

On the Eigenvalue Distribution of Spatio-spectral Limiting Operators in Higher Dimensions

Arie Israel and Azita Mayeli

Abstract

Prolate spheroidal wave functions are an orthogonal family of bandlimited functions on \mathbb{R} that have the highest concentration within a specific time interval. They are also identified as the eigenfunctions of a time-frequency limiting operator (TFLO), and the associated eigenvalues belong to the interval $[0, 1]$. Previous work has studied the asymptotic distribution and clustering behavior of the TFLO eigenvalues.

In this paper, we extend these results to multiple dimensions. We prove estimates on the eigenvalues of a *spatio-spectral limiting operator* (SSLO) on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is an alternating product of projection operators associated to given spatial and frequency domains in \mathbb{R}^d . If one of the domains is a hypercube, and the other domain is convex body satisfying a symmetry condition, we derive quantitative bounds on the distribution of the SSLO eigenvalues in the interval $[0, 1]$.

To prove our results, we design a family of wave packets in \mathbb{R}^d that are highly concentrated in the spatial and frequency domains. We show that these wave packets are “approximate eigenfunctions” of a spatio-spectral limiting operator. To build the wave packets, we use a variant of the Coifman-Meyer local sine basis for $L^2[0, 1]$, and we lift the basis to higher dimensions using a tensor product.

Keywords— Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Spatio-spectral limiting operators, spectral analysis, wave packets

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Statement of the variational problem and main results	4
1.1.1	Contributions	5
1.1.2	Prior results on time-frequency limiting operators	6
2	Notations and Preliminaries	8
2.1	Basic properties of SSLO operators	8

3	Local sine bases with near-exponential frequency decay	10
3.1	Proof of Proposition 3.1	11
3.1.1	Construction of orthonormal local sine bases for $L^2(I)$	11
3.1.2	Gevrey class	13
3.1.3	Construction of cutoff functions and the modified Heavyside function s	14
3.1.4	Near-exponential frequency decay of the local-sine basis	16
4	Technical tools	17
4.1	Estimation of the eigenvalues of positive semidefinite compact operators	17
4.2	Counting lattice points in a convex body	18
4.3	Integral estimates on the envelope function	22
5	Orthonormal wave packet basis for $L^2(Q)$	23
5.1	Fourier decay of wave packets	24
5.2	Main technical result	25
5.2.1	Partitioning the basis	26
5.2.2	Energy estimates	26
6	Proofs of the Main Results	37
6.1	Proof of Theorem 1.1	37
6.2	Proof of Theorem 1.2	37
6.3	Proof of Corollary 1.3	41
7	Appendix: Proofs of properties of Gevrey functions	42
	References	44

1 Introduction

The Heisenberg uncertainty principle states that a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and its Fourier transform $\widehat{f} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ cannot simultaneously be well-localized in the spatial and frequency domains. As a result, one is curious about how much a bandlimited function can be concentrated on a given spatial region, and how much a spacelimited function can be concentrated on a given frequency region. We refer to this as the *spatio-spectral concentration problem*. We shall see that this problem can be formulated as the eigenvalue problem for a certain self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

By the seminal work of Landau, Slepian, and Pollak, [SP61; LP61; LP62], the *prolate spheroidal wave functions* (PSWFs) are known to be the solutions to the spatio-spectral concentration problem in dimension $d = 1$, for the case when the spatial and frequency domains are intervals I, J in \mathbb{R} . Specifically, the PSWFs $\{\psi_k\}$ may be defined recursively as follows: First, ψ_1 is a bandlimited unit-norm L^2 function with the largest proportion of its L^2 energy on I ; then, after ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k are determined, ψ_{k+1} is a bandlimited unit-norm L^2 function that is orthogonal to ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k and with the largest proportion of

its L^2 energy on I . The PSWFs can be characterized as the eigenfunctions of a compact self-adjoint operator, and accordingly, they form an orthogonal basis for the space of all bandlimited functions with Fourier support in J . The PSWF eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}$ measure the (spatial) L^2 concentration of the PSWF sequence on I , i.e., $\lambda_k = \int_I |\psi_k(x)|^2 dx / \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_k(x)|^2 dx$. Naturally, these numbers belong to the interval $[0, 1]$. Further, the λ_k can be interpreted as the eigenvalues of a compact self-adjoint operator, and so, they form a monotonic sequence converging to 0.

The PSWF eigenvalues exhibit a clustering behavior near 0 and 1 and their distribution properties reveal information about the spatial concentration of bandlimited functions on the real line. This behavior has been studied in the papers by Landau, Slepian, and Pollak [SP61; LP61; LP62]. Further results and improvements have been obtained recently; e.g., see the works of Osipov [Osi13], Israel [Isr15], Karnik-Romberg-Davenport [KRD21], and Bonami-Jaming-Karoui [BJK21]. The discrete version of the problem has also been considered, as described in [Sle78; KRD21].

In higher dimensions, the spatio-spectral concentration problem has been examined in [Sle64; Shk07] for the case when the space and frequency domains are discs in \mathbb{R}^2 . In this case, the solution sequence can be described via the eigenfunctions of a certain differential operator. These functions form an orthogonal system in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, known as *generalized prolate spheroidal functions* (GPSFs). We should remark that the higher-dimensional setting is important for applications in scientific imaging problems, e.g., in cryoelectron microscopy (cryo-EM) and MRI, which rely on representations with respect to an orthogonal basis of approximately space-limited and (exactly) bandlimited functions of several variables. In particular, GPSFs have been used to perform signal compression in MRI [Yan+02], clustering and principal component analysis for cryo-EM imaging data [LS17b; LS17a] and also for the analysis of the alignment problem in cryo-EM [Led17]; see also [LS17c; LS20].

By now, many of these problems are rather well understood in one dimension. However, in the higher-dimensional case, fundamental questions still remain unresolved. In particular, no quantitative bounds on the GPSF eigenvalues are presently known.¹ The current work serves as a first step to address this gap in understanding between $d = 1$ and $d \geq 2$. When both the spatial and frequency domains are balls in \mathbb{R}^d , the orthogonal family consisting of the GPSFs in \mathbb{R}^d has been studied in [Led17; GS18]. The main question addressed in this paper is to explain *precisely how well* such functions are concentrated in the spatial domain.

In this paper, we give a solution to a closely related problem: We derive bounds on the distribution of eigenvalues for the spatio-spectral concentration problem, in the case when the spatial domain is a hypercube in \mathbb{R}^d , and the frequency domain is a convex body in \mathbb{R}^d satisfying a certain symmetry condition. In particular, our analysis applies to the case when the spatial and frequency domains are a cube and ball in \mathbb{R}^d , respectively.

¹The paper [GS18] presents a numerical method to compute the eigenvalues associated to GPSFs, and evaluates the eigenvalues numerically in several examples. An asymptotic formula for the distribution of the GPSF eigenvalues, due to Landau [Lan75], will be stated in the next section – see (1.2).

1.1 Statement of the variational problem and main results

The Fourier transform $\mathcal{F} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and inverse Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}^{-1} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are defined by $\mathcal{F}[f](\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)e^{-ix \cdot \xi} dx$, and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}[g](x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(\xi)e^{ix \cdot \xi} d\xi$. We adopt the shorthand $\widehat{f} = \mathcal{F}(f)$ for the Fourier transform of f .

We write $\chi_A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the characteristic function of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, defined by $\chi_A(x) = 1$ if $x \in A$, and $\chi_A(x) = 0$ if $x \notin A$.

Given a measurable set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, a function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to be *S-bandlimited* if $\widehat{f}(\xi) = 0$ for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S$. We denote the subspace of all *S-bandlimited* functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by $\mathcal{B}(S)$.

Given measurable sets $Q, S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with finite and positive d -dimensional Lebesgue measures $\mu_d(Q), \mu_d(S) \in (0, \infty)$, we pose the spatio-spectral concentration problem: *Which S-bandlimited functions have the most L²-energy on Q?* More precisely, we consider the variational problem

$$\sup \left\{ \mathcal{J}(\psi) := \|\psi\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 / \|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 = \int_Q |\psi(x)|^2 dx / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi(x)|^2 dx : \psi \in \mathcal{B}(S), \psi \neq 0 \right\}. \quad (1.1)$$

We can relate problem (1.1) to the eigenvalue problem for a compact self-adjoint operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$. Specifically, we define orthogonal projection operators P_Q (Q -spacelimiting) and B_S (S -bandlimiting) on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by $P_Q[f] := \chi_Q f$, and $B_S[f] := \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\chi_S(\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi)]$, for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We define a *spatio-spectral limiting operator* (SSLO) by $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S} := B_S P_Q B_S : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We note that the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ is compact and positive semidefinite on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and all of its eigenvalues belong to the interval $[0, 1]$. (See Section 2 for further properties of SSLOs.)

Evidently, $\mathcal{J}(\psi)$ in (1.1) is the Rayleigh quotient of the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$, in the sense that $\mathcal{J}(\psi) = \langle \psi, \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S} \psi \rangle / \|\psi\|^2$ whenever $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, $\psi \neq 0$. Therefore, problem (1.1) is equivalent to the task of determining the largest eigenvalue of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$.

More generally, we consider the task of maximizing the quantity $\inf_{\psi \in H, \psi \neq 0} \mathcal{J}(\psi)$ over all k -dimensional subspaces $H \subset \mathcal{B}(S)$. By the variational (max-min) characterization of eigenvalues, the optimal value for this problem is equal to the k 'th eigenvalue of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$, and the optimal subspace H is spanned by the top k eigenfunctions of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$.

For $k \geq 0$, we denote $\lambda_k(Q, S) \in (0, 1]$ for the k 'th largest eigenvalue of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ (counted with multiplicity), and denote $\psi_k(Q, S) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for the corresponding eigenfunction of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$.

In this paper, we consider the following problem: To estimate the distribution and decay rate of the eigenvalue sequence $\lambda_k(Q, S)$. Specifically, given $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, we ask to estimate the number of eigenvalues in the interval $(\epsilon, 1]$, and in the interval $(\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$. Further, we ask to determine the decay rate of $\lambda_k(Q, S)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

If Q and S are bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^d , it is possible to prove a decay estimate of the form $\lambda_k(Q, S) \leq C \exp(-c(Q, S)k^{1/d})$ for large enough k , for some constant $C > 0$ (possibly depending on d), and $c(Q, S) > 0$ determined by the diameters of the domains $Q, S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. See (1.12) (proven in [KRD21]) for a result in the $d = 1$ case. For a result in higher dimensions, see Corollary 1.3 of this paper. It is interesting to ask if the exponent $1/d$ in this bound can be improved to some $\alpha > 1/d$. In dimension $d = 1$, the bound is known to not be asymptotically sharp, by the work of [BJK21].

Regarding the problem of estimating the distribution of the eigenvalues $\lambda_k(Q, S)$, we will be interested in this question for suitably “large” domains $Q, S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. In particular, we will consider the problem in the regime when $\mu_d(Q) \cdot \mu_d(S) \rightarrow \infty$. Further, we will force the domains to grow in a controlled (isotropic) manner. Specifically, we shall fix the spatial domain Q and rescale the frequency domain by a factor of r , i.e., we shall replace S by $S(r) := rS = \{rx : x \in S\}$. We write $\lambda_k(Q, S(r))$ to denote the sequence of nonzero eigenvalues of the operator $B_{S(r)}P_QB_{S(r)}$. For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $M_\epsilon(r)$ denote the number of eigenvalues $\lambda_k(Q, S(r))$ that are larger than ϵ . If Q and S are measurable sets in \mathbb{R}^d , then Landau [Lan75] proves that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-d}M_\epsilon(r) = (2\pi)^{-d}\mu_d(Q)\mu_d(S). \quad (1.2)$$

The techniques in [Lan75] do not yield a quantitative convergence rate in (1.2). The primary goal of this paper is establish a quantitative version of (1.2) under suitable assumptions on the domains Q, S .

Below in Section 1.1.2, we will elaborate more on the previous results in one dimension.

1.1.1 Contributions

Let $Q, S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be measurable sets with finite and positive d -dimensional Lebesgue measure, $\mu_d(Q), \mu_d(S) \in (0, \infty)$. Denote the r -isotropic dilation of S by $S(r) = rS = \{rx : x \in S\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, for $r > 0$. Consider the positive semidefinite operator $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q, S(r)} := B_{S(r)}P_QB_{S(r)}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is the SSLO associated to the space and frequency domains Q and $S(r)$. Let $\{\lambda_k(Q, S(r))\}_{k \geq 0}$ in $(0, 1]$ be the non-increasing arrangement of the positive eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q, S(r)}$. We note that $\{\lambda_k(Q, S(r))\}_{k \geq 0}$ is also the sequence of positive eigenvalues of the operator $\mathcal{T}_{Q, S(r)} := P_QB_{S(r)}P_Q$ – see Remark 2.2.

In our first theorem, we restrict attention to the case where $Q = [0, 1]^d$ is the unit hypercube, and S is a convex domain in \mathbb{R}^d satisfying a symmetry condition. In this setting, we obtain a quantitative bound on the distribution of the eigenvalues $\lambda_k(Q, S(r))$.

We say that a convex set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is *coordinate-wise symmetric* provided that

$$(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in S, \sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \{\pm 1\}^d \implies (\sigma_1 x_1, \dots, \sigma_d x_d) \in S. \quad (1.3)$$

We write $B(x, r) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ for the Euclidean ball centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of radius $r > 0$

Theorem 1.1. *Let $Q = [0, 1]^d$ be the standard unit hypercube, and let $S \subset B(0, 1)$ be a compact coordinate-wise symmetric convex set in \mathbb{R}^d .*

Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ and $r > 0$, let

$$M_\epsilon(r) := \#\{k : \lambda_k(Q, S(r)) > \epsilon\}, \quad (1.4)$$

$$N_\epsilon(r) := \#\{k : \lambda_k(Q, S(r)) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)\}. \quad (1.5)$$

Then there exists a dimensional constant $C_d > 0$ (independent of S) such that

$$|M_\epsilon(r) - (2\pi)^{-d}\mu_d(S(r))| \leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\epsilon)^3, \log(r/\epsilon)^{3d}\} \quad (1.6)$$

$$N_\epsilon(r) \leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\epsilon)^3, \log(r/\epsilon)^{3d}\}. \quad (1.7)$$

The bounds (1.6) and (1.7) describe the clustering behavior of the eigenvalue sequence $\lambda_k(Q, S(r))$ near 0 and 1. Observe that $(2\pi)^{-d}\mu_d(S(r)) = C_d\mu_d(S)r^d$, while the error term on the right-hand side of (1.6) and (1.7) is of lower order $\sim e(r) := \max\{r^{d-1}\log(r)^3, \log(r)^{3d}\}$ (for fixed $\epsilon > 0$). Therefore, our theorem implies that the first $C_d\mu(S)r^d - O(e(r))$ many eigenvalues $\lambda_k(Q, S(r))$ will be very close to 1, followed by at most $O(e(r))$ many eigenvalues of intermediate size, and the remaining eigenvalues decay to 0 at an exponential rate (see Corollary 1.3 for a precise statement about the decay rate). In particular, (1.6) establishes a quantitative version of Landau's formula (1.2).

Briefly, the main idea in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to construct an ‘‘approximate eigenbasis’’ for the operator $\mathcal{T}_r = \mathcal{T}_{Q,S(r)}$. More specifically, we shall define an explicit family of functions $\{\psi_\nu\}$, which is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(Q) = \ker(\mathcal{T}_r)^\perp$, such that either $\|\mathcal{T}_r\psi_\nu\|$ or $\|\mathcal{T}_r\psi_\nu - \psi_\nu\|$ is small for all but a small exceptional set of ν . The main technical results used in the proof are Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 5.3. We complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 6.1.

The bounds in Theorem 1.1 can be somewhat improved when the space and frequency limiting domains are cubes in \mathbb{R}^d with sides parallel to the coordinate axes. This is our next main result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $Q = [0, 1]^d$ and $S = [-1, 1]^d$, so that $S(r) = [-r, r]^d$. Let $M_\epsilon(r)$ and $N_\epsilon(r)$ be defined as in (1.4), (1.5). Then, for any $r \geq 2\pi$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |M_\epsilon(r) - (r/\pi)^d| &\leq C_d B_d(\epsilon, r), \\ N_\epsilon(r) &\leq C_d B_d(\epsilon, r). \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

where C_d is a dimensional constant, and

$$B_d(\epsilon, r) := \max\{r^{d-1}\log(r)\log(1/\epsilon), (\log(r)\log(1/\epsilon))^d\}.$$

To prove Theorem 1.2, we note that the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the d -fold composition of one-dimensional time-frequency limiting operators (TFLOs) acting on each variable. Estimates on the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ are easily derived from the corresponding estimates for TFLOs in 1-dimension, using the results of [KRD21] (which we describe in Section 1.1.2). Details for the proof are given in Section 6.2.

Our final result is a corollary of Theorem 1.2. It gives a bound on the decay rate of the eigenvalues $\lambda_k(Q, S)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We present the proof in Section 6.3.

Below, we write $\text{diam}_\infty(A)$ for the diameter of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to the ℓ^∞ metric on \mathbb{R}^d .

Corollary 1.3. *Let Q and S be compact sets and let $\Delta = \text{diam}_\infty(Q) \cdot \text{diam}_\infty(S) \in (0, \infty)$. Then*

$$\lambda_k(Q, S) \leq C_d \exp\left(-c(\Delta)k^{1/d}\right), \text{ for } k \geq 1.$$

for constants $C_d > 0$, determined by d , and $c(\Delta) > 0$, determined by d and Δ .

