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#### Abstract

The classical sampling Nyquist-Shannon-Kotelnikov theorem states that a band-limited continuous time function is uniquely defined by infinite two-sided sampling series taken with a sufficient frequency. The paper shows that these band-limited functions allows an arbitrarily close uniform approximation by functions that are uniquely defined by their extremely sparse subsamples representing arbitrarily small fractions of one-sided equidistant sample series with fixed oversampling parameter. In particular, for an arbitrarily large $m$, an arbitrarily small adjustment of a band-limited underlying function makes redundant $(m-1)$ members of any sequence of $m$ members of the sample. This allows to bypass, in a certain sense, the restriction on the sampling rate defined by the critical Nyquist rate. Application of this approach to more general non-bandlimited functions allows to approximate them by functions that are recoverable from equidistant samples with arbitrarily large distance between sampling points. |
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## 1 Introduction

The paper suggests a modification of the classical sampling theorem that is also known as NyquistShannon theorem, Nyquist-Shannon-Kotelnikov theorem, Whittaker-Shannon-Kotelnikov theorem, Whittaker-Nyquist-Kotelnikov-Shannon theorem, which is one of the most basic results in the theory of signal processing and information science. This theorem states that any band-limited function can be uniquely recovered without error from a infinite two-sided equidistant sampling sequence taken with sufficient frequency. This result was obtained independently by four authors [21, 11, 10, 14]. The theorem imposes a restriction on the sampling rate defined by the critical Nyquist rate as the lower

[^0]boundary of the sampling rate allowing recovery of the underlying function. Numerous extensions of this theorem were obtained, including the case of nonuniform sampling and restoration of the signal with mixed samples; see some recent literature review in $[1,8,17,19,22]$. There were many works devoted to reducing the set of sampling points required for restoration of the underlying functions. In particular, it is known that a bandlimited function can be recovered without error from an oversampling sample sequence if a finite number of sample values is unknown. It is known [18] that the function can be recovered without error with a missing one-sided half of any oversampling sample sequence. It is also known [7] that the function can be recovered without error with a missing equidistant infinite subsequence consistent of $n$th member of the original sample sequence, i.e. that each $n$th member is redundant, under some additional constraints on the oversampling parameter. The constraints are such that the oversampling parameter is increasing if $n \geq 2$ is decreasing.

The present paper readdress the problem of reducing the sample required for reconstruction of the underlying continuous time band-limited function. We show that an arbitrarily small adjustment of a band-limited underlying function makes redundant $(m-1)$ members of any subsequence of $m$ members from an one-sided equidistant sample (Theorem 1 and Corollary 4). This $m$ can be selected arbitrarily large, without increasing of oversampling parameter for the underlying sampling points. This allows to bypass, in a certain sense, the restriction on the sampling rate described by the critical Nyquist rate. In addition, application of this approach to more general non-bandlimited functions allows to approximate them by functions that are recoverable from equidistant samples with arbitrarily large distance between sampling points. This allows, in a ceratin sense, to overcome aliasing problem arising in time discretization of non-bandlimited continuous time functions.

The corresponding recovery algorithm is based on a pathwise predicting algorithm (Proposition 2).

## 2 Some definitions

We denote by $L_{2}(D)$ the usual Hilbert space of complex valued square integrable functions $x: D \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, where $D$ is a domain.

For $f \in L_{2}(\mathbf{R})$, we denote by $F=\mathcal{F} f$ the function defined on $i \mathbf{R}$ as the Fourier transform of $f$;

$$
F(i \omega)=(\mathcal{F} x)(i \omega)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i \omega t} f(t) d t, \quad \omega \in \mathbf{R} .
$$

Here $i=\sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary unit. For $f \in L_{2}(\mathbf{R})$, the Fourier transform $F$ is defined as an element of $L_{2}(i \mathbf{R})$, i.e. $F(i \cdot) \in L_{2}(\mathbf{R})$ ).

For $\Omega>0$, let $L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$ be the subset of $L_{2}(\mathbf{R})$ consisting of functions $f$ such that $f(t)=$ $\left(\mathcal{F}^{-1} F\right)(t)$, where $F(i \omega) \in L_{2}(i \mathbf{R})$ and $F(i \omega)=0$ for $\left.|\omega|>\Omega\right\}$.

We denote by $\mathbb{Z}$ the set of all integers. Let us introduce some additional notations first.
For $r \in[1,+\infty]$, we denote by $\ell_{r}$ the set of all sequences $x=\{x(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathbf{C}$, such that $\|x\|_{\ell_{r}}=$ $\left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}|x(k)|^{r}\right)^{1 / r}<+\infty$ for $r \in[1, \infty)$ or $\|x\|_{\ell \infty}=\sup _{k \in \mathbb{Z}}|x(k)|<+\infty$ for $r=+\infty$.

