

ORTHOGONAL SYSTEMS OF SPLINE WAVELETS AS UNCONDITIONAL BASES IN SOBOLEV SPACES

RAJULA SRIVASTAVA

ABSTRACT. We exhibit the necessary range for which functions in the Sobolev spaces L_p^s can be represented as an unconditional sum of orthonormal spline wavelet systems, such as the Battle-Lemarié wavelets. We also consider the natural extensions to Triebel-Lizorkin spaces. This builds upon, and is a generalization of, previous work of Seeger and Ullrich, where analogous results were established for the Haar wavelet system.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that unlike the trigonometric system, the Haar system forms an unconditional basis in $L^p[0, 1]$ for all $1 < p < \infty$ (see [14]). In this article, we aim to explore the analogous problem in the case of Sobolev (and Triebel-Lizorkin) spaces. More precisely, we seek to answer the following question: for what Sobolev spaces does a given orthonormal spline wavelet system form an unconditional basis?

Let $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. We consider an orthogonal spline system on the real line, characterized by a scaling function Ψ_n and an associated wavelet ψ_n (both real valued) with the following properties:

- (A) $\Psi_n, \psi_n \in C^{n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ (no condition for $n = 0$).
- (B) The restriction of Ψ_n, ψ_n to each interval $(j, j + \frac{1}{2})$ (for $j \in \mathbb{Z}/2$) is a polynomial of degree at most n .
- (C) When $n > 0$, there exist positive constants C and γ (depending on n) such that

$$|\Psi_n^{(\alpha)}(x)| + |\psi_n^{(\alpha)}(x)| \leq Ce^{-\gamma|x|} \text{ for all } 0 \leq \alpha \leq n-1.$$

(D)

$$\int x^M \psi_n(x) dx = 0, \text{ for } M = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

We say that ψ_n is of order n . When $n = 0$, the Haar wavelet is perhaps the simplest and the most famous example of this type, with

$$\Psi_0(x) = \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}, \quad \psi_0(x) = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\frac{1}{2}]}(x) - \mathbb{1}_{[\frac{1}{2},1]}(x),$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}$ denotes the characteristic function of the interval $[a, b]$. More generally, for $n \geq 0$, the Battle-Lemarié wavelets (constructed independently by Battle [1] and Lemarié [12], also investigated by Mallat [13]) are well-known examples of such a system.

For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$\psi_{n,k,\mu} := \psi_n(2^k \cdot -\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{n,-1,\mu} := \sqrt{2}\Psi_n(2^k \cdot -\mu).$$

The Battle-Lemarié wavelets form an example of what is known as a multiresolution analysis in wavelet theory. We refer the interested reader to standard texts like [6], Section 5.4 and [25], Section 3.3 for a more thorough discussion and actual construction of these wavelet systems. For

Date: 2021/11/17.

our purposes, it is sufficient to know that they satisfy the properties (A)-(D) above. One must think of the Battle-Lemarié system of order n as an "orthonormalized" wavelet version of the n -th order cardinal spline N_n , recursively defined by the relation $N_0 = \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}$, and

$$N_n(x) = (N_{n-1} * N_1)(x),$$

for $n \geq 1$. In particular, the system

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{W}_n := \{2^{k/2} \psi_{n,k,\mu} : k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}, \mu \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

forms an orthonormal basis in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

We remark here that there also exist other (non-orthogonal) wavelet systems which generalize the idea of B-splines, such as

- Chui-Wang wavelets: These wavelets, constructed independently by Chui-Wang [4] and Unser-Aldroubi-Eden [23], retain inter-scale orthogonality and are compactly supported.
- Bi-orthogonal wavelets: Introduced by Cohen-Daubechies-Feauveau [5], these wavelets are compactly supported, symmetric and regular, but non-orthogonal, with a dual basis generated by another compactly supported wavelet.

We refer the reader to [24] for a concise introduction and comparison. In this article, we will focus on orthogonal wavelet systems, although it might be possible to adapt some of our ideas to the aforementioned systems as well.

Triebel ([20], [22]) showed that the Haar system forms an unconditional basis in Besov spaces $B_{p,q}^s$ if $1 < p, q < \infty$ and $-1/p' < s < 1/p$ (also see [15]). The endpoint case $s = 1/p$ (and the dual case $s = -1/p'$) can be excluded by noting that all the Haar functions belong to $B_{p,q}^{1/p}$ if and only if $q = \infty$.

In the case of Sobolev and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces, we have a dependence on the secondary integrability parameter q as well. More precisely, it was shown by Triebel [22] that the Haar system forms an unconditional basis in the Sobolev spaces L_p^s ($1 < p < \infty$) when $\max\{-1/p', -1/2\} < s < \min\{1/p, 1/2\}$ (recall that the norm in L_p^s is given by $\|f\|_{L_p^s} = \|D^s f\|_{L_p}$ where $D^s f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[(1 + |\xi|^2)^{s/2} \hat{f}(\xi)]$). It had been an open question if the Haar system formed an unconditional basis in L_p^s in the range $1/2 \leq s \leq 1/p$ (for $1 < p < 2$) and $-1/p' \leq s \leq -1/2$ (when $2 < p < \infty$). This was answered in the negative in [16], where Seeger and Ullrich established that the aforementioned sufficient condition is also a necessary one. In fact, in [16], the question was settled for the general class of Triebel-Lizorkin spaces $F_{p,q}^s$ (we recall that by Littlewood-Paley theory, $L_p^s = F_{p,2}^s$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 < p < \infty$). In a series of follow up papers, Garrigós, Seeger and Ullrich also established slightly better necessary and sufficient ranges for suitable enumerations of the Haar system to form a Schauder basis in Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces (see [9]), including the limiting case for the former (in [10]) and the endpoint case for the latter (see [11]).

It is clear from the above discussion that the Haar system is not a good candidate for an unconditional basis in function spaces of higher order smoothness. This is because the Haar wavelet has poor regularity (it fails to be even continuous). Hence, we turn our attention to orthonormal spline wavelet systems satisfying properties (A)-(D). For such systems, Bourdaud [2] and Triebel [22] proved results analogous to the Haar case for Besov spaces, with a shift in the range of the smoothness parameter domain corresponding to the shift in regularity of the basis functions. More precisely, they proved that the system \mathcal{W}_n forms an unconditional basis in $B_{p,q}^s$ if $1 < p, q < \infty$ and $-n - 1/p' < s < n + 1/p$. This range is also optimal, for $\psi_n \notin B_{p,q}^s$ for $s \geq n + 1/p$ or for $s \leq -n - 1/p'$.




FIGURE 1. Domain for an unconditional basis in L_p^s spaces for spline wavelets of order 1.

Coming to the case of the Sobolev and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces, Triebel ([22], Theorem 2.49, (ii)) showed that the system \mathcal{W}_n (generated by a spline wavelet ψ_n of order n , satisfying properties (A)-(D)) forms an unconditional basis in $F_{p,q}^s$ ($1 < p, q < \infty$) when

$$(2) \quad \max\{-1/p', -1/q'\} - n < s < \min\{1/p, 1/q\} + n$$

(see [18] for related results for splines). It is an open question if in this case too, the aforementioned sufficient condition is also necessary and in particular, whether the system \mathcal{W}_n is an unconditional basis on the Sobolev space L_p^s for the ranges $1 < p < 2$, $n + 1/2 \leq s \leq n + 1/p$ and $2 < p < \infty$, $-n - 1/p' \leq s \leq -n - 1/2$ (see figure 1). We answer this question in the negative.