1.1.2 Prior results on time-frequency limiting operators

Let $I = [0, 1]$ and $J = [-W, W]$, $W > 0$. The eigenvalues of the time-frequency limiting operator (TFLO) $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_W := \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{I,J} = B_J P_I B_J$ will be denoted $\lambda_k(W) = \lambda_k(I, J) \in (0, 1]$, and are referred to as PSWF eigenvalues.

The operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_W$ is a compact integral operator with square-integrable and continuous kernel. Being the eigenvalues of a compact operator, $\lambda_k(W)$ decreases monotonically to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed $W > 0$. By Mercer's theorem, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k(W) = \text{tr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_W) = W/\pi$; see [Lan75] for more details.

What is more interesting is that the eigenvalues $\lambda_k(W)$ are clustered near 0 or 1, in the following sense: For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, slightly fewer than W/π of the eigenvalues lie in $[1 - \epsilon, 1]$, far fewer eigenvalues lie in $(\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$, and the rest lie in $(0, \epsilon]$. More precisely, Landau [Lan93] proved the following: For $W \geq 2\pi$, let $N = \lfloor W/\pi \rfloor$ be the integer part of W/π . Then

$$\lambda_{N-1}(W) \geq 1/2 \geq \lambda_{N+1}(W). \quad (1.9)$$

Further, Landau-Widom [LW80] proved that for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\#\{k : \lambda_k(W) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)\} = \frac{2}{\pi^2} \log(W) \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - 1\right) + o(\log(W)) \text{ as } W \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.10)$$

We point out that (1.10) is an asymptotic result, not a quantitative one. Indeed, the error term $o(\log W)$ is not explicitly bounded in [LW80]. Therefore, from (1.10) it is unclear how the quantity $\#\{k : \lambda_k(W) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)\}$ grows as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In particular, (1.10) is helpless for the task of proving the decay of the eigenvalues $\lambda_k(W)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

We refer to $\{k : \lambda_k(W) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)\}$ as the “transition region” in the spectrum of the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_W$. Quantitative upper bounds on the size of the transition region were proven by Osipov [Osi13] and the first-named author [Isr15]. Subsequently, Karnik et al. [KRD21] obtained improved quantitative bounds matching the asymptotic formula (1.10), valid for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ and $W > 0$. Bonami et al. [BJK21] prove estimates which are slightly stronger than those in [KRD21] when ϵ is smaller than a negative power of W .

We now state a remarkable theorem of [KRD21], which gives a quantitative upper bound on the width of the transition region achieving the same asymptotic rate as (1.10):

Theorem 1.4 ([KRD21], Theorem 3). *For any $W > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$,*

$$\#\{k : \lambda_k(W) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)\} \leq \frac{2}{\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{50W}{\pi} + 25\right) \log\left(\frac{5}{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)}\right) + 7. \quad (1.11)$$

As noted in [KRD21], this result implies the exponential decay of $\lambda_k(W)$ for $k \geq \lfloor W/\pi \rfloor$:

$$\lambda_k(W) \leq 10 \exp\left[-\frac{k - \lfloor W/\pi \rfloor - 6}{c_1 \log(W) + c_2}\right] \quad k \geq \lfloor W/\pi \rfloor, \quad (1.12)$$

where the constants c_1 and c_2 are explicit.

We shall make use of Theorem 1.4 later, in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2 Notations and Preliminaries

We write \mathbb{N} for the set of non-negative integers, i.e., $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, and $\#(A)$ for the cardinality of a set A . We write $|x| = |x|_2$ for the Euclidean ℓ^2 -norm of x in \mathbb{R}^d , and $|x|_\infty = \max\{|x_i| : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ for the ℓ^∞ -norm of x . We write μ_d for Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d , and $|I|$ for the length of an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. We write $\|f\|_2$ for the L^2 norm of a measurable function f , and $\|f\|_\infty$ for the L^∞ norm of f . A box $\mathbf{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the d -fold Cartesian product of intervals L_j , i.e., $\mathbf{L} = \prod_{j=1}^d L_j$. An axis-parallel hypercube Q is a box such that all the intervals have equal length, i.e., $Q = \prod_{j=1}^d I_j$, with $|I_j| = |I_k|$ for all j, k . We write $\chi_A(x)$ for the indicator function of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, with norm $\|\cdot\|$. Recall, the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of a linear operator $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is $\|T\|_{HS} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^\infty \|Te_j\|^2\right)^{1/2}$, where $\{e_j\}$ is any orthonormal basis for the space \mathcal{H} , and the value of the Hilbert-Schmidt norm does not depend on the choice of the orthonormal basis. By $\|T\|$ we denote the operator norm of T .

Write $B(x, r)$ for the Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^d centered at x with radius r . Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $x + K$ for the set $\{x + y : y \in K\}$. Given $K, K' \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $K \oplus K'$ for the Minkowski sum of K and K' , and $K \ominus K'$ for the Minkowski difference of K and K' , defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} K \oplus K' &= \{y + y' : y \in K, y' \in K'\} \\ K \ominus K' &= \{c \in \mathbb{R}^d : c + K' \subset K\} = \bigcap_{y' \in K'} (-y' + K). \end{aligned}$$

If K, K' are convex then the sum $K \oplus K'$ and difference $K \ominus K'$ are convex as well. (On the second point, recall that the intersection of convex sets is convex.)

When $x = 0$, we write $B(r) = B(0, r)$. Then it is easy to see that for any closed subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} K \ominus B(r) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \in K, d(x, \partial K) \geq r\}, \\ K \oplus B(r) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : d(x, K) \leq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

The set $K \oplus B(r)$ is called the (*closed*) r -neighborhood of K . Note that $K \oplus B(r) \supset K$ and $K \ominus B(r) \subset K$ for any closed set K . If K is convex, then $K \ominus B(r)$ and $K \oplus B(r)$ are also convex.

2.1 Basic properties of SSLO operators

Let Q and S be measurable subsets of \mathbb{R}^d , with positive and finite d -dimensional Lebesgue measure. Let $P_Q : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(Q)$ and $B_S : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(S)$ be the orthogonal projection operators defined by $P_Q[f] := \chi_Q f$, and $B_S[f] := \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\chi_S(\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi)]$, $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The operator P_Q is a *cutoff operator* on the space domain Q , called a Q -*spacelimiting operator*, and B_S is a *cutoff operator* on the frequency domain S , called an S -*bandlimiting operator*. The operators P_Q and B_S do not commute, i.e., $P_Q B_S \neq B_S P_Q$, however, the products are adjoint of each others, i.e., $(P_Q B_S)^* = B_S P_Q$.

Given Q and S , we define an associated *spatio-spectral limiting operator* as $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S} = B_S P_Q B_S$. Note that $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S} = (P_Q B_S)^*(P_Q B_S)$, and thus the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ is positive semidefinite. Further, $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ is product

of orthogonal projections, so it has norm ≤ 1 . Moreover, $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S} : \mathcal{B}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(S)$ is an integral operator. Indeed, for any S -bandlimited function $f \in \mathcal{B}(S)$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}[f](x) = \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} K(x,y)f(y)dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2.1)$$

with $K(x,y) = h(x-y)$, where $\hat{h} = \chi_S$, when $x,y \in Q$, and $K(x,y) = 0$ otherwise.

The kernel of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt kernel, i.e., square integrable on $Q \times Q$, and

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}\|_{HS}^2 = \int_{x \in Q} \int_{y \in Q} |K(x,y)|^2 dx dy.$$

The operator $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ is compact, and by the spectral theorem, the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ are between 0 and 1, and they form an infinite monotonic sequence converging to zero:

$$1 \geq \lambda_0(Q,S) \geq \lambda_1(Q,S) \geq \dots > 0, \quad \text{with } \lambda_k(Q,S) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

The corresponding eigenfunctions $\{\Psi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ are in $\mathcal{B}(S)$, the space of S -bandlimited functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Remark 2.1. Returning to the variational problem (1.1), for any $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ with $\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} = 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{J}(\psi) = \langle \psi, P_Q \psi \rangle = \langle B_S \psi, P_Q B_S \psi \rangle = \langle \psi, B_S P_Q B_S \psi \rangle = \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S} \psi \rangle. \quad (2.3)$$

We also can write

$$\mathcal{J}(\psi) = \langle P_Q \psi, P_Q \psi \rangle = \langle P_Q B_S \psi, P_Q B_S \psi \rangle = \|P_Q B_S(\psi)\|^2 \quad (2.4)$$

Therefore, the variational problem, and the question of which normalized bandlimited functions ψ maximize the quantity $\mathcal{J}(\psi)$, is actually a question about the eigenvalues of SSLO operators. More precisely, our task is to maximize

$$\max_{f \in \mathcal{B}(S), \|f\|=1} \|P_Q B_S(f)\|^2.$$

Remark 2.2. The variational problem corresponding to the operator $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S} = P_Q B_S P_Q$ has a different formulation than the problem (2.3)-(2.4). This is simply due to the fact that the projection operators P_Q and B_S do not commute. Although the eigenfunctions of the operators $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S}$ are different, the set of their eigenvalues is identical. This is due to the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{Q,S} = L_{Q,S}^* L_{Q,S}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S} = L_{Q,S} L_{Q,S}^*$, where $L_{Q,S} = P_Q B_S$, and the fact that the set of nonzero eigenvalues of $L^* L$ is the same as the set of nonzero eigenvalues of LL^* (counted with multiplicity) for any bounded operator L on Hilbert space. Thus,

$$\{\lambda_k(Q,S)\}_{k \geq 0} \text{ is the sequence of nonzero eigenvalues of the operator } \mathcal{T}_{Q,S} = P_Q B_S P_Q. \quad (2.5)$$

Moving forward, we shall use the above as the defining property for $\lambda_k(Q,S)$.

3 Local sine bases with near-exponential frequency decay

In this section we construct an orthonormal basis for $L^2(I)$, $I = [0, 1]$, consisting of compactly supported functions whose Fourier transforms have rapidly decaying tails. For this, we define a variant of the *local sine basis* of Coifman-Meyer [CM91].

We define a family of intervals \mathcal{W} , which forms a partition of $(0, 1)$, given by

$$\mathcal{W} = \{[2^{-j-1}, 2^{-j}]\}_{j \geq 1} \cup \{[1 - 2^{-j}, 1 - 2^{-j-1}]\}_{j \geq 1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Write $\delta_L \in (0, 1]$ to denote the length of an interval $L \in \mathcal{W}$. Note that

$$\delta_L = \text{dist}_\infty(L, \{0, 1\}) \quad \text{for } L \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (3.2)$$

In particular, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\delta_L \leq \delta \implies L \subset [0, 2\delta] \cup [1 - 2\delta, 1]. \quad (3.3)$$

The family \mathcal{W} is a realization of the *Whitney decomposition* of $(0, 1)$ – see [FI20] for a discussion of the Whitney decomposition of an open domain in \mathbb{R}^d .

Given $a > 0$, we define the “envelope function” $\Psi_a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Psi_a(\xi) := \exp\left(-a \cdot |\xi|^{2/3}\right). \quad (3.4)$$

The main result of the section follows:

Proposition 3.1. *There exists a family of functions $\mathcal{B}(I) = \{\phi_{L,k}\}_{(L,k) \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^2(I)$ such that*

- *Each $\phi_{L,k}$ is a C^∞ function on the real line, with $\text{supp}(\phi_{L,k}) \subset I$.*
- *The family $\mathcal{B}(I)$ is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(I)$.*
- *Each $\phi_{L,k}$ satisfies the Fourier decay condition:*

$$|\widehat{\phi_{L,k}}(\xi)| \leq A \delta_L^{1/2} \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \Psi_a(\delta_L(\xi - \sigma\pi(k + 1/2)/\delta_L)) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.5)$$

In particular, one can take $A = 12$, $a = 1/115$ in (3.5).

To prove Proposition 3.1, we let $\mathcal{B}(I)$ be a variant of the local sine basis for $L^2(I)$. The classical construction of the local sine basis (see [CM91; AWW93]) involves first selecting a special family of cutoff functions b_L , each supported on a neighborhood of an interval $L \in \mathcal{W}$, and then multiplying each cutoff function by a family of sine waves (indexed by a frequency $k \in \mathbb{N}$) to obtain a double-indexed family $\phi_{L,k}$. Classically, it is known that the resulting family is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(I)$ satisfying the stated support conditions. To prove Proposition 3.1, we will show that if the cutoff functions are suitably regular – specifically, if they belong to the Gevrey class $G^{3/2}$ – then the decay condition (3.5) will be satisfied. We recall the definition of the Gevrey class in Section 3.1.2.

Note, due to the rapid decay of $\Psi_a(\xi)$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, the inequality (3.5) can be interpreted to say that the L^2 -energy of $\widehat{\phi_{L,k}}(\xi)$ is sharply concentrated near two frequencies, where $\xi \sim \pm\pi(k + 1/2)/\delta_L$.

The next subsection is devoted to the proof of Proposition 3.1.

3.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1

3.1.1 Construction of orthonormal local sine bases for $L^2(I)$

Step 1. Let \mathcal{W} be the collection of subintervals of $I = [0, 1]$ defined in (3.1). We enumerate the intervals of \mathcal{W} as follows: Write $\mathcal{W} = \{L_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, for

$$L_j = [\alpha_j, \alpha_{j+1}), \quad \text{where } \alpha_j = 2^{j-1} \text{ if } j \leq 0, \text{ while } \alpha_j = 1 - 2^{-j-1} \text{ if } j \geq 1.$$

That is, $\dots, L_{-2} = [1/8, 1/4), L_{-1} = [1/4, 1/2), L_0 = [1/2, 3/4), L_1 = [3/4, 7/8), \dots$.

Write $\delta_j := \alpha_{j+1} - \alpha_j$ to denote the sidelength of L_j . Define a sequence $\epsilon_j > 0$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, by

$$\epsilon_j = \delta_j/3 \text{ if } j \leq -1, \text{ and } \epsilon_j = 2\delta_j/3 \text{ if } j \geq 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Note that, for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\alpha_j + \epsilon_j = \alpha_{j+1} - \epsilon_{j+1}. \quad (3.7)$$

To prove (3.7), we shall show that $\epsilon_j + \epsilon_{j+1} = \delta_j$ for all j . First note the basic properties of the sequence δ_j : We have $\delta_{-1} = 1/4$ and $\delta_0 = 1/4$, while $\delta_{j+1} = \delta_j/2$ for $j \geq 0$, and $\delta_j = \delta_{j+1}/2$ for $j \leq -2$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} j \leq -2 &\implies \epsilon_j + \epsilon_{j+1} = \delta_j/3 + \delta_{j+1}/3 = \delta_j/3 + 2\delta_j/3 = \delta_j, \\ j \geq 0 &\implies \epsilon_j + \epsilon_{j+1} = 2\delta_j/3 + 2\delta_{j+1}/3 = 2\delta_j/3 + \delta_j/3 = \delta_j. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $j = -1$, evaluate

$$\epsilon_{-1} + \epsilon_0 = \delta_{-1}/3 + 2\delta_0/3 = 1/12 + 1/6 = 1/4 = \delta_{-1}.$$

Thus, (3.7) is proven.

Step 2. Now we are ready to construct the family $\{\phi_{L,k}\}_{L \in \mathcal{W}, k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^2(I)$ satisfying the conditions in Proposition 3.1.

We follow the construction of the *local sine basis* in [CM91; AWW93]. To match the notation of [AWW93], we set $b_{jk} := \phi_{L_j, k}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. We shall define a family $\{b_{jk}\}_{(j,k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^2(I)$, satisfying the following conditions:

- Each b_{jk} is a C^∞ function with compact support, and $\text{supp}(b_{jk}) \subset [\alpha_j - \epsilon_j, \alpha_{j+1} + \epsilon_{j+1}] \subset I$.
- The family $\{b_{jk}\}_{(j,k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(I)$.
- Each b_{jk} has near-exponential frequency decay:

$$|\widehat{b_{jk}}(\xi)| \leq A\delta_j^{1/2} \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \Psi_a(\delta_j \cdot (\xi - \sigma\pi(k + 1/2)/\delta_j)). \quad (3.8)$$

Here, $A, a > 0$ are constants; we can take $A = 12$, $a = 1/115$.

These conditions on $\{b_{jk}\}_{(j,k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}$ imply the conditions in the conclusion of Proposition 3.1.

We now give the construction of $\{b_{jk}\}$. We follow the presentation in [AWW93], and fix an even non-negative function $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, with $\text{supp}(\psi) \subset [-1, 1]$ and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi(t) dt = \pi/2$. (A particular ψ is defined in (3.18).) Let $\theta(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x \psi(t) dt$. Then $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, and since ψ is even, we have $\theta(x) + \theta(-x) = \pi/2$. Also, $\theta(x) = 0$ for $x \leq -1$ and $\theta(x) = \pi/2$ for $x \geq 1$.