We denote by $L_{r}(-\pi, \pi)$ the usual Banach space of complex valued $L_{r}$-integrable functions $x$ : $[-\pi, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$.

Let $D^{c} \triangleq\{z \in \mathbf{C}:|z|>1\}$, and let $\mathbb{T}=\{z \in \mathbf{C}:|z|=1\}$.
For $x \in \ell_{2}$, we denote by $X=\mathcal{Z} x$ the Z-transform

$$
X(z)=\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} x(k) z^{-k}, \quad z \in \mathbb{T}
$$

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

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

For $x \in \ell_{2}$, the trace $\left.X\right|_{\mathbb{T}}$ is defined as an element of $L_{2}(\mathbb{T})$.
Let $\mathrm{H}^{r}\left(D^{c}\right)$ be the Hardy space of functions that are holomorphic on $D^{c}$ including the point at infinity with finite norm $\left.\|h\|_{\mathrm{H}^{2}\left(D^{c}\right)}=\sup _{\rho>1} \| h\left(\rho e^{i \omega}\right)\right) \|_{L_{r}(-\pi, \pi)}, r \in[1,+\infty]$.

## 3 The main results

Let us formulate first an one-sided modification of Nyquist-Shannon-Kotelnikov Theorem; this modification is known and follows from the result [18].

Lemma 1 Let $\Omega>0$ and $\tau \in(0, \pi / \Omega]$ be given. Let $\left\{t_{k}\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathbf{R}$ be a sequence such that $t_{k}=\tau k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then a band-limited function $f \in L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$ is uniquely defined by the sequence $\left\{f\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Furthermore, if $\tau \in(0, \pi / \Omega)$, then, for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, a band-limited function $f \in L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$ is uniquely defined by the one sided-sequence $\left\{f\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \leq s}$.
In particular, Lemma 1 implies that, for any finite set $S, f \in L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$ is uniquely defined by the values $\left\{f\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash S}$; this was established in [6] by a different method. We cannot claim the same for some infinite sets of missing values. For example, it may happen that $f \in L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$ is not uniquely defined by the values $\left\{f\left(t_{2 k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, if the sampling rate for this sample $\left\{f\left(t_{2 k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is lower than is required by the Nyquist-Shannon-Kotelnikov Theorem; see more examples in [7].

Let $\Omega>0$ and $\tau \in(0, \pi / \Omega]$ be given.
For $\delta>0$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 1$, let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s_{m, k}=\frac{2 \pi k-\pi}{m \tau}, \quad k=0,1, \ldots, m-1 \\
& I_{\delta, m}=\left\{\omega \in \mathbf{R}: \min _{k=0,1, \ldots, m-1}\left|\omega-s_{m, k}\right| \leq \delta\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 1 Let $x \in \ell_{2}, m \geq 1, \delta>0$. We say that $x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m)$ if

$$
\begin{equation*}
X\left(e^{i \omega}\right)=0 \quad \text { for } \quad \omega \in J_{\delta, m} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $X=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} x$.
Theorem 1 Let $x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m)$ for some $\delta>0$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 2$. Then, for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, the sequence $\{x(m k+d)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is uniquely defined by the values $\left.\{x m k+d)\right\}_{k \leq s}$.

Definition 2 Let $x \in \ell_{2}, \delta>0, m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 1$. Consider auxiliary processes $x_{d} \in \ell_{2}, d=0, \ldots, m-1$, such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{d}(k)=x(k), \quad k<0, \\
& x_{d}(k)=x(0), \quad k=0,1, \ldots, d, \\
& x_{d}(k)=x(k-d), \quad k=d+1, d+2, \ldots \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

In particular, $x_{0}=0$. We say that $x \in \mathcal{U}(\delta, m)$ if $x_{d} \in \mathcal{V}\left(\delta, 2^{d} m\right)$ for $d=0,1, \ldots, m-1$.
Theorem 2 For any $m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 1$, the set $\cup_{\delta>0} \mathcal{U}(\delta, m)$ is everywhere dense in $\ell_{2}$.
Theorem 3 For any $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 2$, a process $x \in \cup_{\delta>0} \mathcal{U}(\delta, m)$ is uniquely defined by the values $\{x(m k)\}_{k \leq s}$.

Theorem 4 Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 2, \Omega>0, f \in L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$, and $\tau \in(0, \pi / \Omega]$, be given. Then for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $\widehat{f} \in L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$ such that $\left\{\widehat{f}\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{U}(\delta, m)$ and that $\sup _{t \in \mathbf{R}}|f(t)-\widehat{f}(t)| \leq \varepsilon$. For any $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, this function $\widehat{f}$ is uniquely defined by the values $\left\{\widehat{f}\left(t_{m k}\right)\right\}_{k \leq s}$.

