. It is suggested to apply this data recovery algorithm to forecasting with a preselected dummy long-horizon forecast that helps to regularize the solution.

**Key words:** data recovery, discrete time, branching spectrum degeneracy, multidimensional sequences, band-limited processes.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The paper considers data recovery problems for sequences in pathwise setting, i.e. without probabilistic assumptions, using the approach suggested in [10, 11] in an extended setting, allowing more general type of approximating processes, more general domains for missing data, and more general sequences with a multidimensional index.

For continuous data, the recoverability is associated with smoothness or analytical properties of the processes. For discrete time processes, it is less obvious how to interpret analyticity; so far, these problems were studied in a stochastic setting, where an observed process is deemed to be representative of an ensemble of paths with the probability distribution that is either known or can be estimated from repeating experiments. For stochastic stationary Gaussian processes with the spectral density  $\phi$ , a classical result is that a missing single value is recoverable with zero error if and only if

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \phi(e^{i\omega})^{-1} d\omega = -\infty. \quad (1)$$

(Kolmogorov [20], Theorem 24). Stochastic stationary Gaussian processes without this property are called *minimal* [20]. In particular, a process is recoverable if it is “band-limited” meaning that the spectral density is vanishing on an arc of the unit circle  $\{z \in \mathbf{C} : |z| = 1\}$ . This illustrates how recoverability is connected with bandlimitiness or its relaxed versions. Respectively, it is common to use band-limited approximations of non-bandlimited underlying processes for the forecasting and other applications. There are many works devoted to causal smoothing and sampling, oriented on estimation and minimization of norm of the error, especially in stochastic setting; see e.g. [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19,

20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 2, 26, 27, 29, 28, 30, 32, 33]. Some analogs of criterion (1) or error-free recoverability were obtained in [9].

The present paper considers optimal data recovering problem for sequences that are not necessary parts of band-limited processes. We consider the problem in the deterministic setting, i.e. pathwise. This means that the method has to rely on the intrinsic properties of a sole underlying sequence without appealing to statistical properties of an ensemble of sequences. An estimate of the missing value has to be done based on the intrinsic properties of this sole sequence and the observed values. The paper suggests a method of optimal recovering missing values of sequences (discrete time processes) based on extension of the approach from [10, 11]. The optimality criterion is pathwise; it does not involve an expectation on a probability space. In [10] band-limited extensions of one-sided sequences with one-dimensional index were considered. In [11], data recovery based on band-limited approximations was considered for sequences with one-dimensional index with finite number of missing values at consequent points. In the present paper, we consider more general type of approximating processes, more more general domains for missing data, and sequences with a multidimensional index that can be used in spatial processes and image analysis.

The method requires to solve a convenient closed linear equation connecting directly the set of observations of the underlying process with the set of recovered values of the approximating process (equation (5) in Theorem 1 and equation (7) in Theorem 2 below). The equations are finite dimensional for the case of a finite number of missing values. Since the selection of the basis in the frequency domain is not required, this allows to avoid calculation of Slepian’s type basis [25]. We established solvability and uniqueness of the solution of the recovering problem. Furthermore, we established numerical stability and robustness of the method with respect to the input errors and data truncation. For the case of a large set of missing values, this would require to impose a penalty on the norm of the approximation process, i.e. to run a Tikhonov regularization. We found that this regularization can be achieved with an arbitrarily small modification of the optimization problem (Theorem 2). For the case of a small finite set of missing values, this regularization is not required.

We considered approximations by band-limited processes (Section V), in the setting that is close to the setting from [10, 11] but with more general type of the domain for the missing data. In this case, the recovery equation (5) is in the time domain.

As an example of applications, we consider forecasting of sequences on a short horizon. Approximation of underlying

Submitted April 29, 2016. Revised October 27, 2017.

The author is with Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, 6845 Western Australia.

processes by smooth predictable processes is a traditional forecasting tool. In the present paper, we suggest to supplement regularization by a penalty on the growth of the solution by regularization via including some dummy long-horizon forecast and considering forecasting as a data recovery problem, with missing data between current time and times covered by this long-term forecast. In other words, we have to replace the extrapolation of the past path by interpolation between the past path and this dummy long-horizon forecast. It appears that this helps to stabilize the numerical solution similarly to the penalty on the growth. Of course, the choice of this dummy long-term forecast have an impact on the short-horizon forecast; however, we found that this impact is mild with appropriate choices of the horizon. The sustainability of the method is illustrated with some numerical experiments.

## II. SOME DEFINITIONS AND BACKGROUND

Let  $\mathbb{Z}$  be the set of all integers.

Let  $V$  be a Hilbert space, and let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  be given,  $n \geq 1$ .

Let  $D \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  be a given set, and let  $M = \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus D$ .

For a set  $G \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ , we denote by  $\ell_2(G, V)$  a Hilbert space of sequences  $\{x(t)\}_{t \in G} \subset V$  such that  $\|x\|_{\ell_2(G, V)} = (\sum_{t \in G} \|x(t)\|_V^2)^{1/2} < +\infty$ .

We will denote  $\ell_2(G) = \ell_2(G, \mathbf{R})$  and  $\ell_2 = \ell_2(\mathbb{Z})$ .

Let a mapping  $\nu : \ell_2(\mathbb{Z}^n, V) \rightarrow \ell_2(\mathbb{Z}^n, V)$  be defined such that  $\nu(x)(t) = x(t)$  for  $t \in D$  and  $\nu(x)(t) = 0$  for  $t \in M$ , i.e.  $\nu(x)(t) = \mathbb{I}_{\{t \in D\}} x(t)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a closed linear subspace of  $\ell_2(\mathbb{Z}^n, V)$  such that if  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  then  $\nu(x) \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{X}(D)$  be the subset of  $\mathcal{X}$  formed by the traces  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in D}$  for all sequences  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{X}^M$  be the linear subspace in  $\mathcal{X}$  consisting of all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $x(t) = 0$  for  $t \notin M$ .

