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Abstract

For a wide family of even kernels \{\varphi_u, u \in I\}, we describe discrete sets \Lambda such that every bandlimited signal \(f\) can be reconstructed from the space-time samples \{(f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda, u \in I\}.
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1 Introduction

The classical sampling problem asks when a continuous signal (function) \(f\) can be reconstructed from its discrete samples \(f(\lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda\). In the dynamical sampling problem, the set of space samples is replaced by a set of space-time samples (see e.g. [1], [2], [3], [5] and references therein). An interesting case is the problem of reconstruction of a bandlimited signal \(f\) from the space-time samples of its states \(f \ast \varphi_u\) resulting from the convolution with a kernel \(\varphi_u\). An important example (see [3] and [4]) is the Gaussian kernel \(\varphi_u(x) = \exp(-ux^2)\), which arises from the diffusion process. More generally, the kernel

\[
\varphi_u(x) = \exp(-u|x|^\alpha), \quad \alpha > 0,
\]

arises from the fractional diffusion equation.

Denote by \(PW_\sigma\) the Paley–Wiener space

\[
PW_\sigma := \{f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) : \text{supp}(\hat{f}) \subseteq [-\sigma, \sigma]\},
\]

where \(\hat{f}\) denotes the Fourier transform

\[
\hat{f}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-itx} f(x) \, dx.
\]

A set \(\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}\) is called uniformly discrete (u.d.) if

\[
\delta(\Lambda) := \inf_{\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda, \lambda \neq \lambda'} |\lambda - \lambda'| > 0.
\]

The following problem is considered in [3]: Given a u.d. set \(\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}\) and a kernel \{\varphi_u, u \in I\}, where \(I\) is an interval. What are the conditions that allow one to recover a function \(f \in PW_\sigma\) in a stable way from the data set

\[
\{(f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda, u \in I\}?
\]
In what follows, we denote by $\Phi_u$ the Fourier transform of $\varphi_u$ and assume that the functions $\varphi_u(x)$ and $\Phi_u(t)$ are continuous functions of $(x, u)$ and $(t, u)$, respectively.

It is remarked in [3], that the property of stable recovery formulated above is equivalent to the existence of two constants $A, B$ such that

$$A \|f\|_2^2 \leq \int_I \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |(f * \varphi_u)(\lambda)|^2 \, du \leq B \|f\|_2^2, \quad \forall f \in PW_\sigma. \quad (4)$$

It often happens in the sampling theory that inequalities similar to the one in the right hand-side of (4) are not difficult to check. It is also the case here, it suffices to assume the uniform boundedness of the $L^1(\mathbb{R})$-norms $\|\varphi_u\|_1$:

**Proposition 1** Assume

$$\sup_{u \in I} \|\varphi_u\|_1 < \infty. \quad (5)$$

Then for every $\sigma > 0$ and every u.d. set $\Lambda$ there is a constant $B$ such that

$$\int_I \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |(f * \varphi_u)(\lambda)|^2 \, du \leq B \|f\|_2^2, \quad \forall f \in PW_\sigma.$$  

We present a simple proof in Section 3. Hence, the main difficulty lies in proving the left hand-side inequality.

Recall that the classical Shannon sampling theorem states that every $f \in PW_\sigma$ admits a stable recovery from the uniform space samples $f(k/a)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, if and only if $a \geq \sigma/\pi$. The critical value $a = \sigma/\pi$ is called the Nyquist rate. Since the space-time samples (3) produce “more information” compared to the space samples, one may expect that every $f \in PW_\sigma$ can be recovered from the space-time uniform samples at sub-Nyquist spatial density. However, it is not the case, as shown in [4] for the convolution with the Gaussian kernel. On the other hand, it is proved in [3] that uniform dynamical samples at sub-Nyquist spatial rate allow one to stably reconstruct the Fourier transform $\hat{f}$ away from certain, explicitly described blind spots.