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $1 < p, q < \infty$. The system \mathcal{W}_n (as defined in (1)) is an unconditional basis in $F_{p,q}^s$ only if*

$$\max\{-1/p', -1/q'\} - n < s < \min\{1/p, 1/q\} + n.$$

Remark 1.2. *Since the Haar system corresponds to the case $n = 0$, our result is a generalization of the one in [16] to orthogonal spline wavelet systems of arbitrary order.*

Following [16], we introduce a suitable framework to quantify the failure of unconditional convergence. For $k \geq 0$, we define the spline wavelet frequency of $\psi_{n,k,\mu}$ to be 2^k . For any subset E of the system \mathcal{W} let $SF(E)$ denote the spline wavelet frequency set of E . In other words,

$$SF(E) = \{2^k : k \geq 0, \text{ there exists } \mu \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } \psi_{n,k,\mu} \in E\}.$$

We denote by P_E the orthogonal projection to the subspace spanned by $\{g : g \in E\}$ (which is closed in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$). In particular, for a Schwartz function f ,

$$P_E f = \sum_{\psi_{n,k,\mu} \in E} \langle f, \psi_{n,k,\mu} \rangle \psi_{n,k,\mu}.$$

Now for any $A \subset \{2^j : j = 0, 1, \dots\}$, we set

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^s, A) = \sup\{\|P_E\|_{F_{p,q}^s} : SF(E) \subset A\}.$$

For $\Lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the lower wavelet projection number

$$(4) \quad \gamma_*(F_{p,q}^s, \Lambda) = \inf\{\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^s, A) : \#A \geq \Lambda\}.$$

As $\psi_{n,k,\mu} \notin F_{p,q}^s$ for $s \geq 1/p + n$, we have that $\gamma_*(\Lambda) = \infty$. By duality, $\gamma_*(\Lambda) = \infty$ for $s \leq -n + 1/p'$. In our discussion throughout, we shall assume that $\Lambda > 10$.

The approach used in [16] to establish the necessary range for unconditional convergence in the case of the Haar basis was the quantification of the growth rate $\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^s, A)$ in terms of the cardinality of A . In particular, to give precise lower bounds for $\gamma_*(F_{p,q}^s, \Lambda)$, the authors constructed a suitable test function, by first considering a sum of the translates of a smooth compactly supported function η at a fixed dyadic scale and then taking a randomized sum of the functions hence constructed at different scales, dictated by the frequency of the given set A . The Sobolev (or Triebel-Lizorkin) norm of the test function was controlled by introducing enough separation between the translates at the same scale (Proposition 4.1). This separation and the compact support of the Haar wavelet was also used to ensure that at each scale, a given translate of the wavelet interacted with exactly one translate of the test function. Finally, by choosing η to be an odd function and exploiting the anti-symmetry of the Haar wavelet (with respect to the midpoint of the associated interval), the authors were able to avoid cancellation and get the different interactions to add up, yielding the desired lower bounds.

In this paper, we use the same example as above, and verify that this approach also works for the wavelet systems we consider. In [16], the authors had the advantage of working with the Haar wavelet, which can be written down in a very simple closed form and is compactly supported. However, in our article we do not use any explicit formulas for the wavelets (which can get very tedious as the order increases). Neither are our wavelets compactly supported. The novelty of this paper lies in identifying the properties hidden behind the deceptively simple form of the Haar wavelet, which make the example in [16] work, and adapting them to our setting. Moreover, exponential decay (property (C)) is only slightly worse than being compactly supported, and can be essentially dealt with by increasing the separation between the different translates. Consequently, we obtain some tail terms (absent in [16]), which need to be carefully considered.

Notation. We shall use the notation $A \lesssim B$, or $B \gtrsim A$, if $A \leq CB$ for a positive constant depending only on p, q, s and the wavelet ψ_n under consideration. Also, if both $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$, we shall use the notation $A \approx B$.

Plan of the paper. In Section 2, we briefly discuss the characterization of Triebel-Lizorkin spaces via compactly supported local means, which is quite suitable for our problem. In Section 3, we reformulate the properties of the orthogonal spline wavelets in a quantitative form. In Section 4, we state and prove a technical lemma. This is in preparation for defining a suitable family of test functions in $F_{p,q}^s$, which we do for $p > q$ and $s \leq -1/q' - n$ in Section 5. In Section 6, we establish a few preliminary estimates and lower bounds for the interactions of the test functions with the members $\psi_{n,k,\mu}$ of the wavelet family. In Sections 7 and 8, we prove the existence of the desired lower bounds for $\gamma_*(F_{p,q}^s, \Lambda)$ when $s < -1/q'$ and $s = 1/q'$, respectively.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank her advisor Andreas Seeger for introducing this problem, for his guidance and several illuminating discussions. She is also grateful to Dr. Nadiia Derevianko and Prof. Tino Ullrich for sharing a copy of their manuscript [7], which helped shape some of the ideas contained here. Research supported in part by NSF grant 1500162.

2. SOME BACKGROUND ON TRIEBEL-LIZORKIN SPACES

We briefly discuss the characterization of Triebel-Lizorkin spaces via "local means" (termed so in [21], Section 2.4.6) which will be useful for our purposes.

The usual way to define Triebel-Lizorkin spaces is via a smooth dyadic decomposition of unity. Let φ_0 be a smooth function supported in $[-3/2, 3/2]$ such that $\varphi_0 \equiv 1$ on $[-4/3, 4/3]$. We set $\varphi = \varphi_0(\cdot) - \varphi_0(2\cdot)$, so that $\varphi_0 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi_0(2^{-k}\cdot) \equiv 1$. Defining $\widehat{L_0 f} = \varphi_0 \hat{f}$ and $\widehat{L_k f} = \varphi(2^{-k}\cdot) \hat{f}$ for a Schwartz function f , we obtain an inhomogenous Littlewood-Paley decomposition

$$(5) \quad f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} L_k f,$$

with convergence in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ and in all L^p spaces. For $0 < p < \infty$, $0 < q \leq \infty$, and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the Triebel-Lizorkin space $F_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R})$ is defined as the collection of all tempered distributions $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$(6) \quad \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s} = \left\| \left(\sum_k 2^{ksq} |L_k f|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p} < \infty,$$

with the usual modification when $q = \infty$. We now define another pair of functions ϕ_0 and ϕ such that $|\widehat{\phi_0}| > 0$ on $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ and $|\widehat{\phi}| > 0$ on the set $\{\xi : \epsilon/4 < |\xi| < \epsilon\}$. We also assume that

$$(7) \quad \int \phi(y) y^m dy = 0,$$

for $m = 0, \dots, M_1$ where $M_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $M_1 + 1 > s$. It can be proved using vector valued singular integrals (see [21], Section 2.4.6) that

$$(8) \quad \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s} \approx \left\| \left(\sum_k 2^{ksq} |\phi_k * f|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p},$$

with $\phi_k(x) = 2^k \phi(2^x)$. The above characterization allows for compactly supported ϕ and ϕ_0 , termed as "local means".

3. PROPERTIES OF THE ORTHOGONAL SPLINE WAVELETS

For $k, \mu \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$(9) \quad I_{k,\mu} := [2^{-k}\mu, 2^{-k}(\mu + 1)],$$

and

$$(10) \quad x_{k,\mu} := 2^{-k}\mu + 2^{-k+1}.$$

The Haar wavelet generates a system that can be easily written down explicitly. Unfortunately, these formulas become extremely complicated when $n > 0$. Moreover, ψ_n is no longer compactly supported in this case. However, on a closer inspection, one can isolate the primary properties of the Haar system on which the arguments in [16] are based. These are:

- (a) Each $\psi_{0,k,\mu}$ is supported on the dyadic interval $I_{k,\mu}$.
- (b) $\psi_{0,k,\mu}$ is anti-symmetric around $x_{k,\mu}$.

The test functions are then constructed by taking a sum of compactly supported functions $\eta_{k,\mu}$ centred around $x_{k,\mu}$ for $0 \leq \mu \leq 2^k - 1$. The first property ensures enough separation so that each wavelet translate ψ_{0,k,μ_0} interacts with exactly one translate of η at scale 2^{-k} , namely η_{k,μ_0} . The second property is exploited by considering $\eta_{k,\mu}$ to be *odd*, so that the contributions from both halves of $I_{k,\mu}$ get added up.

In our case, even though ψ_n does not have compact support, it is only slightly worse: $\psi_{n,k,\mu}$ (and its derivatives) decay exponentially off of $I_{k,\mu}$ (property (C)). Thus, by introducing enough separation (as determined by the decay rate), we can still ensure that the interaction of $\eta_{k,\mu}$ with $\psi_{n,k,\mu'}$ is negligibly small when $\mu \neq \mu'$.