Remark 1 In the proof given below, we suggest an algorithm of calculation of the complete sample $\left\{\widehat{f}\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ from the set of values $\left\{\widehat{f}\left(t_{m k}\right)\right\}_{k \leq s}$. This leads to recovery of $f$ by standard methods.

Remark 2 In Theorem 4 the value $\varepsilon$ can be selected arbitrarily small, and $m$ can be selected arbitrarily large. This means that selection of a large $m$ and an arbitrarily small adjustment of a band-limited function $f$ (i.e. replacement $f$ by $\widehat{f}$ ) makes redundant every $(m-1)$ members among any set of $m$ samples. Since $m$ can be arbitrarily large, the fraction of remaining samples that we need for recovery can be arbitrarily small.

Remark 3 Theorem 4 consider a subsequence of the left hand half of the sampling series; it is convenient for representation of past historical observations, for instance, for predicting problems. However, a similar statement can be formulated for a subsequence of the right hand half of the sampling series. More precisely, we could replace the set $\left\{f\left(t_{m k}\right)\right\}_{k \leq s}$ by the set $\left\{f\left(t_{m k}\right)\right\}_{k \geq q}$ for any $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. This would require to replace the predicting algorithm in the proofs below on its backward version which is rather technical.

## Extension on non-bandlimited functions

Theorem 4 offers an approach to a long standing problem of sampling for functions that are not necessarily band-limited. Clearly, any $f \in L_{1}(\mathbf{R}) \cap L_{2}(\mathbf{R})$ can be approximated by bandlimited functions $f_{\Omega} \triangleq \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(F \mathbb{I}_{[-\Omega, \Omega]}\right), F=\mathcal{F} f$, where $\Omega \rightarrow+\infty$. However, for any given $\tau$, the samples $\left\{f_{\Omega}(\tau k)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are insufficient to define the function $f_{\Omega}$ if $\Omega>\pi / \tau$. This means that the sampling frequency has to be increasing along with $\Omega$. A related problem is aliasing of continuous time processes after time discretization.

It appears that Theorem 1 allows to overcome this obstacle in a certain sense as the following.
Corollary 1 Let $\rho \in(0,1]$ be given. For any $f \in L_{1}(\mathbf{R}) \cap L_{2}(\mathbf{R}), \varepsilon>0$, and $\Delta>0$, there exist $\bar{\Omega}>0$ such that the following holds for any $\Omega \geq \bar{\Omega}$ :
(i) $\sup _{t \in \mathbf{R}}\left|f(t)-f_{\Omega}(t)\right| \leq \varepsilon$, where $f_{\Omega} \triangleq \mathcal{F}^{-1} F_{\Omega}, F_{\Omega}=F \mathbb{I}_{[-\Omega, \Omega]}, F=\mathcal{F} f$.
(ii) The function $f_{\Omega}$ belongs to $L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$, and, for $\tau=\rho \pi / \Omega$, satisfies assumptions of Theorem $\square$ For this function, for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $\widehat{f} \in L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$ such that $\sup _{t \in \mathbf{R}}\left|f_{\Omega}(t)-\widehat{f}(t)\right| \leq \varepsilon$ and that $\widehat{f}$ is uniquely defined by the values $\left\{\widehat{f}\left(\theta_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \leq s}$ for an equidistant sequence of sampling points $\left\{\theta_{k}\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that $\theta_{k}-\theta_{k-1} \geq \Delta$, for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}$.

## 4 Proofs

Let $\ell_{2}^{B L}$ be the subset of $\ell_{2}$ consisting of sequences $\{x(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that $x=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} X$ for some $X\left(e^{i \omega}\right) \in$ $\cup_{W \in(0, \pi)} \mathbb{L}^{W}(\mathbb{T})$. Let $\ell_{2}^{B L}(-\infty, s)$ be the subset of $\ell_{2}(-\infty, s)$ consisting of traces $\{x(k)\}_{k \leq s}$ of all $x \in \ell_{2}^{B L}$.

Proposition 1 For any $x \in \ell_{2}^{B L}(-\infty, s)$, there exists an unique $X \in \cup_{W \in(0, \pi)} \mathbb{L}^{W}(\mathbb{T})$ such that $x(k)=$ $\left(\mathcal{Z}^{-1} X\right)(k)$ for $k \leq s$.

By Proposition 11 the future $\{x(k)\}_{k>s}$ of a band-limited process $x=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} X, X \in \mathbb{L}^{W}(\mathbb{T})$, is uniquely defined by its history $\{x(k)\}_{k \leq s}$. This statement represent a reformulation in the deterministic setting of the classical Szegö-Kolmogorov Theorem for stationary Gaussian processes [9, 15, 16, 20].