It is well-known that the nonuniform sampling is sometimes more efficient than the uniform one. For example, this is so for the universal sampling, see e.g. [6], Lecture 6. It is also the case for the problem above: For a wide class of even kernels, we show that data (3) always allows stable reconstruction, provided $\Lambda$ is any relatively dense set “different” from an arithmetic progression.

To state precisely our main result, we need the following definition: Given a u.d. set $\Lambda$, the collection of sets $W(\Lambda)$ is defined as all weak limits of the translates $\Lambda - x_k$, where $x_k$ is any bounded or unbounded sequence of real numbers (for the definition of weak limit see e.g. Lecture 3.4.1 in [6]).

Consider the following condition:

$(\alpha)$ $W(\Lambda)$ does not contain the empty set, and no element $\Lambda^* \in W(\Lambda)$ lies in an arithmetic progression.

The first property in $(\alpha)$ means that $\Lambda$ is relatively dense, i.e. there exists $r > 0$ such that every interval $(x, x + r)$ contains at least one point of $\Lambda$. It follows that every element $\Lambda^* \in W(\Lambda)$ is also a relatively dense set.

The second condition in $(\alpha)$ means that no $\Lambda^* \in W(\Lambda)$ is a subset of $b + (1/a)\mathbb{Z}$, for some $a > 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let us now define a collection of kernels $\mathcal{C}$: A kernel $\{\varphi_u, u \in I\}$, where $I$ is an interval, belongs to $\mathcal{C}$ if it satisfies the following five conditions:
(β) There is a constant \( C \) such that
\[
\sup_{u \in I} |\varphi_u(x)| \leq \frac{C}{1 + x^4}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}; \quad (6)
\]

(γ) There is a constant \( C \) such that
\[
\|\varphi_u' - \varphi_u\|_1 \leq C|u - u'|, \quad u, u' \in I; \quad (7)
\]

(ζ) Every \( \varphi_u \) is real and even: \( \varphi_u(x) \in \mathbb{R}, \varphi_u(-x) = \varphi_u(x), x \in \mathbb{R}, u \in I; \)

(η) \( \sup_{u \in I} |\Phi_u(t)| > 0 \) for every \( t \in \mathbb{R}; \)

(θ) For every \( w \in \mathbb{C} \) and every \( \sigma > 0 \), the family \( \{\Phi_u''(t) + w\Phi_u(t), u \in I\} \) forms a complete set in \( L^2(0, \sigma) \).

Clearly, condition [β] implies that the derivatives \( \Phi_u''(t), u \in I, \) are continuous and uniformly bounded. Condition (ζ) implies that the functions \( \Phi_u \) are real and even.

One may easily check that \( C \) contains the kernels defined in (1), where \( I = (a, b) \) is any interval such that \( 0 < a < b < \infty \).

Our main result is as follows:

**Theorem 1** Given a u.d. set \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R} \) and a kernel \( \{\varphi_u, u \in I\} \in C \). The following conditions are equivalent:

(a) The left inequality in (4) is true for every \( \sigma > 0 \) and some \( A = A(\sigma); \)

(b) \( \Lambda \) satisfies condition (α).

2 Space–Time Sampling in Bernstein Spaces

The aim of this section is to prove a variant of Theorem 1 for the Bernstein space \( B_\sigma \).

It is well-known that every function \( f \in PW_\sigma \) admits an analytic continuation to the complex plane and satisfies
\[
|f(x + iy)| \leq C e^{\sigma|y|}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}; \quad (8)
\]
where \( C \) depends only on \( f \).

The Bernstein space \( B_\sigma \) is defined as the set of entire functions \( f \) satisfying (8) with some \( C \) depending only on \( f \). An equivalent definition is that \( B_\sigma \) consists of the bounded continuous functions that are the inverse Fourier transforms of tempered distributions supported by \( [-\sigma, \sigma] \).

