

Sampling discretization of integral norms of the hyperbolic cross polynomials

V. Temlyakov

Abstract

The paper is devoted to discretization of integral norms of functions from a given finite dimensional subspace. We use recent general results on sampling discretization to derive a new Marcinkiewicz type discretization theorem for the multivariate trigonometric polynomials with frequencies from the hyperbolic crosses. It is shown that recently developed techniques allow us to improve the known results in this direction.

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d with the probability measure μ . By L_q , $1 \leq q < \infty$, norm we understand

$$\|f\|_q := \|f\|_{L_q(\Omega)} := \left(\int_{\Omega} |f|^q d\mu \right)^{1/q}.$$

By discretization of the L_q norm we understand a replacement of the measure μ by a discrete measure μ_m with support on a set $\xi = \{\xi^j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \Omega$. This means that integration with respect to measure μ is replaced by an appropriate cubature formula. Thus, integration is replaced by evaluation of a function f at a finite set ξ of points. This is why we call this way of discretization *sampling discretization*. Discretization is a very important step in making a continuous problem computationally feasible. The reader can find a corresponding discussion in a recent survey [4]. The first results in sampling discretization were obtained by Marcinkiewicz and by

Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund (see [29]) for discretization of the L_q norms of the univariate trigonometric polynomials in 1930s. We call discretization results of this kind the *Marcinkiewicz type theorems*. Recently, a substantial progress in sampling discretization has been made in [26], [27], [4], [13], [5], [6], [15]. To discretize the integral norms successfully, a new technique was introduced. This technique takes different forms in different papers but the common feature of its forms is the following. The new sampling discretization technique is a combination of probabilistic technique, in particular chaining technique, with results on the entropy numbers in the uniform norm (or its variants). Fundamental results from [2], [20], [17] were used. The reader can find results on chaining in [14], [23] and on the generic chaining in [20]. We note that the idea of chaining technique goes back to the 1930s, when it was suggested by A.N. Kolmogorov. Later, these type of results have been developed in the study of the central limit theorem in probability theory (see, for instance, [8]). Also, the reader can find general results on metric entropy in [16, Ch.15], [23, Ch.3], [28, Ch.7], [3], [19] and in the recent papers [25] and [9]. Bounds for the entropy numbers of function classes are important by themselves and also have important connections to other fundamental problems (see, for instance, [23, Ch.3] and [7, Ch.6]).

We now proceed to the detailed presentation.

Marcinkiewicz problem. Let Ω be a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d with the probability measure μ . We say that a linear subspace X_N (index N here, usually, stands for the dimension of X_N) of $L_q(\Omega)$, $1 \leq q < \infty$, admits the Marcinkiewicz type discretization theorem with parameters $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and q and positive constants $C_1 \leq C_2$ if there exist a set

$$\left\{ \xi^j \in \Omega : j = 1, \dots, m \right\}$$

such that for any $f \in X_N$ we have

$$C_1 \|f\|_q^q \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(\xi^j)|^q \leq C_2 \|f\|_q^q. \quad (1.1)$$

In the case $q = \infty$ we define L_∞ as the space of continuous functions on Ω and ask for

$$C_1 \|f\|_\infty \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |f(\xi^j)| \leq \|f\|_\infty. \quad (1.2)$$

We will also use the following brief way to express the above properties: the $\mathcal{M}(m, q)$ (more precisely the $\mathcal{M}(m, q, C_1, C_2)$) theorem holds for a subspace X_N , written $X_N \in \mathcal{M}(m, q)$ (more precisely $X_N \in \mathcal{M}(m, q, C_1, C_2)$).

Our main interest in this paper is to discuss the Marcinkiewicz problem in the case, when X_N is a subspace of the trigonometric polynomials with frequencies (harmonics) from a hyperbolic cross. By Q we denote a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^d , and $|Q|$ stands for the number of elements in Q . Let

$$\mathcal{T}(Q) := \left\{ f : f = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in Q} c_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})}, \quad c_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

For $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ define

$$\rho(\mathbf{s}) := \{ \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : [2^{s_j-1}] \leq |k_j| < 2^{s_j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d \}$$

where $[x]$ denotes the integer part of x . We define the step hyperbolic cross Q_n as follows

$$Q_n := \cup_{\mathbf{s}: \|\mathbf{s}\|_1 \leq n} \rho(\mathbf{s})$$

and the corresponding set of the hyperbolic cross polynomials as

$$\mathcal{T}(Q_n) := \{ f : f = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in Q_n} c_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})} \}.$$

In addition to the step hyperbolic cross Q_n we also consider a more general step hyperbolic cross Q_n^γ , where $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d)$ has the form $1 = \gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_\nu < \gamma_{\nu+1} \leq \dots \leq \gamma_d$ with $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $\nu \leq d$:

$$Q_n^\gamma := \cup_{\mathbf{s}: (\gamma, \mathbf{s}) \leq n} \rho(\mathbf{s}).$$

It is clear that in the case $\gamma = \mathbf{1} := (1, \dots, 1)$ we have $Q_n^\mathbf{1} = Q_n$. In this paper we are primarily interested in the Marcinkiewicz type discretization theorems for the hyperbolic cross trigonometric polynomials from $\mathcal{T}(Q_n^\gamma)$.