Speaking of symmetry, although the Battle-Lemarié wavelet of order n is known to be symmetric (anti-symmetric) around $1/2$ when n is odd (even), we don't rely on this property in our argument, in order to make it applicable to general settings. Let us consider the unit interval $[0, 1]$ (for the other dyadic intervals can be obtained from this case by appropriate scaling and translation). ψ_n is represented by (different) polynomials of degree n on $[0, 1/2]$ and $[1/2, 1]$. However, the condition that $\psi_n \in C^{n-1}$ forces the non-leading left and right co-efficients to be equal. This takes care of the cancellation of the lower order polynomial terms, provided the lower moments of the test function disappear, which is indeed chosen to be so by construction. Further, by considering a translation of ψ_n , if necessary, we can assume that the leading co-efficients of the left and right polynomial representation of ψ_n around $1/2$ are not equal. Then by choosing a test function η such that $y^n \eta(y)$ is odd, we can still get the interactions to add up, yielding non-zero lower bounds. In the endpoint case, we use a slight generalization of this idea, choosing η to be even or odd depending on the signs of the leading co-efficients of ψ_n around 0 with respect to each other.

In the paper henceforth, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ shall remain fixed and be understood from the context. Consequently, we denote $\psi_n(x)$ by $\psi(x)$ and $\psi_{n,k,\mu}$ by $\psi_{k,\mu}$. The following lemma is a quantitative interpretation of Properties (A) and (C).

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose ψ is represented by*

$$(11) \quad \psi(x) = A_{\theta-1}^n \left(x - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^n + A_{\theta-1}^{n-1} \left(x - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{n-1} + \dots + A_{\theta-1}^0$$

on $[\frac{\theta-1}{2}, \frac{\theta}{2}]$, and

$$(12) \quad \psi(x) = A_{\theta}^n \left(x - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^n + A_{\theta}^{n-1} \left(x - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{n-1} + \dots + A_{\theta}^0$$

on $[\frac{\theta}{2}, \frac{\theta+1}{2}]$. Then we have

(i)

$$A_{\theta-1}^j = A_{\theta}^j$$

for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$.

(ii)

$$|A_{\theta}^n| \leq 4Ce^{\gamma/2} e^{-\gamma|\frac{\theta}{2}|},$$

where C and γ are as defined in Property (C).

Proof. By virtue of the fact that $\psi \in C^j$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ (Property (A)), we have that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \theta/2^-} \psi^{(j)}(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \theta/2^+} \psi^{(j)}(x),$$

which yields

$$A_{\theta-1}^j = A_{\theta}^j$$

for $0 \leq j \leq n-1$, thus proving (i).

For proving (ii), we use Property (C) with $\alpha = n-1$ to obtain

$$(13) \quad \left| n! A_\theta^n \left(x - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) + (n-1)! A_{\theta-1}^n \right| \leq C e^{-\gamma|x|}$$

for $x \in [\frac{\theta}{2}, \frac{\theta+1}{2}]$. In particular, taking the limit as $x \rightarrow \theta/2$, we get

$$(14) \quad |A_{\theta-1}^n| \leq \frac{C}{(n-1)!} e^{-\gamma|\frac{\theta}{2}|}.$$

Now, we substitute $x = \frac{\theta+1}{2}$ in (13) and use the triangle inequality, along with (14), which yields

$$\left| \frac{A_\theta^n}{2} \right| \leq \frac{C}{n!} (e^{-\gamma|\frac{\theta+1}{2}|} + e^{-\gamma|\frac{\theta}{2}|}) \leq 2C e^{\gamma/2} e^{-\gamma|\frac{\theta}{2}|},$$

which implies (ii). \square

4. BOUNDEDNESS OF TEST FUNCTIONS

We now prepare the ground for the definition of test functions to be used to establish the desired lower bounds. The arguments used in this section are identical to those in [16], Section 4. Nevertheless, we include them here for completeness. Throughout this section, we fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

We will use the local means characterization of Triebel-Lizorkin spaces, as described in Section 2. To this effect, we consider smooth functions ϕ_0 and ϕ , both supported in $(-1/2, 1/2)$ so that $|\widehat{\phi_0}(\xi)| > 0$ for $|\xi| \leq 1$ and $|\widehat{\phi}(\xi)| > 0$ for $1/4 \leq |\xi| \leq 1$. We also assume that the cancellation condition (7) holds for ϕ , for $M_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M_1 + 1 > s$. We set $\phi_k = 2^k \phi(2^k \cdot)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We shall use the characterization of $F_{p,q}^s$ using the ϕ_k , as defined in (8).

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be supported in $(-1/2, 1/2)$ such that $\int x^M \eta(x) dx = 0$ for $M = 0, 1, \dots, n+2$. Let \mathfrak{L}^m be a finite set of non-negative integers $\geq m$, such that $\#\mathfrak{L}^m \geq 2^m$. For each $l \in \mathfrak{L}^m$, let \mathcal{P}_l^m denote a set of $K_0 2^{m-l}$ separated points in $[0, K_0]$, where $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ is a fixed positive integer to be decided later. More precisely, we have $\mathcal{P}_l^m = \{x_{l,1}, \dots, x_{l,N(l)}\}$ with $N(l) \leq 2^{l-m}$ and $x_{l,\nu} < x_{l,\nu+1}$ with $x_{l,\nu+1} - x_{l,\nu} \geq K_0 2^{m-l}$. For each $l \in \mathfrak{L}^m$, let

$$(15) \quad \mathfrak{S}_l^m = \{\nu : x_{l,\nu} \in \mathcal{P}_l^m\}.$$

Next, we define

$$(16) \quad \eta_{l,\nu} = \eta(2^l(x - x_{l,\nu})).$$

For a sequence $\{a_{l,\nu}\}$ with $\sup_{l,\nu} |a_{l,\nu}| \leq 1$, we define

$$(17) \quad g_m(x) = \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} 2^{-ls} \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{S}_l^m} a_{l,\nu} \eta_{l,\nu}(x).$$

If the families \mathfrak{L}^m , ($m \in \mathbb{N}$) are disjoint, we define

$$(18) \quad g = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \beta_m g_m$$

for $\beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$.

The following proposition is identical to Proposition 4.1 in [16] (which was in turn a modification of the corresponding result in [3]).

Proposition 4.1. *Let $s > -n-2$.*

(i) For $1 \leq p, q < \infty$, we have

$$\|g_m\|_{F_{p,q}^s} \lesssim_{p,q,s} \left\| \left(\sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} \left| \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{S}_l^m} a_{l,\nu} \mathbb{1}_{l,\nu} \right|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_p$$

and

$$\|g\|_{F_{p,q}^s} \lesssim_{p,q,s} \left\| \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} |\beta_m|^q \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} \left| \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{S}_l^m} a_{l,\nu} \mathbb{1}_{l,\nu} \right|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_p.$$

Here, $\mathbb{1}_{l,\nu}$ denotes the characteristic function of the interval centred at $x_{l,\nu}$ of radius 2^{-l} .

(ii) For $1 \leq q \leq p, \infty$, we have

$$(19) \quad \|g_m\|_{F_{p,q}^s} \lesssim_{p,q,s} (2^{-m} \#(\mathfrak{L}^m))^{1/q}$$

and

$$(20) \quad \|g\|_{F_{p,q}^s} \lesssim_{p,q,s} \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} |\beta_m|^q 2^{-m} \#(\mathfrak{L}^m) \right)^{1/q}.$$

Proof. (i) is a consequence of the fact that $\{\eta_{l,\nu}\}_{l,\nu}$ form a family of smooth atoms in the sense of Frazier and Jawerth ([8], Theorem 4.1 and Section 12). We use the pairwise disjointness of the sets \mathfrak{L}^m here.