Denote by \( C_0 \) the collection of kernels \( \{\varphi_u, u \in I\} \) satisfying the properties (β)-(η) in the definition of \( C \) above. However, we do not require \( I \) to be an interval. In particular, it can be a countable set.

**Theorem 2** Given a u.d. set \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R} \) and a kernel \( \{\varphi_u, u \in I\} \in C_0 \). The following conditions are equivalent:

(a) For every \( \sigma > 0 \) there is a constant \( K = K(\sigma) \) such that
\[
\|f\|_\infty \leq K \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda, u \in I} |(f * \varphi_u)(\lambda)|, \quad \forall f \in B_\sigma; \quad (9)
\]

(b) \( \Lambda \) satisfies condition (α).

To prove this theorem we need a lemma:
Lemma 1 Assume \( f \in B_\sigma \) and \( \{ \varphi_u, u \in I \} \in \mathcal{C}_0 \). If \( (f \ast \varphi_u)(0) = 0, u \in I, \) then \( f \) is odd, \( f(-x) = -f(x), x \in \mathbb{R}. \)

Proof. 1. Given a function \( f \in B_\sigma \), set

\[
f_r(z) := \frac{f(z) + f(\bar{z})}{2}, \quad f_i(z) := \frac{f(z) - f(\bar{z})}{2i}.
\]

Then \( f_r, f_i \) are real (on \( \mathbb{R} \)) entire functions satisfying \( f = f_r + if_i \). It is clear that both \( f_r \) and \( f_i \) satisfy (5), so that they both lie in \( B_\sigma \). Hence, since every \( \varphi_u \) is real, it suffices to prove the lemma for the real functions \( f \in B_\sigma \).

2. Let us assume that \( f \in B_\sigma \) is real. Write

\[
f_e(x) := \frac{f(z) + f(-z)}{2}, \quad f_o(x) := \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2}.
\]

Clearly, \( f_o \in B_\sigma \) is even, \( f_e \in B_\sigma \) is odd and \( f = f_e + f_o \). Since \( \varphi_u \) is even, we have \( (f_o \ast \varphi_u)(0) = 0, u \in I \). Hence, to prove Lemma 1, it suffices to check that if a real even function \( f \in B_\sigma \) satisfies \( (f \ast \varphi_u)(0) = 0, u \in I, \) then \( f = 0 \).

3. Let us assume that \( f \in B_\sigma \) is real, even and satisfies \( (f \ast \varphi_u)(0) = 0, u \in I \). If \( f \) does not vanish in \( \mathbb{C} \) then \( f(z) = e^{iaz} \) for some \(-\sigma \leq a \leq \sigma\), which implies \( a = 0, f(z) \equiv 1 \). Then \( (f \ast \varphi_u)(0) = \Phi_u(0) = 0, u \in I, \) which contradicts condition (\( \eta \)). Hence, \( f(w) = 0 \) for some \( w \in \mathbb{C} \). It follows that \( f(-w) = 0 \). Set

\[
g(z) := \frac{f(z)}{z^2 - w^2}.
\]

Denote by \( G \) the Fourier transform of \( g \). Then \( G \) is continuous, even and vanishes outside \((-\sigma, \sigma)\). Now, condition \( (f \ast \varphi_u)(0) \), \( u \in I \), implies:

\[
0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_u(s)f(s) \, ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (s^2 - w^2) \varphi_u(s) g(s) \, ds =
\]

\[
- \int_{-\sigma}^{\sigma} (\Phi_u''(t) + w^2 \Phi_u(t))G(t) \, dt = -2 \int_{0}^{\sigma} (\Phi_u''(t) + w^2 \Phi_u(t))G(t) \, dt.
\]

Using property (\( \theta \)), we conclude that \( G = 0 \) and so \( f = 0 \).

2.1 Proof of Theorem 2

We denote by \( C \) different positive constants.