The most complete results on sampling discretization are obtained in the case $q = 2$. The problem is basically solved in the case of subspaces of trigonometric polynomials $\mathcal{T}(Q)$ with arbitrary Q . In [26] it was shown how to derive the following result from the recent paper by S. Nitzan, A. Olevskii, and A. Ulanovskii [18], which in turn is based on the paper of A. Marcus, D.A. Spielman, and N. Srivastava [17].

Theorem 1.1. *There are three positive absolute constants C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 with the following properties: For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $Q \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ there exists a set of $m \leq C_1|Q|$ points $\xi^j \in \mathbb{T}^d$, $j = 1, \dots, m$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$ we have*

$$C_2 \|f\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(\xi^j)|^2 \leq C_3 \|f\|_2^2.$$

In other words, there exist three positive absolute constants $C_1, C_2,$ and C_3 such that for any $Q \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have $\mathcal{T}(Q) \in \mathcal{M}(m, 2, C_2, C_3)$ provided $m \geq C_1|Q|$. We now restrict ourselves to the case $q \in [1, \infty), q \neq 2$ and $Q = Q_n^\gamma$. In this paper we provide some bounds on m , which guarantee that $\mathcal{T}(Q_n^\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q)$. The following Theorem 1.2 is the main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.2. *For $q \in [1, \infty)$, and γ , where $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d)$ has the form $1 = \gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_\nu < \gamma_{\nu+1} \leq \dots \leq \gamma_d$ with $\nu \in \mathbb{N}, \nu \leq d$, there are three positive constants $C_i = C_i(q, \gamma), i = 1, 2, 3$, such that we have*

$$\mathcal{T}(Q_n^\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q, C_2, C_3) \quad \text{provided} \quad m \geq C_1|Q_n^\gamma|n^{w(\nu, q)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w(\nu, 1) &= 3; & w(\nu, q) &= 2, & q &\in (1, 2]; \\ w(\nu, q) &= (\nu - 1)(q - 2) + \min(q, 3), & q &> 2. \end{aligned}$$

We point out that in case $\nu = 1$ the exponent of the extra factor in the bound for m does not grow with q : $w(1, q) \leq 3$. Theorem 1.2 improves the corresponding result of E.S. Belinsky [1]. In [1] there is the following condition on the number of sampling points $m \geq C_1|Q_n^\gamma|n^{\max((d-1)(q-2), 0)+4}$. Theorem 1.2 improves the bound from [1] for all $q \in [1, \infty)$. We note that in the case $q = 2$ Theorem 1.1 provides a stronger than Theorem 1.2 result. In the case $q \in [1, 3]$ Theorem 1.2 follows from known general results. A new bound proved in this paper corresponds to the case $q \in (3, \infty)$. We present this proof in Section 2. In Section 3 we discuss entropy numbers of the L_q unit balls of $\mathcal{T}(Q_n^\gamma)$ in the uniform norm. Finally, in Section 4 we discuss extension of Theorem 1.2 to the case of arbitrary $Q \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Theorem 1.2 does not cover the case $q = \infty$. It is known that the sampling discretization results in case $q = \infty$ are fundamentally different from those in case $q \in [1, \infty)$. Theorem 1.2 shows that for all $q \in [1, \infty)$ condition $m \geq C(q, d)|Q_n|n^{w(d, q)}$ is sufficient for $\mathcal{T}(Q_n) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q)$. An extra factor $n^{w(d, q)}$ is a logarithmic in terms of $|Q_n|$ factor. A nontrivial surprising negative result was proved for $q = \infty$ (see [10], [11], [12], and, also, [28], p.344, Theorem 7.5.17). The authors proved that the necessary condition for $\mathcal{T}(Q_n) \in \mathcal{M}(m, \infty)$ is $m \geq C|Q_n|^{1+c}$ with absolute constants $C, c > 0$. We do not present new results for the case $q = \infty$ in this paper. The reader can find further results and discussions of the case $q = \infty$ in [4] and [13].