Define

$$s(x) := \sin(\theta(x)) \text{ and } c(x) := \cos(\theta(x)),$$

so that

$$c(x) = \cos(\pi/2 - \theta(-x)) = \sin(\theta(-x)) = s(-x).$$

Observe that s in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$s(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \leq -1, \quad s(x) = 1 \text{ for } x \geq 1, \quad (3.9)$$

$$s^2(x) + s^2(-x) = 1 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.10)$$

For $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, define the dilated functions

$$s_\epsilon(x) = s(x/\epsilon), \quad c_\epsilon(x) = c(x/\epsilon) = s_\epsilon(-x). \quad (3.11)$$

Then $s_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$s_\epsilon(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \leq -\epsilon, \quad s_\epsilon(x) = 1 \text{ for } x \geq \epsilon,$$

$$s_\epsilon^2(x) + s_\epsilon^2(-x) = 1 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Following [AWW93], for each interval $[\alpha_j, \alpha_{j+1}]$, and for the prescribed values of ϵ_j and ϵ_{j+1} , we define a ‘‘bell function’’ $b_j = b_{[\alpha_j, \alpha_{j+1}]}$, given by

$$b_j(x) = s_{\epsilon_j}(x - \alpha_j) c_{\epsilon_{j+1}}(x - \alpha_{j+1}), \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.12)$$

Recalling (3.11), the function $b_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be written as

$$b_j(x) := s\left(\frac{x - \alpha_j}{\epsilon_j}\right) s\left(\frac{\alpha_{j+1} - x}{\epsilon_{j+1}}\right). \quad (3.13)$$

Thus, by applying (3.9),

$$b_j \equiv 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R} \setminus [\alpha_j - \epsilon_j, \alpha_{j+1} + \epsilon_{j+1}]. \quad (3.14)$$

It follows from (3.7) that $\alpha_j - \epsilon_j \geq \alpha_{j-1} + \epsilon_{j-1} > 0$, and similarly that $\alpha_{j+1} + \epsilon_{j+1} \leq \alpha_{j+2} - \epsilon_{j+2} < 1$. Thus, $[\alpha_j - \epsilon_j, \alpha_{j+1} + \epsilon_{j+1}] \subset [0, 1]$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

We define the ‘‘local sine basis’’ $\{b_{jk}\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{N}}$, where

$$b_{jk}(x) = b_j(x) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\alpha_{j+1} - \alpha_j}} \sin\left(\pi \frac{2k+1}{2} \frac{x - \alpha_j}{\alpha_{j+1} - \alpha_j}\right) \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.15)$$

Using (3.14) and the definition of b_{jk} in (3.15), we see that

$$\text{supp}(b_{jk}) = \text{supp}(b_j) \subset [\alpha_j - \epsilon_j, \alpha_{j+1} + \epsilon_{j+1}] \subset [0, 1] \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (3.16)$$

as stated in the first bullet point above. The following theorem establishes the second bullet.

Theorem 3.2. *The family $\{b_{jk}\}$ defined in (3.15) is an orthonormal basis for $L^2([0, 1])$.*

The papers [CM91; AWW93] prove the orthonormality and completeness in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ for a basis of the form (3.15), whenever $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a strictly monotone sequence satisfying $\alpha_j \rightarrow +\infty$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\alpha_j \rightarrow -\infty$ as $j \rightarrow -\infty$, while the sequence $\epsilon_j > 0$ (used in (3.12) to define the bell functions b_j) is assumed to satisfy (3.7). By trivial modifications to the proof in [CM91; AWW93], one can see that the functions in (3.15) form an orthonormal basis for $L^2(I)$ ($I = [0, 1]$) provided that α_j is a strictly monotone sequence in $(0, 1)$ satisfying $\alpha_j \rightarrow 1$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, $\alpha_j \rightarrow -1$ as $j \rightarrow -\infty$, and $\epsilon_j > 0$ satisfies (3.7), where the bell functions b_j are defined in (3.12). In particular, the basis constructed here, where α_j are picked to be the endpoints of intervals of \mathcal{W} , is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(I)$. We do not provide details for the proof of Theorem 3.2, but instead, refer the reader to [CM91; AWW93], where the argument is given.

Thus, the second bullet point is satisfied for the family $\{b_{jk}\}$.

We point out that the construction of the local sine basis is somewhat flexible, due to the choice of the smooth cutoff function $\psi \in C_c^\infty$, which determines θ and s in C^∞ . Recall, from (3.9), (3.10) that s resembles a smoothed version of the Heavyside function, and it is used to define the bell functions b_j in (3.12).

As we shall see, if ψ is picked carefully, then s will belong to the Gevrey class $G^{3/2}$, and it will follow that the basis $\{b_{jk}\}$ satisfies (3.8), completing the proof of Proposition 3.1.

In the next subsection we give the definition of the Gevrey class, and state some of its basic properties. In the following subsection we define the cutoff function $\psi \in C_c^\infty$ and prove the required properties of s . In the final subsection, we prove the Fourier decay condition (3.8) for the basis $\{b_{jk}\}$.

3.1.2 Gevrey class

We denote by $C^\infty(I)$ the class of all C^∞ function $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on an interval I . We denote the k -fold derivative of f by $f^{(k)}$ and write $\|f\|_\infty$ for the L^∞ norm of f on I .

Following Hörmander's book [Hör03] (see also [Rod93]), we say that a function $f \in C^\infty(I)$ is in the Gevrey class G^r ($r \geq 1$) provided that for all compact sets $K \subset I$ there exist $C_K, R_K > 0$ such that $|f^{(k)}(x)| \leq C_K R_K^k (k!)^r$ for all $x \in K$ and $k \geq 0$. Observe that $G^r \subset C^\infty(I)$.

We say that f is in the Gevrey class G_0^r provided that there exist constants $C, R > 0$ such that (1) $|f^{(k)}(x)| \leq CR^k (k!)^r$ for all $x \in I$ and $k \geq 0$. Sometimes we shall want to record the constants in the Gevrey condition: We say that f is in the class $G_0^r(C, R)$ when (1) is valid for given C and R . Note that $G_0^r = \bigcup_{C, R > 0} G_0^r(C, R)$, and $G_0^r \subset L^\infty(I) \cap C^\infty(I)$.

Gevrey classes interpolate between the space C^∞ (identified with G^r in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$) and the space of analytic functions \mathcal{A} (identified with G^1).

Note that the functions $\sin(x)$ and $\cos(x)$ belong to the Gevrey class $G_0^r(1, 1)$ for any $r \geq 1$. Also, for each $r > 1$, the Gevrey class G^r contains a nonzero compactly supported C^∞ function (see [Hör03]).

To conclude this section, we state two standard results on the Gevrey class, which will be needed in what follows. We defer proofs to the appendix (Section 7). The first result states that the Gevrey class is closed under multiplication and composition.

Proposition 3.3. *For any $r > 1$, the Gevrey class G_0^r is an Algebra closed under multiplication and composition. In particular,*

1. *Suppose $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in $G_0^r(C, R)$ and $g : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in $G_0^r(D, S)$. Then: $fg \in G_0^r(CD, 2 \max\{R, S\})$.*
2. *Suppose $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in $G_0^r(C, R)$ and $g : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in $G_0^r(D, S)$, and suppose $f(I) \subset J$. Then: $g \circ f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in $G_0^r(D, T)$, with $T = R(1 + CS)$.*

By the Paley-Wiener theorem, if $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ then \widehat{f} is analytic, and its restriction on the real line $\widehat{f}(\xi)$ has polynomial (Schwartz) decay as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, namely, for every $N \geq 1$ there exists $C_N > 0$ such that $|\widehat{f}(\xi)| \leq C_N(1 + |\xi|)^{-N}$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. One can improve the polynomial decay to near-exponential decay provided f is in the Gevrey class. This is the second result. In particular, the next result is proven in [Hör03] (see Lemma 12.7.4) in a more general context – see also [DH98]. We provide a proof in the appendix, to illustrate the explicit nature of the constants.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose that $B : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C^∞ , satsufying:*

- (a) *B is supported on $[-2, 2]$.*
- (b) *$B \in G_0^{3/2}(C, R)$ for some $C, R > 0$.*

Set $A = 12C$ and $a = 1/(2eR^{2/3})$. Then $|\widehat{B}|$ has near-exponential decay:

$$|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \leq A \exp(-a \cdot |\xi|^{2/3}) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

3.1.3 Construction of cutoff functions and the modified Heavyside function s

In this section we define the function $\psi \in C_c^\infty$ used in the construction of the local sine basis $\{b_{jk}\}$.

Define the bump function

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} e^{-(1-x^2)^{-2}} & x \in (-1, 1) \\ 0 & x \in (-\infty, -1] \cup [1, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

Lemma 3.5. *The function v given in (3.17) is in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, with $\text{supp}(v) \subset [-1, 1]$. Further, v is in the Gevrey class $G_0^{3/2}(1, C_1)$ on \mathbb{R} , for $C_1 = 2 + 3\sqrt{2}$. Thus, v satisfies*

$$\|v^{(k)}\|_\infty \leq C_1^k \cdot (k!)^{3/2} \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

Proof. We shall demonstrate that v is the composition of two functions in the Gevrey class. Then we use Proposition 3.3 to complete the proof.

Note that $v(t) = g(1-t^2)$ for $t \in (-1, 1)$, where $g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the function $g(x) = e^{-x^{-2}}$. We claim that that g is in the Gevrey class $G_0^{3/2}(1, 3/\sqrt{2})$ on $(0, \infty)$. Indeed, apply the Cauchy integral formula for $g(z) = e^{-z^{-2}}$, with γ a circle in \mathbb{C} of center x and radius $x/2$,

$$g^{(k)}(x) = \frac{k!}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma \frac{e^{-z^{-2}}}{(z-x)^{k+1}} dz.$$

On γ the function $\operatorname{Re}(z^{-2})$ achieves its minimum value at $z = 3x/2$, hence, $\sup_{z \in \gamma} |e^{-z^{-2}}| = e^{-4/9x^2}$; thus,

$$|g^{(k)}(x)| \leq k! (2/x)^k e^{-4/9x^2} = k! 3^k (4/9x^2)^{k/2} e^{-4/9x^2}.$$

By elementary calculus, $y^R e^{-y} \leq (R/e)^R$ for $y, R > 0$. Use this inequality with $y = 4/9x^2$ and $R = k/2$, to get

$$|g^{(k)}(x)| \leq k! 3^k (k/2e)^{k/2}.$$

By Stirling's formula, $\sqrt{2\pi k}(k/e)^k \leq k!$ (see [Rob55]), so that

$$|g^{(k)}(x)| \leq (3/\sqrt{2})^k (k!)^{3/2}.$$

Therefore, g is in the Gevrey class $G_0^{3/2}(1, 3/\sqrt{2})$ on $(0, \infty)$.

On the other hand, the function $f(t) = 1 - t^2$ is in the Gevrey class $G_0^{3/2}(1, 2)$ on $I = (-1, 1)$, since $|f(t)| \leq 1$, $|f'(t)| \leq 2$, and $|f''(t)| \leq 2$ on I , while the higher derivatives vanish. By the composition law for Gevrey functions (part 2 of Proposition 3.3) and $f(I) \subset (0, \infty)$, $v(t) = e^{-(1-t^2)^{-2}}$ is in the Gevrey class $G_0^{3/2}(1, 2(1+3/\sqrt{2}))$ on $(-1, 1)$. Because $v \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus (-1, 1)$, we deduce that v is in $G_0^{3/2}(1, 2(1+3/\sqrt{2}))$ on \mathbb{R} . This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Next, we define the cutoff function $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ using the function v defined above. Set

$$\psi(y) := (\pi/2) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} v dx \right)^{-1} v(y). \quad (3.18)$$

Clearly, ψ is even (since v is even), $\psi \geq 0$, $\operatorname{supp}(\psi) \subset [-1, 1]$ and $\int \psi dy = \pi/2$. As in the discussion preceding (3.9), we let

$$\theta(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x \psi(y) dy, \quad \text{and} \quad s(x) := \sin(\theta(x)).$$

We had shown that s satisfies (3.9), (3.10). Next, we establish that s is in the Gevrey class $G_0^{3/2}$ with an explicit description of the involved constants.

Lemma 3.6. *The function s is in $G_0^{3/2}(1, C_2)$ on \mathbb{R} , for $C_2 = (2 + 3\sqrt{2})(1 + \pi/2)$.*

Proof. From (3.17), by numerical integration,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} v dx = \int_{-1}^1 e^{-(1-x^2)^{-2}} dx = 0.3402 \dots \geq 1/3.$$

So, according to the definition of ψ above, $\psi = cv$ for $|c| \leq 3\pi/2$. If f is in the Gevrey class $G_0^r(A, B)$ then cf is in $G_0^r(|c|A, B)$ for any constant c . In Lemma 3.5 we showed that $v \in G_0^{3/2}(1, C_1)$, for $C_1 = 2 + 3\sqrt{2}$. Thus, $\psi \in G_0^{3/2}(3\pi/2, C_1)$. Given that $\theta(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \psi(y) dy$, we have

$$\|\theta\|_\infty \leq \int \psi dy = \pi/2.$$

Using that $\theta' = \psi \in G_0^{3/2}(3\pi/2, C_1)$, we obtain

$$\|\theta^{(k)}\|_\infty = \|\psi^{(k-1)}\|_\infty \leq (3\pi/2)C_1^{k-1}(k!)^{3/2} = (3\pi/2C_1)C_1^k(k!)^{3/2} \quad \text{for } k \geq 1.$$

Note that $(3\pi/2C_1) \leq \pi/2$, since $C_1 \geq 5$, so the previous two lines establish that θ is in $G_0^{3/2}(\pi/2, C_1)$.

Note that $g(x) = \sin(x)$ is in $G_0^{3/2}(1, 1)$. From part 2 of Proposition 3.3, $s(x) = \sin(\theta(x))$ is in $G_0^{3/2}(1, C_2)$, for $C_2 = C_1(1 + \pi/2) = (2 + 3\sqrt{2})(1 + \pi/2)$, as claimed. \square

3.1.4 Near-exponential frequency decay of the local-sine basis

Here, we show that the local sine basis $\{b_{jk}\}_{(j,k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}$ in (3.15) satisfies the Fourier decay condition (3.8). This concludes the verification of the properties of b_{jk} , and completes the proof of Proposition 3.1.

For $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $B_j(x) := b_j(x \cdot \delta_j + \alpha_j) = s\left(x \cdot \frac{\delta_j}{\epsilon_j}\right) \cdot s\left((1-x) \cdot \frac{\delta_j}{\epsilon_{j+1}}\right)$ (see (3.13)). By definition of ϵ_j in (3.6), $\delta_j/\epsilon_j \leq 3$ and $\delta_j/\epsilon_{j+1} \leq 3$ for all j . Therefore, by Lemma 3.6, $\|s^{(k)}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_2^k(k!)^{3/2}$ for $C_2 = (2 + 3\sqrt{2})(1 + \pi/2)$, and by the chain and product rules for differentiation we obtain

$$\|B_j^{(k)}\|_{L^\infty} \leq 3^k \cdot 2^k \cdot C_2^k \cdot (k!)^{3/2} = C_3^k(k!)^{3/2} \quad \text{for } k \geq 0,$$

where $C_3 = 6C_2 = (12 + 18\sqrt{2})(1 + \pi/2)$. Thus, B_j is in the Gevrey class $G_0^{3/2}(1, C_3)$. Note that b_j is supported on $[\alpha_j - \epsilon_j, \alpha_{j+1} + \epsilon_{j+1}] \subset [\alpha_j - 2\delta_j, \alpha_j + 2\delta_j]$ – here, we apply (3.16) and note that $\alpha_{j+1} = \alpha_j + \delta_j$, while $\epsilon_j \leq 2\delta_j/3$ (by (3.6)) and $\epsilon_{j+1} \leq 2\delta_j/3$ (by the discussion after (3.7)). Thus, B_j is supported on $[-2, 2]$. By applying Proposition 3.4, with $C = 1$ and $R = C_3$, we deduce that

$$|\widehat{B}_j(\xi)| \leq A \exp\left(-a|\xi|^{2/3}\right) \quad \text{for } \xi \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $A = 12$ and $a = [2e((12 + 18\sqrt{2})(1 + \pi/2))^{2/3}]^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{115}$.

Since $b_j(x) = B_j\left(\frac{x - \alpha_j}{\delta_j}\right)$, by scaling properties of the Fourier transform we conclude that

$$|\widehat{b}_j(\xi)| \leq A\delta_j \exp\left(-a|\delta_j\xi|^{2/3}\right) \quad \text{for } \xi \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.19)$$

Using $\sin(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2i}(e^{i\gamma} - e^{-i\gamma})$ in equation (3.15), and noting that $\delta_j = \alpha_{j+1} - \alpha_j$, while using the standard identities for the composition of the Fourier transform and a modulation², we obtain

$$\widehat{b}_{jk}(\xi) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2i\sqrt{\delta_j}} \left[\widehat{b}_j\left(\xi - \pi(k + 1/2)\delta_j^{-1}\right) \cdot e^{-i\pi(k+1/2)\alpha_j/\delta_j} - \widehat{b}_j\left(\xi + \pi(k + 1/2)\delta_j^{-1}\right) \cdot e^{i\pi(k+1/2)\alpha_j/\delta_j} \right].$$

²Specifically, we use that $\mathcal{F}(e^{i(x-x_0)\xi_0} f(x))(\xi) = \widehat{f}(\xi - \xi_0)e^{-ix_0\xi_0}$.

In particular, thanks to (3.19) and the triangle inequality,

$$|\widehat{b}_{jk}(\xi)| \leq A\delta_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \exp\left(-a|\delta_j\xi - \sigma\pi(k+1/2)|^{2/3}\right). \quad (3.20)$$

This completes the proof of (3.8). Thus, we have completed the proof of Proposition 3.1.