1. Suppose \( W(\Lambda) \) contains an empty set. It means that \( \Lambda \) contains arbitrarily long gaps: For every \( \rho > 0 \) there exists \( x_\rho \) such that \( \Lambda \cap (x_\rho - 2\rho, x_\rho + 2\rho) = \emptyset \). Set

\[
f_\rho(x) := \frac{\sin(\sigma(x - x_\rho))}{\sigma(x - x_\rho)} \in B_\sigma.
\]

Then \( ||f_\rho||_\infty = 1 \). Using (\( \beta \)), for all \( x \) such that \( |x - x_\rho| \geq 2\rho \), we have

\[
|(f_\rho \ast \varphi_u)(x)| \leq \int_{|s| > \frac{|x - x_\rho|}{2}} \frac{2}{\sigma|x - x_\rho|} |\varphi_u(s)| \, ds + \\
\int_{|s| > \frac{|x - x_\rho|}{2}} |\varphi_u(s)| \, ds \leq \frac{C}{|x - x_\rho|}.
\]

(11)
and so the first term in the right hand-side of (14) is less than \( \pi \epsilon \).

2. Suppose \( \Lambda^* \subset b + (1/a)\mathbb{Z} \) for some \( \Lambda^* \in W(\Lambda), b \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( a > 0 \). Since \( \Lambda^* - b \in W(\Lambda) \), we may assume that \( b = 0 \).

Consider two cases: First, let us assume that \( \Lambda \subset (1/a)\mathbb{Z} \). Clearly, the function \( f(z) := \sin(\pi az) \in B_\sigma \). Since every function \( \varphi_u \) is even while \( f \) is odd, one may easily check that \( (f * \varphi_u)(k/a) = 0, k \in \mathbb{Z} \), so that (13) is not true.

Now, assume that \( \Lambda^* \subset (1/a)\mathbb{Z} \), for some \( \Lambda^* \in W(\Lambda) \). This means that for every small \( \epsilon > 0 \) and large \( R > 0 \) there is a point \( v = v(\epsilon, R) \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \((\Lambda - v) \cap (-R, R)\) is close to a subset of \((1/a)\mathbb{Z}\) in the sense that for every \( \lambda \in \Lambda \cap (v - R, v + R) \) there exists \( k(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z} \) with

\[
|\lambda - v - k(\lambda)/a| \leq \epsilon, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda \cap (v - R, v + R).
\]

For simplicity of presentation, we assume that \( v = 0, a = 1, \) and that

\[
\Lambda \cap (-R, R) = \{ \lambda_k : |k| \leq m \}, \quad |\lambda_k - k| \leq \epsilon, \quad m = [R], \quad |k| \leq m.
\]  

(12)

The proof of the general case is similar.

Fix \( \epsilon := 1/\sqrt{R} \). Set

\[
f(x) := \sin(\pi x) \frac{\sin(\epsilon x)}{\epsilon x} \in B_{x+\epsilon},
\]

and

\[
f_k(x) := \sin(\pi x) \frac{\sin(\epsilon \lambda_k)}{\epsilon \lambda_k}.
\]

Then

\[
|f(\lambda_k - s) - (-1)^{k+1} f_k(s)| \leq \left| \sin(\pi (\lambda_k - s)) - \sin(\pi (k - s)) \right| \frac{\sin(\epsilon \lambda_k - s)}{\epsilon (\lambda_k - s)} + \left| \sin(\pi s) \left( \frac{\sin(\epsilon \lambda_k - s)}{\epsilon (\lambda_k - s)} - \frac{\sin(\epsilon \lambda_k)}{\epsilon \lambda_k} \right) \right|.
\]

(14)