There are many open problems in sampling discretization (see [4]). We now formulate one directly related to Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Open problem 1. Is it true that for $q \in [1, \infty)$, $q \neq 2$, and γ there are three positive constants $C_i = C_i(q, \gamma)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that we have

$$\mathcal{T}(Q_n^\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q, C_2, C_3) \quad \text{provided} \quad m \geq C_1 |Q_n^\gamma|.$$

Throughout the paper letter C denotes a positive constant, which may be different in different formulas. Notation $C(q, d)$ means that the constant C may depend on parameters q and d . Sometimes it will be convenient for us to use the following notation. For two sequences $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\{b_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ we write $a_k \asymp b_k$ if there are two positive constants C_1 and C_2 independent of k such that $C_1 a_k \leq b_k \leq C_2 a_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$

2 General results and proof of Theorem 1.2

We begin with a simple remark on a connection between real and complex cases. Usually, general results are proved for real subspaces X_N . Suppose that a complex subspace has a form

$$\mathcal{C}_N = \{f = f_R + if_I, \quad f_R, f_I \in X_N\},$$

where X_N is a real subspace.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $q \in [1, \infty)$. Suppose $X_N \in \mathcal{M}(m, q, C_2, C_3)$. Then $\mathcal{C}_N \in \mathcal{M}(m, q, C_2 2^{-q-1}, C_3 2^{q+1})$.*

Proof. Using a simple inequality for a complex number $z = x + iy$

$$\max(|x|, |y|) \leq |z| \leq |x| + |y|$$

we obtain the following inequalities. Let $\xi = \{\xi^j\}_{j=1}^m$ be such that for all $g \in X_N$

$$C_2 \|g\|_q^q \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |g(\xi^j)|^q \leq C_3 \|g\|_q^q. \quad (2.1)$$

Denote

$$g_\xi := (g(\xi^1), \dots, g(\xi^m)), \quad f_{R,\xi} := (f_R)_\xi, \quad f_{I,\xi} := (f_I)_\xi$$

and

$$\|g_\xi\|_{\ell_{q,m}}^q := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |g(\xi^j)|^q.$$

Then for $f \in \mathcal{C}_N$ we obtain

$$\|f\|_q^q \leq 2^q (\|f_R\|_q^q + \|f_I\|_q^q) \leq 2^q C_2^{-1} (\|f_{R,\xi}\|_{\ell_{q,m}}^q + \|f_{I,\xi}\|_{\ell_{q,m}}^q) \leq 2^{q+1} C_2^{-1} \|f_\xi\|_{\ell_{q,m}}^q.$$

and

$$\|f_\xi\|_{\ell_{q,m}}^q \leq 2^q (\|f_{R,\xi}\|_{\ell_{q,m}}^q + \|f_{I,\xi}\|_{\ell_{q,m}}^q) \leq 2^q C_3 (\|f_R\|_q^q + \|f_I\|_q^q) \leq 2^{q+1} C_3 \|f\|_q^q.$$

This proves Proposition 2.1. \square

Thus, it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.2 for the subspace $\mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma)$ of real trigonometric polynomials from $\mathcal{T}(Q_n^\gamma)$. Our proof is based on conditional theorems. We now formulate the known conditional theorems.

We begin with the definition of the entropy numbers. Let X be a Banach space and let B_X denote the unit ball of X with the center at 0. Denote by $B_X(y, r)$ a ball with center y and radius r : $\{x \in X : \|x - y\| \leq r\}$. For a compact set A and a positive number ε we define the covering number $N_\varepsilon(A)$ as follows

$$N_\varepsilon(A) := N_\varepsilon(A, X) := \min\{n : \exists y^1, \dots, y^n, y^j \in A : A \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^n B_X(y^j, \varepsilon)\}.$$

It is convenient to consider along with the entropy $H_\varepsilon(A, X) := \log_2 N_\varepsilon(A, X)$ the entropy numbers $\varepsilon_k(A, X)$:

$$\varepsilon_k(A, X) := \inf\{\varepsilon : \exists y^1, \dots, y^{2^k} \in A : A \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^{2^k} B_X(y^j, \varepsilon)\}.$$

In our definition of $N_\varepsilon(A)$ and $\varepsilon_k(A, X)$ we require $y^j \in A$. In a standard definition of $N_\varepsilon(A)$ and $\varepsilon_k(A, X)$ this restriction is not imposed. However, it is well known (see [23], p.208) that these characteristics may differ at most by a factor 2. Throughout the paper we use the following notation for the unit L_q ball of X_N

$$X_N^q := \{f \in X_N : \|f\|_q \leq 1\}.$$

The first conditional theorem in the sampling discretization was proved in [27] in the case $q = 1$.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that a subspace X_N satisfies the condition ($B \geq 1$)*

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^1, L_\infty) \leq B \begin{cases} N/k, & k \leq N, \\ 2^{-k/N}, & k \geq N. \end{cases}$$

Then for large enough absolute constant C there exists a set of

$$m \leq CNB(\log_2(2N \log_2(8B)))^2$$

points $\xi^j \in \Omega$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, such that for any $f \in X_N$ we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\|f\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(\xi^j)| \leq \frac{3}{2}\|f\|_1.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1 in [27] is based on the concentration measure result from [2] (see Lemma 2.1 in [27]) and on the elementary chaining type technique from [14] (see also [23], Ch.4). Theorem 2.1 was extended to the case $q \in [1, \infty)$ in [5].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $1 \leq q < \infty$. Suppose that a subspace X_N satisfies the condition*