We will consider  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $\mathcal{X}^M$  as Hilbert spaces provided with the norm from  $\ell_2(\mathbb{Z}^n, V)$ . Similarly, we will consider  $\mathcal{X}(D)$  as a Hilbert space provided with the norm from  $\ell_2(D, V)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a linear subspace in  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\mathcal{Y}(D)$  be the subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$  formed by the traces  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in D}$  for all sequences  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

We assume that  $D$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are selected such that the following condition holds.

**Condition 1.** 1) For any  $x \in \mathcal{Y}(D)$ , there exists a unique  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{Y}$  such that  $\hat{x}(t) = x(t)$  for  $t \in D$ .  
2)  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a closed subspace of  $\ell_2(\mathbb{Z}^n, V)$ .

Condition 1 implies that the trace  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in M}$  of a process  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{Y}$  is uniquely defined by its trace  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in D}$ .

The setting of this paper targets situations where this condition is satisfied for classes  $\mathcal{Y}$  of processes with some spectrum degeneracy, as a generalization of the setting from [10, 11], where the case of  $n = 1$ ,  $V = \mathbf{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{X} = \ell_2$  was considered, with  $\mathcal{Y}$  being a set of band-limited processes, in the notations of the present paper. In [10], finite sets  $M$  were considered. In [10], the set  $D = \{t \in \mathbb{Z} : t \leq 0\}$  was considered.

More general setting studied in the present paper allows to cover a variety of models. For example, inclusion of  $n > 1$  allows applications for the image analysis and spatial processes. Models with finite sequences can be covered with the selection of  $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \ell_2(\mathbb{Z}^n, v) : \|x(t)\|_V = 0 \text{ if } |t| < N\}$ , for  $N > 0$ .

## III. THE EQUATION FOR OPTIMAL RECOVERING

We consider below input processes  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and their approximations in  $\mathcal{Y}$ . The sequences  $\{x(t)\}_{t \in D}$  represent the available data; the values for  $t \in M$  are unavailable.

We will be using approximation described in the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** 1)  $\mathcal{Y}(D)$  is a closed linear subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$ .  
2) There exists a unique optimal solution  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{Y}$  of the minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Minimize} \quad & \sum_{t \in D} \|x_{\mathcal{Y}}(t) - x(t)\|_V^2 \\ \text{over} \quad & x_{\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{Y}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, there exists a unique process  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{Y}$  such that the trace  $\hat{x}|_{t \in D}$  provides an optimal approximation of its observable trace  $\{x(t)\}_{t \in D}$ . The corresponding trace  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in M}$  can be interpreted as a result of optimal recovery of missed trace  $x|_M$  (optimal in the sense of problem (2) given  $\mathcal{Y}$ ). We will suggest below a method of finding this trace  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in M}$  only; the calculation of the trace  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in D}$  will not be required and will be excluded.

Let  $P : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be the projection operator.

Let  $A : \mathcal{X}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  be an operator defined as

$$Ay = \mathbb{I}_M P(\mathbb{I}_M y). \quad (3)$$

Let a mapping  $a : \mathcal{X}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  be defined as

$$a(x) = \mathbb{I}_M P(\nu(x)). \quad (4)$$

**Theorem 1.** For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ , the equation

$$y = Ay + a(x) \quad (5)$$

has a unique solution  $\hat{y} = \mathbb{I}_M \hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}^M$ .

The trace  $\hat{y}|_{t \in M}$  of the solution in Theorem 1 is the sought extension on  $M$  of the optimal  $\hat{x}$  approximating the observed sequence  $\{x(t)\}_{t \in D}$ .

Approach of Theorem 1 represents a version of so-called alternative projection method; see e.g. Theorem 4 in [12], p. 912-913, and the bibliography therein. It can be noted that the assumptions of Theorem 1 do not require restriction on data sparsity or the wide of the frequency band, as is usually required by data recovery algorithms exploring uncertainty principle [12].

The following lemma shows that the mapping  $A$  is not a contraction but it is close to a contraction.

**Lemma 2.** 1) For any  $y \in \mathcal{X}^M$  such that  $y \neq 0$ ,  $\|Ay\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} < \|y\|_{\mathcal{X}^M}$ .  
2) The operator  $A : \mathcal{X}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  has the norm  $\|A\| \leq 1$ .  
3) If the space  $V$  is finite dimensional and the set  $M$  is finite, then the operator  $A : \mathcal{X}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  has the norm  $\|A\| < 1$ .

### Regularized setting

Let us consider a modification the original problem (2)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{t \in D} \|x_y(t) - x(t)\|_V^2 + \rho \|x_y\|_{\ell_2}^2 \\ & \text{over } x \in \mathcal{Y}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here  $\rho \geq 0$  is a parameter.

The setting with  $\rho > 0$  helps to prevent selection of  $\hat{x}$  with excessive norm. It can be noted that it is common to put restrictions on the norm of the optimal process in data recovery, extrapolation, and interpolation problems in signal processing; see e.g. [1, 4, 28].

Lemma 1 can be generalized as the following.

**Lemma 3.** *For any  $\rho \geq 0$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ , there exists a unique optimal solution  $\hat{x}_\rho$  of the minimization problem (6). In addition,  $\hat{x}_\rho = (1 + \rho)^{-1} \hat{x}_0$ .*

In these notations,  $\hat{x}_0$  is the optimal process presented in Lemma 1.