By (12),

\[
|\sin(\pi (\lambda_k - s)) - \sin(\pi (k - s))| \leq \pi \epsilon, \quad s \in \mathbb{R},
\]

and so the first term in the right hand-side of (14) is less than \( \pi \epsilon \) for every \( s \in \mathbb{R} \). To estimate the second term in (14), we use the classical Bernstein’s inequality (see e.g. [6], Lecture 2.10):

\[
\left| \frac{\sin(\epsilon \lambda_k - s)}{\epsilon (\lambda_k - s)} - \frac{\sin(\epsilon \lambda_k)}{\epsilon \lambda_k} \right| = \left| \int_0^s \left( \frac{\sin(\epsilon (\lambda_k - u))}{\epsilon (\lambda_k - u)} \right)' \, du \right| \leq |s| \left\| \left( \frac{\sin(\epsilon s)}{\epsilon s} \right)' \right\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon |s|.
\]

Therefore,

\[
|f(\lambda_k - s) - (-1)^{k+1} f_k(s)| \leq \pi \epsilon (1 + |s|), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.
\]

Observe that

\[
(f * \varphi_u)(\lambda_k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (f(\lambda_k - s) - (-1)^{k+1} f_k(s)) \varphi(u(s)) \, ds + (-1)^{k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_k(s) \varphi_u(s) \, ds.
\]

Since \( f_k \) is odd, the last integral is equal to zero. It follows that for every \( |k| \leq m \) we have

\[
|(f * \varphi_u)(\lambda_k)| \leq \pi \epsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + |s|) |\varphi_u(s)| \, ds, \quad u \in I.
\]
Hence, using (6) we conclude that
\[ |(f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)| \leq C\epsilon, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda \cap (-R, R), \quad u \in I. \]

On the other hand, for all \( \lambda \in \Lambda, |\lambda| \geq R \) and \(|s| < 1/\epsilon = \sqrt{R}\), we get
\[ |f(\lambda - s)| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon|\lambda - s|} \leq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{R - \sqrt{R}} < 2\epsilon, \]
provided \( R \) is sufficiently large. This and (6) imply
\[ |(f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)| \leq 2\epsilon \int_{|s| < \sqrt{R}} |\varphi_u(s)| \, ds + \int_{|s| > \sqrt{R}} |\varphi_u(s)| \, ds \leq C\epsilon, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda, |\lambda| \geq R, u \in I. \]

Since \( \epsilon \) can be chosen arbitrarily small, we conclude that (4) is not true.

3. Assume condition (a) holds. We have to show that for every \( \sigma > 0 \) there is a constant \( K = K(\sigma) \) such that (9) is true. Assume this is not so. It means that there exists \( \sigma > 0 \) and a sequence of functions \( f_n \in B_\sigma \) satisfying
\[ \|f_n\|_\infty = 1, \quad \sup_{u \in I, \lambda \in \Lambda} |(f_n \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)| \leq 1/n. \]

Choose points \( x_n \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( |f_n(x_n)| > 1 - 1/n \), and set \( g_n(x) := f_n(x + x_n) \). It follows from the compactness property of Bernstein spaces (see e.g. [6], Lecture 2.8.3), that there is a subsequence \( n_k \) such that \( g_{n_k} \) converge (uniformly on compacts in \( \mathbb{C} \)) to some non-zero function \( g \in B_\sigma \). We may also assume (by taking if necessary a subsequence of \( n_k \)) that the translates \( \Lambda - x_{n_k} \) converge weakly to some \( \Gamma \in W(\Lambda) \). By property (a), \( \Gamma \) is an infinite set which is not a subset of any arithmetic progression.

Clearly, we have
\[ (g \ast \varphi_u)(\gamma) = 0, \quad u \in I, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma. \]
By Lemma 1 we see that every function \( g(x - \gamma), \gamma \in \Gamma \), is odd. Clearly, this implies that \( g \) is a periodic function and \( \Gamma \) is a subset of an arithmetic progression whose difference is a half-integer multiple of the period of \( g \). Contradiction.

3 Space–Time Sampling in Paley-Wiener Spaces

Throughout this section we denote by \( C \) different positive constants.

In what follows we assume that \( I \) is an interval. We denote by \( C \) different positive constants.