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty) \leq B(N/k)^{1/q}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N, \quad (2.2)$$

where $B \geq 1$. Then for large enough constant $C(q)$ there exists a set of

$$m \leq C(q)NB^q(\log_2(2BN))^2$$

points $\xi^j \in \Omega$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, such that for any $f \in X_N$ we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\|f\|_q^q \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(\xi^j)|^q \leq \frac{3}{2}\|f\|_q^q.$$

Note that it is well known that the inequality

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty) \leq B(N/k)^{1/q}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N$$

implies

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty) \leq 6B2^{-k/N}, \quad k > N.$$

In the same way as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 proof of Theorem 2.2 in [5] is based on the concentration measure result from [2]. However, the chaining

technique, used in [5] differs from that in [27]. In [5] the corresponding ε -nets are built in a more delicate way than in [27] (sandwiching technique). In both Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 the conditions are formulated in terms of the entropy numbers in the uniform norm L_∞ . Very recently, a new idea in this direction was developed in [15]. E. Kosov in [15] proves the corresponding theorem with the conditions imposed on the entropy numbers in a weaker metric than the uniform norm. We now formulate his result.

Let $Y_s := \{y_j\}_{j=1}^s \subset \Omega$ be a set of sample points from the domain Ω . Introduce a semi-norm

$$\|f\|_{Y_s} := \|f\|_{L_\infty(Y_s)} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq s} |f(y_j)|.$$

Clearly, for any Y_s we have $\|f\|_{Y_s} \leq \|f\|_\infty$. The following result is from [15] (see Corollary 3.4 there).

Theorem 2.3. *Let $1 \leq q < \infty$. There exists a number $C_1(q) > 0$ such that for m and B satisfying*

$$m \geq C_1(q) N B^q (\log N)^{w(q)}, \quad w(1) := 2, \quad w(q) := \max(q, 2) - 1, \quad 1 < q < \infty,$$

and for a subspace X_N satisfying the condition: for any set $Y_m \subset \Omega$

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty(Y_m)) \leq B(N/k)^{1/q}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N \quad (2.3)$$

there are points $\xi^j \in \Omega$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, such that for any $f \in X_N$ we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \|f\|_q^q \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(\xi^j)|^q \leq \frac{3}{2} \|f\|_q^q.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We now proceed to the proof of Theorem 1.2. We treat separately four cases. We have

$$X_N = \mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma), \quad N = |Q_n^\gamma| \asymp 2^n n^{\nu-1}. \quad (2.4)$$

1. Case $q = 1$. We use Theorem 2.1 here. We obtain the required bounds on the entropy numbers from Proposition 3.1. It gives us $B = C(\gamma)n$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1 we obtain that

$$\mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(m, 1), \quad \text{provided } m \geq C(\gamma) |Q_n^\gamma| n^3, \quad (2.5)$$

which is claimed in Theorem 1.2.

2. Case $q \in (1, 2]$. We use Theorem 2.3 here. We obtain the required bounds on the entropy numbers from Proposition 3.1. It gives us $B = C(q, \gamma)n^{1/q}$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.3 we obtain that

$$\mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q), \quad \text{provided } m \geq C(q, \gamma)|Q_n^\gamma|n^2, \quad (2.6)$$

which is claimed in Theorem 1.2.

3. Case $q \in (2, 3)$. We use Theorem 2.3 here. We obtain the required bounds on the entropy numbers from Lemma 3.2. It is well known that the condition $\mathcal{T}(Q_n^\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(s, \infty)$ with $s \leq C(d)2^{nd}$ holds (see the argument in the proof of Proposition 3.1). It gives us $B = C(q, d)n^{1/q}(MN^{-1/q})$ where M is from the Nikol'skii inequality (3.9). It is known (see [21] and [22]) that

$$M \asymp 2^{n/q}n^{(\nu-1)(1-1/q)}.$$

Therefore,

$$MN^{-1/q} \asymp n^{(\nu-1)(1-2/q)}, \quad B^q \asymp n^{(\nu-1)(q-2)+1}.$$

By Theorem 2.3 we obtain that

$$\mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q), \quad \text{provided } m \geq C(q, \gamma)|Q_n^\gamma|n^{(\nu-1)(q-2)+q}, \quad (2.7)$$

which is claimed in Theorem 1.2.

4. Case $q \in [3, \infty)$. We use Theorem 2.2 here. In the same way as above in Case 3 we get

$$B^q \asymp n^{(\nu-1)(q-2)+1}.$$

By Theorem 2.2 we obtain that

$$\mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q), \quad \text{provided } m \geq C(q, \gamma)|Q_n^\gamma|n^{(\nu-1)(q-2)+3}, \quad (2.8)$$

which is claimed in Theorem 1.2.