Proof of Proposition , The proof follows from predictability results for band-limited discrete time processes obtained in $[2,3]$. For completeness, we will provide a direct and independent proof. (This proof can be found in [4]). Let $D \triangleq\{z \in \mathbf{C}:|z|<1\}$. It suffices to prove that if $x(\cdot) \in \ell_{2}^{B L}$ is such that $x(k)=0$ for $k \leq s$, then either $x(k)=0$ for $k>s$ or $x \notin \ell_{2}^{B L}$. If $x(k)=0$ for $k>s$, then $X=\mathcal{Z} x=z^{s} Y(z)$, where $Y \in H^{2}\left(D^{c}\right)$. Hence, by the property of the Hardy space,
$Y \notin \cup_{W \in(0, \pi)} \mathbb{L}^{W}(\mathbb{T})$; see e.g. Theorem 17.18 from [13]. This completes the proof of Proposition [1]

## Proof of Lemma 1

The result of the lemma is known [18]. We provide a different proof since we will use this proof for the proof of Theorem 1

Consider a sequence of samples

$$
x(k)=f\left(t_{k}\right)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\Omega}^{\Omega} F(i \omega) e^{i \omega t_{k}} d \omega, \quad k=0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots
$$

Since $t_{k}=k \tau$, we have that

$$
x(k)=\frac{1}{2 \pi \tau} \int_{-\tau \Omega}^{\tau \Omega} F(i \nu / \tau) e^{i \nu k} d \nu=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\tau \Omega}^{\tau \Omega} G\left(e^{i \nu}\right) e^{i \nu k} d \nu
$$

The function $G$ here is such that $G\left(e^{i \nu}\right)=\tau^{-1} F(i \nu / \tau)$ for $\nu \in(-\tau \Omega, \tau \Omega)$; we have used a change of variables $\nu=\omega \tau$. Since $F(i \nu / \tau) \in L_{2}(i \mathbf{R})$, it follows that $G\left(e^{i \nu}\right) \in L_{2}(\mathbb{T})$. The two-sided sequence $\{x(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ represents the sequence of Fourier coefficients of $G$ and defines uniquely $G$ as well as $F$ and $f$; this gives the statement of the Nyquist-Shannon-Kotelnikov Theorem. Further, if $\tau<\pi / \Omega$ then $x \in \ell_{2}^{B L}$.

In this case, Proposition $\square$ implies that a sequence from $\ell_{2}^{B L}$ is uniquely defined by its trace on the set $\{k \leq 0\}$. It follows that the function $f$ is uniquely defined by the sequence $\{x(k)\}_{k \leq 0}=\left\{f\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \leq 0}$. This completes the proof of Lemma

Proof of Theorem $\mathbb{1}$ It suffices to proof the theorem for $s=0$ only; the extension on $s \neq 0$ is straightforward.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the set of all $h \in \ell_{\infty}$ such that $h=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} H$ for some $H \in H^{\infty}\left(D^{c}\right)$. For these $h$, we have that $h(k)=0$ if $k<0$.

Proposition 2 For any $q \in\{0,1, \ldots, m-1\}$ and any $\varepsilon>0$, there exist $\widehat{h} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{k \in \mathbb{Z}}|x(m k+q+m)-\widehat{y}(m k+q)| \leq \varepsilon \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m)$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{y}(m k+q) \triangleq \sum_{p=-\infty}^{k} \widehat{h}(m k-m p) x(m p+q) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The process $\widehat{y}$ is the output of a linear predictor defined by the kernels $\widehat{h}$.

## Proof of Proposition 2. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
V(z) \triangleq 1-\exp \left[-\frac{\gamma}{z+\alpha}\right], \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha=1-\gamma^{-r}$ and where $r>0$ and $\gamma>0$ are parameters. This function $V$ was introduced in [2]. (In the notations from [2], $r=2 \mu /(q-1)$, where $\mu>1, q>1$ are the parameters).

Let $W(\alpha)=\arccos (-\alpha)$, let $D_{+}(\alpha)=(-W(\alpha), W(\alpha))$, and let $D(\alpha) \triangleq[-\pi, \pi] \backslash D_{+}(\alpha)$. We have that $\cos (W(\alpha))+\alpha=0, \cos (\omega)+\alpha>0$ for $\omega \in D_{+}(\alpha)$, and $\cos (\omega)+\alpha<0$ for $\omega \in D(\alpha)$.

Note that $\alpha=\alpha(\gamma) \rightarrow 1$ as $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$.
It was shown in [2] that the following holds:
(i) $V(z) \in H^{\infty}\left(D^{c}\right)$ and $z V(z) \in H^{\infty}\left(D^{c}\right)$.
(ii) $V\left(e^{i \omega}\right) \rightarrow 1$ for all $\omega \in(-\pi, \pi)$ as $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$.
(iii) If $\omega \in D_{+}(\alpha)$ then $\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\gamma}{e^{i \omega}+\alpha}\right)>0$ and $\left|V\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-1\right| \leq 1$.