Under the assumptions of Lemma 3, the trace on  $M$  of the band-limited solution  $\hat{x}_\rho$  of problem (6) can be interpreted as a result of optimal recovery of the missed trace of  $x|_M$  (optimal in the sense of problem (6) given  $\Omega$  and  $\rho$ ). Let us derive an equation for this solution.

Let  $I : \mathcal{X}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  be the identity operator.

Let  $A_\rho = (1 + \rho)^{-1}A$  and  $a_\rho(x) = (1 + \rho)^{-1}a(x)$ , where  $A$  and  $a(x)$  are such as defined above.

It follows immediately from Lemma 2(ii) that, for any  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\|A_\rho\| < 1$ . Hence the operator  $(I - A_\rho)^{-1} : \mathcal{X}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  is continuous and

$$\|(I - A_\rho)^{-1}\| < +\infty,$$

for the corresponding norm. In addition, by the properties of projections presented in the definition for  $a(x)$ , we have that  $\|a_\rho(x)\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \leq \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)}$ .

Theorem 1 stipulates that equation (5) has a unique solution. However, this theorem does not establish the continuity of the dependence of  $\hat{y}$  on the input  $x|_{t \in D}$ . The following theorem shows that regularity of solutions is feasible for problem (6) with  $\rho > 0$ .

**Theorem 2.** 1) *For any  $\rho > 0$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ , the equation*

$$(1 + \rho)y = Ay + a(x) \quad (7)$$

*has a unique solution  $y_\rho = \mathbb{I}_M \hat{x}_\rho = (I - A_\rho)^{-1}a_\rho(x)$  in  $\mathcal{X}^M$ . Furthermore, for any  $\rho > 0$ ,*

$$\|y_\rho\|_{\ell_2^M} \leq \|(I - A_\rho)^{-1}\| \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)} \quad (8)$$

*for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ .*

2) *If the set  $M$  is finite and the space  $V$  is finite dimensional, then statement (i) holds for  $\rho = 0$  as well.*

Similarly to Theorem 1, the trace  $\hat{y}_\rho|_{t \in M}$  of the solution in Theorem 2 is the sought extension on  $M$  of the optimal band-limited  $\hat{x}$  approximating the observed sequence  $\{x(t)\}_{t \in D}$  (optimal in the sense of problem (6) given  $\Omega$  and  $\rho$ ).

Replacement of the original problem by problem (6) with  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  can be regarded as a Tikhonov regularization of the original problem. By Theorem 2, it leads to solution featuring continuous dependence on  $x$  in the corresponding  $\ell_2$ -norm.

**Remark 1.** *Since the operator  $A_\rho$  is a contraction, the solution of (7) can be approximated by partial sums  $\sum_{k=0}^d A_\rho^k a_\rho(x)$ .*

### IV. NUMERICAL STABILITY AND ROBUSTNESS

Let us consider a situation where an input process  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$  is observed with an error. In other words, assume that we observe a process  $x_\eta = x + \eta$ , where  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}(D)$  is a noise. Let  $y_\eta$  be the corresponding solution of equation (13) with  $x_\eta$  as an input, and let  $y$  be the corresponding solution of equation (13) with  $x$  as an input. By Theorem 2, it follows immediately that, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\|y - y_\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \leq \|(I - A_\varepsilon)^{-1}\| \|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)} \quad \text{for all } \eta \in \mathcal{X}(D).$$

This demonstrates some robustness of the method with respect to the noise in the observations.

In particular, this ensures robustness with respect to truncation of the input processes, such that semi-infinite sequences  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$  are replaced by truncated sequences  $x_\eta(t) = x(t)\mathbb{I}_{\{|t| \leq q\}}$  for  $q > 0$ ; in this case  $\eta(t) = \mathbb{I}_{\{|t| > q\}}x(t)$  is such that  $\|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $q \rightarrow +\infty$ . This overcomes principal impossibility to access infinite sequences of observations.

In practice, only finite-dimensional systems of linear equations can be solved numerically. This means that, in the case where the set  $M$  is infinite, equation (7) cannot be solved numerically even for truncated inputs, since it involves a sequence  $a(x)$  that has an infinite support for truncated  $x$ . Therefore, we have to apply the method with  $A$  replaced by its truncated version represented by a matrix of finite dimension. We will consider below the impact of truncation of  $A$ .

*Robustness with respect to the data errors and truncation:* For  $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $N > 0$ , let  $D_N = \{t : |t| \leq N\}$ , and let the operator  $A_N : \mathcal{X}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  be defined as

$$A_N y = \mathbb{I}_{M \cap D_N} P(\mathbb{I}_{M \cap D_N} y).$$

Replacement of  $A$  by  $A_N$  addresses the restrictions on the data size for numerical methods.

Again, we consider a situation where an input process is observed with an error. In other words, we assume that we observe a process  $x_\eta = x + \eta \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ , where  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}(D)$  is a noise. As was mentioned above, this allows to take into account truncation of the inputs as well.

**Lemma 4.** *For any  $N > 0$ , the following holds.*

- 1)  $\|A_N y\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \leq \|y\|_{\mathcal{X}^M}$  for any  $y \in \mathcal{X}^M$ .
- 2) For any  $\rho \geq 0$  and any  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ , the equation

$$(1 + \rho)y = A_N y + a(x) \quad (9)$$

*has a unique solution  $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{X}^M$ .*

**Theorem 3.** *For  $\rho > 0$ , the solution of (7) is robust with respect to data errors and truncation, in the sense that*

$$\|y_{\rho, \eta, N} - y_\rho\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{and } \|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Here  $y_\rho$  denote the solution in  $\mathcal{X}^M$  of equation (7), and  $y_{\rho,\eta,N}$  denote the solution in  $\mathcal{X}^M$  of equation (9) with  $x$  replaced by  $x_\eta$ , such that  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ ,  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ , and  $x_\eta = x + \eta$ .