3 Bounds of the entropy numbers

In this section we obtain bounds of the entropy numbers $\varepsilon_k(\mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma)^q, L_\infty)$ in the form (2.2). Some results on the entropy numbers $\varepsilon_k(\mathcal{RT}(Q_n)^q, L_\infty)$ can be found in [28], Ch. 7. However, those results are designed for proving upper bounds of the entropy numbers of classes of functions with mixed smoothness. Here we obtain bounds, which serve better for the sampling discretization (see a detailed discussion of such a comparison in [27], Section 7). We begin with the case $q \in [1, 2]$. The following result is from [6].

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that X_N is an N -dimensional subspace of $L_\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying the following two conditions:*

(i) *There exists a constant $K_1 > 1$ such that*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq (K_1 N)^{1/2} \|f\|_2, \quad \forall f \in X_N. \quad (3.1)$$

(ii) *There exists a constant $K_2 > 1$ such that*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq K_2 \|f\|_{\log N}, \quad \forall f \in X_N. \quad (3.2)$$

Then for each $1 \leq q \leq 2$, there exists a constant $C(q) > 0$ depending only on q such that

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty) \leq C(q)(K_1 K_2^2 \log N)^{1/q} \begin{cases} (N/k)^{1/q}, & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq N, \\ 2^{-k/N}, & \text{if } k > N. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

We now apply Theorem 3.1 to the case $X_N = \mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma)$. Clearly, in this case $N = \dim \mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma) = |Q_n^\gamma| \asymp 2^n n^{\nu-1}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $q \in [1, 2]$. We have the bound*

$$\varepsilon_k(\mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma)^q, L_\infty) \leq C(q, \gamma) n^{1/q} (|Q_n^\gamma|/k)^{1/q}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. It is well known and easy to check that condition (i) is satisfied with $K_1 = 1$. Condition (ii) follows from known results on sampling discretization. We now explain it. Let $\Pi_n := [-2^n, 2^n]^d$ be a d dimensional cube. It is known (see, for instance, [28], p.102, Theorem 3.3.15) that there exists a set Y_s with $s \leq C_1(d)2^{nd}$ such that for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $f \in \mathcal{RT}(\Pi_n)$

$$C_2(d) \|f\|_p \leq \|f_{Y_s}\|_{\ell_{p,s}} \leq C_3(d) \|f\|_p. \quad (3.5)$$

It remains to note that $Q_n^\gamma \subset \Pi_n$ and that in \mathbb{R}^s we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq C(a) \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\ell_{a \log s, s}}. \quad (3.6)$$

□

We now proceed to the case $q \in (2, \infty)$. We will use the following result from [15], which was proved with a help of deep results from functional analysis (see [20], p.552, Lemma 16.5.4).

Lemma 3.1. *Let $q \in (2, \infty)$. Assume that for any $f \in X_N$ we have*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq M\|f\|_q \quad (3.7)$$

with some constant M . Then for $k \in [1, N]$ we have for any Y_s

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty(Y_s)) \leq C(q)(\log s)^{1/q}(MN^{-1/q})(N/k)^{1/q}. \quad (3.8)$$

We would like to estimate the entropy numbers in the uniform norm. For that purpose we derive from Lemma 3.1 the following statement.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $q \in (2, \infty)$. Assume that for any $f \in X_N$ we have*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq M\|f\|_q \quad (3.9)$$

with some constant M . Also, assume that $X_N \in \mathcal{M}(s, \infty)$ with $s \leq aN^c$. Then for $k \in [1, N]$ we have

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty) \leq C(q, a, c)(\log N)^{1/q}(MN^{-1/q})(N/k)^{1/q}. \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. Condition $X_N \in \mathcal{M}(s, \infty)$ means that there exists a set Y_s such that for any $f \in X_N$ we have

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq C_1\|f\|_{Y_s}. \quad (3.11)$$

Lemma 3.1, relation (3.11), and inequality $\log s \leq c \log N$ imply Lemma 3.2. \square

We now show how to derive a bound on the entropy numbers $\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty(Y_s))$, obtained in [15], from Theorem 3.1.

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that X_N is an N -dimensional subspace of $L_\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying the following condition:*

(i) *There exists a constant $K_1 > 1$ such that*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq (K_1 N)^{1/2}\|f\|_2, \quad \forall f \in X_N. \quad (3.12)$$

Then for each $1 \leq q \leq 2$ and any Y_s with $\log s \leq a \log N$ there exists a constant $C(q, a) > 0$ depending only on q and a such that

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty(Y_s)) \leq C(q, a)(K_1 \log N)^{1/q} \begin{cases} (N/k)^{1/q}, & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq N, \\ 2^{-k/N}, & \text{if } k > N. \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 4.3 from [6] we discretize simultaneously the L_q and L_2 norms – replace Ω by Ω_N with $8K_1N^{a+2} \leq |\Omega_N| \leq CK_1N^{a+2}$ to get for $p = q$ and $p = 2$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|f\|_p \leq \|f\|_{L_p(\Omega_N)} \leq \frac{3}{2}\|f\|_p, \quad \|f\|_{L_p(\Omega_N)}^p := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_N} |f(\omega)|^p.$$