The definitions imply that there exists $\gamma_{0}>0$ such that for any $\gamma \geq \gamma_{0}$ and for $V$ selected with $\alpha=\alpha(\gamma)$ we have $\sup _{\omega \in(-\pi, \pi] \backslash J_{\delta}}\left|V\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-1\right| \leq 1$.

We will prove that the predicting can be ensured by kernels $\widehat{h}=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} \widehat{H}$ represented as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{H}(z) \triangleq z V\left(z^{m}\right), \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

This predictor produces the process $\widehat{y}(t)$ approximating $y(t)=x(t+1)$ as $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$ for all inputs $x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m)$.

Let

$$
Q(\alpha)=\cup_{k=0}^{m-1}\left(\frac{W(\alpha)+2 \pi k}{m}, \frac{2 \pi-W(\alpha)+2 \pi k}{m}\right), \quad Q_{+}(\alpha)=[-\pi, \pi] \backslash Q(\alpha) .
$$

From the properties of $V$, it follows that the following holds.
(i) $V\left(z^{m}\right) \in H^{\infty}\left(D^{c}\right)$ and $\widehat{H}(z) \triangleq z V\left(z^{m}\right) \in H^{\infty}\left(D^{c}\right)$.
(ii) $V\left(e^{i m \omega}\right) \rightarrow 1$ for all $\omega \in(-\pi, \pi] \backslash\left\{\tau s_{k, m}\right\}_{k=0}^{m-1}$ as $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$.
(iii) If $\omega \in Q_{+}(\alpha)$ then $\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\gamma}{e^{i m \omega}+\alpha}\right)>0$ and $\left|V\left(e^{i m \omega}\right)-1\right| \leq 1$.

By the choice of $V$, it follows that $|V(z)| \rightarrow 0$ as $|z| \rightarrow+\infty$. Hence $v(0)=0$ for $v=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} V$. Hence $V\left(z^{m}\right)=z^{-m} v(1)+z^{-2 m} v(2)+z^{-3 m} v(3) \ldots$. Hence $\widehat{H}(z)=z V\left(z^{m}\right)$ is such that $\widehat{h}=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} \widehat{H}$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{H}$.

It can be noted that $\widehat{h}$ is real valued, since $\widehat{H}(\bar{z})=\overline{\widehat{H}(z)}$.
Figures [1] 2 show examples of the shape of error curves for approximation of the forward one step shift operator. More precisely, they show the shape of $\left|\widehat{H}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-e^{i \omega}\right|$ for the transfer function (6), and the shape of the corresponding predicting kernel $\widehat{h}$ with some selected parameters.

Suppose that we are given $x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m), X \triangleq \mathcal{Z} x, Y(z)=z X(z)$. Let $\widehat{Y} \triangleq \mathcal{Z} \widehat{y}=\widehat{H} X$.
Let $B$ be the unit ball in $\ell_{2}$. Let us show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{k \in \mathbb{Z}}|x(k+1)-\widehat{y}(k)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad \gamma \rightarrow+\infty \quad \text { uniformly over } \quad x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m) \cap B . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $y(t) \triangleq x(t+m)$ and $Y=\mathcal{Z} y$. We have that $\left\|Y\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-\widehat{Y}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)\right\|_{L_{1}(-\pi, \pi)}=I_{1}+I_{2}$, where

$$
I_{1}=\int_{Q(\alpha)}\left|Y\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-\widehat{Y}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)\right| d \omega, \quad I_{2}=\int_{Q_{+}(\alpha)}\left|Y\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-\widehat{Y}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)\right| d \omega .
$$

By the definitions, there exists $\gamma_{0}>0$ such that, for all $\gamma>\gamma_{0}$, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(\alpha) \subset I_{\delta, m}, \quad I_{1}=0 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

This means that $I_{1} \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$ uniformly over $x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m) \cap B$.
Let us estimate $I_{2}$. By the known properties of $V$, we have that $\left|V\left(e^{i m \omega}\right)-1\right| \leq 1$ for all $\omega \in$ $Q_{+}(\alpha)$. We have that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
I_{2}=\int_{Q(\alpha)}\left|\left(e^{i \omega}-H\left(e^{i m \omega}\right)\right) X\left(e^{i \omega}\right)\right| d \omega \leq \int_{Q(\alpha)}\left|e^{i \omega}\left(1-V\left(e^{i m \omega}\right)\right) X\left(e^{i \omega}\right)\right| d \omega \\
\leq\left\|1-V\left(e^{i m \omega}\right)\right\|_{L_{2}\left(Q_{+}(\alpha)\right)}\left\|X\left(e^{i \omega}\right)\right\|_{L_{2}(-\pi, \pi)} .
\end{array}
$$

We have that $\mathbb{I}_{Q_{+}(\alpha)}(\omega)\left|1-V\left(e^{i \omega m}\right)\right| \rightarrow 0$ a.e. as $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$, where $\mathbb{I}$ is the indicator function. We have that

$$
\mathbb{I}_{Q_{+}(\alpha)}(\omega)\left|1-V\left(e^{i m \omega}\right)\right| \leq 1
$$