Theorem 3 establishes robustness with respect to truncation of  $(A, x)$  and with respect to the presence of the noise in the input. Therefore, this theorem justifies acceptance of a result for  $(A_N, x_\eta)$  as an approximation of the sought result for  $(A, x)$ .

#### V. SPECIAL CASE: APPROXIMATION BY BAND-LIMITED PROCESSES

In this section, we assume that  $V = \mathbf{R}$ ,  $n = 1$ , and  $\mathcal{X} = \ell_2 = \ell_2(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{R})$ .

For  $x \in \ell_2$ , we denote by  $X = \mathcal{Z}x$  the Z-transform

$$X(z) = \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} x(t)z^{-t}, \quad z \in \mathbf{C}.$$

Respectively, the inverse  $x = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}X$  of Z-transform is defined as

$$x(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} X(e^{i\omega}) e^{i\omega t} d\omega, \quad t = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$$

We assume that we are given  $\Omega \in (0, \pi)$ .

Let  $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbf{C} : |z| = 1\}$ .

Let  $\ell_2^{\text{BL}}(\mathbb{T})$  be the set of all mappings  $X : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  such that  $X(e^{i\omega}) \in L_2(-\pi, \pi)$  and  $X(e^{i\omega}) = 0$  for  $|\omega| > \Omega$ . We will call the corresponding processes  $x = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}X$  *band-limited*.

Let  $\ell_2^{\text{BL}}$  be the set of all band-limited processes from  $\ell_2 = \ell_2(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{R})$ , and let  $\ell_2^{\text{BL}}(D)$  be the subset of  $\ell_2(D) = \ell_2(D, \mathbf{R})$  formed by the traces  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in D}$  for all sequences  $\hat{x} \in \ell_2^{\text{BL}}$ .

We will use the notation  $\text{sinc}(x) = \sin(x)/x$ , and we will use notation “ $\circ$ ” for the convolution in  $\ell_2$ .

Let  $H(z)$  be the transfer function for an ideal low-pass filter such that  $H(e^{i\omega}) = \mathbb{I}_{[-\Omega, \Omega]}(\omega)$ , where  $\mathbb{I}$  denotes the indicator function. Let  $h = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}H$ ; it is known that  $h(t) = \Omega \text{sinc}(\Omega t)/\pi$ . The definitions imply that  $Px \in \ell_2^{\text{BL}}$  for any  $x \in \ell_2$  and that  $Px = h \circ x$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y} = \ell_2^{\text{BL}}$ , and let  $D \subset \mathbb{Z}$  be such that there exist  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that either  $\{t : t \leq s\} \subset D$  or  $\{t : t \geq s\} \subset D$ . Then Condition 1 holds.*

Proposition 1 can be considered as reformulation in the deterministic setting of a sufficient condition of predictability implied by the classical Szegő-Kolmogorov Theorem known for stationary Gaussian processes [20, 26, 27].

Up to the end of this section, we assume that  $D$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are such as described in Proposition 1.

By the definitions, we have that

$$Ay = \mathbb{I}_M(h \circ y), \quad a(x) = \mathbb{I}_M(h \circ (\nu(x))). \quad (10)$$

Since  $h(t) = \Omega \text{sinc}(\Omega t)/\pi$ , the operator  $A = \mathbb{I}_M(P \cdot)$  can be represented as a matrix with the components

$$A_{t,m} = \mathbb{I}_{\{t,m \in M\}} \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \text{sinc}[\Omega(t-m)], \quad t, m \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and  $a(x) = \{a(x, t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  can be represented as a vector

$$a(x, t) = \mathbb{I}_{\{t \in M\}} \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \sum_{m \in D} x_m \text{sinc}[\Omega(t-m)], \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

**Example 1.** Let  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$  be given. If  $M = \{s\}$  is a singleton, then the problem becomes the problem of optimal recovery of a missing value  $x(s)$  for  $x \in \mathcal{X}(D)$ , where  $D = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}$ . By Theorem 1, the problem has a unique solution given

$$\hat{x}(s) = \frac{\Omega}{\pi - \Omega} \sum_{m \neq s} x(m) \text{sinc}[\Omega(s-m)]. \quad (11)$$

(The same solution was obtained in [11]). This solution is optimal in the sense of problem (2) given  $\Omega$ , with  $M = \{s\}$ . In addition,

$$|\hat{x}(0)| \leq \frac{\Omega}{\pi - \Omega} \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)}.$$

To obtain this, we have to apply Theorem 1 with  $M = \{s\}$ . We have that the mapping  $y \rightarrow y(s)$  is a bijection between  $\mathcal{X}^M$  and  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $A_{t,m} = \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s, m=s\}}$ , and optimal solution of the recovering problem is  $y = \{y(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is such that  $y(t) = 0$  for  $t \neq s$ , and

$$y(s) = \frac{\Omega}{\pi} y(s) + \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \sum_{m \neq 0} x(m) \text{sinc}[\Omega(s-m)]$$

or

$$y(s) = \left(1 - \frac{\Omega}{\pi}\right)^{-1} \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \sum_{m \neq s} x(m) \text{sinc}[\Omega(s-m)]. \quad (12)$$

It gives equation (11) for the result  $\hat{x}(s) = y(s)$  of the optimal recovering of the missing value  $x(s)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** *Formula (11) applied to  $x_{\text{BL}} \in \ell_2^{\text{BL}}$  gives that  $f$*

$$x_{\text{BL}}(s) = \frac{\Omega}{\pi - \Omega} \sum_{m \neq s} x_{\text{BL}}(m) \text{sinc}[\Omega(s-m)]$$