Consequently, in order to prove (19), it suffices to show that

$$(21) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} \left| \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{S}_l^m} \mathbb{1}_{l,\nu} \right|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_p \lesssim_{p,q} (2^{-m} \#(\mathfrak{L}^m))^{1/q}$$

(recall that $\sup_{l,\nu} |a_{l,\nu}| \leq 1$). Let $G_l(x) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{S}_l^m} \mathbb{1}_{l,\nu}(x)$ and $G(x) = (\sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} |G_l(x)|^q)^{1/q}$. To prove the desired inequality for the L^p norm of G , we use the dyadic version of the Fefferman-Stein interpolation theorem for L^q and BMO (see [19], Chapter 4). Here we use the fact that $p \geq q$. Thus, it is enough to show that both the L^q and the BMO_{dyad} norms of G are bounded by $(2^{-m} \#(\mathfrak{L}^m))^{1/q}$. This follows almost immediately for the former. For the BMO_{dyad} norm, we need to show that

$$(22) \quad \sup_J \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|J|} \int |G(y) - c| dy \lesssim 2^{-m} \#(\mathfrak{L}^m)^{1/q},$$

where the supremum is taken over all dyadic intervals J . We fix J and denote its midpoint by x_J . We define

$$c_{J,l} = \begin{cases} \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{S}_l^m} \mathbb{1}_{l,\nu}(x_J) & \text{if } |J| \leq 2^{-l} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$c_J = \left(\sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} c_{J,l}^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|J|} \int |G(y) - c_J| dy &= \frac{1}{|J|} \int \left| \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} |G_l(y)|^{1/q} - \left(\sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} c_{J,l}^q \right)^{1/q} \right| dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|J|} \int \left(\sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} |G_l(y) - c_{J,l}|^q \right)^{1/q} dy \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} \frac{1}{|J|} \int |G_l(y) - c_{J,l}|^q dy \right)^{1/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the triangle inequality in l^q and Hölder's inequality on the interval J . Now for $|J| \leq 2^{-l}$ and $y \in J$, we have that $G_l(y) = c_{J,l}$. Also, as $c_{J,l} = 0$ for $|J| > 2^{-l}$, we get

$$\frac{1}{|J|} \int |G(y) - c_J| dy \leq \left(\sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m, 2^{-l} < |J|} \frac{1}{|J|} \int |G_l(y)|^q dy \right)^{1/q}.$$

But as the points in \mathfrak{S}_l^m are $K_0 2^{m-l}$ separated, by the definition of $G_l(y)$, we have

$$\int |G_l(y)|^q dy \leq \begin{cases} 2^{-l} & \text{if } 2^{-l} < |J| \leq 2^{m-l} \\ 2^{-m} |J| & \text{if } 2^{m-l} < |J|. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m, 2^{-l} < |J|} \frac{1}{|J|} \int |G_l(y)|^q dy &\leq \sum_{l: 2^{-l} < |J| \leq 2^{m-l}} (2^l |J|)^{-1} + \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^m} 2^{-m} \\ &\lesssim (1 + 2^{-m} \#(\mathfrak{L}^m)). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (22), as $(\mathfrak{L}^m) \geq 2^m$.

Finally, (20) can be proven by using the second assertion in (i), (21) and the triangle inequality in $L^{p/q}$, noting that $p \geq q$. \square

5. DEFINITION OF THE TEST FUNCTIONS FOR THE NON-ENDPOINT CASE

In this section, we define the test functions to be used to establish the lower bounds in the non-endpoint case. Our example is essentially the same as the one used in [16], except we take care to increase the separation between the translates at each dyadic scale (by a factor of K_0), to allow the exponential decay of the spline wavelet to kick in. Consequently, our function lives on $[0, K_0]$, rather than the unit interval. We now present the details.

Let η be a C^∞ function supported in $(-2^{-5}, 2^{-5})$. We require η to be odd for even n , and even for odd n , so that $x^n \eta(x)$ is always odd. Furthermore, let

$$(23) \quad \int x^M \eta(x) dx = 0,$$

for $M = 0, 1, \dots, n+2$ and let

$$(24) \quad \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} x^n \eta(x) dx \geq 1.$$

Let A be an arbitrary set of wavelet frequencies and N so that

$$(25) \quad \Lambda < \#A + 1 \text{ and } 2^N \leq \#A < 2^{N+1}.$$

N and η will remain fixed henceforth. For $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$(26) \quad \eta_{k, K_0 \mu}(y) = \eta(2^{k+N}(y - 2^{-k}K_0\mu - 2^{-k-1})).$$

Let r_k denote the k -th Rademacher function on $[0, 1]$. For $t \in [0, 1]$ and $2^k \in A$ let

$$(27) \quad \Upsilon_k(y) = 2^{N(-s+1/q)} \sum_{\mu=0}^{2^k-1} \eta_{k, K_0 \mu}(y)$$

and

$$(28) \quad f_t(y) = 2^{-N/q} \sum_{2^k \in A} r_k(t) 2^{-ks} \Upsilon_k(y).$$

Lemma 5.1. $\|f_t\|_{F_{p,q}^s} \lesssim_{p,q,s} 1$ uniformly in $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. We write f_t in the expanded form

$$f_t = \sum_{k: 2^k \in A} 2^{-(k+N)s} \sum_{\mu=0}^{2^k-1} r_k(t) \eta(2^{k+N}(y - 2^{-k}K_0\mu - 2^{-k-1})).$$

We now set $m = N$, $\mathfrak{L}^N = \{k + N : 2^k \in A\}$ and apply Proposition 4.1, (i). The lemma now follows as $2^{-N} \#(\mathfrak{L}^N) \lesssim 1$ and the points $\{2^{-k}K_0\mu + 2^{-k-1} : 0 \leq \mu \leq 2^k - 1\}$ are $K_0 2^{m-l}$ separated, for $l = k + N$. \square

6. A FEW PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES

In this section we require ϕ (as defined in Section 4) to be supported on $(-2^{-4}, 2^{-4})$ such that

$$(29) \quad \int x^M \phi(x) dx = 0$$

for $M = 0, 1, \dots, n+1$, and $\|\phi\|_{L^1} \leq 1$. Let $\phi_k = 2^k \phi(2^k \cdot)$. We define $\Phi_1(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \phi(t) dt$ and for $j = 2, \dots, n+1$, let

$$\Phi_j(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \Phi_{j-1}(t) dt$$

be the j th order primitive of ϕ , also supported in $(-2^{-4}, 2^{-4})$. Further, let

$$(30) \quad \psi(x) = A_0^n \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^n + A^{n-1} \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-1} + \dots + A^0.$$

on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and

$$(31) \quad \psi(x) = A_1^n \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^n + A^{n-1} \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-1} + \dots + A^0$$

on $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, where the equality of the non-leading co-efficients follows from Lemma 3.1, (i). By considering a suitable translation of ψ_n if necessary, we can assume that

$$(32) \quad A_0^n \neq A_1^n$$

and in particular, that $A_0^n \neq 0$.

Lemma 6.1. *There exists $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ and a subinterval $J \subset [1/4, 3/4]$ so that*

$$|\phi * \psi(x)| \geq c_0$$

for $x \in J$.

Proof. We observe that the support of ϕ is contained in $[x-1, x]$, whenever $x \in [1/4, 3/4]$. For such x , we have

$$\phi * \psi(x) = \int_{x-1/2}^x \phi(y)\psi(x-y) dy + \int_{x-1}^{x-1/2} \phi(y)\psi(x-y) dy.$$

We observe that $x-y$ lies in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ in the first integral and in $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ in the second one. Hence we can use (30) and (31) in the left and right integral, respectively. Now, for $j = 0, \dots, n-1$, we have

$$A^j \int_{x-1/2}^x \left(x-y-\frac{1}{2}\right)^j \phi(y) dy + A^j \int_{x-1}^{x-1/2} \left(x-y-\frac{1}{2}\right)^j \phi(y) dy = A^j \int \left(x-y-\frac{1}{2}\right)^j \phi(y) dy.$$

The last expression is easily seen to be 0 by (29). Thus, all the lower degree terms cancel, and we have

$$\phi * \psi(x) = A_0^n \int_{x-1/2}^x \left(x-y-\frac{1}{2}\right)^n \phi(y) dy + A_1^n \int_{x-1}^{x-1/2} \left(x-y-\frac{1}{2}\right)^n \phi(y) dy.$$

Now performing an integration by parts n times, along with the observation that the boundary terms are all zero, gives

$$\phi * \psi(x) = (-1)^n n! \left[A_0^n \int_{x-1/2}^x \Phi_n(y) dy + A_1^n \int_{x-1}^{x-1/2} \Phi_n(y) dy \right].$$

We thus conclude that

$$\phi * \psi(x) = (-1)^n n! \left[A_0^n \Phi_{n+1}(x) - A_1^n \Phi_{n+1}(x-1) + (A_1^n - A_0^n) \Phi_{n+1}\left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right) \right].$$

In particular, for $x \in [1/4, 3/4]$, we have that $\phi * \psi(x) = (-1)^{n+1} n! (A_1^n - A_0^n) \Phi\left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)$. Using (32), we conclude that there exists $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ (depending on ψ_n and ϕ) and a subinterval $J \subset [1/4, 3/4]$ so that

$$|\phi * \psi(x)| \geq c_0$$

for $x \in J$. □

We again use K_0 to denote a fixed positive integer (to be decided later), which shall depend only on the wavelet ψ_n . For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $J_{k, K_0 \mu} = 2^{-k} K_0 \mu + 2^{-k} J$ (where J is as in Lemma 6.1). We then have

$$(33) \quad |\phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu}(x)| \geq c_0$$

for $x \in J_{k, K_0 \mu}$. We note that $J_{k, K_0 \mu}$ is an interval of length $\gtrsim 2^{-k}$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let Υ_k be as defined in (27). Then for K_0 large enough, we have*

$$\frac{|\tilde{A}|}{2} 2^{N(-s+1/q-n-1)} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y)y dy \right| \leq |2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu} \rangle| \leq 2|\tilde{A}| 2^{N(-s+1/q-n-1)} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y)y dy \right|.$$

Here $\tilde{A} = A_1^n - A_0^n$ and depends only on the wavelet ψ_n .