4 Technical tools

4.1 Estimation of the eigenvalues of positive semidefinite compact operators

The following lemma is the main apparatus we shall use for estimating the distribution of the eigenvalues of a compact operator, assuming the operator satisfies the Hilbert-Schmidt type condition (4.1) with respect to some basis. This result will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 4.1. *Let \mathcal{H} be a real Hilbert space. Given a positive semidefinite compact operator $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, let $\lambda_j(T)$, $j \geq 1$, be the eigenvalues of T , counted with multiplicity, and sorted in non-increasing order.*

Suppose that there exists an orthonormal basis $\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{I}}$ for \mathcal{H} , and suppose the index set \mathcal{I} can be partitioned as $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{low} \cup \mathcal{I}_{res} \cup \mathcal{I}_{hi}$, with \mathcal{I}_{res} and \mathcal{I}_{low} finite sets, such that, for some $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}} \|T\psi_k\|^2 + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{low}} \|(I - T)\psi_k\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2. \quad (4.1)$$

Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, let $M_\epsilon(T) := \#\{j : \lambda_j(T) > \epsilon\}$ and $N_\epsilon(T) := \#\{j : \lambda_j(T) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)\}$. Then

$$N_\epsilon(T) \leq \#(\mathcal{I}_{res}), \quad \text{and} \quad |M_\epsilon(T) - \#(\mathcal{I}_{low})| \leq \#(\mathcal{I}_{res}).$$

Proof. Let $K_1 = \#(\mathcal{I}_{low})$ and $K_2 = \#(\mathcal{I}_{low}) + \#(\mathcal{I}_{res})$. We will prove that

$$\lambda_{K_1}(T) \geq 1 - \epsilon > \epsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{K_2+1}(T) \leq \epsilon. \quad (4.2)$$

From these bounds, it follows that $\{j : \lambda_j(T) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)\} \subset \{K_1 + 1, \dots, K_2\}$, and thus, $N_\epsilon(T) \leq K_2 - K_1$ and $K_1 \leq M_\epsilon(T) \leq K_2$. So, the desired bounds on $M_\epsilon(T)$ and $N_\epsilon(T)$ follow from (4.2).

Condition (4.1) is equivalent to the statement that

$$\|T - TP_{res} - P_{low}\|_{HS} \leq \epsilon,$$

where $P_{low} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow X_{low}$ and $P_{res} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow X_{res}$ are orthogonal projection operators for the orthogonal subspaces $X_{low} := \text{span}\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{low}}$ and $X_{res} := \text{span}\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{res}}$ in \mathcal{H} , and where $\|\cdot\|_{HS}$ denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. Recall that the operator norm is bounded by the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, i.e. $\|T_0\| \leq \|T_0\|_{HS}$ for any linear operator $T_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. Thus, condition (4.1) implies

$$T = TP_{res} + P_{low} + T_{err}, \quad \text{with} \quad \|T_{err}\| \leq \epsilon. \quad (4.3)$$

We apply the variational characterization of eigenvalues (the Courant-Fischer-Weyl lemma) to prove (4.2). Recall that for any positive semidefinite (self-adjoint) compact operator T on \mathcal{H} ,

$$\lambda_j(T) = \sup_{\dim(W)=j} \min_{x \in W, \|x\|=1} \langle Tx, x \rangle, \quad (4.4)$$

where the supremum is over all j -dimensional subspaces $W \subset \mathcal{H}$.

We first estimate $\lambda_{K_1}(T)$. Note that $\dim(X_{low}) = \#\mathcal{I}_{low} = K_1$. For $x \in X_{low}$ with $\|x\| = 1$, we have $P_{res}x = 0$ and $P_{low}x = x$, thus, from (4.3),

$$\langle Tx, x \rangle = \langle x, x \rangle + \langle T_{err}x, x \rangle \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

By (4.4), this implies $\lambda_{K_1}(T) \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

We next estimate $\lambda_{K_2+1}(T)$. Let W be an arbitrary subspace of \mathcal{H} with $\dim(W) = K_2 + 1$. Let X_{hi} be the closure of $\text{span}\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}}$. The orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{H} = X_{low} \oplus X_{res} \oplus X_{hi}$ implies that $\text{codim}(X_{hi}) = \dim(X_{low}) + \dim(X_{res}) = \#\mathcal{I}_{low} + \#\mathcal{I}_{res} = K_2$. Since $\text{codim}(X_{hi}) < \dim(W)$, it holds that $X_{hi} \cap W \neq \{0\}$. Fix $y \in X_{hi} \cap W$ with $\|y\| = 1$. Because $y \in X_{hi}$, also y belongs to the kernel of $TP_{res} + P_{low}$. Thus, from (4.3), $\langle Ty, y \rangle = \langle T_{err}y, y \rangle \leq \epsilon$. Since W is an arbitrary $(K_2 + 1)$ -dimensional subspace of \mathcal{H} , we have, by (4.4), that $\lambda_{K_2+1}(T) \leq \epsilon$.

This concludes the proof of (4.2), and with it, the proof of the lemma. \square

4.2 Counting lattice points in a convex body

The main result of this section is Corollary 4.4, which will be used in the proofs of Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.8 in Section 5.

In Lemma 4.2 below, we recall the Steiner formula (4.5) for the volume of the outer neighborhood of a convex body K , and prove a related inequality (4.6) for the volume of the inner neighborhood of K . These geometric inequalities will be used in the proofs of Lemma 4.3 and Corollary 4.4.

By a *convex body* in \mathbb{R}^d , we mean a compact and convex subset of \mathbb{R}^d . A convex body K is said to be *symmetric* provided that $x \in K \implies -x \in K$. Recall that $B(r)$ denotes the closed ball in \mathbb{R}^d centered at 0 with radius r .

Lemma 4.2. *Let K be a symmetric convex body in \mathbb{R}^d . Then $r \mapsto \mu_d(K \oplus B(r))$ is a polynomial function of degree at most d , with coefficients determined by K and d . Specifically,*

$$\mu_d(K \oplus B(r)) = \mu_d(K) + \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \kappa_{d-j} V_j(K) r^{d-j}, \quad \text{for all } r > 0, \quad (4.5)$$

where κ_ℓ is the ℓ -dimensional Lebesgue measure of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^ℓ , and $V_j(K) \geq 0$ is a coefficient, called the j 'th intrinsic volume of K .

Further:

$$\mu_d(K \ominus B(r)) \geq \mu_d(K) - \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \kappa_{d-j} V_j(K) r^{d-j}, \quad \text{for all } r > 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. Equation (4.5) is the classical Steiner formula – see [Sch13] for details.

We now apply (4.5) to prove (4.6). Write $r_1(K) \in [0, \infty)$ to denote the inner radius of K , defined by

$$r_1(K) = \sup\{r \geq 0 : B(r) \subset K\}.$$

By compactness of K , the supremum is achieved, thus, $B(r_1(K)) \subset K$. For $\rho \leq r_1(K)$, one has $0 \in K \ominus B(\rho)$ – in particular, $K \ominus B(\rho) \neq \emptyset$. Further, one can check that $(K \ominus B(0, \rho)) \oplus B(0, \rho) = K$ for $\rho \leq r_1(K)$. We apply Steiner’s formula (4.5) with $K \ominus B(\rho)$ in place of K , to give

$$\mu_d(K) = \mu_d(K \ominus B(\rho)) + \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \gamma_{d-j} V_j(K \ominus B(\rho)) \rho^{d-j} \quad (\rho \leq r_1(K)).$$

Intrinsic volumes are inclusion monotone, i.e., $V_j(K_1) \leq V_j(K_2)$ for $K_1 \subset K_2$ – this is because intrinsic volumes can be identified as mixed volumes, and mixed volumes are inclusion monotone (see [Sch13]). Hence, $V_j(K \ominus B(\rho)) \leq V_j(K)$. Thus,

$$\mu_d(K \ominus B(\rho)) \geq \mu_d(K) - \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \gamma_{d-j} V_j(K) \rho^{d-j} \quad (\rho \leq r_1(K)).$$

If $\rho = r_1(K)$ then $K \ominus B(\rho)$ is convex with an empty interior, and therefore $\mu_d(K \ominus B(\rho)) = 0$; thus, the RHS of the above inequality is ≤ 0 for $\rho = r_1(K)$. Also, the RHS is a decreasing function of ρ , and the LHS is 0 if $\rho > r_1(K)$ since then $K \ominus B(\rho) = \emptyset$. Therefore, the inequality persists for $\rho > r_1(K)$, and this proves (4.6). □

We mention a few alternate characterizations for the intrinsic volumes of convex bodies. The leading term $\mu_d(K)$ in (4.5) is the d ’th intrinsic volume $V_d(K)$. Further, $V_0(K) = 1$, and $V_{d-1}(K) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}_{d-1}(\partial K)$ is half the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of the boundary of K . In general, $V_j(K)$ is a constant multiple of the average diameter of a (random) projection of the body K onto a j -dimensional subspace. See [Sch13] for details. We do not use these remarks in the remainder of the paper, they are meant only to describe the geometric interpretations of the coefficients in the Steiner formula.

One can upper bound the intrinsic volumes of a symmetric convex body K via the outer radii of K . For $1 \leq j \leq d$, the j ’th outer radius of K , written $R_j(K)$, is the smallest R such that $K \subset (B(R) \cap W) \oplus W^\perp$ for some j -dimensional subspace $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ – here, W^\perp is the orthogonal complement of W . Equivalently: $R_j(K)$ is the smallest R such that K is contained in a cylindrical tube with cross section given by a j -dimensional ball of radius R . Observe,

$$R_1(K) \leq R_2(K) \leq \dots \leq R_d(K) = \text{diam}(K)/2.$$

To illustrate the definition: Let $E = E(r_1, \dots, r_d)$ be the ellipsoid in \mathbb{R}^d given by all points $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\sum_j x_j^2 / r_j^2 \leq 1$. Then $R_1(E), \dots, R_d(E)$ is the nondecreasing rearrangement of r_1, \dots, r_d .

In [HC08] (see Theorem 1.2), the following bound is given:

$$V_j(K) \leq 2^j s_j(R_1(K), \dots, R_d(K)) \quad \text{for } j = 0, \dots, d,$$

where $s_j(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ is the j 'th elementary symmetric polynomial,

$$s_j(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_j} \prod_{k=1}^j x_{i_k},$$

and we set $s_0(x_1, \dots, x_d) = 1$. Since $R_1(K) \leq \dots \leq R_d(K)$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} V_j(K) &\leq 2^j \binom{d}{j} \prod_{m=d-j+1}^d R_m(K) =: C_j(K), \quad 1 \leq j \leq d, \\ V_0(K) &\leq 1 =: C_0(K) \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

We define $\text{dist}_\infty(x, \Omega) := \inf_{y \in \Omega} \|x - y\|_\infty$ for $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{L} = x_0 + \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a lattice in \mathbb{R}^d centered at the point $x_0 \in [0, 1)^d$, and let K be a symmetric convex body in \mathbb{R}^d . Fix $\eta > 1$.*

Define subsets $X_1 = X_1(K, \eta)$ and $X_2 = X_2(K, \eta)$ in \mathcal{L} , by

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(K, \eta) &:= \{x \in \mathcal{L} : \text{dist}_\infty(x, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus K) \geq \eta\} \\ X_2(K, \eta) &:= \{x \in \mathcal{L} : \text{dist}_\infty(x, \partial K) < \eta\}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

and let

$$e(K, \eta) := \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (2\sqrt{d})^{d-j} \kappa_{d-j} C_j(K) \eta^{d-j}.$$

with $C_j(K)$ defined as in (4.7).

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\#X_1(K, \eta) - \mu_d(K)| &\leq e(K, \eta) \\ \#X_2(K, \eta) &\leq 2e(K, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For a finite set $Y \subset \mathcal{L}$, let

$$D(Y) := \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{L}} (y + [-1/2, 1/2]^d)$$

Note $D(X) \subset D(Y)$ if $X \subset Y \subset \mathcal{L}$, and $\mu_d(D(Y)) = \#Y$.

Note that $X_1 = X_1(K, \eta)$ and $X_2 = X_2(K, \eta)$ defined in (4.8) are disjoint subsets of \mathcal{L} , and

$$X_1 \cup X_2 = \{x \in \mathcal{L} : \text{dist}_\infty(x, K) < \eta\}. \tag{4.9}$$

Our task is to estimate $\#X_1$ and $\#X_2$.

We establish that,

$$K \ominus B(\sqrt{d}(\eta + 1)) \subset D(X_1) \subset D(X_1 \cup X_2) \subset K \oplus B(\sqrt{d}(\eta + 1)). \quad (4.10)$$

For the proof of the first set inclusion, let $z \in K \ominus B(\sqrt{d}(\eta + 1))$. Then $z \in K$ and $\text{dist}(z, \partial K) \geq \sqrt{d}(\eta + 1)$. Note: $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot) \leq \sqrt{d} \text{dist}_\infty(\cdot, \cdot)$. Therefore, $\text{dist}_\infty(z, \partial K) \geq \eta + 1$. Any point of \mathbb{R}^d is within ℓ^∞ distance of $1/2$ to a point of \mathcal{L} . So there exists $p \in \mathcal{L}$ with $|z - p|_\infty \leq 1/2$. By the triangle inequality, $\text{dist}_\infty(p, \partial K) \geq \eta$. Since $p \in \mathcal{L}$, we have $p \in X_1$ by definition of X_1 . Since $|z - p|_\infty \leq 1/2$, also $z \in p + [-1/2, 1/2]^d$, so that $z \in D(X_1)$. This proves the first set inclusion. The second set inclusion is trivial. For the third set inclusion, let $w \in D(X_1 \cup X_2)$ – then, $w \in q + [-1/2, 1/2]^d$ for some $q \in X_1 \cup X_2$. Then $q \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\text{dist}_\infty(q, K) < \eta$ by (4.9). But $|q - w|_\infty \leq 1/2$. So, by the triangle inequality, $\text{dist}_\infty(w, K) \leq \eta + 1$ – hence, $\text{dist}(w, K) \leq \sqrt{d}(\eta + 1)$. Therefore, $w \in K \oplus B(\sqrt{d}(\eta + 1))$, proving the third set inclusion.

From (4.10), $\sqrt{d}(\eta + 1) \leq 2\sqrt{d}\eta$, and $\mu_d(D(X)) = \#(X)$, a volume comparison gives that

$$\mu_d(K \ominus B(2\sqrt{d}\eta)) \leq \#(X_1) \leq \#(X_1 \cup X_2) \leq \mu_d(K \oplus B(2\sqrt{d}\eta)). \quad (4.11)$$

We apply (4.5) and (4.6) for $r = 2\sqrt{d}\eta$, together with $V_j(K) \leq C_j(K)$ (see (4.7)) in each inequality. We get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_d(K \oplus B(2\sqrt{d}\eta)) &\leq \mu_d(K) + e(K, \eta) \\ \mu_d(K \ominus B(2\sqrt{d}\eta)) &\geq \mu_d(K) - e(K, \eta) \\ e(K, \eta) &:= \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (2\sqrt{d})^{d-j} \kappa_{d-j} C_j(K) \eta^{d-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above bounds in (4.11), we get:

$$\mu_d(K) - e(K, \eta) \leq \#(X_1) \leq \#(X_1 \cup X_2) \leq \mu_d(K) + e(K, \eta). \quad (4.12)$$

These inequalities imply that

$$|\#(X_1) - \mu_d(K)| \leq e(K, \eta)$$

and since X_1 and X_2 are disjoint,

$$\#(X_2) = \#(X_1 \cup X_2) - \#(X_1) \leq 2e(K, \eta).$$

□

If K is contained in an ellipsoid $E = E(r_1, \dots, r_d)$ then $R_j(K) \leq R_j(E)$ for all j , and hence also $C_j(K) \leq C_j(E)$. Further, as already noted, $R_1(E), \dots, R_d(E)$ is the nondecreasing rearrangement of r_1, \dots, r_d . Therefore, from (4.7),

$$\begin{aligned} C_j(K) \leq C_j(E) &= 2^j \binom{d}{j} \max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_j} \\ &\leq 2^{j+d} \max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_j}. \end{aligned}$$

This estimate in conjunction with the previous lemma immediately gives:

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose $K \subset E(r_1, \dots, r_d)$ for some $r_1, \dots, r_d > 0$. Define $X_1(K, \eta)$ and $X_2(K, \eta)$ as in (4.8). Let*

$$e_0(\eta) = 4^d \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\sqrt{d})^{d-j} \kappa_{d-j} \cdot \left(\max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} r_{i_1} \dots r_{i_j} \right) \eta^{d-j}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\#X_1(K, \eta) - \mu_d(S)| &\leq e_0(\eta) \\ \#X_2(K, \eta) &\leq 2e_0(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

4.3 Integral estimates on the envelope function

The function $\Psi_a(t) = \exp(-a|t|^{2/3})$, for $a = 1/115$, was introduced in (3.4) in order to control the Fourier transform of the local sine basis functions. Here we present some integral inequalities for this function.