*This formula is known [13, 14]; however, equation (11) is different since  $x$  in (11) is not necessarily band-limited.*

**Example 2.** If  $M = \{0, 1, 2\}$ , then the problem becomes the problem of optimal recovery of a missing values  $(x(0), x(1), x(2))$ . In this case, the result  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t=0,1,2} = \{y(t)\}_{t=0,1,2}$  of the optimal recovering is  $(I - \bar{A})^{-1}\bar{a}$ , where  $I$  is the unit matrix in  $\mathbf{R}^{3 \times 3}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A} &= \{A_{t,m}\}_{t,m=0}^3 \\ &= \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \text{sinc}(\Omega) & \text{sinc}(2\Omega) \\ \text{sinc}(\Omega) & 1 & \text{sinc}(\Omega) \\ \text{sinc}(2\Omega) & \text{sinc}(\Omega) & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{R}^{3 \times 3}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\bar{a} = \{a(x, t)\}_{t=0,1,2} \in \mathbf{R}^3,$$

$$a(x, t) = \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \sum_{m \notin \{0,1,2\}} x_m \text{sinc}[\Omega(t-m)].$$

It was shown in [10] that the matrix  $I - \bar{A}$  is invertible.

*A. Example of an application: forecasting with a dummy long-horizon forecast*

Assume that  $D = \mathbb{Z}^- = \{t \in \mathbb{Z} : t \leq 0\}$ , i.e. that we observe past values  $\{x(t)\}_{t \leq 0}$  and wish to predict the values at  $t \in \widetilde{M}$ , where  $\widetilde{M} = \{1, \dots, \widetilde{m}\}$  using the extension  $\hat{x}|_{\mathbb{Z}^+}$  of a band-limited approximation of  $x|_{\mathbb{Z}^-}$ , i.e., solution of problem (2) with  $D = \mathbb{Z}^-$  and  $M = \mathbb{Z}^+$ . In this case, we



have not established the continuity of the operator  $(I - A)^{-1}$ . Moreover, our numerical experiments show that the minimal eigenvalues of the truncated operator  $I - A_N$  converges to zero as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ . To ensure numerical stability and exclude excessive growth of  $\hat{x}(t)$  for  $t > 0$ , we may use a modified problem (6) with  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $\hat{x}_\rho$  be the corresponding solution. Unfortunately this approach always leads to decreasing of the norm  $\hat{x}_\rho|_{\mathbb{Z}^-}$ , so the approximation error  $\|x - \hat{x}_\rho\|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{Z}^-)}$  can be large.

We suggest an alternative approach. We suggest the following algorithm for predicting of  $x|_M$ :

- 1) Select  $m > \tilde{m}$ . Set  $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $D = \mathbb{Z} \setminus M = \mathbb{Z}^- \cup \tilde{D}$ .
- 2) Select some dummy sequence  $z \in \ell_2(\tilde{D})$  as a dummy long-horizon forecast. Here  $\tilde{D} \triangleq \{t \in \mathbb{Z} : t > m\}$ .
- 3) Find  $\hat{x} \in \ell_2^{\mathbb{B}^L}$  solving problem (2) or (6) with some  $\rho > 0$ .
- 4) Accept  $\hat{x}(t)$  as an optimal short-horizon forecast for  $t = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}$ .

It can be noted that, for finite  $M$  and finite dimensional  $V$ , the operator  $(I - A)^{-1} : \mathcal{X}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  is continuous. Hence we can select  $\rho = 0$  in (6). This approach could be preferable since it does not penalize directly for a large norm of  $x_{BL}|_D$  regardless of the choice of  $z$ . On the other hand, the choice of  $\rho > 0$  leads to a distortion of the performance criterion since it penalizes for a large norm of  $x_{BL}|_D$ . However, our numerical experiments show that the minimal eigenvalues of operator  $I - A$  is quite small, especially if the number of elements of  $M$  is large. This is the reason why we may use solution of (6) with some small  $\rho > 0$ , to achieve more robust numerical stability.

In some numerical experiments described below, we found that if  $\tilde{m}$  is significantly smaller than  $m$  then the choice of a dummy long-horizon forecast  $z|_{\tilde{D}}$  has a relatively weak impact on the short-horizon forecast  $\hat{x}|_{\tilde{M}}$ .

This can be explained as the following.

Let  $\hat{z} \in \ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{Z}^-)$  and  $\tilde{m} > 0$  be given, and let  $z \in \ell_2(\tilde{D})$  be selected such that  $z(t) = \hat{z}(t - m + 1)$ ,  $t > m$ . We have that

$$\hat{x} = (I - A_\rho)^{-1}a(x) = (I - A_\rho)^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_{\{t \leq 0\}}a(x)) + \hat{x}_m,$$

where

$$\hat{x}_m = (I - A_\rho)^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_{\{t > m\}}a_\rho(x)) = (I - A_\rho)^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_{\{t > m\}}(P(\nu_m(z)))).$$

Here  $\nu_m(z)$  is an element of  $\ell_2$  such that  $\nu_m(z)(t) = z(t)$  for  $t \geq m$  and  $\nu_m(z)(t) = 0$  for  $t < m$ . Clearly, for any  $\hat{z}$ , we have that  $(\mathbb{I}_{\{t > m\}}(P(\nu_m(z)))) \rightarrow 0$  weakly in  $\ell_2$  as  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence  $\hat{x}_m \rightarrow 0$  weakly in  $\ell_2$  as  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ . It follows that  $x_m(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow +\infty$  for  $t = 1, \dots, m_0$ . In other words,

$$\hat{x}|_{\tilde{M}} \rightarrow (I - A_\rho)^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_{\{t \leq 0\}}a(x))|_{\tilde{M}} \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow +\infty;$$

the limit here does not depend on  $z$ . This implies that the short-horizon forecast obtained by this method can be similarly meaningful for different choices of the dummy long-horizon forecast  $z$ . We observed this feature in some numerical experiments described below.