Proof. Using the definition of Υ_k , we get

$$2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu} \rangle = 2^{N(-s+1/q)} \sum_{\mu'=0}^{2^k-1} 2^k \langle \eta_{k, K_0 \mu'}, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu} \rangle.$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 2^k \langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu'}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle &= 2^k \int \eta(2^{k+N}(x - 2^{-k}K_0\mu' - 2^{-k-1}))\psi(2^k x - K_0\mu) dx \\
 &= \int_0^1 \eta\left(2^N\left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right)\psi\left(y + \frac{\lambda}{2}\right) dy \\
 &= \int_0^{1/2} \eta\left(2^N\left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right)\psi\left(y + \frac{\lambda}{2}\right) dy + \int_{1/2}^1 \eta\left(2^N\left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right)\psi\left(y + \frac{\lambda}{2}\right) dy,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda = 2K_0(\mu' - \mu)$. We observe that $y + \frac{\lambda}{2}$ lies in $[\frac{\lambda}{2}, \frac{\lambda+1}{2}]$ in the first integral and in $[\frac{\lambda+1}{2}, \frac{\lambda+2}{2}]$ in the second one. Hence we can use formulations (11) and (12) of ψ (with $\theta = \lambda + 1$), for the left and right integral, respectively. By arguing as in the proof of Lemma 6.1, using (23) instead of (29), it is easy to see that the lower degree terms cancel out, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 2^k \langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu'}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle &= \\
 &A_\lambda^n \int_0^{1/2} \eta\left(2^N\left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right)\left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)^n dy + A_{\lambda+1}^n \int_{1/2}^1 \eta\left(2^N\left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right)\left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)^n dy.
 \end{aligned}$$

Applying a change of variables, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 2^k \langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu'}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle &= A_\lambda^n \int_{-1/2}^0 y^n \eta(2^N y) dy + A_{\lambda+1}^n \int_0^{1/2} y^n \eta(2^N y) dy \\
 &= 2^{-(n+1)N} \left(A_\lambda^n \int_{-1/2}^0 y^n \eta(y) dy + A_{\lambda+1}^n \int_0^{1/2} y^n \eta(y) dy \right) \\
 &= 2^{-(n+1)N} (A_{\lambda+1}^n - A_\lambda^n) \int_0^{1/2} y^n \eta(y) dy,
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used the fact that $y^n \eta(y)$ is odd.

When $\mu = \mu'$ and $\lambda = 0$, we conclude that

$$2^k \langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle = 2^{-(n+1)N} \tilde{A} \int_0^{1/2} y^n \eta(y) dy.$$

When $\mu \neq \mu'$, we take absolute values and use the exponential decay of the leading co-efficients (part (ii) of Lemma 3.1) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 |2^k \langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu'}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle| &\leq 8C 2^{-(n+1)N} e^\gamma e^{-\gamma|\lambda/2|} \left| \int_0^{1/2} y^n \eta(y) dy \right| \\
 &= 8C 2^{-(n+1)N} e^\gamma e^{-\gamma K_0|\mu' - \mu|} \left| \int_0^{1/2} y^n \eta(y) dy \right|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two estimates above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle| &= 2^{N(-s+1/q)} \left| \sum_{\mu'=0}^{2^k-1} 2^k \langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu'}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle \right| \\
 &\geq 2^{N(-s+1/q)} \left(2^k |\langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle| - \left| \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu} 2^k \langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu'}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle \right| \right) \\
 &\geq 2^{N(-s+1/q)} 2^{-(n+1)N} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y) y dy \right| \left(|\tilde{A}| - 8C \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu} e^{\gamma} e^{-\gamma K_0 |\mu' - \mu|} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by using triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle| &\leq 2^{N(-s+1/q)} \left(2^k |\langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle| + \left| \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu} 2^k \langle \eta_{k,K_0\mu'}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle \right| \right) \\
 &\leq 2^{N(-s+1/q)} 2^{-(n+1)N} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y) y dy \right| \left(|\tilde{A}| + 8C \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu} e^{\gamma} e^{-\gamma K_0 |\mu' - \mu|} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

We choose K_0 large enough so that

$$\left| 4C \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu} e^{\gamma} e^{-\gamma K_0 |\mu' - \mu|} \right| \leq \frac{|\tilde{A}|}{2},$$

which gives us the desired result. \square

Proposition 6.3. *For $x \in J_{k,K_0\mu}$ and $\mu \neq \mu'$, we have that*

$$|\phi_k * \psi_{k,K_0\mu'}(x)| \leq C e^{7\gamma/8} e^{-\gamma K_0 |\mu - \mu'|}.$$

Proof.

$$|\phi_k * \psi_{k,K_0\mu'}(x)| = \left| \int \phi_k(y) \psi(2^k(x - y) - K_0\mu') dy \right| = \left| \int \phi(y) \psi(x_1 - y - K_0\mu') dy \right|$$

where $x_1 = 2^k x \in J_{0,K_0\mu} \subset K_0\mu + [1/4, 3/4]$. We observe that

$$|x_1 - y - K_0\mu'| \geq |K_0(\mu - \mu')| - |x_1 - y - K_0\mu| \geq |K_0(\mu - \mu')| - 7/8.$$

Combining this with the fact that

$$|\psi(x)| \leq C e^{-\gamma|x|},$$

we obtain

$$|\phi_k * \psi_{k,\mu'}(x)| \leq C \int |\phi(y)| e^{-\gamma K_0 |\mu - \mu'|} e^{7\gamma/8} \leq C e^{7\gamma/8} e^{-\gamma K_0 |\mu - \mu'|}.$$

\square

7. LOWER BOUNDS FOR THE NON-ENDPOINT CASE

In this section, we prove the following, which can be interpreted as a quantitative version of Theorem 1.1 for the non-endpoint case.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\Lambda > 10$ and let $\gamma_*(F_{p,q}^s)$ be as defined in (4).*

(1) *For $1 < p < q < \infty$, $1/q + n < s < 1/p + n$, we have*

$$\gamma_*(F_{p,q}^s, \Lambda) \gtrsim_{p,q,s} \Lambda^{s-1/q-n}.$$

(2) *For $1 < q < p < \infty$, we have $-1/p' - n < s < -1/q' - n$,*

$$\gamma_*(F_{p,q}^s, \Lambda) \gtrsim_{p,q,s} \Lambda^{-1/q'-n-s}.$$

In other words, the magnitude of $\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^s, A)$ depends on the cardinality of A alone.

Remark 7.2. *The statements for (1) and (2) above are equivalent, by a standard argument using the duality of the Triebel-Lizorkin spaces*

$$(F_{p,q}^s)^* = F_{p',q'}^{-s}.$$

We refer the reader to [16], Section 2.3 for the details. Consequently, it suffices to prove only the second assertion above.

The following proposition is the main ingredient in the proof.