From Lebesgue Dominance Theorem, it follows that $\left\|1-V\left(e^{i m \omega}\right)\right\|_{L_{2}\left(Q_{+}(\alpha)\right)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$. It follows that $I_{1}+I_{2} \rightarrow 0$ uniformly over $x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m) \cap B$. Hence (7) holds and

$$
\sup _{k \in \mathbb{Z}}|x(k+1)-\widehat{y}(k)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad \gamma \rightarrow+\infty \quad \text { uniformly over } \quad x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m) \cap B .
$$

Hence the predicting kernels $\widehat{h}(\cdot)=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} \widehat{H}$ are such as required. This completes the proof of Proposition 2,

We now are in the position to complete the proof of Theorem It suffices to prove that if $x$ is such that $x(k m)=0$ for $k \leq s$, then $x(k m+q)=0$ for $k>s$. Let us apply predictability established above to a process $x \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m)$ such that $x(k m)=0$ for $k \leq s$. Let $\widehat{y}(k m+q) \triangleq \sum_{p=-\infty}^{k} \widehat{h}(k m-$
$p m) x(p m+q)$, where $\widehat{h}$ are selected as above. Clearly, $\widehat{y}(k m+q)=0$ if $k m \leq s$. Letting $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$, we obtain from the predictability of $x$ established in Proposition 2 that $x(k m+q+m)=0$.

Further, let us apply the proof given above to the process $x_{1}(k m+q)=x(k m+q+m)$. Clearly, $x_{1} \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, m)$ and $x_{1}(k m+q)=0$ for $k<s$. Similarly, we obtain that $x_{1}(k m+q)=0$ for all $k \leq s+1$. Repeating this procedure $n$ times, we obtain that $x(k m+q)=0$ for all $k<s+n$ for all $n$. This completes the proof of Theorem $1, \square$

Proof of Theorem 2 Let $d \in\{0,1, \ldots, m-1\}$ be selected, and let

$$
\mu(d)=2^{d} m, \quad s_{\mu(d), k}=\frac{2 \pi k-\pi}{\mu(d) \tau}, \quad d=0, \ldots, m-1, \quad k=0,1, \ldots, \mu(d)-1 .
$$

For $\delta>0$, let

$$
I_{\delta, \mu(d)}=\left\{\omega \in \mathbf{R}: \min _{k=0,1, \ldots, \mu(d)-1}\left|\omega-s_{\mu(d), k}\right| \leq \delta\right\}
$$

Let us show that, for small $\delta>0$, the sets $I_{\delta, \mu(d)}$ are disjoint for different $d \in\{0, \ldots, m-1\}$. It suffices to show that $s_{\mu\left(d_{1}\right), k} \neq s_{\mu\left(d_{2}\right), l}$ if $d_{1} \neq d_{2}$ for all $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose that $s_{\mu\left(d_{1}\right), k}=s_{\mu\left(d_{2}\right), l}$ for some $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $d_{2}=d_{1}+r$, for some $d_{1}, d_{2} \in\{0,1, \ldots, m-1\}$ such that $r \triangleq d_{2}-d_{1} \neq 0$. In this case, the definitions imply that

$$
\frac{2 k-1}{2^{d_{1}}}=\frac{2 l-1}{2^{d_{2}}} .
$$

This means that $2^{r}(2 k-1)=2 l-1$, and, therefore $2 k-1=2^{r}(2 l-1)$. This is impossible for $r>0$. Hence the sets $I_{\delta, \mu(d)}$ are disjoint for different $d \in\{0, \ldots, m-1\}$ for small $\delta>0$. Without a loss of generality, we assume that $\delta$ used below have this properties.

Consider auxiliary processes $x_{d} \in \ell_{2}$, defined by (2) for $d=0,1, \ldots, m-1$. In particular, $x_{0}=0$.
Let $Y_{d} \triangleq X_{0}-X_{d}$, where $X_{d}=\mathcal{Z} x_{d}, d=0,1, \ldots, d$. Since $x_{d}(k)=x_{0}(k)$ for $k \leq 0$, it follows that $y_{d}(k)=0$ for $k \leq 0$ for $y_{d}=\mathcal{Z}^{-1} Y_{d}, d=1,2, \ldots, m-1$; in addition, $Y_{0} \equiv 0$ and $y_{0} \equiv 0$. Further, let

$$
\widehat{X}_{0}\left(e^{i \omega}\right) \triangleq \widehat{X}_{0}\left(e^{i \omega}\right) \mathbb{I}_{\left\{\omega \notin \cup_{d=1}^{m-1} J_{\delta, \mu(d)}\right\}}+\sum_{d=1}^{m-1} Y_{d}\left(e^{i \omega}\right) \mathbb{I}_{\left\{\omega \in J_{\delta, m, d}\right\}}
$$