Note that the Nikol'skii inequality (3.12) implies the inequality

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq (K_1N)^{1/q} \|f\|_q, \quad \forall f \in X_N. \quad (3.14)$$

For a given Y_s consider a new domain $\Omega_S := \Omega_N \cup Y_s$, $|\Omega_S| = S$. Then

$$\frac{1}{S} \sum_{j=1}^s |f(y_j)|^q \leq \frac{1}{S} (sK_1N \|f\|_q^q) \leq (8N)^{-1} \|f\|_q^q.$$

This implies that $\|f\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \asymp \|f\|_{L_q(\Omega_S)}$. In the same way we obtain $\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \asymp \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega_S)}$. We now want to apply Theorem 3.1 to X_N restricted to Ω_S . Condition (i) is satisfied because of $\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \asymp \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega_S)}$. Relation (3.6) guarantees that condition (ii) of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied in the case of Ω_S . Therefore, applying Theorem 3.1 to X_N restricted to Ω_S we obtain the bounds of the entropy numbers in the metric $L_\infty(\Omega_S)$. Obviously, $\|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(Y_s)} \leq \|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_S)}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.2. \square

A comment on limitations. In Proposition 3.1, which is a corollary of Theorem 3.1, we proved the following bound for $X_N = \mathcal{RT}(Q_n^\gamma)$, $1 \leq q \leq 2$,

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty) \leq C(q, \gamma) (\log N)^{1/q} (N/k)^{1/q}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N. \quad (3.15)$$

Open problem 2. Could we replace in the bound (3.3) of Theorem 3.1 $(\log N)^{1/q}$ by the $(\log N)^\alpha$ with $\alpha < 1/q$?

It follows from known results on the behavior of the entropy numbers of the classes $\mathbf{W}_q^{a,b}$ of functions with mixed smoothness that for $1 \leq q < \infty$ it must be $\alpha \geq 1/2$. We now give a definition of these classes.

Define for $f \in L_1$

$$\delta_s(f) := \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \rho(\mathbf{s})} \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})}, \quad \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}) := (2\pi)^{-d} \int_{[0, 2\pi]^d} f(\mathbf{x}) e^{-i(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x},$$

and

$$f_l := \sum_{\|s\|_1=l} \delta_s(f), \quad l \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Consider the class (see [24])

$$\mathbf{W}_q^{a,b} := \{f : \|f_l\|_q \leq 2^{-al}(\bar{l})^{(d-1)b}\}, \quad \bar{l} := \max(l, 1).$$

Let $X_N := \mathcal{T}(Q_n)$ in dimension $d = 2$. Then $N \asymp 2^n n$. If (3.15) holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then by Theorem 7.7.15 from [28], p.371, we obtain for $a > 1/q$

$$\varepsilon_k(\mathbf{W}_q^{a,b}, L_\infty) \leq C(q, a, b)k^{-a}(\log k)^{a+b+\alpha}. \quad (3.16)$$

On the other hand by Theorem 7.7.10 from [28], p.365, we obtain for $q = 1$, $a > 1$

$$\varepsilon_k(\mathbf{W}_1^{a,b}, L_\infty) \asymp k^{-a}(\log k)^{a+b+1/2}. \quad (3.17)$$

Also, by Theorem 7.7.14 from [28], p.365, we obtain for $1 < q < \infty$, $a > \max(1/q, 1/2)$

$$\varepsilon_k(\mathbf{W}_q^{a,b}, L_\infty) \asymp k^{-a}(\log k)^{a+b+1/2}. \quad (3.18)$$

Comparing (3.16) with (3.17) and (3.18) we obtain the above claim.

4 Discussion

As we pointed out in the Introduction, our main interest in this paper is sampling discretization of the L_q norms, $1 \leq q < \infty$, of hyperbolic cross polynomials from $\mathcal{T}(Q_n^\gamma)$. Theorem 1.2 provides such results. In this section we discuss the following question: "Is it possible to extend Theorem 1.2 to $\mathcal{T}(Q)$ with arbitrary $Q \in \mathbb{Z}^d$?" This discussion will illustrate advantages and limitations of the techniques used in the proof of Theorem 1.2. Theorem 1.1 gives the sampling discretization result for all $\mathcal{T}(Q)$ in case $q = 2$. It turns out that in case $q \in [1, 2)$ Theorem 1.2 can be extended to the case of arbitrary Q .