The following statement easily follows from (4) and (8):

**Corollary 1** Assume condition (4) holds for some kernel \( \{\varphi_u\} \) satisfying (4), a u.d. set \( \Lambda \) and \( \sigma > 0 \). Then there is a constant \( K' = K'(\sigma) \) such that
\[ \|f\|_\infty^2 \leq K' \int I \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |(f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)|^2 \, du, \quad \forall f \in B_\sigma. \]

We skip the simple proof.
3.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Take any function \( f \in PW_\sigma \) and denote by \( F \) its Fourier transform. It follows from (5) that \( \| \Phi u \|_\infty \leq C, u \in I \). Hence, the functions \( F \cdot \Phi u \in L^2(-\sigma, \sigma) \) and

\[
\| f \ast \varphi_u \|_2 = \| F \cdot \Phi u \|_2 \leq \| \Phi u \|_\infty \| F \|_2 \leq C \| f \|_2.
\]

Clearly, \( f \ast \varphi_u \in PW_\sigma \), for every \( u \). Using Bessel’s inequality (see e.g. Proposition 2.7 in [6]), we get

\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |(f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)|^2 \leq C \| f \ast \varphi_u \|_2^2 \leq C \| f \|_2^2, \quad u \in I,
\]

which proves Proposition 1.

3.2 Connection between space–time sampling in \( B_\sigma \) and \( PW_\sigma \)

Observe that if \( \Lambda \) is a sampling set (in the ‘classical sense’) for the Paley-Wiener space \( PW_\sigma' \), then it is a sampling set for the Bernstein spaces \( B_\sigma \) with a ‘smaller’ spectrum \( \sigma < \sigma' \), and vice versa (see Theorem 3.32 in [6]). We provide a corresponding statement for the space-time sampling problem.

For the reader’s convenience, we recall the main inequalities:

\[
\| f \|_2^2 \leq D \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |(f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)|^2 \, du, \quad (15)
\]

\[
\| f \|_\infty \leq K \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda, u \in I} |(f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)|. \quad (16)
\]

**Theorem 3** Let \( \Lambda \) be a u.d. set, a kernel \( \{ \varphi_u \} \) satisfy (6) and (7) and \( \sigma' > \sigma > 0 \).

(i) Assume that (16) holds with some constant \( K \) for all \( f \in B_\sigma' \). Then there is a constant \( D \) such that (15) is true for every \( f \in PW_\sigma \).

(ii) Assume that (15) holds with some constant \( D \) for all \( f \in PW_\sigma' \). Then there is a constant \( K \) such that (16) is true for every \( f \in B_\sigma \).

**Proof.** The proof is somewhat similar to the proof of Theorem 3.32 in [6], but is more technical.

(i) Assume that (16) holds for every \( f \in B_\sigma' \). Fix any positive number \( \varepsilon \) satisfying

\[
\sigma + \varepsilon \leq \sigma'. \quad (17)
\]

Set

\[
h_\varepsilon(x) := \frac{\sin \varepsilon x}{\varepsilon x}, \quad \varepsilon > 0. \quad (18)
\]

It is easy to check that

\[
h_\varepsilon(0) = 1, \quad \| h_\varepsilon \|_2^2 = \frac{C}{\varepsilon}, \quad \| h'_\varepsilon \|_2^2 = C \varepsilon. \quad (19)
\]

For every \( f \in PW_\sigma \), we have

\[
\| f \|_2^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x)|^2 \, dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |h_\varepsilon(x - s) f(s)|^2 \, dx.
\]
Note that $h_\varepsilon(x-s)f(s) \in PW_{\sigma+\varepsilon} \subset B_{\sigma'}$. By Corollary 1, for every $x$ and $s$,

$$|h_\varepsilon(x-s)f(s)|^2 \leq C \int \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \int \varphi_u(\lambda-s)h_\varepsilon(x-s)f(s) \, ds \right|^2 \, du \leq$$

$$C \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \int \varphi_u(\lambda-s)h_\varepsilon(x-s)f(s) \, ds \right|^2 \, du.$$ 