Let $\widehat{X}_{d} \triangleq \widehat{X}_{0}-Y_{d}$ for $d=1, \ldots, m-1$. By the definitions, it follows that $\widehat{X}_{d}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)=0$ for $\omega \in J_{\delta, \mu(d)}$, $d=0,1, \ldots, m-1$. Hence $\widehat{x}_{d} \triangleq \mathcal{Z}^{-1} \widehat{X}_{d} \in \mathcal{V}(\delta, \mu(d))$ for $d=0,1, \ldots, m-1$. It follows that $x=x_{0} \in \mathcal{U}(\delta, m)$. In addition, $\widehat{x}_{d}(k)=\widehat{x}_{0}(k)$, for $k \leq 0$ and $d=1,2, \ldots, m-1$. Clearly, $\left\|\widehat{x}_{0}-x_{0}\right\|_{\ell_{2}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2,

Proof of Theorem [3) Let $\widehat{x} \in \ell_{2}$. Consider again auxiliary processes $x_{d} \in \ell_{2}$, defined by (2) for $d=0,1, \ldots, m-1$. By Theorem 1 the paths $\left\{\widehat{x}_{d}(m k)\right\}_{k \geq 1}=\left\{\widehat{x}_{0}(m k-d)\right\}_{k \geq 1}$ and $\left\{\widehat{x}_{d}(m k)\right\}_{k \leq 0}=$
$\left\{\widehat{x}_{0}(m k)\right\}_{k \leq 0}$ are uniquely defined by the paths $\left\{\widehat{x}_{d}(m k)\right\}_{k \leq s}=\left\{\widehat{x}_{0}(m k)\right\}_{k \leq s}$. The same proposition applied backward in time implies that the paths $\left\{\widehat{x}_{0}(m k-d)\right\}_{k \leq 0}$ are uniquely defined by the paths $\left\{\widehat{x}_{0}(m k-d)\right\}_{k \geq 1}$ (see Remark 3 above). This completes the proof of Theorem 3,

Proof of Theorem 4. Let $x(k)=f\left(t_{k}\right)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Theorem 2, for any $\varepsilon>0$, there exist $\delta=\delta(\varepsilon)>0$ and $\widehat{x} \in U(\delta, m)$ such that $\left\|\widehat{x}-x_{0}\right\|_{\ell_{2}} \leq \varepsilon$. Further, there exists a unique function $\widehat{f} \in L_{2}^{B L, \Omega}(\mathbf{R})$ such that $\widehat{f}\left(t_{k}\right)=\widehat{x}(k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\widehat{F}=\mathcal{F} \widehat{f}$. It follows that $\| \widehat{F}(i \cdot)-$ $F(i \cdot) \|_{L_{2}(\mathbf{R})} \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, where $\widehat{F}=\mathcal{F} \widehat{f}$. Since $F(i \omega)=0$ and $\widehat{F}(i \omega)=0$ if $|\omega|>\Omega$, it follows that $\|\widehat{F}(i \cdot)-F(i \cdot)\|_{L_{1}(\mathbf{R})} \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence $\|\widehat{f}-f\|_{L_{p}(\mathbf{R})} \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for $p=2,+\infty$. This completes the proof of Theorem 4

Proof of Corollary $\mathbb{Z}$ We have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sup _{t \in \mathbf{R}}\left|f(t)-f_{\Omega}(t)\right|=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|F(i \omega)-F_{\Omega}(i \omega)\right| d \omega \\
& =\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{\mathbf{R} \backslash[-\Omega, \Omega]}|F(i \omega)| d \omega \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad \Omega \rightarrow+\infty, m \rightarrow+\infty .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then statement (i) follows. The function $f_{\Omega}$ has the same properties as the function $f$ in Theorem 3 This completes the proof of Corollary 1

## 5 An algorithm of recovery of $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{U}(\delta, m)$ from a decimated sample

The present paper targets the theoretical aspects of possibility of recovering functions from decimated samples rather than numerical methods. However, the proofs are based on construction of a recovering algorithm that still may have a potential for practical applications.

To apply the classical Nyquist-Shannon-Kotelnikov Theorem for the data recovery, one has to restore the Fourier transform $\widehat{F}=\mathcal{F} \widehat{f}$ from the two-sided sampling series $\left\{\widehat{f}\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$. This procedure is relatively straightforward. The algorithm used in the proof of Theorem 1 requires to restore Z-transform $G\left(e^{i \nu}\right)=\widehat{F}(i \omega / \tau)$ from sparse subsequences using predicting algorithms such as the one described in Proposition 2 This task is feasible but numerically challenging.