Theorem 4.1. *For $q \in [1, 2)$ there are three positive constants $C_i = C_i(q)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that we have for any $Q \in \mathbb{Z}^d$*

$$\mathcal{T}(Q) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q, C_2, C_3) \quad \text{provided} \quad m \geq C_1|Q|(\log(2|Q|))^{w(q)},$$

where

$$w(1) = 3; \quad w(q) = 2, \quad q \in (1, 2).$$

Proof. Let $X_N = \mathcal{RT}(Q)$, $N = |Q|$. First, we use Proposition 3.2. Condition (i) of that proposition is satisfied with $K_1 = 1$. Therefore, Proposition 3.2 guarantees that for each $1 \leq q \leq 2$ and any Y_s with $\log s \leq a \log N$ there exists a constant $C(q, a) > 0$ depending only on q and a such that

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty(Y_s)) \leq C(q, a)(\log N)^{1/q}(N/k)^{1/q} \quad \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq N. \quad (4.1)$$

We now apply Theorem 2.3. Set $m = s$. Parameter a satisfying $\log m \leq a \log N$ will be chosen later. Then by (4.1) we find $B = C(q, a)(\log N)^{1/q}$. We need to satisfy the following inequality in order to apply Theorem 2.3

$$m \geq C_1(q)NC(q, a)^q(\log N)^{1+w(q)}. \quad (4.2)$$

Clearly, for any fixed $a > 1$ we can satisfy simultaneously (4.2) and $\log m \leq a \log N$ provided $N \geq C''(q, a)$. Thus, we apply Theorem 2.3 and complete the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

We note that a version of Theorem 4.1 with $w(q) = 3$, $q \in [1, 2]$, follows from Theorem 4.2, which was obtained in [6].

Theorem 4.2. *Let X_N be an N -dimensional subspace of $L_\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying the following condition*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq (K_1 N)^{1/2} \|f\|_2, \quad \forall f \in X_N, \quad \log K_1 \leq \alpha \log N.$$

Then for $q \in [1, 2]$ we have

$$X_N \in \mathcal{M}(m, q) \quad \text{provided} \quad m \geq C(q, \alpha)N(\log N)^3.$$

We note that the key fact, which allowed us to prove Theorem 4.1, is the fact that both in Theorem 4.2 and in Proposition 3.2 we only need the Nikol'skii type inequality (3.12) between $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$. This inequality is the same for all $\mathcal{T}(Q)$ with $|Q| = N$. We do not know if Theorem 1.2 can be extended to $\mathcal{T}(Q)$ with arbitrary $Q \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ in the case $q \in (2, \infty)$. Our proof of Theorem 1.2 in case $q \in (2, \infty)$ is based on the Nikol'skii type inequality (3.9) between $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\cdot\|_q$, which depends on Q , not only on $|Q|$.

Open problem 3. Is the following statement true? For $q \in (2, \infty)$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, there are positive constants $C_i = C_i(q, d)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $c(q, d)$ such that for any $Q \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have

$$\mathcal{T}(Q) \in \mathcal{M}(m, q, C_2, C_3) \quad \text{provided} \quad m \geq C_1|Q|(\log(2|Q|))^{c(q, d)}.$$

We refer the reader to a list of open problems on sampling discretization in [4].

The cornerstone of the above discussed technique of proving the sampling discretization results is the entropy bounds of the type

$$\varepsilon_k(X_N^q, L_\infty) \leq B(N/k)^{1/q}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N, \quad 1 \leq q < \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, the problem of finding conditions on X_N , which guarantee relation (4.3) is a natural problem. It is well known (see, for instance, [5]) that relation (4.3) for $k = 1$ implies the following Nikol'skii type inequality for X_N :

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq 4BN^{1/q}\|f\|_q \text{ for any } f \in X_N. \quad (4.4)$$

Therefore, the Nikol'skii type inequality (4.4) is a necessary condition for (4.3) to hold. Lemma 3.2 shows that in the case $q \in (2, \infty)$ condition (4.4) combined with one more condition $X_N \in \mathcal{M}(s, \infty)$, $s \leq aN^c$, imply a little weaker inequality than in (4.3): instead of B we get $B' = BC(q, a, c)(\log N)^{1/q}$.

Acknowledgment. The work was supported by the Russian Federation Government Grant N^o14.W03.31.0031.

References

- [1] E.S. Belinsky, Interpolation and integral norms of hyperbolic polynomials, *Mathematical Notes*, **66** (1999), 16–23. Translation from *Matem. Zametki*, **66** (1999), 20–29.
- [2] J. Bourgain, J. Lindenstrauss, and V. Milman, Approximation of zonoids by zonotopes, *Acta Math.*, **162** (1989), 73–141.
- [3] B. Carl, Entropy numbers, s -numbers, and eigenvalue problem, *J. Func. Analysis*, **41** (1981), 290–306.
- [4] F. Dai, A. Prymak, V.N. Temlyakov, and S. Tikhonov, Integral norm discretization and related problems, *Russ. Math. Surv.*, **74** (2019), 579–630. Translation from *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, **74**, Is. 4(448) (2019), 3–58; arXiv:1807.01353v1 [math.NA] 3 Jul 2018.
- [5] F. Dai, A. Prymak, A. Shadrin, V. Temlyakov, S. Tikhonov, Sampling discretization of integral norms, arXiv:2001.09320v1 [math.CA] 25 Jan 2020.