Proposition 7.3. *Let $-1 < s \leq -1/q' - n$. Let f_t as in (28). Then there exists a $c > 0$ such that*

$$\left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \|T_{t_1} f_{t_2}\|_{F_{p,q}^s}^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q} \geq c 2^{N(-s-1/q'-n)}.$$

Proof. We can rewrite the left hand side of the above inequality as

$$\left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\| \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{ksq} |\phi_k * T_{t_1} f_{t_2}|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p}^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q}.$$

Restricting the innermost function to the interval $[-1, K_0]$ and using Hölder's inequality (with $p \geq q$), we can bound the expression above by a positive constant times

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\| \left(\sum_{2^k \in A} 2^{ksq} |\phi_k * T_{t_1} f_{t_2}|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^q([-1, K_0])}^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q} \\ (34) \quad & = \left(\sum_{2^k \in A} 2^{ksq} \left\| \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\phi_k * T_{t_1} f_{t_2}(x)|^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^q([-1, K_0])}^q \right)^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

For a fixed x we have

$$\phi_k * T_{t_1} f_{t_2}(x) = 2^{-N/q} \sum_{2^j \in A} \sum_{2^l \in A} r_j(t_1) r_l(t_2) 2^{-ls} \sum_{\mu=0}^{2^j-1} 2^j \langle \Upsilon_l, \psi_{j, K_0 \mu} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{j, K_0 \mu}(x).$$

By Khinchine's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\phi_k * (T_{t_1} f_{t_2})(x)|^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q} \\ & \geq c(q) 2^{-N/q} \left(\sum_{2^j \in A} \sum_{2^l \in A} |2^{-ls} \sum_{\mu=0}^{2^j-1} 2^j \langle \Upsilon_l, \psi_{j, K_0 \mu} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{j, K_0 \mu}(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

For a given $2^k \in A$, we consider only the terms with $j = k$ and $l = k$, and get

$$\left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\phi_k * (T_{t_1} f_{t_2})(x)|^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q} \gtrsim 2^{-N/q} |2^{-ks} \sum_{\mu=0}^{2^k-1} 2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu}(x)|.$$

Now for $x \in J_{k, K_0 \mu}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\mu'=0}^{2^k-1} 2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'}(x) \right| \geq \left| 2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu}(x) \right| - \\ & \left| \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu} 2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'}(x) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

which, using Proposition 6.2, can be bounded below by a positive constant times

$$\frac{|\tilde{A}|}{2} 2^{N(-s+1/q-n-1)} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y) y dy \right| \left(|\phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu}(x)| - 4 \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu} |\phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'}(x)| \right).$$

An application of Proposition 6.3 to the second term in the brackets then yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\mu'=0}^{2^k-1} 2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'}(x) \right| \\ & \gtrsim 2^{N(-s+1/q-n-1)} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y) y dy \right| \left(|\phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu}(x)| - 4C \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu} |e^{7\gamma/8} e^{-\gamma K_0 |\mu - \mu'|}| \right) \\ & \gtrsim c_0 2^{N(-s+1/q-n-1)} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y) y dy \right|, \text{ for } c_0 \text{ as defined in (33) and for } K_0 \text{ sufficiently large.} \end{aligned}$$

Continuing with the proof, we can bound (34) below by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{2^k \in A} 2^{ksq} \left\| \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\phi_k * T_{t_1} f_{t_2}(x)|^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^q([-1, K_0])}^q \right)^{1/q} \\ & \gtrsim \left(\sum_{2^k \in A} 2^{ksq} \sum_{\mu=0}^{2^k-1} \int_{J_{k, \mu}} \left[2^{-N/q} 2^{-ks} \left| \sum_{\mu'=0}^{2^k-1} 2^k \langle \Upsilon_k, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{k, K_0 \mu'}(x) \right| \right]^q dx \right)^{1/q} \\ & \gtrsim 2^{N(-s+1/q-n-1)} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y) y dy \right| \left(\sum_{2^k \in A} 2^{-N} \sum_{\mu=0}^{2^k-1} |J_{k, K_0 \mu}| \right)^{1/q} \\ & \gtrsim 2^{N(-s+1/q-n-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (24) and (25), and the fact that $|J_{k, K_0 \mu}| \gtrsim 2^{-k}$ in the last step. \square

Growth of $\gamma_*(\Lambda)$ for $s < -1/q' - n$. We take A as in (25). Let f_t be as in (28), so that $\|f_t\| \lesssim 1$. By Proposition 7.3, there exist t_1, t_2 in $[0, 1]$ so that

$$\|T_{t_1} f_{t_2}\|_{F_{p,q}^s} \gtrsim 2^{N(-s-1/q'-n)}.$$

Hence,

$$\|T_{t_1}\|_{F_{p,q}^s \rightarrow F_{p,q}^s} \gtrsim c_{p,q,s} 2^{N(-s-1/q'-n)}.$$

Now we let

$$(35) \quad E^\pm := \{\psi_{k,K_0\mu} : 2^k \in A, r_j(t_1) = \pm 1, \mu = 0, \dots, 2^k - 1\}.$$

Then we have

$$T_{t_1} = P_{E^+} - P_{E^-}$$

and we conclude that at least one of P_{E^+} or P_{E^-} has operator norm bounded below by $c_{p,q,s} 2^{N(-s-1/q'-n)}$. Since $SF(E^\pm) \subset A$, we get

$$\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^s, A) \gtrsim 2^{N(-s-1/q'-n)}$$

for $s < -1/q' - n$ and the asserted lower bound for $\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^s, A)$ follows in this range.

Remark 7.4. *Like the corresponding argument in [16], the above proof is probabilistic in nature. In [17], Seeger and Ullrich explicitly constructed subsets of the Haar system for which the corresponding projections have large operator norms. It might be of interest to try to adapt this deterministic approach to the case of orthogonal spline wavelets as well.*

8. LOWER BOUNDS FOR THE ENDPOINT CASE

In this section we prove the lower bounds for the endpoint cases $s = 1/q + n$ and $s = -1/q' - n$. We still have failure of unconditional convergence here, but with a new phenomenon: the growth rate $\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^{n+1/q}, A)$ also depends upon the density of the set $\log_2(A) = \{k : 2^k \in A\}$ on intervals of length $\log_2(\#A)$. We define for any A with $\#A \geq 2$,

$$\underline{\mathcal{Z}}(A) = \min_{2^m \in A} \#\{k \in \log_2(A) : |k - m| \leq \log_2(\#A)\}.$$

Then the following is the analog of Theorem 7.1 for the endpoint cases:

Theorem 8.1. *Let $A = \{2^n : n \geq 0\}$ be a set of large enough cardinality.*

(1) For $1 < p < q < \infty$,

$$\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^{n+1/q}, A) \gtrsim_{p,q} \log_2(\#A)^{1/q} \underline{\mathcal{Z}}(A)^{1-1/q}.$$

(2) For $1 < q < p < \infty$,

$$\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^{-n-1/q'}, A) \gtrsim_{p,q} \log_2(\#A)^{1-1/q} \underline{\mathcal{Z}}(A)^{1/q}.$$

We can re-frame the above in terms of the lower wavelet projection numbers.

Corollary 8.2. *For $\Lambda \geq 4$, we have*

(1) For $1 < p < q < \infty$,

$$\gamma_*(F_{p,q}^{n+1/q}, \Lambda) \gtrsim_{p,q} \log_2(\Lambda)^{1/q}.$$

(2) For $1 < q < p < \infty$,

$$\gamma_*(F_{p,q}^{-n-1/q'}, \Lambda) \gtrsim_{p,q} \log_2(\Lambda)^{1-1/q}.$$

By Remark 7.2, it suffices in this case as well to prove only the second assertion of Theorem 8.1. Let N be such that $4^N \leq 8^{N-1} \leq \#A \leq 8^N$. Using the definition of $\underline{Z}(A)$, we can find M_N disjoint intervals $I_i = (n_i - 3N, n_i + 3N)$ with midpoints $n_i \in \log_2(A)$ ($1 \leq i \leq M_N$) and $M_N \geq 8^{N-1}/6N \geq 4^N$, such that each I_i contains at least $\underline{Z}(A)$ points in $\log_2(A)$. By a pigeonholing argument, each I_i contains a subinterval \tilde{I}_i of length N with at least $\underline{Z}(A)/6$ points in $\log_2(A)$. The upshot is that we have essentially reduced our problem to proving the following:

Theorem 8.3. *Let $\#A \geq 4^N$. Suppose there exist 4^N disjoint intervals I_κ ($1 \leq \kappa \leq 4^N$), each of length N , with $I_\kappa \cap \log_2(A) \neq \emptyset$. Let*

$$(36) \quad Z = \frac{1}{4^N} \sum_{\kappa=1}^{4^N} \#(I_\kappa \cap A).$$

Then, for $q \leq p < \infty$, we have that

$$(37) \quad \mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^{-1/q'}; A) \geq c(p, q) N^{1-1/q} Z^{1/q}.$$

In order to show (37) for the endpoint case, we need to construct a suitable family of test functions. To this effect, let η denote a C^∞ function supported in $(-2^{-5}, 2^{-5})$ satisfying the conditions (23) and (24). However, the parity of η would be decided later in the argument.