In these experiments, we calculated the solution  $\hat{x}|_M$  of linear system (5) for a given  $x$  directly using build-in MATLAB operation for solution of linear algebraic systems.

We used truncated input sequences  $\{x(t)\}_{t \in \{-q, \dots, 0\}}$  and matrices  $\{A_{t,m}\}_{k,m \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$ , for  $q, N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . We selected  $N > m$  and  $q = N$ . The sequences were generated using Monte-Carlo simulation. The experiments demonstrated a good numerical stability of the method; the calculations were completed in few seconds; the results were quite robust with respect to deviations of input processes and truncation.

Figure 1 shows an example of a process  $x(t)$ , and examples of the corresponding band-limited extensions  $\hat{x}|_M$  obtained from (7) with  $\Omega = 0.25\pi$ ,  $q = -60$ ,  $N = 60$ ,  $m = 12$ ,  $M = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  with two different dummy sequences  $z$  (i.e. dummy long-horizon forecasts). Since our method does not require  $\hat{x}(t)|_{t \notin M}$ , these values were not calculated; the extension  $\hat{x}(t)|_{t \in M}$  was derived directly from  $x(t)|_{t \leq 0}$ . Respectively, the values  $\hat{x}(t)|_{t \notin M}$  are not shown.

It can be noted that the paths  $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{1 \leq t \leq \tilde{m}}$  are close if  $\tilde{m}$  is small.

As was mentioned above, the extension  $\hat{x}|_{t > 0}$  to the future times  $t = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}$  can be interpreted as an optimal forecast of  $x|_{t \leq 0}$  (optimal in the sense of problem (6) given  $\Omega$  and  $\rho$ ).

## VI. PROOFS

The following proofs represent extension of the proofs given in [10] for the case where  $n = 1$ ,  $D = \mathbb{Z}^-$ , and  $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{R}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Consider the mapping  $\zeta : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}(D)$  such that  $x(t) = (\zeta(x))(t)$  for  $t \in D$ . Clearly, it is a linear continuous operator. By Condition 1(i), it is a bijection. Since the mapping  $\zeta : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}(D)$  is continuous, it follows that the inverse mapping  $\zeta^{-1} : \mathcal{Y}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is also continuous; see, e.g., Corollary in Ch.II.5 [31], p. 77. Since the set  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a closed linear subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{Y}(D)$  is a closed linear subspace of  $\mathcal{X}(D)$ . This completes the proof of statement (i).

Further, problem (2) can be represented as problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{t \in D} \|\bar{x}(t) - x(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \\ & \text{over} \quad \bar{x} \in \mathcal{Y}(D). \end{aligned}$$

By statement(i), there is a unique solution  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{Y}(D)$  of this problem; this is a projection of  $x|_D$  on  $\mathcal{Y}(D)$ . Then a solution  $\hat{x}$  of problem (2) is such that  $\hat{x}|_D$  is this  $\bar{x}$ , and this  $\hat{x}$  is unique by Condition 1(ii). This completes the proof of Lemma 1.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $\hat{x}$  be the optimal solution described in Lemma 1. Let  $\mathcal{X}' = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : x|_M = \hat{x}|_D\}$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}'$  and  $\tilde{x}_y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x} - x\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &= \|\hat{x} - x\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)}^2 + \|\hat{x} - x\|_{\mathcal{X}^M}^2 \\ &= \|\hat{x} - x\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)}^2 \leq \|\tilde{x}_y - x\|_{\mathcal{X}^M}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality here holds because  $\hat{x}|_D$  is optimal for problem (2). This implies that, for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the sequence  $\hat{x}$  is optimal for the minimization problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \|x_y - x\|_{\mathcal{X}} \quad \text{over} \quad x_y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$




Fig. 1. Examples of  $x(t)$  and band-limited interpolations/forecasts  $\hat{x}(t)$  for two different dummy long-term forecasts.

Since  $P : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is the projection operator, the optimal process  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{Y}$  from Lemma 1 is such that

$$\hat{x} = Px = P(\nu(x) + \mathbb{I}_M \hat{x}).$$

For  $\hat{y} = \mathbb{I}_M \hat{x}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y} &= \mathbb{I}_M (P(\nu(x) + \mathbb{I}_M \hat{x})) = \mathbb{I}_M (P\nu(x)) + \mathbb{I}_M (P(\mathbb{I}_M \hat{x})) \\ &= a(x) + A\hat{y}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Let us prove statement (i). Let  $y \in \mathcal{X}^M$  and  $y \neq 0$ . In this case, by Condition 1,  $y \notin \mathcal{Y}$ . Hence  $\|Py\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \|y\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Hence

$$\|Ay\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} = \|\mathbb{I}_M Py\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \|Py\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \|y\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \|y\|_{\mathcal{X}^M}.$$

This completes the proof of statement (i) of Lemma 2. Statement (ii) follows from statement (i). Statement (iii) follows from statement (i) and from finite dimensionality of  $\mathcal{X}^M$  in this case. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.* As was shown in the proof of Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{Y}(D)$  is a closed linear subspace of  $\mathcal{X}(D)$ . The quadratic form in (6) is positively defined. Then the proof follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* First, let us show that the optimal process  $\hat{x}_\rho \in \mathcal{Y}$  which existence is established in Lemma 3 is such that

$$\hat{x}_\rho = \frac{1}{1+\rho} P(\nu(x) + \hat{x}_\rho \mathbb{I}_M). \quad (13)$$