- [6] F. Dai, A. Prymak, A. Shadrin, V. Temlyakov, and S. Tikhonov, Entropy numbers and Marcinkiewicz-type discretization theorems, arXiv:2001.10636v1 [math.CA] 28 Jan 2020.
- [7] Ding Dũng, V.N. Temlyakov, and T. Ullrich, Hyperbolic Cross Approximation, Advanced Courses in Mathematics CRM Barcelona, Birkhäuser, 2018; arXiv:1601.03978v2 [math.NA] 2 Dec 2016.
- [8] E. Giné and J. Zinn, Some limit theorems for empirical processes, Ann. Prob., **12** (1984), 929–989.
- [9] A. Hinrichs, J. Prochno, and J. Vybiral, Entropy numbers of embeddings of Schatten classes, J. Functional Analysis, **273** (2017), 3241–3261; arXiv:1612.08105v1 [math.FA] 23 Dec 2016.
- [10] B.S. Kashin and V.N. Temlyakov, On a norm and related applications, Mathematical Notes **64** (1998), 551–554. Translation from Mat. Zametki **64** (1998), 637–640.
- [11] B.S. Kashin and V.N. Temlyakov, On a norm and approximation characteristics of classes of functions of several variables, Metric theory of functions and related problems in analysis, Izd. Nauchno-Issled. Aktuarno-Finans. Tsentra (AFTs), Moscow, 1999, 69–99.
- [12] B.S. Kashin and V.N. Temlyakov, The volume estimates and their applications, East J. Approx., **9** (2003), 469–485.
- [13] B.S. Kashin and V.N. Temlyakov, A remark on discretization of trigonometric polynomials with given spectrum, Russian Math. Surveys, **73** (2018), 197–198 (in Russian).
- [14] S.V. Konyagin and V.N. Temlyakov, The entropy in learning theory. Error estimates, Constr. Approx., **25** (2007), 1–27.
- [15] E. Kosov, The Marcinkiewicz-type discretization of L^p -norms under the Nikolskii-type assumptions, arXiv:2005.01674v1 [math.FA] 4 May 2020.
- [16] G. Lorentz, M. von Golitschek, and Y. Makovoz, Constructive Approximation: Advanced Problems. Springer, Berlin, 1996.

- [17] A. Marcus, D.A. Spielman, and N. Srivastava, Interlacing families II: Mixed characteristic polynomials and the Kadison-Singer problem, *Annals of Math.*, **182** (2015), 327–350.
- [18] S. Nitzan, A. Olevskii, and A. Ulanovskii, Exponential frames on unbounded sets, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **144** (2016), 109–118.
- [19] C. Schütt, Entropy numbers of diagonal operators between symmetric Banach spaces, *J. Approx. Theory*, **40** (1984), 121–128.
- [20] M. Talagrand, *Upper and lower bounds for stochastic processes: modern methods and classical problems.* – Springer Science and Business Media, 2014.
- [21] V.N. Temlyakov, Approximation of periodic functions of several variables with bounded mixed derivative, *Trudy MIAN*, **156** (1980), 233–260; English transl. in *Proceedings of Steklov Inst. Math.*, **2** (1983).
- [22] V.N. Temlyakov, Approximation of functions with bounded mixed derivative, *Trudy MIAN*, **178** (1986), 1–112. English transl. in *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.*, **1** (1989).
- [23] V.N. Temlyakov, *Greedy Approximation*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [24] V.N. Temlyakov, Constructive sparse trigonometric approximation for functions with small mixed smoothness, *Constr. Approx.*, **45** (2017), 467–495.
- [25] V.N. Temlyakov, On the entropy numbers of the mixed smoothness function classes, *J. Approx. Theory*, **207** (2017), 26–56; arXiv:1602.08712v1 [math.NA] 28 Feb 2016.
- [26] V.N. Temlyakov, The Marcinkiewicz-type discretization theorems for the hyperbolic cross polynomials, *Jaen Journal on Approximation*, **9** (2017), No. 1, 37–63; arXiv: 1702.01617v2 [math.NA] 26 May 2017.
- [27] V.N. Temlyakov, The Marcinkiewicz-type discretization theorems, *Constr. Approx.* **48** (2018), 337–369; arXiv: 1703.03743v1 [math.NA] 10 Mar 2017.

- [28] V. Temlyakov, Multivariate Approximation, Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [29] A. Zygmund, Trigonometric Series, Cambridge University Press, 1959.

V.N. Temlyakov, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
STEKLOV INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS,
AND LOMONOSOV MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY
E-MAIL: temlyak@math.sc.edu