Lemma 4.5. *For any integer $d \geq 1$ there is a constant $C_d > 0$ such that for any $\eta > 1$,*

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d: |x| > \eta} \Psi_a(|x|) dx \leq C_d \Psi_a(\eta/4). \quad (4.13)$$

Proof. By the Taylor series formula for the exponential function,

$$t^K \leq K! e^t \text{ for } t > 0, \quad K = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (4.14)$$

Using polar coordinates, if σ_d is the surface measure of the $(d-1)$ -sphere, then

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d: |x| > \eta} \Psi_a(|x|) dx = \sigma_d \int_{r > \eta} e^{-ar^{2/3}} r^{d-1} dr = (3/2)a^{-(3/2)d} \sigma_d \int_{t > a\eta^{2/3}} e^{-t} t^{(3d-2)/2} dt,$$

where the second identity uses the change of variables $t = ar^{2/3}$, $r = a^{-3/2}t^{3/2}$, $dr = (3/2)a^{-3/2}t^{1/2}dt$. Next, applying (4.14) with $K = 3d - 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t > a\eta^{2/3}} e^{-t} t^{(3d-2)/2} dt &\leq \sqrt{(3d-2)!} \int_{t > a\eta^{2/3}} e^{-t/2} dt \\ &= 2\sqrt{(3d-2)!} e^{-a\eta^{2/3}/2} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{(3d-2)!} e^{-a(\eta/4)^{2/3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous lines gives

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d: |x| > \eta} \Psi_a(|x|) dx \leq 3\sigma_d \sqrt{(3d-2)!} a^{-(3/2)d} e^{-a(\eta/4)^{1/2}} = C_d a^{-(3/2)d} \Psi_a(\eta/4).$$

□

Next we estimate the sum of $\Psi_a(\pi|x|)$, when x ranges in a subset X of a lattice \mathcal{L} in \mathbb{R}^d .

Lemma 4.6. *Let \mathcal{L} be a lattice in \mathbb{R}^d of the form $\mathcal{L} = x_0 + \delta\mathbb{Z}^d = \{x_0 + \delta\mathbf{k} : \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$, where $x_0 \in [0, 1)^d$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $X \subset \mathcal{L}$ be given, and denote*

$$D_\delta(X) = \bigcup_{x \in X} \left(x + [-\delta/2, \delta/2]^d \right).$$

Then

$$\sum_{x \in X} \Psi_a(\pi|x|) \leq C_d \delta^{-d} \int_{D_\delta(X)} \Psi_a(\pi|z|) dz.$$

Proof. The function $\varphi_a : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_a(z) = a(\pi|z|)^{2/3}$ is uniformly continuous (in fact, it is Hölder-2/3 continuous), and so it follows that $|\varphi_a(z) - \varphi_a(x)| \leq c_d$ whenever $|x - z|_\infty \leq 1$, for some constant $c_d > 0$. Thus,

$$\Psi_a(\pi|x|) \leq C_d \Psi_a(\pi|z|), \text{ whenever } |x - z|_\infty \leq 1.$$

for some constant $C_d > 0$. We integrate this inequality over z in the cube $x + [-\delta/2, \delta/2]^d$, and note that the Lebesgue measure of $x + [-\delta/2, \delta/2]^d$ is δ^d . Then we sum the resulting inequality over $x \in X$, to get

$$\sum_{x \in X} \Psi_a(\pi|x|) \cdot \delta^d \leq C_d \int_{D_\delta(X)} \Psi_a(\pi|z|) dz.$$

□

5 Orthonormal wave packet basis for $L^2(Q)$

Let \mathcal{W} be the partition of the interval $I = [0, 1]$ defined in Section 3, and let $Q = I^d$ be the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^d . We denote by $\mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}$ the set of all d -fold Cartesian products of intervals in \mathcal{W} , so, $\mathcal{W}^{\otimes d} = \{\mathbf{L} = L_1 \times \cdots \times L_d : L_1, \dots, L_d \in \mathcal{W}\}$. We regard the elements \mathbf{L} of $\mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}$ as boxes contained in Q .

Define an indexing set $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d} \times \mathbb{N}^d$. Indices in \mathcal{I} will be written $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})$, with $\mathbf{L} = L_1 \times \cdots \times L_d \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}$, $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$. We define “wave packets” $\psi_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$\psi_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \prod_{r=1}^d \phi_{L_r, k_r}(x_r), \tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(I) = \{\phi_{L, k}\}_{L \in \mathcal{W}, k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the local sine basis for $L^2(I)$ (see Proposition 3.1).

Set $\mathcal{B}(Q) = \{\psi_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}}$. Then $\mathcal{B}(Q) = \mathcal{B}(I)^{\otimes d}$ is the d -fold tensor product of the basis $\mathcal{B}(I)$ for $L^2(I)$, where we identify the d -fold tensor power of $L^2(I)$ with $L^2(Q)$.

By elementary properties of tensor products of Hilbert spaces, $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(Q)$. We refer to $\mathcal{B}(Q) = \{\psi_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}\}_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}}$ as an “orthonormal wave packet basis” for $L^2(Q)$.

5.1 Fourier decay of wave packets

Here, we prove a decay bound on the Fourier transform $\widehat{\psi_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}}(\xi)$ of a wave packet in $\mathcal{B}(Q)$. The estimates will follow immediately from the decay estimate (3.5) for the local sine basis.

We write $\mathbf{1}$ for the all-ones vector $(1, \dots, 1)$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d$, we denote $\sigma \circ x := (\sigma_1 x_1, \dots, \sigma_d x_d)$ in \mathbb{R}^d .

Definition 5.1. Given a box $\mathbf{L} = L_1 \times \dots \times L_d$ in \mathbb{R}^d , define the map $\tau_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) := \pi^{-1}(\delta_{L_1} \xi_1, \dots, \delta_{L_d} \xi_d). \quad (5.2)$$

Given $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \{\pm 1\}^d$, define the coordinate-wise reflection $\tau_{\sigma} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\tau_{\sigma}(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \sigma \circ x = (\sigma_1 x_1, \dots, \sigma_d x_d). \quad (5.3)$$

Then $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}$ is a non-isotropic rescaling map, and $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}^{-1}$ sends the box \mathbf{L} to a cube of measure π^d .

Lemma 5.2. For all $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d} \times \mathbb{N}^d$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|\widehat{\psi_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}}(\xi)|^2 \leq 2^d A^{2d} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \Psi_{2a}(\pi \cdot |\tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi) - \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})|). \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. Squaring both sides of (3.5), using $(s+t)^2 \leq 2(s^2 + t^2)$, and $\Psi_a(t)^2 = \Psi_{2a}(t)$ (see (3.4)), we get

$$|\widehat{\phi_{L,k}}(\xi)|^2 \leq 2A^2 \delta_L \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \Psi_{2a}(\xi \delta_L - \sigma \pi(k + 1/2)). \quad (5.5)$$

Note the identity $\widehat{\psi_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}}(\xi) = \prod_{r=1}^d \widehat{\phi_{L_r, k_r}}(\xi_r)$ for $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d)$, where $\widehat{\cdot}$ on the LHS is the multivariate Fourier transform on \mathbb{R}^d , and $\widehat{\cdot}$ on the RHS is the univariate Fourier transform. Thus, from (5.5), we obtain:

$$|\widehat{\psi_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}}(\xi)|^2 \leq 2^d A^{2d} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d \delta_{L_j} \right) \sum_{\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \prod_{j=1}^d \Psi_{2a}(|\xi_j \delta_{L_j} - \sigma_j \pi(k_j + 1/2)|). \quad (5.6)$$

By definition of Ψ_a (see (3.4)), we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^d \Psi_{2a}(|\omega_j|) = \exp(-2a(\sum_{j=1}^d |\omega_j|^{2/3})) \leq \exp(-2a|\omega|^{2/3}) = \Psi_{2a}(|\omega|) \quad (5.7)$$

for $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d)$, where the last inequality uses the inequality $(|t_1|^3 + \dots + |t_d|^3)^{1/3} \leq |t_1| + \dots + |t_d|$ (with $t_j = |\omega_j|^{2/3}$). Note also if $\mathbf{L} = L_1 \times \dots \times L_d$ is a box in \mathbb{R}^d , then $\prod_j \delta_{L_j} = \mu_d(\mathbf{L})$.

Returning to (5.6), we make the substitution $\mu_d(\mathbf{L}) = \prod_j \delta_{L_j}$, and then apply the inequality (5.7) for the vector $\omega = \pi \tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi) - \pi \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})$, which is given in coordinates by $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d)$, $\omega_j = \xi_j \delta_{L_j} - \sigma_j \pi(k_j + 1/2)$. This shows

$$|\widehat{\psi_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}}(\xi)|^2 \leq 2^d A^{2d} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi \tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi) - \pi \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})|),$$

completing the proof of (5.4). □

Inequality (3.5) can be interpreted to say that $\widehat{\phi_{L,k}}(\xi)$ is concentrated near two points of \mathbb{R} , where $\xi \sim \pm \xi_{L,k}$, with $\xi_{L,k} := \pi(k + 1/2)/\delta_L$. By (5.1), we have $\widehat{\psi_{(\mathbf{L},\mathbf{k})}}(\xi) = \prod_{j=1}^d \widehat{\psi_{L_j,k_j}}(\xi_j)$. Therefore, $\widehat{\psi_{(\mathbf{L},\mathbf{k})}}(\xi)$ is concentrated for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ close to the 2^d many points $(\pm \xi_{L_1,k_1}, \dots, \pm \xi_{L_d,k_d})$ in \mathbb{R}^d . We now define frequency regions $R_\eta(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})$ (parametrized by $\eta > 1$) where $\widehat{\psi_{(\mathbf{L},\mathbf{k})}}(\xi)$ is concentrated.

Given a map $\tau : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we let $\tau[S] = \{\tau(x) : x \in S\}$.

For $(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d} \times \mathbb{N}^d$, we define the frequency region $R_\eta(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\begin{cases} R_\eta(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \tau_\sigma[R_\eta^1(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})], \text{ where} \\ R_\eta^1(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) = \prod_{j=1}^d [\xi_{L_j,k_j} - \eta\delta_{L_j}^{-1}, \xi_{L_j,k_j} + \eta\delta_{L_j}^{-1}], \text{ and} \\ \xi_{L,k} = \pi(k + 1/2)/\delta_L. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

We define $\xi_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{k}} = (\xi_{L_1,k_1}, \dots, \xi_{L_d,k_d})$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Observe that $R_\eta(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})$ is the union of 2^d many boxes centered at the points $\tau_\sigma(\xi_{\mathbf{L},\mathbf{k}})$ in \mathbb{R}^d ($\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d$), and $R_\eta(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})$ is coordinate-wise symmetric. The regions are nested with respect to η , i.e., $R_\eta(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \subset R_{\eta'}(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})$ for $\eta \leq \eta'$.

5.2 Main technical result

The following result realizes the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 for the operator $\mathcal{T}_r = P_Q B_{S(r)} P_Q$ and the wave packet basis $\mathcal{B}(Q)$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $Q = [0, 1]^d$. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be convex and coordinate-wise symmetric (see (1.3)), with $S \subset B(0, 1)$. Let $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $r \geq 1$ be given, and define $S(r) := rS = \{rx : x \in S\}$. Let $\mathcal{T}_r := \mathcal{T}_{Q,S(r)} = P_Q B_{S(r)} P_Q$. Let $\{\psi_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}}$ be the tensor local sine basis for $L^2(Q)$, defined in (5.1). Then there exists a partition of $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{low} \cup \mathcal{I}_{res} \cup \mathcal{I}_{hi}$, determined by S, r, δ , satisfying*

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{low}} \|(I - \mathcal{T}_r)\psi_\nu\|_2^2 + \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}} \|\mathcal{T}_r\psi_\nu\|_2^2 \leq \overline{C}_d \delta r^d$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{I}_{res} &\leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\delta)^3, (\log(r/\delta))^{3d}\}, \text{ and} \\ |\#\mathcal{I}_{low} - (2\pi)^{-d} \mu_d(S(r))| &\leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\delta)^3, (\log(r/\delta))^{3d}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, C_d and $\overline{C}_d \geq 1$ are dimensional constants, determined solely by d (in particular, these constants are independent of the choice of the body $S \subset B(0, 1)$.)

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of the Proposition 5.3.

5.2.1 Partitioning the basis

Here, we start on the proof of Proposition 5.3. Given $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, let

$$\eta := 125(a^{-1} \ln(1/\delta))^{3/2},$$

with $a = 1/115$ as in Proposition 3.1. For this η ,

$$\Psi_{2a}(\eta/8) \leq \delta. \tag{5.9}$$

(Note, from (3.4), $\Psi_{2a}(\eta/8) = \exp(-a\eta^{2/3}/2) = \exp(-25 \ln(1/\delta)/2) \leq \exp(\ln(\delta)) = \delta$.)

Associated to the rescaled bandlimiting domain $S(r) = rS$, the value of δ , and η (determined by δ), we define the index sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{low} &:= \left\{ \nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) : \delta_{L_j} > \delta/r \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, d\}, R_\eta(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \subset S(r) \right\} \\ \mathcal{I}_{hi} &:= \left\{ \nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) : R_\eta(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r) \right\} \\ &\quad \cup \left\{ \nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) : \delta_{L_j} \leq \delta/r \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \right\} \\ \mathcal{I}_{res} &:= \mathcal{I} \setminus (\mathcal{I}_{low} \cup \mathcal{I}_{hi}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Clearly, $\{\mathcal{I}_{low}, \mathcal{I}_{res}, \mathcal{I}_{hi}\}$ is a partition of \mathcal{I} .

5.2.2 Energy estimates

We define the “energy loss” for the operator $\mathcal{T}_r = P_Q B_{S(r)} P_Q$ with respect to the partition (5.10) of the basis $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ by

$$\mathcal{E} := \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}} \|\mathcal{T}_r \psi_\nu\|^2 + \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{low}} \|(I - \mathcal{T}_r) \psi_\nu\|^2.$$

By Plancherel’s theorem, and the fact that the projection P_Q is a contraction on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we see that

$$\mathcal{E} \leq \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}} \|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2 + \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{low}} \|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r))}^2 =: \mathcal{E}_{hi} + \mathcal{E}_{low}.$$

Here, and in what follows, we write $\|g\|_{L^2(A)} = \int_A |g(x)|^2 dx$ to denote the L^2 norm of g on a measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We now work to bound the two terms on the right-hand side of the above inequality.

Lemma 5.4. $\mathcal{E}_{hi} \leq C_d \delta r^d$, for a dimensional constant C_d .

Proof. We write

$$\mathcal{E}_{hi} = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}} \|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2.$$

Recall that $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}$ iff either $\delta_{L_j} \leq \delta/r$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ or $R_\eta(\nu) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r)$. We write

$$\mathcal{I}_{hi} = \mathcal{I}_{osc} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^d \mathcal{I}_\partial^j.$$

where we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\partial^j &:= \{\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) : \delta_{L_j} \leq \delta/r\}, \quad \text{for each } j \in \{1, \dots, d\}; \\ \mathcal{I}_{osc} &:= \{\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) : \delta_{L_j} > \delta/r \text{ for all } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, \text{ and } R_\eta(\nu) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define Z_∂^j ($j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$) as the sum of $\|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2$ over $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_\partial^j$, and Z_{osc} as the sum of $\|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2$ over $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{osc}$. Then:

$$\mathcal{E}_{hi} \leq \sum_{j=1}^d Z_\partial^j + Z_{osc}.$$

For $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}$, we have

$$\widehat{\psi}_{(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})}(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_d) = \prod_{r=1}^d \widehat{\phi}_{L_r, k_r}(\xi_r).$$

Since $S(r) = rS$, and $S \subset B(0, 1)$, we have $S(r) \subset B(0, r) \subset [-r, r]^d$. Thus,

$$\|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2 \leq \|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2([-r, r]^d)}^2 = \prod_{j=1}^d \|\widehat{\phi}_{(L_j, k_j)}\|_{L^2([-r, r])}^2. \quad (5.11)$$

By summing (5.11) over all those $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}_\partial^1$, which satisfy $\delta_{L_1} \leq \delta/r$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\partial^1 &= \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_\partial^1} \|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{(L, k) \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{N}} \|\widehat{\phi}_{(L, k)}\|_{L^2([-r, r])}^2 \right)^{d-1} \sum_{(L_1, k_1) \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{N} : \delta_{L_1} \leq \delta/r} \|\widehat{\phi}_{(L_1, k_1)}\|_{L^2([-r, r])}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

To continue the bound of (5.12), we establish:

Claim 5.5 (Preparatory claim). For fixed $L \in \mathcal{W}(I)$,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\widehat{\phi}_{(L, k)}\|_{L^2([-r, r])}^2 \leq \widehat{C} \delta_L r$$

for a universal constant \widehat{C} .

Proof of preparatory claim. Recall from (5.5) that

$$|\widehat{\phi_{(L,k)}}(\xi)|^2 \leq 2A^2\delta_L \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \Psi_{2a}(\xi\delta_L - \sigma\pi(k + 1/2)).$$

with $\Psi_a(t) = \exp(-at^{1/2})$. Thus, for fixed $L \in \mathcal{W}(I)$,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\widehat{\phi_{(L,k)}}\|_{L^2([-r,r])}^2 = 2A^2\delta_L \int_{-r}^r \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi_{2a}(|\xi\delta_L - \sigma(2k + 1)/4|) d\xi.$$

Note, for fixed $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, we have, by comparison of Riemann sums to a Riemann integral, that

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi_{2a}(|\xi\delta_L - \sigma(2k + 1)/4|) \leq C \int_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \Psi_{2a}(t) dt \leq C_0;$$

therefore, continuing the previous bounds:

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\widehat{\phi_{(L,k)}}\|_{L^2([-r,r])}^2 \leq 2A^2C_0\delta_L \int_{-r}^r d\xi = 4A^2C_0\delta_L r,$$

establishing the preparatory claim. □

Now, returning to the proof of the lemma, note that the preparatory claim implies

$$\sum_{(L,k) \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{N}} \|\widehat{\phi_{(L,k)}}\|_{L^2([-r,r])}^2 \leq \widehat{C} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{W}(I)} \delta_L r = \widehat{C} r;$$

indeed, $\sum_{L \in \mathcal{W}(I)} \delta_L = 1$ follows because $\mathcal{W}(I)$ is a partition of $I = [0, 1]$.