Let  $x'_\rho = x \mathbb{I}_D + \hat{x}_\rho \mathbb{I}_M$ . Then  $\hat{x}_\rho$  is a unique solution of the minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \|x_{\mathcal{Y}}(t) - x'_\rho(t)\|_V^2 + \rho \|x_{\mathcal{Y}}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \\ &\text{over} \quad x_{\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{Y}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $\hat{x}_\rho = (1+\rho)^{-1} \tilde{x}_\rho$ , where  $\tilde{x}_\rho$  is a unique solution of the minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \|x_{\mathcal{Y}}(t) - x'_\rho(t)\|_V^2 \\ &\text{over} \quad x_{\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{Y}. \end{aligned}$$

By the property of the projection,  $\tilde{x}_\rho = Px'_\rho$ . By the definitions, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (1+\rho)\hat{x}_\rho &= \tilde{x}_\rho = P(\nu(x) + x'_\rho \mathbb{I}_M) \\ &= P(\nu(x) + \hat{x}_\rho \mathbb{I}_M). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1, we have that (13) holds.

Further, equation (13) is equivalent to equation (7) which, on its turn, is equivalent to the equation

$$y = A_\rho y + a_\rho(x).$$

Since the operator  $(I - A_\rho)^{-1} : \mathcal{X}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$  is continuous, this equation has a unique solution  $y_\rho = \hat{x}_\rho \mathbb{I}_M = (I - A_\rho)^{-1} a_\rho(x)$  in  $\mathcal{X}^M$ , and the required estimate for  $\|y_\rho\|_{\mathcal{X}^M}$  holds. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* Let us prove statement (i). We have that  $A_N y = \mathbb{I}_{D_N} (P(\mathbb{I}_{D_N} y))$ . Then statement (i) follows. Further, it follows that  $(1+\rho)^{-1} \|A_N\| < 1$  for the norm of the operator  $A_N : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^M$ . Then statement (i) follows. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Let  $e_N = y_{\rho, \eta, N} - y_\rho$ . We have that

$$(1+\rho)e_N = A_N e_N + (A_N - A)y_\rho + a(x_\eta) - a(x). \quad (14)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (A_N - A)y_\rho &= \mathbb{I}_{D_N} [P(\mathbb{I}_{D_N} y_\rho) - \mathbb{I}_M (P y_\rho)] \\ &= \hat{\zeta}_{N, \rho} + \tilde{\zeta}_{N, \rho}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\zeta}_{N, \rho} &= \mathbb{I}_{D_N} [P(\mathbb{I}_{D_N} y_\rho) - P y_\rho] = \mathbb{I}_{D_N} [P(\mathbb{I}_{D_N} y_\rho - y_\rho)] \\ &= \mathbb{I}_{D_N} [P(\mathbb{I}_{D_N} y_\rho - y_\rho)] = -\mathbb{I}_{D_N} [P(\mathbb{I}_{\{t: t > N\}} y_\rho)] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{N, \rho} = [\mathbb{I}_{D_N} - \mathbb{I}_M](P y_\rho) = -\mathbb{I}_{\{t: t > N\}}(P y_\rho).$$

Clearly,  $\|\hat{\zeta}_{N, \rho}\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\|\tilde{\zeta}_{N, \rho}\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence  $\|(A_N - A)y_\rho\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ .

By the continuity of the operator  $a(\cdot)$ , we have that

$$\|a(x) - a(x_\eta)\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \leq \|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{\rho,\eta,N}\|_{\ell_2(M,V)} &\leq \|(I - A_\rho)^{-1}\| \left( \|(A_N - A)y_\rho\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|a_\rho(x) - a_\rho(x_\eta)\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} \right) \\ &\leq \|(I - A_\rho)^{-1}\| \left( \|(A_N - A)y_\rho\|_{\mathcal{X}^M} + \|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)} \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}(D)} \rightarrow 0$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 3.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.* Let us show that Condition 1(i) is satisfied. It suffices to consider the case where  $\{t : t \leq 0\} \subset D$ . Furthermore, it suffices to prove that if  $x(\cdot) \in \ell_2^{BL}$  is such that  $x(t) = 0$  for  $t \leq 0$ , then  $x(t) = 0$  for  $t > 0$ . The proof of this repeats the proof of Proposition 1 [10].

Let us show that Condition 1(ii) is satisfied. Consider the mapping  $\zeta : L_2^{BL}(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \ell_2^{BL}(D)$  such that  $x(t) = (\zeta(X))(t) = (\mathcal{Z}^{-1}X)(t)$  for  $t \in D$ . It is a linear continuous operator. By Condition 1(i), it is a bijection.