Write

$$J = J_u(x, \lambda) := \left| \int \varphi_u(\lambda-s)h_\varepsilon(x-s)f(s) \, ds \right|^2.$$ 

Then

$$\|f\|^2 \leq C \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int J \, dudx. \quad (20)$$

Clearly,

$$J \leq 2(J_1 + J_2),$$

where

$$J_1 := \left| \int \varphi_u(\lambda-s)h_\varepsilon(x-\lambda)f(s) \, ds \right|^2 = |h_\varepsilon(x-\lambda)|^2 |f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)|^2,$$

and using property (6) and the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, we have

$$J_2 := \left| \int \varphi_u(\lambda-s)(h_\varepsilon(x-s) - h_\varepsilon(x-\lambda))f(s) \, ds \right|^2 \leq$$

$$\int |\varphi_u(s-\lambda)| \, ds \int |\varphi_u(\lambda-s)||h_\varepsilon(x-s) - h_\varepsilon(x-\lambda)|^2 |f(s)|^2 \, ds \leq$$

$$C \int |\varphi_u(\lambda-s)||h_\varepsilon(x-s) - h_\varepsilon(x-\lambda)|^2 |f(s)|^2 \, ds.$$

Observe that

$$|h_\varepsilon(x-s) - h_\varepsilon(x-\lambda)|^2 = \left| \lambda \int_s^\lambda h_\varepsilon'(x-v) \, dv \right|^2 \leq |s-\lambda| \int_s^\lambda |h_\varepsilon'(x-v)|^2 \, dv.$$

Hence,

$$J_2 \leq C \int |\varphi_u(\lambda-s)||s-\lambda| \left( \int_s^\lambda |h_\varepsilon'(x-v)|^2 \, dv \right) |f(s)|^2 \, ds.$$ 

Using (6), we have

$$\int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int J_1 \, dudx = \int |h_\varepsilon(x-s)|^2 \, dx \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int |f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)|^2 \, du \leq$$
\[ \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int (f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda)^2 du. \]

To estimate the second sum we switch the order of integration and apply (19):

\[ \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} J_2 \, du \, dx \leq \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \varphi_u(\lambda - s) \right| \left| f(s) \right|^2 \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |h(x - v)|^2 \, dv \, dx \right) \, du \, ds \leq C \varepsilon \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \varphi_u(\lambda - s) \right| \left| f(s) \right|^2 \, du \, ds. \]

Now, by (6) we get

\[ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \varphi_u(\lambda - s) \right| \left| f(s) \right|^2 \leq C \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left( \lambda - s \right)^2 1 + \left( \lambda - s \right)^4 < C, \quad u \in I, s \in \mathbb{R}. \]

where the second inequality holds since \( \Lambda \) is a u.d. set (see definition in (2)). Hence,

\[ \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} J_2 \, du \, dx \leq C \varepsilon \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| f \right|^2. \]

where \( |I| \) is the length of \( I \).

Combining this with the estimate for \( J_1 \) and using (20), we conclude that

\[ \|f\|^2_2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int \left| (f \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda) \right|^2 du + C \varepsilon \|f\|^2_2. \]

Choosing \( \varepsilon \) small enough, we obtain (15).

(ii) Assume (15) holds with some constant \( D \) for all \( f \in PW_{\sigma'} \).

We will argue by contradiction. Assume that there is no constant \( K \) such that (16) holds for every \( f \in B_{\sigma} \). This means that there exist \( g_j \in B_{\sigma} \) such that

\[ \sup_{u \in I \lambda \in \Lambda} \left| (g_j \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda) \right| < \frac{1}{j}, \]

and for some points \( x_j \) we have \( |g_j(x_j)| \geq 1/2 \).

Assume \( \varepsilon > 0 \) satisfies (17) and let \( h_\varepsilon \) be defined by formula (18). Set

\[ f_j(x) := g_j(x) h_\varepsilon(x - x_j). \]

It is clear that for every \( j \) we have \( f_j \in PW_{\sigma'} \), \( \|f_j\|_\infty \leq 1 \), and that \( |f_j(x_j)| \geq 1/2 \).