Furthermore,

$$\sum_{(L_1, k_1) \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{N}: \delta_{L_1} \leq \delta/r} \|\widehat{\phi_{(L_1, k_1)}}\|_{L^2([-r,r])}^2 \leq \widehat{C} \sum_{L_1 \in \mathcal{W}: \delta_{L_1} \leq \delta/r} \delta_{L_1} r \leq 4\widehat{C}\delta.$$

where the latter inequality uses the fact that $L \in \mathcal{W}(I), \delta_L \leq \delta/r \implies L \subset [0, 2\delta/r] \cup [1 - 2\delta/r, 1]$ by the geometric properties of the family \mathcal{W} (see (3.3)). We have $\bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{W}(I): \delta_L \leq \delta/r} L \subset [0, 2\delta/r] \cup [1 - 2\delta/r, 1]$. So, $\sum_{L \in \mathcal{W}: \delta_L \leq \delta/r} \delta_L$ is bounded by the Lebesgue measure of $[0, 2\delta/r] \cup [1 - 2\delta/r, 1]$, which is at most $4\delta/r$.

Therefore, returning to (5.12), we have

$$Z_{\partial}^1 \leq (\widehat{C}r)^{d-1} \cdot (4\widehat{C}\delta) \leq 4\widehat{C}^d \delta r^{d-1}.$$

By symmetry, also

$$Z_{\partial}^j = Z_{\partial}^1 \leq 4\widehat{C}^d \delta r^{d-1}, \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, d. \quad (5.13)$$

It remains to bound Z_{osc} . Note that

$$Z_{osc} = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{osc}} \|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2 \quad (5.14)$$

We get an upper bound on $\|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2$ by integrating both sides of (5.4) over $\xi \in S(r)$, to get:

$$\|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2 \leq 2^d A^{2d} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{\xi \in S(r)} \Psi_{2a}(\pi \cdot |\tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi) - \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})|) d\xi,$$

where $\tau_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the map $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) = \pi^{-1}(\delta_{L_1}\xi_1, \dots, \delta_{L_d}\xi_d)$, and \circ denotes the entrywise product of vectors. Performing a change of variable $\tilde{\xi} = \tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi)$, and noting the Jacobian of $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}$ is $\det \tau_{\mathbf{L}} = \pi^{-d} \mu_D(\mathbf{L})$, we get

$$\|\widehat{\psi}_\nu\|_{L^2(S(r))}^2 \leq C_d \int_{\xi \in \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)} \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \Psi_{2a}(\pi \cdot |\xi - \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})|) d\xi. \quad (5.15)$$

Note, for $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k})$, that $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{osc} \iff \delta_{L_j} \geq \delta/r$ for all j , and $R_\eta(\nu) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r)$. We next rewrite the second condition on ν in a more manageable way. Fix $\mathbf{L} = L_1 \times \dots \times L_d \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}$ satisfying $\delta_{L_j} \geq \delta/r$ for all j . By symmetry of $S(r)$ and $R_\eta(\nu)$ with respect to coordinate reflections, and by the relation between $R_\eta(\nu)$ and $R_\eta^1(\nu)$ in (5.8), we have that

$$R_\eta(\nu) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r) \iff R_\eta^1(\nu) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r).$$

Now, we can apply the rescaling $\tau_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ to both sides of the second inclusion above, and obtain an equivalent inclusion. Note, by the form of $R_\eta^1(\nu)$ in (5.8):

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathbf{L}}[R_\eta^1(\nu)] &= \prod_{j=1}^d [(k_j + 1/2) - \pi^{-1}\eta, (k_j + 1/2) + \pi^{-1}\eta] \\ &= (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}) + [-\eta/\pi, \eta/\pi]^d. \end{aligned}$$

Also, $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}[\mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r)] = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}}[S(r)]$. So, we have shown

$$\begin{aligned} R_\eta(\nu) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r) &\iff (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}) + [-\eta/\pi, \eta/\pi]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}}[S(r)] \\ &\iff \text{dist}_\infty(\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}, \tau_{\mathbf{L}}[S(r)]) \geq \eta/\pi. \end{aligned}$$

Returning to the first line of this paragraph, we have proven that

$$\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}_{osc} \iff \begin{cases} \delta_{L_j} \geq \delta/r \text{ for all } j, \text{ and} \\ \text{dist}_\infty(\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}, \tau_{\mathbf{L}}[S(r)]) \geq \eta/\pi. \end{cases} \quad (5.16)$$

We let $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{L}, \eta) := \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d : \text{dist}_\infty(\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}, \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)) \geq \eta/\pi\}$. Using (5.16), and (5.15) in (5.14), we get

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{osc} &\leq C_d \sum_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{L}, \eta)} \\ &\sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{\xi \in \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi\xi - \pi\sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})|) d\xi. \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

By definition of $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{L}, \eta)$, for relevant $(\xi, \mathbf{L}, \sigma, \mathbf{k})$ as in the above line, we have

$$\text{dist}_\infty(\xi, \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})) \geq \eta/\pi,$$

thus also

$$|\xi - \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})| \geq \eta/\pi.$$

Further, the map $(\sigma, \mathbf{k}) \mapsto \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})$ is injective into the lattice $(\mathbb{Z} + 1/2)^2$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.6, we have a uniform bound for any $\xi \in \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{L}, \eta)} \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi\xi - \pi\sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})|) d\xi &\leq C \int_{\xi': |\xi - \xi'| > \eta/\pi} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi\xi - \pi\xi'|) d\xi' \\ &\leq C' \int_{\xi': |\xi - \xi'| > \eta} \Psi_{2a}(|\xi - \xi'|) d\xi' \\ &= C' \int_{x: |x| > \eta} \Psi_{2a}(|x|) dx \\ &\leq C'' \Psi_{2a}(\eta/4) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses (4.13). Now, substituting the above in (5.17), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{osc} &\leq C_d \Psi_{2a}(\eta/4) \sum_{\mathbf{L}: \delta_{L_j} \geq \delta/r \forall j} \int_{\xi \in \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)} 1 d\xi \\ &\leq C_d \Psi_{2a}(\eta/4) \sum_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}} \mu_d(\tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)) \\ &= C_d \Psi_{2a}(\eta/4) \sum_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}} \pi^{-d} \mu_d(S(r)) \prod_{j=1}^d \delta_{L_j} \\ &= C'_d \Psi_{2a}(\eta/4) \mu_d(S(r)) \sum_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) \\ &= C'_d \Psi_{2a}(\eta/4) \mu_d(S(r)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses that $\det(\tau_{\mathbf{L}}) = \pi^{-d} \prod_j \delta_{L_j}$, and the last equality uses that $\mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}$ is a partition of $Q = I^d$, hence, $\sum_{\mathbf{L}} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) = \mu_d(Q) = 1$. Now, we recall that $\eta \geq 100(a^{-1} \log(1/\delta))^2$ so that

$\Psi_{2a}(\eta/4) \leq \delta$. Also, $\mu_d(S(r)) = \mu_d(S)r^d \leq \mu_d(B(0,1))r^d = \kappa_d r^d$, where κ_d is the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d . Therefore,

$$Z_{osc} \leq C_d'' \delta r^d.$$

Combined with the earlier bound on Z_{∂}^j ((5.13)), we learn that

$$\mathcal{E}_{hi} \leq \sum_{j=1}^d Z_{\partial}^j + Z_{osc} \leq C_d \delta r^{d-1} + C_d'' \delta r^d \leq C_d''' \delta r^d.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We next prove the following:

Lemma 5.6. $\mathcal{E}_{low} \leq C_d \delta r^d$, for a dimensional constant C_d .

Proof. We have to estimate

$$\mathcal{E}_{low} = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{low}} \|\widehat{\psi}_{\nu}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r))}^2.$$

By integrating both sides of (5.4) over $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r)$, and making a change of variables on the RHS, we get: for any $\nu \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\|\widehat{\psi}_{\nu}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r))}^2 \leq C_d \int_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}} S(r)} \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi \xi - \pi \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})|) d\xi, \quad (5.18)$$

where $\tau_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the rescaling map defined by $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi) = (\pi^{-1} \delta_{L_1} \xi_1, \dots, \pi^{-1} \delta_{L_d} \xi_d)$. (See the proof of (5.15) for comparison.)

Recall $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}_{low} \iff \delta_{L_j} > \delta/r$ for all j , and $R_{\eta}(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \subset S(r)$. Now, replicating the proof of (5.16) for this setting, we have that

$$\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{low} \implies \text{dist}_{\infty}(\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}} S(r)) \geq \eta/\pi. \quad (5.19)$$

We set $\overline{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{L}, \eta) := \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d : \text{dist}_{\infty}(\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}} S(r)) \geq \eta/\pi\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{low} &\leq C \sum_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{L}, \eta)} \\ &\quad \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}} S(r)} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi \xi - \pi \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})|) d\xi. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

For relevant $(\xi, \sigma, \mathbf{k})$ as above, we have $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}} S(r)$ and the points $\xi_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}} = \sigma \circ (\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1})$ satisfy $\xi_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}} \in (\mathbb{Z} + 1/2)^d$, while $\text{dist}_{\infty}(\xi_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}}, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}} S(r)) \geq \eta/\pi$, with the last inequality using the definition of $\overline{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{L}, \eta)$ and the coordinate-symmetry of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}} S(r)$. In particular, $|\xi - \xi_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}}| \geq \text{dist}_{\infty}(\xi, \xi_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}}) \geq \eta/\pi$.

Also, the triangle inequality implies $\xi_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}} + [-1/2, 1/2]^d \subset \{\xi' \in \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r) : |\xi - \xi'| > \eta/\pi - 1\}$. Consequently, by Lemma 4.6, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)$ we have the uniform bound

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{L}, \eta)} \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi\xi - \pi\xi_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}}|) \leq C \int_{\xi' \in \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r) : |\xi - \xi'| > \eta/\pi - 1} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi\xi - \pi\xi'|) d\xi'.$$

Note $\eta \geq 2\pi$, by definition, so $\eta/\pi - 1 \geq \eta/(2\pi)$. Thus, we maintain the inequality if we integrate on the larger domain $|\xi - \xi'| > \eta/(2\pi)$. Substituting that inequality in (5.20), we get

$$\mathcal{E}_{low} \leq C \sum_{\mathbf{L}} \int_{(\xi, \xi') \in (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)) \times \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r) : |\xi - \xi'| > \eta/(2\pi)} \Psi_{2a}(|\pi\xi - \pi\xi'|) d\xi d\xi'$$

We now make the change of variables $\xi'' = \xi - \xi'$ and change the integral into a $d\xi' d\xi''$ integral integrated over the larger set of all $\xi' \in \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)$ and $|\xi''| > \eta/(2\pi)$; note the integrand is positive, so this integral over a larger domain is greater. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{low} &\leq C_d \sum_{\mathbf{L}} \int_{\xi' \in \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)} \int_{|\xi''| > \eta/(2\pi)} \Psi_{2a}(\pi|\xi''|) d\xi'' d\xi' \\ &\leq C_d \sum_{\mathbf{L}} \mu_d(\tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)) \int_{|\xi''| > \eta/2} \Psi_{2a}(|\xi''|). \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.13), $S(r) \subset B(r)$, and that the Jacobian of the transformation $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}$ is $\det \tau_{\mathbf{L}} = \pi^{-d} \mu_d(\mathbf{L})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{low} &\leq C_d \Psi_{2a}(\eta/8) \sum_{\mathbf{L}} \mu_d(\tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)) \\ &\leq C_d \Psi_{2a}(\eta/8) r^d \sum_{\mathbf{L}} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) \\ &= C_d \Psi_{2a}(\eta/8) r^d. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $\Psi_{2a}(\eta/8) \leq \delta$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{low} \leq C_d \delta r^d$$

as desired. □

Lemma 5.7. *There exists a dimensional constant C_d such that*

$$\#(\mathcal{I}_{res}) \leq C_d \max \left\{ r^d \log(r/\epsilon)^3, \log(r/\epsilon)^{3d} \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}_{res}$. Then $\nu \notin \mathcal{I}_{hi}$. By definition of \mathcal{I}_{hi} , $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{res} \implies$

$$\delta_{L_j} > \delta/r \quad \forall j. \tag{5.21}$$

Because \mathcal{W} is a family of subintervals of $[0, 1]$, we have $\delta_L \leq 1$ for all $L \in \mathcal{W}$. By definition of \mathcal{W} , there are exactly 2 intervals $L \in \mathcal{W}$ satisfying $\delta_L = 2^{-k}$ for each $k \geq 2$. Therefore,

$$\#\{L \in \mathcal{W}(I) : \delta_L \geq \delta/r\} \leq 2 \log(r/\delta). \quad (5.22)$$

Now, if $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{res}$ then neither $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{low}$ nor $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}$, and so by definition, neither $R_\eta(\nu) \subset S(r)$ nor $R_\eta(\nu) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r)$. Note, both $R_\eta(\nu)$ and $S(r)$ are coordinate-wise symmetric, and further, in (5.8), we write $R_\eta(\nu) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{2^d} R_\eta^j(\nu)$, where $R_\eta^1(\nu), \dots, R_\eta^{2^d}(\nu)$ are given by applying coordinate-wise reflections to $R_\eta^1(\nu)$. Via this decomposition of $R_\eta(\nu)$, and the coordinate-wise symmetry of $S(r)$, we learn that $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{res} \implies$ neither $R_\eta^1(\nu) \subset S(r)$ nor $R_\eta^1(\nu) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus S(r)$. Therefore, $\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{res} \implies$

$$R_\eta^1(\nu) \cap \partial S(r) \neq \emptyset.$$

Therefore, if $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}_{res}$, then condition (5.21) holds, and also

$$R_\eta^1(\nu) \text{ intersects } \partial S(r), \quad \nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}). \quad (5.23)$$

We now work to simplify the condition (5.23) on (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) .

Write $E(r_1, \dots, r_d)$ for the set of all $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $(\xi_1/r_1)^2 + \dots + (\xi_d/r_d)^2 \leq 1$. Consider the rescaling map $\tau_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, given by

$$\tau_{\mathbf{L}}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) = (\pi^{-1}\delta_{L_1}\xi_1, \dots, \pi^{-1}\delta_{L_d}\xi_d).$$

Applying $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}$ to the box $R_\eta^1(\nu)$, defined in (5.8) we obtain a cube of sidelength $2\pi^{-1}\eta$, and condition (5.23) is equivalent to the condition:

$$\tau_{\mathbf{L}}R_\eta^1(\nu) = \prod_{j=1}^d [\pi^{-1}\delta_{L_j}\xi_{L_j, k_j} - \pi^{-1}\eta, \pi^{-1}\delta_{L_j}\xi_{L_j, k_j} + \pi^{-1}\eta] \text{ intersects } \partial(\tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)),$$

$$\text{where } \xi_{L, k} = \pi(k + 1/2)/\delta_L.$$

Note that $\pi^{-1}\delta_{L_j}\xi_{L_j, k_j} = (k_j + 1/2)$. So, the cube $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}R_\eta^1(\nu)$ above is just the ℓ^∞ -neighborhood of the lattice point $\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}$ of radius η/π . Therefore, condition (5.23) is equivalent to

$$\text{dist}_\infty(\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}, \partial(\tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r))) \leq \pi^{-1}\eta. \quad (5.24)$$

Thus, we have established that if $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}_{res}$ then $\delta_{L_j} > \delta/r$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and condition (5.24) holds. Let $N(\mathbf{L})$ denote the number of $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ satisfying condition (5.24) for fixed $\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}$. Then

$$\#(\mathcal{I}_{res}) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d} : \delta_{L_j} > \delta/r \forall j} N(\mathbf{L}). \quad (5.25)$$

Recall the assumption $S \subset B(0, 1)$, so $S(r) \subset B(r)$, so

$$\tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r) \subset \tau_{\mathbf{L}}B(r) = E(\pi^{-1}r\delta_{L_1}, \dots, \pi^{-1}r\delta_{L_d}).$$

Thus, by Corollary 4.4, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} N(\mathbf{L}) &\leq 2 \cdot 4^d \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\sqrt{d})^{d-j} (\pi^{-1}\eta)^{d-j} \kappa_{d-j} \max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} (\pi^{-1}r\delta_{L_{i_1}}) \cdots (\pi^{-1}r\delta_{L_{i_j}}) \\ &\leq C_d \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j \eta^{d-j} \max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} \delta_{L_{i_1}} \cdots \delta_{L_{i_j}}, \quad C_d = 12(4/\pi)^d d^{d/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, κ_ℓ denotes the volume of the unit ball in ℓ -dimensional Euclidean space, and we have used that $\kappa_\ell \leq \kappa_5 \leq 6$ for all ℓ . Returning to (5.25),

$$\#(\mathcal{I}_{res}) \leq C_d \sum_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d}: \delta_{L_j} > \delta/r \forall j} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j \eta^{d-j} \max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} \delta_{L_{i_1}} \cdots \delta_{L_{i_j}} =: T_0. \quad (5.26)$$