Let us summarize the steps implied by Theorem 1 for recovery of $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{U}(\delta, m)$ from the sample $\left\{\widehat{f}\left(t_{m k}\right)\right\}_{k \leq 0}$ under the assumptions of Theorem 1 with a fixed $\delta$. The algorithm requires the following steps:
(i) For a given $\varepsilon>0$, find $\gamma$ that ensures that (3) holds for $\widehat{h}$ constructed as described above with this $\gamma$.
(ii) Using (3), estimate $\left.\widehat{x}_{0}(k m-d)\right|_{k \geq 1}=\left.\widehat{x}_{d}(k m)\right|_{k \geq 0}$ from $\left.\widehat{x}_{0}(k m)\right|_{k \leq 0}=\left.\widehat{x}_{d}(k m)\right|_{k \leq 0}$, where $\widehat{f}\left(t_{k}\right)=\widehat{x}(k), d=1, \ldots, m-1$, and where $\widehat{x}_{d}$ are formed as in (2).
(iii) Using an anticausal modification of (3) applied backward, estimate $\left.x_{0}(k m-d)\right|_{k \leq 0}$ from $\left.\widehat{x}_{0}(k m-d)\right|_{k \geq 1}$ for $d=1, \ldots, m-1$.
(iv) Accept the values $\widehat{x}_{0}(k)$ as estimates of the values $\widehat{f}\left(t_{k}\right)$.
(v) Restore $\widehat{f}$ from the complete sample $\left\{\widehat{f}\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

It can be noted that the choice of $\varepsilon$ in (3) controls the size of the error for given that the complete sequences $x=\{x(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}=\left\{f_{\delta}\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are normalized such that $\|x\|_{\ell_{2}} \leq 1$. However, the complete sequences are unknown a prior and have to be calculated from a subsample. If the norm $\|x\|_{\ell_{2}}$ of the calculated $x$ will be larger than one, than the error may exceed $\varepsilon$. To achieve higher precision, one may need to repeat the steps listed above with a smaller $\varepsilon$.

Some examples of applications of related predicting algorithms can be found in [5].

## 6 Discussion and future developments

(i) It could be interesting to find non-equidistant infinite sets that can be redundant for recoverability of the underlying function. In particular, it could be interesting to investigate if recovery of $f$ suggested in Theorem 1 is robust with respect to errors in location of the sampling points $t_{k}$.
(ii) It is unclear if our approach based on predictability of discrete time processes is applicable to processes defined on multidimensional lattices. It could be interesting to extend this approach on functions $f: \mathbf{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, using the setting from [12].
(iii) It can be noted that the choice of predicting kernels presented in the proofs above is not unique. For example, we could use a predicting algorithm from [3] instead of the the predicting algorithm based on [2] that was used in the present paper.
(iv) Since we used a predicting algorithm [2] that does not require that the spectrum of an underlying process is actually vanishing on an arc of $\mathbb{T}$, we can relax conditions of Theorem 1 Instead of the condition that the spectrum vanishes on open sets $J_{\delta, m}$, we can require that the spectrum vanishes only at the middle points of the intervals forming $J_{\delta, m}$; however, the rate of vanishing has to be sufficient, similarly to [2].
(v) It seems that a practical recovery of the sample based on Theorem 3 and the algorithm described above is numerically challenging. So far, this possibility is rather theoretical, since the presence of noise in the data can cause a significant error. The algorithm of recovering of the complete sampling sequences $\{x(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}=\left\{\widehat{f}\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ from a decimated sequence uses the linear predictor defined by the transfer functions $\widehat{H}$ given by (6) that approximate the function $e^{i \omega}$ representing
the forward one step shift in the time domain; the values $\left|\widehat{H}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-e^{i \omega}\right|$ are small for $\omega \notin Q(\alpha)$. However, the errors $\left|\hat{H}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-e^{i \omega}\right|$ for $\omega \in Q(\alpha)$ rise sharply as $\operatorname{mes} Q(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$, i.e. if $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ or $\gamma \rightarrow+\infty$ in Proposition 2 , this can be seen on Figures 1 and 2 This means that the presence of a noise, i.e. $\widehat{X}_{d}\left(e^{i \omega}\right) \neq 0$ for $\omega \in J_{\delta, \mu(d)}$, can imply a significant error for large $\gamma$ or small $\delta$. We leave investigation of robustness and experiments with practical implementation for the future research.
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Figure 1: Approximation of the one-step forward shift operator: the values $\left|\widehat{H}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-e^{i \omega}\right|$ for the transfer function of the predictor (6) and the values of the corresponding kernel $\widehat{h}$ with $\gamma=2.5$, $r=0.4, m=2$.


Figure 2: Approximation of the one-step forward shift operator: the values $\left|\hat{H}\left(e^{i \omega}\right)-e^{i \omega}\right|$ for the transfer function of the predictor (6) and the values of the corresponding kernel $\widehat{h}$ with $\gamma=4, r=0.4$, $m=4$.
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