Since the mapping  $\zeta : L_2^{BL}(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \ell_2^{BL}(D)$  is continuous, it follows that the inverse mapping  $\zeta^{-1} : \ell_2^{BL}(D) \rightarrow L_2^{BL}(\mathbb{T})$  is also continuous; see, e.g., Corollary in Ch.II.5 [31], p. 77. Since the set  $L_2^{BL}(\mathbb{T})$  is a closed linear subspace of  $L_2(-\pi, \pi)$ , it follows that  $\ell_2^{BL}(D)$  is a closed linear subspace of  $\mathcal{X}(D)$ . Then a solution  $\hat{x}$  of problem (2) is such that  $\hat{x}|_D$  is a projection of  $x|_D$  on  $\ell_2^{BL}(D)$  which is unique. This completes the proof of Proposition 1.  $\square$

#### Acknowledgment

This work was supported by ARC grant of Australia DP120100928 to the author.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Alem, Z. Khalid, R.A. Kennedy. (2014). Band-limited extrapolation on the sphere for signal reconstruction in the presence of noise, *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. ICASSP'2014*, pp. 4141-4145.
- [2] J.M. Almira, A.E. Romero. (2008). How distant is the ideal filter of being a causal one? *Atlantic Electronic Journal of Mathematics* **3** (1) 46–55.
- [3] T. Cai, G. Xu, and J. Zhang. (2009). On recovery of sparse signals via  $\ell_1$  minimization, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3388-3397.
- [4] E. Candés, T. Tao. (2006). Near optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies? *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **52**(12) (2006), 5406-5425.
- [5] E.J. Candés, J. Romberg, T. Tao. (2006). Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **52** (2), 489–509.
- [6] N.Dokuchaev. (2012). On predictors for band-limited and high-frequency time series. *Signal Processing* **92**, iss. 10, 2571-2575.
- [7] N. Dokuchaev. (2012). Predictors for discrete time processes with energy decay on higher frequencies. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **60**, No. 11, 6027-6030.
- [8] N. Dokuchaev. (2016). Near-ideal causal smoothing filters for the real sequences. *Signal Processing* **118**, iss. 1, pp. 285-293.
- [9] N. Dokuchaev. (2016). On recovering missing values in a pathwise setting. Working paper: ArXiv 1604.04967.
- [10] Dokuchaev, N. A closed equation in time domain for band-limited extensions of one-sided sequences *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*. In press.
- [11] N. Dokuchaev. (2017). On exact and optimal recovering of missing values for sequences. *Signal Processing* **135**, 81–86.
- [12] D. L. Donoho and P. B. Stark. (1989). Uncertainty principles and signal recovery. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 906–931.
- [13] P.J.S.G. Ferreira. (1992). Incomplete sampling series and the recovery of missing samples from oversampled band-limited signals, *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, **40**(1), pp.225–227.
- [14] P.J.S.G. Ferreira. (1994). The stability of a procedure for the recovery of lost samples in band-limited signals, *Signal Processing*, **40**(2-3), pp.195-205.
- [15] P. G. S. G. Ferreira (1994). Interpolation and the discrete Papoulis-Gerchberg algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **42** (10), 2596–2606.
- [16] P. G. S. G. Ferreira (1995a). Nonuniform sampling of nonbandlimited signals. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* **2**, Iss. 5, 89–91.
- [17] P. G. S. G. Ferreira (1995b). Approximating non-band-limited functions by nonuniform sampling series. In: *SampTA'95, 1995 Workshop on Sampling Theory and Applications*, 276–281.
- [18] P. J. S. G. Ferreira, A. Kempf, and M. J. C. S. Reis (2007). Construction of Aharonov-Berrys superoscillations. *J. Phys. A, Math. Gen.*, vol. 40, pp. 5141–5147.
- [19] A. Jerri (1977). The Shannon sampling theorem - its various extensions and applications: A tutorial review. *Proc. IEEE* **65**, 11, 1565–1596.
- [20] A.N. Kolmogorov. (1941). Interpolation and extrapolation of stationary stochastic series. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 5:1, 3–14.
- [21] D.G. Lee, P.J.S.G. Ferreira, (2014). Direct construction of superoscillations. *IEEE Transactions on Signal processing*, V. 62, No. 12, 3125-3134.
- [22] V. V. Peller (2000). Regularity conditions for vectorial stationary processes. In: *Complex Analysis, Operators, and Related Topics. The S.A. Vinogradov Memorial Volume*. Ed. V. P. Khavin and N. K. Nikol'skii. Birkhauser Verlag, pp 287-301.
- [23] M. Pourahmadi (1984). On minimality and interpolation of harmonizable stable processes. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 44, No. 5, pp. 1023–1030.
- [24] M. Pourahmadi. Estimation and interpolation of missing values of a stationary time series. *J. Time Ser. Anal.*, 10 (1989), pp. 149-169

- [25] D. Slepian, D., Pollak, H.O. (1961). Prolates spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis and uncertainty-I. *Bell Syst.Tech.J.* **40**, 43–63.
- [26] G. Szegő. (1920). Beiträge zur Theorie der Toeplitzschen Formen. *Math. Z.* 6, 167–202.
- [27] G. Szegő. (1921). Beiträge zur Theorie der Toeplitzschen Formen, II. *Math. Z.* 9, 167-190.
- [28] R. Tzschoppe, J. B. Huber. (2009). Causal discrete-time system approximation of non-bandlimited continuous-time systems by means of discrete prolate spheroidal wave functions. *Eur. Trans. Telecomm.***20**, 604–616.
- [29] J. Tropp and A. Gilbert. (2007). Signal recovery from partial information via orthogonal matching pursuit, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 4655–4666.
- [30] N. Wiener. (1949). *Extrapolation, Interpolation, and Smoothing of Stationary Time Series with Engineering Applications*, Technology Press MIT and Wiley, New York.
- [31] K. Yosida. (1965). *Functional Analysis*. Springer, Berlin Heilderberg New York.
- [32] H. Zhao, R. Wang, D. Song, T. Zhang, D. Wu/ (2014). Extrapolation of discrete bandlimited signals in linear canonical transform domain *Signal Processing* **94**, 212–218.
- [33] H. Zhao, R. Wang, D. Song, T. Zhang, Y. Liu. (2014). Unified approach to extrapolation of bandlimited signals in linear canonical transform domain. *Signal Processing* **101**, 65–73.