The last two inequalities and the Bernstein’s inequality imply that there is a constant \( K' > 0 \) such that

\[ \|f_j\|^2 \geq K', \quad j \in \mathbb{N}. \]

By (19), we get

\[ \|f_j\|^2 \leq C \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| (f_j \ast \varphi_u)(\lambda) \right|^2 du = C \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} g_j(x) \varphi_u(\lambda - x) h_\varepsilon(x - x_j) \, dx \right|^2 du. \]
This gives
\[ \|f_j\|_2^2 \leq C(\tilde{J}_1 + \tilde{J}_2), \]  
(23)
where \( \tilde{J}_1 \) and \( \tilde{J}_2 \) are defined as follows:

\[
\tilde{J}_1 := \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \int g_j(x) \varphi_u(\lambda - x) (h_\varepsilon(x - x_j) - h_\varepsilon(\lambda - x_j)) \, dx \right|^2 \, du.
\]

\[
\tilde{J}_2 := \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \int g_j(x) \varphi_u(\lambda - x) h_\varepsilon(\lambda - x_j) \, dx \right|^2 \, du.
\]

By Bessel’s inequality (see, e.g. [4], Proposition 2.7) and (19),
\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |h_\varepsilon(\lambda - s)|^2 \leq C \|h_\varepsilon\|_2^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}.
\]

Therefore, using (21) we arrive at
\[
\tilde{J}_2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} |I|.
\]

Let us now estimate \( \tilde{J}_1 \). Recall that \( \|g_j\|_\infty = 1 \). Using the change of variables \( x = t + \lambda \), we get
\[
\tilde{J}_1 \leq \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_u(-t) \int_0^t h'_\varepsilon(s + \lambda - x_j) \, ds \, dt \right)^2 \, du.
\]

Now, use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality:
\[
\tilde{J}_1 \leq \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \varphi_u(t) \right|^2 (1 + t^2)^2 \, dt \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| h'_\varepsilon(s + \lambda - x_j) \right|^2 \, ds \, dt \, du.
\]

Using again the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and condition (3), we arrive at
\[
\tilde{J}_1 \leq C \int \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|I|}{(1 + t^2)^2} \left( \int_0^t |h'_\varepsilon(s + \lambda - x_j)|^2 \, ds \right) \, dt \, du.
\]

Finally, Bessel’s inequality yields
\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |h'_\varepsilon(s + \lambda - x_j)|^2 \leq C \|h_\varepsilon\|_2^2 \leq C \varepsilon,
\]
and we conclude that
\[
\tilde{J}_1 \leq C |I| \varepsilon.
\]

We now insert the estimate for \( \tilde{J}_1, \tilde{J}_2 \) in (23) and use (22) to get the estimate
\[
(K^\prime)^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon j^2} + C |I| \varepsilon.
\]

Choosing \( \varepsilon \) sufficiently small, we arrive at contradiction for all large enough \( j \).
3.3 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof easily follows from Theorems 2 and 3. Assume that the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold.

(i) Assume that \( \Lambda \) satisfies condition (\( \alpha \)). Then by Theorem 2, for every \( \sigma > 0 \) there exists \( K = K(\sigma) \) such that inequality (9) is true. Applying Theorem 3, we see that there exists \( A = A(\sigma) > 0 \) the left hand-side inequality in (4) is also true for every \( \sigma > 0 \).

(ii) Assume that \( \Lambda \) does not satisfy condition (\( \alpha \)). Then by Theorem 2 there exists \( \sigma > 0 \) such that there is no constant \( K \) for which condition (9) is true. Applying Theorem 3 we see that for every positive \( \sigma' > \sigma \) there is no constant \( D \) such that inequality (15) holds for every \( f \in PW_{\sigma'} \).
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