Let

$$\mathfrak{L} = \{b_\kappa + N : \kappa = 1, 2, \dots, 4^N\}$$

and for $\tau = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$, let

$$\mathfrak{L}^{N+\tau} = \{b_\kappa + \tau : \kappa = 1, 2, \dots, 4^N\}.$$

Then $\mathfrak{L}^{N+\tau}$ are disjoint sets, each of cardinality 4^N . Further, for $l \in \mathfrak{L}$, we define

$$(38) \quad H_\kappa(x) = \sum_{\tau=0}^{N-1} 2^{(\tau-N)(n+1)} \sum_{\rho \in \mathbb{N}: 0 < 2^{N-b_\kappa+2}\rho < 1} \eta(2^{b_\kappa+\tau}(x - 2^{N+2-b_\kappa} K_0 \rho)).$$

Finally, for $t \in [0, 1]$, let

$$(39) \quad f_t(x) = \sum_{\kappa=1}^{4^N} r_{b_\kappa+N}(t) 2^{(b_\kappa+N)/q'} H_\kappa(x),$$

where r_j denotes the j th Radamacher function with $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 8.4. *We have*

$$\|f_t\|_{F_{p,q}^{-1/q'-n}} \leq C(p, q) N^{1/q}.$$

Proof. Define $g_{\tau,t}$ to be

$$g_{\tau,t} = \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}^{N+\tau}} 2^{l(n+1/q')} \sum_{\tau=0}^{N-1} 2^{(\tau-N)(n+1)} \sum_{\substack{\rho \in \mathbb{N}: \\ 0 < 2^{N+\tau+2-l}\rho < 1}} r_{l+N-\tau}(t) \eta(2^l(x - 2^{N+\tau+2-l} K_0 \rho)).$$

Then we can write

$$f_t = \sum_{\tau=0}^{N-1} 2^{(\tau-N)/q} g_{\tau,t}.$$

This sets the stage to apply Proposition 4.1 with $m = N + \tau$. It is clear that the points $2^{N+\tau+2-l}K_0\rho$ are K_02^{m-l} separated. Using (20) with $\beta_{N+\tau} = 2^{(\tau-N)/q}$, we get

$$\|f_t\|_{F_{p,q}^{-1/q'}} \lesssim_{p,q} \left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{N-1} ((2^{(\tau-N)/q})^q 2^{-\tau-N} \#(\mathfrak{L}^{N+\tau}))^{1/q} \right) \lesssim N^{1/q}.$$

□

For $\kappa = 1, 2, \dots, 4^N$, we define

$$(40) \quad \mathfrak{A}(\kappa) = I_\kappa \cap \log_2(A),$$

$$(41) \quad \mathfrak{P}(\kappa) = \{(j, \mu) : j \in \mathfrak{A}(\kappa), \mu \in 2^{j-b_\kappa+N+2}\mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq \mu < 2^j\}.$$

and

$$(42) \quad \mathfrak{P} = \bigcup_{\kappa=1}^{4^N} \mathfrak{P}(\kappa).$$

For $t \in [0, 1]$, we also define

$$T_t f(x) = \sum_{(j,\mu) \in \mathfrak{P}} r_j(t) 2^j \langle f, \psi_{j,K_0\mu} \rangle \psi_{j,K_0\mu}(x).$$

Proposition 8.5. *For $q < p < \infty$, there exists $c(p, q) > 0$ such that for K_0 and N large enough, we have*

$$(43) \quad \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \|T_{t_1} f_{t_2}\|_{F_{p,q}^{-1/q'-n}}^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q} \geq c(p, q) N Z^{1/q}.$$

Proof. As in the non-endpoint case, it suffices to show that

$$(44) \quad \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\| \left(\sum_{\kappa} \sum_{k \in \mathfrak{A}(k)} 2^{kq(-n-1/q')} |\phi_k * T_{t_1} f_{t_2}|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^q([-1, K_0])}^q dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/q} \geq c(p, q) N Z^{1/q}.$$

Interchanging integrals and applying Khinchine's inequality, we see that the above follows if we show

$$\left(\sum_{\kappa} \sum_{k \in \mathfrak{A}(k)} 2^{kq(-n-1/q')} \left\| \left(\sum_j \sum_{\kappa'} \left| \sum_{\mu: (j,\mu) \in \mathfrak{P}} 2^j \langle 2^{(b_{\kappa'}+N)(n+1/q')} H_{\kappa'}, \psi_{j,K_0\mu} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{j,K_0\mu} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^q([-1, K_0])}^q \right)^{1/q} \geq c(p, q) N Z^{1/q}.$$

For the two inner summations, we only consider terms with $j = k$ and $\kappa' = \kappa$. Then the left hand side of the above expression is bounded below by

$$(45) \quad \left(\sum_{\kappa} \sum_{k \in \mathfrak{A}(k)} 2^{kq(-n-1/q')} \left\| \sum_{\mu: (j,\mu) \in \mathfrak{P}(\kappa)} 2^{(b_\kappa+N)(n+1/q')} 2^k \langle H_\kappa, \psi_{j,K_0\mu} \rangle \phi_k * \psi_{j,K_0\mu} \right\|_{L^q([-1, K_0])}^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

Setting

$$\zeta_{\kappa,\tau,\rho}(x) = \eta(2^{b_\kappa+\tau}(x - 2^{N+2-b_\kappa}K_0\rho)),$$

we can write

$$\langle H_\kappa, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle = \sum_{0 \leq \tau \leq n-1} 2^{(\tau-N)(n+1)} \sum_{\substack{\rho \in \mathbb{N}: \\ 0 < 2^{N+2-b_\kappa} \rho < 1}} \langle \zeta_{\kappa,\tau,\rho}, \psi_{k,K_0\mu} \rangle.$$

We recall that by (41), μ is of the form $\mu = \mu_n = 2^{k-b_\kappa+N+2}m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 2^k \langle \zeta_{\kappa, \tau, \rho}, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu_m} \rangle &= 2^k \int \eta(2^{b_\kappa+\tau}(x - 2^{N+2-b_\kappa} K_0 \rho)) \psi(2^k x - K_0 \mu_m) dx \\ &= \int \eta(2^{b_\kappa+\tau-k}(y - 2^{N+2-b_\kappa+k} K_0(\rho - m))) \psi(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\lambda = 2.2^{N+2-b_\kappa+k} K_0(\rho - m)$, we observe that the range of the above integral is contained in $[\frac{\lambda-1}{2}, \frac{\lambda+1}{2}]$, owing to the fact that η is supported in $[-2^{-5}, 2^{-5}]$. Hence, we can use the spline formulations (11) and (12) for ψ on $[\frac{\lambda-1}{2}, \frac{\lambda}{2}]$ and $[\frac{\lambda}{2}, \frac{\lambda+1}{2}]$ respectively, and argue in the same way as in the proof of Proposition 6.2.

In the light of the moment cancellation condition (23) (for η) and symmetry of the lower order co-efficients of ψ (Lemma 3.1, (i)), the integrals involving the lower degree terms cancel. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \eta\left(2^{b_\kappa+\tau-k}\left(y - \frac{\lambda}{2}\right)\right) \psi(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\frac{\lambda-1}{2}}^{\frac{\lambda}{2}} \eta\left(2^{b_\kappa+\tau-k}\left(y - \frac{\lambda}{2}\right)\right) A_{\lambda-1}^n\left(y - \frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^n dy + \int_{\frac{\lambda}{2}}^{\frac{\lambda+1}{2}} \eta\left(2^{b_\kappa+\tau-k}\left(y - \frac{\lambda}{2}\right)\right) A_{\lambda}^n\left(y - \frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^n dy \\ &= 2^{-(b_\kappa+\tau-k)(n+1)} \left[\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^0 \eta(y) A_{\lambda-1}^n y^n dy + \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta(y) A_{\lambda}^n y^n dy \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Because of the rapid decay of ψ , the major contribution comes in the case when $\rho = m$ (in which case $\lambda = 0$), provided we choose η in a suitable way, so as to prevent unwanted cancellation. It is here that we choose the parity of η to our advantage. More precisely, we choose η such that

$$\eta(y)y^n \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{odd,} & \text{if } A_{-1}^n \text{ and } A_0^n \text{ are of opposite signs} \\ \text{even,} & \text{if } A_{-1}^n \text{ and } A_0^n \text{ are of the same sign.} \end{cases}$$

Such a choice ensures that for $\lambda = 0$, we have

$$\left| \int \eta(2^{b_\kappa+\tau-k}y) \psi(y) dy \right| \geq |A_0^n| 2^{-(b_\kappa+\tau-k)(n+1)} \left| \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta(y)y^n dy \right| > 0.$$

When $\lambda \neq 0$, it is a non-zero integer multiple of K_0 . Hence the exponential decay of the leading co-efficients $A_{\lambda-1}^n$ and A_{λ}^n (Lemma 3.1, (ii)) kicks in, and we get the bound

$$\left| \int \eta\left(2^{b_\kappa+\tau-k}\left(y - \frac{\lambda}{2}\right)\right) \psi(y) dy \right| \leq 8C 2^{-(b_\kappa+\tau-k)(n+1)} e^\gamma e^{-\gamma|\lambda/2|} \left| \int_0^{1/2} \eta(y)y^n dy \right|$$

We now combine the two estimates above and use the triangle inequality as in the proof of Lemma 6.2. For K_0 large enough, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|A_0^n|}{2} 2^{-(b_\kappa+\tau-k)(n+1)} \left| \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta(y)y^n dy \right| &\leq \left| 2^k \sum_{\substack{\rho \in \mathbb{N}: \\ 0 < 2^{N+2-b_\kappa} \rho < 1}} \langle \zeta_{\kappa, \tau, \rho}, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu_m} \rangle \right| \\ &\leq 2|A_0^n| 2^{-(b_\kappa+\tau-k)(n+1)} \left| \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta(y)y^n dy \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\frac{|A_0^n|}{2} N 2^{(k-b_\kappa-N)(n+1)} \left| \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta(y)y^n dy \right| \leq 2^k \langle H_\kappa, \psi_{k, K_0 \mu} \rangle \leq 2|A_0^n| N 2^{(k-b_\kappa-N)(n+1)} \left| \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta(y)y^n dy \right|.$$

The intervals $J_{k,K_0\mu}$ (where $J_{k,K_0\mu}$ is as in (33)) are disjoint. Using Proposition 6.3 and arguing as in the non-endpoint case (proof of Proposition 7.3), we conclude that for K_0 large enough, (45) is bounded below by

$$c \left(\sum_{\kappa} \sum_{k \in \mathfrak{A}(\kappa)} 2^{kq(-n-1/q')} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{N}: \\ 0 < 2^k + N + 2^{-b_\kappa} m < 2^k}} \int_{J_{k,\mu_m}} \left| 2^{(b_\kappa+N)(n+1/q')} N 2^{(k-b_\kappa-N)(n+1)} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta(y) y^n dy \right|^q dx \right)^{1/q}.$$

The measure of $\cup_{m \in \mathbb{N}: 0 < 2^k + N + 2^{-b_\kappa} m < 2^k} J_{k,\mu_m}$ is about $2^{b_\kappa-N-k}$. Hence, the above expression is bounded below by

$$\begin{aligned} & c' \left(\sum_{\kappa} \sum_{k \in \mathfrak{A}(\kappa)} 2^{kq(-n-1/q')} 2^{b_\kappa-N-k} \left(2^{(b_\kappa+N)(n+1/q')} N 2^{(k-b_\kappa-N)(n+1)} \right)^q \right)^{1/q} \\ & \gtrsim \left(\sum_{\kappa} \sum_{k \in \mathfrak{A}(\kappa)} 2^{-2N} N^q \right)^{1/q} \gtrsim N Z^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes our proof. \square

Finally, we have all the ingredients ready to prove Theorem 8.3.

Proof. By Proposition 8.5, there exist $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$ such that $\|T_{t_1} f_{t_2}\|_{F_{p,q}^{-1/q'-n}} \gtrsim N Z^{1/q}$ but $\|f_{t_2}\|_{F_{p,q}^{-1/q'-n}} \lesssim N^{1/q}$. Consequently,

$$\|T_{t_1}\|_{F_{p,q}^{-1/q'-n}} \gtrsim c_{p,q} N^{1-1/q} Z^{1/q}.$$

Defining E^\pm as in (35), we get

$$\max_{\pm} \|P_{E^\pm}\|_{F_{p,q}^{-1/q'-n}} \geq \frac{c_{p,q}}{2} N^{1-1/q} Z^{1/q}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{G}(F_{p,q}^{-1/q'-n}, A) \gtrsim N^{1/q'} Z^{1/q}$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Guy Battle, *A block spin construction of ondelettes. Part I: Lemarié functions*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **110** (1987), no. 4, 601–615.
- [2] Gerard Bourdaud, *Ondelettes et espaces de Besov*, Revista Matemática Iberoamericana **11** (1995), no. 3, 477–512.
- [3] Michael Christ and Andreas Seeger, *Necessary conditions for vector-valued operator inequalities in Harmonic Analysis*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society **93** (2006), no. 2, 447–473.
- [4] Charles K Chui and Jian-Zhong Wang, *On compactly supported spline wavelets and a duality principle*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **330** (1992), no. 2, 903–915.
- [5] Albert Cohen, Ingrid Daubechies, and J-C Feauveau, *Biorthogonal bases of compactly supported wavelets*, Communications on pure and applied mathematics **45** (1992), no. 5, 485–560.
- [6] Ingrid Daubechies, *Ten lectures on wavelets*, Vol. 61, SIAM, 1992.
- [7] N. Derevianko and T. Ullrich, *A higher order Faber spline basis for sampling discretization of functions*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.00391 (2019).
- [8] Michael Frazier and Björn Jawerth, *A discrete transform and decompositions of distribution spaces*, Journal of Functional Analysis **93** (1990), no. 1, 34–170.
- [9] Gustavo Garrigós, Andreas Seeger, and Tino Ullrich, *The Haar system as a Schauder basis in spaces of Hardy–Sobolev type*, Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications **24** (2018), no. 5, 1319–1339.

- [10] ———, *Basis properties of the Haar system in limiting Besov spaces*, to appear in Geometric aspects of Harmonic Analysis: A Conference in honour of Fulvio Ricci, arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09117 (2019).
- [11] ———, *The Haar system in Triebel-Lizorkin spaces: Endpoint results*, to appear in Journal of Geometric Analysis, arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.03738 (2019).
- [12] Pierre-Gilles Lemarié, *Ondelettes à localisation exponentielle*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **67** (1988), 227–236.
- [13] Stephane G Mallat, *Multiresolution approximations and wavelet orthonormal bases of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$* , Transactions of the American mathematical society **315** (1989), no. 1, 69–87.
- [14] Józef Marcinkiewicz, *Quelques théoremes sur les séries orthogonales*, Vol. 16, 1937.
- [15] S Ropela, *Spline bases in Besov spaces*, Bulletin of the Polish Academy Of Sciences-Series of Mathematical Astronomical and Physical Sciences **24** (1976), no. 5, 319–325.
- [16] Andreas Seeger and Tino Ullrich, *Haar projection numbers and failure of unconditional convergence in Sobolev spaces*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **285** (2017), no. 1-2, 91–119.
- [17] ———, *Lower bounds for Haar projections: deterministic examples*, Constructive Approximation **46** (2017), no. 2, 227–242.
- [18] Winfried Sickel, *Spline representations of functions in Besov-Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on \mathbb{R}^n* , Forum mathematicum, 1990, pp. 451–476.
- [19] Elias M Stein and Timothy S Murphy, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Vol. 3, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [20] Hans Triebel, *On Haar bases in Besov spaces*, Serdica **4** (1978), no. 4, 330–343.
- [21] ———, *Theory of function spaces II*, Monographs in Mathematics Vol. 84 (Birkhäuser, Basel) (1992).
- [22] ———, *Bases in function spaces, sampling, discrepancy, numerical integration*, Vol. 11, European Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [23] Michael Unser, Akram Aldroubi, and Murray Eden, *On the asymptotic convergence of B-spline wavelets to Gabor functions*, IEEE transactions on information theory **38** (1992), no. 2, 864–872.
- [24] Michael A Unser, *Ten good reasons for using spline wavelets*, Wavelet applications in signal and image processing V, 1997, pp. 422–431.
- [25] Przemysław Wojtaszczyk, *A mathematical introduction to wavelets*, Vol. 37, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

RAJULA SRIVASTAVA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON, 480 LINCOLN DR, MADISON, WI-53706, USA
E-mail address: `rsrivastava9@wisc.edu`