We estimate T_0 as follows. By symmetry,

$$T_0 \leq d! C_d \sum_{\mathbf{L}: \delta_{L_1} \geq \dots \geq \delta_{L_d} \geq \delta/r} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j \eta^{d-j} \max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} \delta_{L_{i_1}} \cdots \delta_{L_{i_j}}.$$

Above, the factor of $d!$ accounts for all possible permutations of the ordering of the d interval lengths $\delta_{L_1}, \dots, \delta_{L_d}$. The maximum in the above sum is equal to $\delta_{L_1} \cdots \delta_{L_j}$. We sum over a larger collection of \mathbf{L} , to give

$$T_0 \leq C'_d \sum_{\mathbf{L}: \delta_{L_{j+1}}, \dots, \delta_{L_d} \geq \delta/r} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j \eta^{d-j} \delta_{L_1} \cdots \delta_{L_j}.$$

The summands on the RHS above do not depend on L_{j+1}, \dots, L_d . The number of $(L_{j+1}, \dots, L_d) \in \mathcal{W}^{d-j}$ satisfying $\delta_{L_{j+1}}, \dots, \delta_{L_d} \geq \delta/r$ is at most $(2 \log(r/\delta))^{d-j}$, thanks to (5.22). Thus,

$$T_0 \leq C''_d \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j \eta^{d-j} (\log(r/\delta))^{d-j} \sum_{L_1, \dots, L_j \in \mathcal{W}} \delta_{L_1} \cdots \delta_{L_j}.$$

Note $\sum_{L_1, \dots, L_j \in \mathcal{W}} \delta_{L_1} \cdots \delta_{L_j} = (\sum_{L \in \mathcal{W}} \delta_L)^j$. Also, $\sum_{L \in \mathcal{W}} \delta_L = 1$, since \mathcal{W} is a partition of $I = [0, 1]$. Given that $\eta = 125(a^{-1} \ln(1/\delta))^{3/2} \leq C \log(1/\delta)^{3/2}$, we have

$$T_0 \leq \bar{C}_d \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j (\log(r/\delta))^{3(d-j)}.$$

Note that $\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j (\log(r/\delta))^{3(d-j)}$ is a geometric series. Its terms are monotone. Thus, the sum of the series is at most d times the maximum of the first term ($j = 0$) and last term ($j = d - 1$). We deduce that

$$T_0 \leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\epsilon)^3, (\log(r/\epsilon))^{3d}\}. \quad (5.27)$$

From (5.26), we have $\#(\mathcal{I}_{res}) \leq T_0$. The previous bound concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 5.8. *There exists a dimensional constant C_d such that*

$$|\#\mathcal{I}_{low} - (2\pi)^{-d}\mu_d(S(r))| \leq C_d \max \left\{ r^d \log(r/\epsilon)^3, \log(r/\epsilon)^{3d} \right\}.$$

Proof. From (5.19), we learn that $\nu = (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{I}_{low} \iff$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{L_j} &> \delta/r \quad \forall j, \text{ and} \\ \text{dist}_\infty(\mathbf{k} + (1/2)\mathbf{1}, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)) &\geq \eta/\pi. \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

Here, dist_∞ is the distance with respect to the ℓ^∞ -norm on \mathbb{R}^d , and $\tau_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the map defined as in the proof of the previous lemma.

Now, we ask: For fixed \mathbf{L} , how many $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ satisfy the second line of (5.28)? Let $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{L}, \eta)$ denote the number of such $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ satisfying (5.28). Note that, by symmetry, this number $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{L}, \eta)$ is exactly 2^{-d} times the number $\mathcal{M}_0(\mathbf{L}, \eta)$ of points x in the lattice $(\mathbb{Z} + 1/2)^d$ satisfying

$$\text{dist}_\infty(x, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r)) \geq \eta/\pi.$$

As in the proof of the previous lemma, we have that

$$\tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r) \subset E(\pi^{-1}r\delta_{L_1}, \dots, \pi^{-1}r\delta_{L_d}).$$

By Corollary 4.4, we have that

$$|\mathcal{M}_0(\mathbf{L}, \eta) - \mu_d(\tau_{\mathbf{L}}S(r))| \leq C_d \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \eta^{d-j} \max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} (r\delta_{L_{i_1}}) \cdots (r\delta_{L_{i_j}}).$$

We note that the Jacobian of the transformation $\tau_{\mathbf{L}}$ is $\det \tau_{\mathbf{L}} = \pi^{-d}\delta_{L_1} \cdots \delta_{L_d} = \pi^{-d}\mu_d(\mathbf{L})$. Thus, by multiplying the previous inequality by 2^{-d} , and using the Jacobian change of volume formula, we get

$$|\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{L}, \eta) - (2\pi)^{-d}\mu_d(S(r))\mu_d(\mathbf{L})| \leq C_d \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j \eta^{d-j} \max_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} \delta_{L_{i_1}} \cdots \delta_{L_{i_j}}. \tag{5.29}$$

Now, note, by definition

$$\#\mathcal{I}_{low} = \sum_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes d} : \delta_{L_j} > \frac{\delta}{r} \forall j} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{L}, \eta). \tag{5.30}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{L} : \delta_{L_j} > \frac{\delta}{r} \forall j} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) - 1 \right| &= \left| \sum_{\mathbf{L} : \delta_{L_j} > \frac{\delta}{r} \forall j} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) - \mu_d(Q) \right| \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{L} : \delta_{L_j} \leq \frac{\delta}{r} \text{ for some } j} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses that $\{\mathbf{L}\}$ is a partition of $Q = [0, 1]^d$. Now, by the construction of \mathcal{W} , if \mathbf{L} satisfies $\delta_{L_j} \leq \delta/r$ for some j , then $\mathbf{L} = L_1 \times \cdots \times L_d$ is contained in the region $[0, 1]^d \setminus [2\delta/r, 1 - 2\delta/r]^d$ (recall $\delta_L \leq \delta_0 \implies L \subset [0, 2\delta_0] \cup [1 - 2\delta_0, 1]$), hence,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{L}: \delta_{L_j} \leq \frac{\delta}{r} \text{ for some } j} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) \leq \mu_d([0, 1]^d \setminus [2\delta/r, 1 - 2\delta/r]^d) \leq 2d(2\delta/r) = 4d\delta/r.$$

Thus,

$$\left| \sum_{\mathbf{L}: \delta_{L_j} > \frac{\delta}{r} \forall j} \mu_d(\mathbf{L}) - 1 \right| \leq 4d\delta/r.$$

Now, by summing (5.29) and using (5.30), as well as the above line, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\#\mathcal{I}_{low} - (2\pi)^{-d} \mu_d(S(r))| &\leq \underbrace{(4d\delta/r)(2\pi)^{-d} \mu_d(S(r))}_{T_1} \\ &+ C_d \underbrace{\sum_{\mathbf{L}: \delta_{L_j} > \delta/r \forall j} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} r^j \eta^{d-j} \max_{i_1 < \cdots < i_j} \delta_{L_{i_1}} \cdots \delta_{L_{i_j}}}_{T_0} \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

The term T_1 is controlled as follows, using that $S(r) \subset B(r)$,

$$T_1 = (4d\delta/r)(2\pi)^{-d} \mu_d(S(r)) \leq C_d(\delta/r)r^d \leq C_d r^{d-1}.$$

The term T_0 is the same term defined in (5.26). In (5.27) we showed that

$$T_0 \leq \overline{C}_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\delta)^3, (\log(r/\delta))^{3d}\}.$$

Using these bounds on T_1 and T_0 in (5.31), and noting the upper bound on T_0 dominates the upper bound on T_1 , we get

$$|\#\mathcal{I}_{low} - (2\pi)^{-d} \mu_d(S(r))| \leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\delta)^3, (\log(r/\delta))^{3d}\}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

From Lemmas 5.4 and 5.6, we have

$$\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E}_{hi} + \mathcal{E}_{low} \leq C_d \delta r^d.$$

From Lemmas 5.7 and 5.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{I}_{res} &\leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\delta)^3, (\log(r/\delta))^{3d}\} \\ |\#\mathcal{I}_{low} - (2\pi)^{-d} \mu_d(S(r))| &\leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\delta)^3, (\log(r/\delta))^{3d}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.3

6 Proofs of the Main Results

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Fix a convex set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ that is coordinate-wise symmetric. Let $Q = [0, 1]^d$. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ and $r \geq 1$. Set $S(r) = \{rx : x \in S\}$.

We consider the operator $\mathcal{T}_r = P_Q B_{S(r)} P_Q$ on L^2 . We write $\lambda_k(\mathcal{T}_r)$ for the nonzero eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_r ($k \geq 0$). These are identical to the eigenvalues $\lambda_k(Q, S(r))$ for the operator $\tilde{T}_{Q, S(r)} = B_{S(r)} P_Q B_{S(r)}$; see Remark 2.2.

Let C_d, \bar{C}_d be as in Proposition 5.3. Define $\delta = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\bar{C}_d r^d}$. We apply Proposition 5.3 to produce a partition $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{low} \cup \mathcal{I}_{res} \cup \mathcal{I}_{hi}$ of the index set for the tensor local sine basis $\{\psi_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}}$, such that

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{low}} \|(I - \mathcal{T}_r)\psi_\nu\|_2^2 + \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{I}_{hi}} \|\mathcal{T}_r\psi_\nu\|_2^2 \leq \bar{C}_d \delta r^d = \epsilon^2 \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{I}_{res} &\leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\delta)^3, (\log(r/\delta))^{3d}\} \\ |\#\mathcal{I}_{low} - (2\pi)^{-d} \mu_d(S(r))| &\leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\delta)^3, (\log(r/\delta))^{3d}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\log(r/\delta) = \log(\bar{C}_d r^{d+1}/\epsilon^2) \leq \log(\bar{C}_d) + (d+1) \log(r/\epsilon) \leq C_d \log(r/\epsilon).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{I}_{res} &\leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\epsilon)^3, (\log(r/\epsilon))^{3d}\} \\ |\#\mathcal{I}_{low} - (2\pi)^{-d} \mu_d(S(r))| &\leq C_d \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\epsilon)^3, (\log(r/\epsilon))^{3d}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Owing to (6.1), we are in a position to apply Lemma 4.1. We learn that, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\#\{k : \lambda_k(\mathcal{T}_r) > \epsilon\} - \#\mathcal{I}_{low}| &\leq \#\mathcal{I}_{res} \\ \#\{k : \lambda_k(\mathcal{T}_r) \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)\} &\leq \#\mathcal{I}_{res}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the preceding bounds on $\#\mathcal{I}_{low}$ and $\#\mathcal{I}_{res}$, we obtain the desired bounds on $M_\epsilon(r)$ and $N_\epsilon(r)$ as in the statement of Theorem 1.1.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Recall, given intervals $I, J \subset \mathbb{R}$, the operator $\mathcal{T}_{I,J} : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is defined by $\mathcal{T}_{I,J} = P_I B_J P_I$. We establish the following

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\{\psi_l\}_{l \geq 0}$ be an orthonormal basis for $L^2(I)$ consisting of the eigenfunctions of the operator $\mathcal{T}_{I,J}$, and let $\{\lambda_l\}_{l \geq 0}$ denote the sequence of associated non-negative eigenvalues. We assume $\{\lambda_l\}_{l \geq 0}$ is sorted in non-increasing order. Then the set*

$$\left\{ \Psi_{\vec{\ell}}(x) = \prod_{k=1}^d \psi_{\ell_k}(x_k) : \vec{\ell} = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d \right\}$$

is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(Q)$, consisting of the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S}$, with associated eigenvalues

$$\left\{ \lambda_{\vec{\ell}} = \prod_{k=1}^d \lambda_{\ell_k} : \vec{\ell} = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d \right\}.$$

Proof. If \mathcal{B} is an orthonormal basis for a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , then $\mathcal{B}^{\otimes d} := \{\otimes_{j=1}^d \psi_j : \psi_j \in \mathcal{H}\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\overline{\otimes_{k=1}^d \mathcal{H}}$. Note that $L^2(Q) = \overline{\otimes_{k=1}^d L^2(I)}$. Therefore, $\{\Psi_{\vec{\ell}}\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(Q)$.

It remains to verify that $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S}\Psi_{\vec{\ell}} = \lambda_{\vec{\ell}}\Psi_{\vec{\ell}}$. Recall that $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S} = P_Q B_S P_Q$ as introduced in Section 2. We have the kernel representation for $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S}$:

$$\mathcal{T}_{Q,S}\Psi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_{Q,S}(x,y)\Psi(y)dy \quad (\Psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)).$$

with

$$K_{Q,S}(x,y) = \chi_Q(x)\chi_S(y)\pi^{-d} \prod_{k=1}^d \frac{\sin(W(x_k - y_k))}{x_k - y_k},$$

where the term π^{-d} times the product of sinc functions is just the inverse fourier transform of $\chi_{[-W,W]^d}(\xi)$. Given that $Q = I^d$ we have $\chi_Q(x) = \prod_k \chi_I(x_k)$, and similarly for $\chi_S(y) = \prod_k \chi_J(y_k)$ so

$$K_{Q,S}(x,y) = \prod_{k=1}^d K_{I,J}(x_k, y_k),$$

with $K_{I,J}$ defined as before. Hence, using the definition of $\Psi_{\vec{\ell}}$, and the eigenproperty of ψ_{ℓ_k} ,

$$\mathcal{T}_{Q,S}\Psi_{\vec{\ell}}(x) = \prod_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_{I,J}(x_k, y_k)\psi_{\ell_k}(y_k)dy = \prod_{k=1}^d \lambda_{\ell_k}\psi_{\ell_k}(x_k)$$

So, $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S}\Psi_{\vec{\ell}} = \lambda_{\vec{\ell}}\Psi_{\vec{\ell}}$, as claimed. □

Combining Theorem 1.4 with Landau's result in (1.9), we obtain the following result.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and $W \geq 2\pi$. Then*

$$|\#\{k : \lambda_k > \gamma\} - W/\pi| \leq (2/\pi^2) \log(50W/\pi + 25) \log(5/(\gamma(1 - \gamma))) + 9.$$

Proof. We split the proof into cases depending on whether $\gamma \leq 1/2$ or $\gamma > 1/2$.

Case 1: Suppose $\gamma \leq 1/2$. Then

$$\#\{k : \lambda_k > \gamma\} = \#\{k : \lambda_k \in [1/2, 1)\} + \#\{k : \lambda_k \in (\gamma, 1/2)\}.$$

The first term is between N and $N + 2$, due to Landau's result (1.9). The second term is between 0 and $\#\{k : \lambda_k \in (\gamma, 1 - \gamma)\}$, or between 0 and $(2/\pi^2) \log(50W/\pi + 25) \log(5/(\gamma(1 - \gamma))) + 7$, due to Theorem 1.4. Therefore,

$$N \leq \#\{k : \lambda_k > \gamma\} \leq (N + 2) + (2/\pi^2) \log(50W/\pi + 25) \log(5/(\gamma(1 - \gamma))) + 7.$$

Now note that N is the integer part of W/π , so $W/\pi - 1 \leq N \leq W/\pi$. Thus,

$$W/\pi - 1 \leq \#\{k : \lambda_k > \gamma\} \leq W/\pi + (2/\pi^2) \log(50W/\pi + 25) \log\left(\frac{5}{\gamma(1 - \gamma)}\right) + 9,$$

which implies the desired bound.

Case 2: Now suppose $\gamma > 1/2$. Then

$$\#\{k : \lambda_k > \gamma\} = \#\{k : \lambda_k \in [1/2, 1)\} - \#\{k : \lambda_k \in [1/2, \gamma]\}.$$

The first term is between N and $N + 2$, by (1.9). The second term, that is being subtracted, is between 0 and $\#\{k : \lambda_k \in [1 - \gamma, \gamma]\}$, or between 0 and $(2/\pi^2) \log(50W/\pi + 25) \log(5/(\gamma(1 - \gamma))) + 7$, thanks to Theorem 1.4 (applied with $\epsilon = 1 - \gamma \in (0, 1/2)$). Therefore,

$$N - (2/\pi^2) \log(50W/\pi + 25) \log(5/(\gamma(1 - \gamma))) - 7 \leq \#\{k : \lambda_k > \gamma\} \leq N + 2$$

As before, $W/\pi - 1 \leq N \leq W/\pi$. Thus,

$$W/\pi - (2/\pi^2) \log(50W/\pi + 25) \log(5/(\gamma(1 - \gamma))) - 8 \leq \#\{k : \lambda_k > \gamma\} \leq W/\pi + 2,$$

which implies the desired bound. This completes the proof of Theorem 6.2. \square

Next we give the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Let $Q = [0, 1]^d$ and $S = [-W, W]^d$. By Proposition 6.1, we parameterize the sequence of positive eigenvalues of $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S}$ by $\lambda_{\vec{\ell}} := \prod_{k=1}^d \lambda_{\ell_k}$ for $\vec{\ell} = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$, where $(\lambda_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence of positive eigenvalues of the one-dimensional operator $\mathcal{T}_{[0,1],[-W,W]} : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Our first task is to estimate

$$M_{\epsilon}(Q, S) = \#\left\{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d : \prod_{k=1}^d \lambda_{\ell_k} > \epsilon\right\}.$$

We will give two-sided bounds on $M_{\epsilon}(Q, S)$ for $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. From this, we can upper bound $N_{\epsilon}(Q, S)$ for $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, since $N_{\epsilon}(Q, S) \leq M_{\epsilon}(Q, S) - M_{1-\epsilon}(Q, S)$.

Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Given $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d \in [0, 1]$, note that if $\prod_{k=1}^d \lambda_k > \epsilon$ then $\lambda_k > \epsilon$ for all k . Conversely, if $\lambda_k > \epsilon^{1/d}$ for all k , then $\prod_{k=1}^d \lambda_k > \epsilon$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{\ell \geq 0 : \lambda_{\ell} > \epsilon^{1/d}\right\}^d &\subset \\ \left\{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d : \prod_{k=1}^d \lambda_{\ell_k} > \epsilon\right\} &\subset \left\{\ell \geq 0 : \lambda_{\ell} > \epsilon\right\}^d. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\left(\#\{\ell \geq 0 : \lambda_\ell > \epsilon^{1/d}\}\right)^d \leq M_\epsilon(Q, S) \leq \left(\#\{\ell \geq 0 : \lambda_\ell > \epsilon\}\right)^d. \quad (6.2)$$

By Proposition 6.2, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} W/\pi - C \log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))) &\leq \#\{\ell \geq 0 : \lambda_\ell > \epsilon\} \\ &\leq W/\pi + C \log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))). \end{aligned}$$

Now, take both sides to the power d , and apply the Binomial Theorem. This gives:

$$\begin{aligned} (W/\pi)^d - \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \binom{d}{j} (W/\pi)^j (C \log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^{d-j} \\ \leq \left(\#\{\ell \geq 0 : \lambda_\ell > \epsilon\}\right)^d \\ \leq (W/\pi)^d + \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \binom{d}{j} (W/\pi)^j (C \log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^{d-j} \end{aligned}$$

Note $\binom{d}{j} \leq 2^d$, so the above series is bounded by $(2C)^d \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} W^j (\log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^{d-j}$. This series has monotone terms, so its value is at most d times the maximum of the first and last terms. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \binom{d}{j} (W/\pi)^j (C \log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^{d-j} \\ \leq C_d \max\{W^{d-1} \log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))), (\log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^d\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this bound in the previous bound, we get that

$$\left| \left(\#\{\ell : \lambda_\ell > \epsilon\}\right)^d - (W/\pi)^d \right| \leq C_d \max\{W^{d-1} \log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))), (\log(W) \log(1/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^d\}.$$

Note that $\log(1/\epsilon^{1/d}) = \frac{1}{d} \log(1/\epsilon) \leq \log(1/\epsilon)$. Next, note that $\epsilon^{1/d} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{d}(\epsilon - 1)$ for $\epsilon \in (0, 1)^3$. Thus, $1 - \epsilon^{1/d} \geq \frac{1}{d}(1 - \epsilon)$, hence, $\log(1/(1 - \epsilon^{1/d})) \leq \log(d/(1 - \epsilon))$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \log(1/(\epsilon^{1/d}(1 - \epsilon^{1/d}))) &= \log(1/\epsilon^{1/d}) + \log(1/(1 - \epsilon^{1/d})) \\ &\leq \log(1/\epsilon) + \log(d/(1 - \epsilon)) = \log(d/(\epsilon(1 - \epsilon))). \end{aligned}$$

³The function $t \mapsto t^{1/d}$ is concave on $(0, \infty)$, and its first order taylor polynomial at $t = 1$ is $1 + \frac{1}{d}(t - 1)$; thus, by concavity, $t^{1/d} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{d}(t - 1)$ for $t > 0$.

So, we can apply the previous inequality with ϵ replaced by $\epsilon^{1/d}$, to get:

$$\left| \left(\#\{\ell : \lambda_\ell > \epsilon^{1/d}\} \right)^d - (W/\pi)^d \right| \leq C_d \max\{W^{d-1} \log(W) \log(d/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))), (\log(W) \log(d/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^d\}.$$

Using the previous inequalities in (6.2), for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & |M_\epsilon(Q, S) - (W/\pi)^d| \\ & \leq C_d \max\{W^{d-1} \log(W) \log(d/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))), (\log(W) \log(d/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^d\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

When $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, we have $1/(1-\epsilon) \leq 2$, so $\log(d/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))) \leq \log(2d/\epsilon) = \log(2d) + \log(1/\epsilon) \leq 2 \log(2d) \log(1/\epsilon)$, so, the above inequality implies the first line of (1.8).

Next, we give the bound on $N_\epsilon(Q, S)$. For $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} N_\epsilon(Q, S) & \leq M_\epsilon(Q, S) - M_{1-\epsilon}(Q, S) \\ & \leq |M_\epsilon(Q, S) - (W/\pi)^d| + |M_{1-\epsilon}(Q, S) - (W/\pi)^d|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, apply (6.3) (note the RHS is symmetric with respect to the map $\epsilon \mapsto 1-\epsilon$), to give

$$N_\epsilon(Q, S) \leq 2C_d \max\{W^{d-1} \log(W) \log(d/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))), (\log(W) \log(d/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))))^d\}$$

As before, if $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, we have $\log(d/(\epsilon(1-\epsilon))) \leq C_d \log(1/\epsilon)$, so the above inequality implies the second line of (1.8).

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

6.3 Proof of Corollary 1.3

Given measurable sets Q, S in \mathbb{R}^d with positive and finite d -dimensional Lebesgue measure, let $\{\lambda_k(Q, S)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence of nonzero eigenvalues of the compact operator $\mathcal{T}_{Q,S} = P_Q B_S P_Q$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, counted with multiplicity, and arranged in non-increasing order.

The following observations are due to Landau; see Lemma 1 of [Lan67].

Lemma 6.3. *For all $k \geq 0$,*

$$\lambda_k(Q, S) = \lambda_k(S, Q) \tag{6.4}$$

$$\lambda_k(Q, S_1) \leq \lambda_k(Q, S_2), \quad \text{if } S_1 \subset S_2 \tag{6.5}$$

$$\lambda_k(Q_1, S) \leq \lambda_k(Q_2, S), \quad \text{if } Q_1 \subset Q_2. \tag{6.6}$$

Now, we are ready to prove Corollary 1.3.

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Let $\Delta = \text{diam}_\infty(Q) \cdot \text{diam}_\infty(S) < \infty$. Rescalings of the form $(Q, S) \mapsto (\kappa^{-1}Q, \kappa S)$ preserve the eigenvalues of SSLOs. Similarly, translations of the domains Q and S preserve the eigenvalues

of SSLOs. So, we may assume without loss of generality that $Q \subset [0, 1]^d$ and $S \subset [-\Delta, \Delta]^d$. By Lemma 6.3, we have

$$\lambda_k(Q, S) \leq \lambda_k([0, 1]^d, [-\Delta, \Delta]^d).$$

Therefore, to prove the result, it suffices to show that

$$\lambda_k(\Delta) := \lambda_k([0, 1]^d, [-\Delta, \Delta]^d) \leq C_d \exp(-c(\Delta)k^{1/d}),$$

for constants $C_d > 0$ (determined by d) and $c(\Delta) > 0$ (determined by d and Δ).

In Theorem 1.2, we showed that, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\#\{k : \lambda_k(\Delta) > \epsilon\} \leq (\Delta/\pi)^d + C_d \max\{\Delta^{d-1} \log(\Delta) \log(1/\epsilon), (\log(\Delta) \log(1/\epsilon))^d\}.$$

In particular, since $\log(1/\epsilon)^d \geq \log(1/\epsilon) \geq 1$ for $\epsilon < 1/2$, and $0 < \log(\Delta) \leq \Delta$ for $\Delta > 1$, we have,

$$\#\{k : \lambda_k(\Delta) > \epsilon\} \leq C_d \Delta^d \log(1/\epsilon)^d \quad \text{for } \epsilon \in (0, 1/2). \quad (6.7)$$

Note, if $\#\{k : \lambda_k(\Delta) > \epsilon\} \leq T$ for some integer $T > 0$ then $\lambda_{T+1}(\Delta) \leq \epsilon$. Conversely, if $\lambda_T(\Delta) \leq \epsilon$ then $\#\{k : \lambda_k(\Delta) > \epsilon\} \leq T + 1$.

Now, for each integer $K > C_d \Delta^d \log(2)^d$, choose $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ such that $C_d \Delta^d \log(1/\epsilon)^d \leq K < C_d \Delta^d \log(1/\epsilon)^d + 1$. By (6.7), $\#\{k : \lambda_k(\Delta) > \epsilon\} \leq K$, and so $\lambda_{K+1}(\Delta) \leq \epsilon$. Note that $K \leq C_d \Delta^d \log(1/\epsilon)^d + 1$ implies that $\epsilon \leq \exp(-c_d(K-1)^{1/d}/\Delta)$ where $c_d = C_d^{-1/d}$. Therefore,

$$\lambda_{K+1}(\Delta) \leq \exp(-c_d(K-1)^{1/d}/\Delta) \text{ provided that } K > C_d \Delta^d \log(2)^d.$$

Note, if $K \leq C_d \Delta^d \log(2)^d$ then $\lambda_{K+1}(\Delta) \leq 1 \leq C'_d \exp(-c_d(K-1)^{1/d}/\Delta)$, provided that $C'_d \geq \exp(c_d C_d^{1/d} \log(2))$.

Therefore,

$$\lambda_{K+1}(\Delta) \leq C'_d \exp(-c_d(K-1)^{1/d}/\Delta) \text{ for all } K \geq 1.$$

This completes the proof of Corollary 1.3. □

7 Appendix: Proofs of properties of Gevrey functions

Proof of Proposition 3.3. By the product rule, $(fg)^{(k)}$ is the sum of 2^k terms of the form $f^{(k_1)}g^{(k_2)}$ with $k_1 + k_2 = k$. By hypothesis on f and g ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^{(k_1)}g^{(k_2)}\|_\infty &\leq CR^{k_1}(k_1!)^r \cdot DS^{k_2}(k_2!)^r \leq CD \max\{R, S\}^{k_1+k_2} ((k_1 + k_2)!)^r \\ &= CD \max\{R, S\}^k (k!)^r. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|(fg)^{(k)}\|_\infty \leq 2^k CD \max\{R, S\}^k (k!)^r.$$

So, $fg \in G_0^r(CD, 2 \max\{R, S\})$, as claimed.

The below proof of the composition law for Gevrey functions appears in [Fig16] (see Theorem 2.5). We repeat the proof here for the sake of completeness.

Let $f : I \rightarrow J$ and $g : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be in $G_0^r(C, R)$ and $G_0^r(D, S)$, respectively. Apply the Faà di Bruno formula for the n th derivative of $h = g \circ f$, $n \geq 1$, $t \in I$,

$$h^{(n)}(t) = \sum \frac{n!}{k_1! \cdots k_n!} g^{(k)}(f(t)) \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f^{(j)}(t)}{j!} \right)^{k_j},$$

where the sum is taken over all k_1, \dots, k_n with

$$k_1 + 2k_2 + \cdots + nk_n = n,$$

and $k := k_1 + \cdots + k_n$ varies in the summation. Because $f \in G_0^r(C, R)$ and $g \in G_0^r(D, S)$, we learn that

$$\begin{aligned} |h^{(n)}(t)| &\leq \sum \frac{n!}{k_1! \cdots k_n!} \left(DS^k(k!)^r \right) \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{CR^j(j!)^r}{j!} \right)^{k_j} \\ &= n! DR^n \sum \frac{1}{k_1! \cdots k_n!} C^k S^k (k!)^r m(k_1, \dots, k_n), \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

where

$$m(k_1, \dots, k_n) = \prod_{j=1}^n ((j!)^{r-1})^{k_j}.$$

The sequence $(n!)^{1/(n-1)}$ is increasing. Therefore,

$$(m!)^{r-1} \leq ((n!)^{r-1})^{(m-1)/(n-1)}$$

for $1 < m \leq n$. Therefore,

$$m(k_1, \dots, k_n) = \prod_{j=1}^n ((j!)^{r-1})^{k_j} \leq ((n!)^{r-1})^{(k_2+2k_3+\cdots+(n-1)k_n)/(n-1)}.$$

and

$$(k!)^r = k!(k!)^{r-1} \leq k!((n!)^{r-1})^{(k-1)/(n-1)},$$

so

$$(k!)^r m(k_1, \dots, k_n) \leq k!((n!)^{r-1})^{(k_2+2k_3+\cdots+(n-1)k_n+k-1)/(n-1)} = k!(n!)^{r-1}.$$

Plugging that into (7.1), we get

$$|h^{(n)}(t)| \leq DR^n (n!)^r \sum \frac{k!}{k_1! \cdots k_n!} C^k S^k$$

Applying the following equality (see Lemma 1.3.2 of [KP02])

$$\sum \frac{k!}{k_1! \cdots k_n!} H^k = H(1+H)^{n-1},$$

gives

$$|h^{(n)}(t)| \leq DR^n (n!)^r CS(1+CS)^{n-1} \leq D(R(1+CS))^n (n!)^r.$$

This is valid for any $n \geq 1$.

Obviously $h = g \circ f$ satisfies $\|h\|_\infty \leq \|g\|_\infty \leq D$. Therefore, the above inequality is valid also for $n = 0$, which implies that $g \circ f \in G_0^r(D, T)$ for $T = R(1+CS)$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.4. We have $|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \leq \int_{-2}^2 |B(x)| dx \leq 4C$. So, in particular, the bound is true for $\xi = 0$.

Now, for $\xi \neq 0$, apply integration by parts, and condition (a), and get that for any integer $k \geq 0$,

$$\widehat{B}(\xi) = (-i\xi)^{-k} \int_{-2}^2 e^{-ix\xi} B^{(k)}(x) dx$$

Then using condition (b),

$$|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \leq |\xi|^{-k} 4CR^k (k!)^{3/2} \leq 4C(R/|\xi|)^k k^{3k/2}.$$

In particular, $|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \leq 4C$. Further, by geometric averaging of the previous formula at consecutive integers, we obtain for any real number $s > 0$,

$$|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \leq 4C(R/|\xi|)^s \lceil s \rceil^{3\lceil s \rceil/2}.$$

In particular, we can take $s = 2n/3$ for an integer $n \geq 1$. Note that $\lceil s \rceil \leq \min\{n, 2n/3 + 1\}$, so

$$|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \leq 4C(R/|\xi|)^{2n/3} n^{2n/3+1}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Now,

$$|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \exp(a|\xi|^{2/3}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a^n |\xi|^{2n/3} |\widehat{B}(\xi)|}{n!} = |\widehat{B}(\xi)| + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a^n |\xi|^{2n/3} |\widehat{B}(\xi)|}{n!}.$$

Using the Stirling approximation, $n! \geq (n/e)^n$, and the previous bounds, we get

$$|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \exp(a|\xi|^{2/3}) \leq 4C + 4C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (eaR^{2/3})^n n.$$

Now, set $a = \frac{1}{2eR^{2/3}}$, so we get

$$|\widehat{B}(\xi)| \exp(a|\xi|^{2/3}) \leq 4C + 4C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} n = 12C.$$

□

References

- [AWW93] P. Auscher, G. Weiss, and V. Wickerhauser. “Local sine and cosine bases of Coifman and Meyer and the construction of smooth wavelets”. In: *Wavelets: A Tutorial in Theory and Applications* (1993), pp. 237–256.
- [BJK21] A. Bonami, P. Jaming, and A. Karoui. “Non-asymptotic behaviour of the spectrum of the sinc kernel operator and related applications”. In: *J. Math. Phys.* 62 (2021), p. 033511.
- [CM91] R.R. Coifman and Y. Meyer. “Remarques sur l’analyse de Fourier à fenêtre”. In: *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 312 (1991), pp. 259–261.
- [DH98] J. Dziubański and E. Hernández. “Band-limited wavelets with subexponential decay”. In: *Canad. Math. Bull.* 41 (1998), pp. 398–403.
- [FI20] C. Fefferman and A. Israel. *Fitting smooth functions to data*. Vol. 135. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2020. ISBN: 978-1-4704-6130-0.
- [Fig16] D. Figueirinhas. *On the Properties of Gevrey and Ultra-analytic Spaces*. 2016. eprint: <http://www.diva-portal.se/smash/get/diva2:952969/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- [GS18] A. Greengard and K. Serkh. *On generalized prolate spheroidal functions*. 2018.
- [HC08] M. Henk and M. Cifre. “Intrinsic volumes and successive radii”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 343 (2008), pp. 733–742.
- [Hör03] L. Hörmander. *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators II*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [Isr15] A. Israel. *The Eigenvalue Distribution of Time-Frequency Localization Operators*. 2015. eprint: [arXiv:1502.04404](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.04404).
- [KP02] S. Krantz and H. R. Parks. *A Primer of Real Analytic Functions*. Birkhäuser, 2002.
- [KRD21] S. Karnik, J. Romberg, and M. Davenport. “Certain upper bounds on the eigenvalues associated with prolate spheroidal wave functions”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 55.1 (2021), pp. 97–128.
- [Lan67] H. J. Landau. “Necessary density conditions for sampling and interpolation of certain entire functions”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 117 (1967), pp. 37–52.
- [Lan75] H. J. Landau. “On Szegő’s eigenvalue distribution theorem and non-Hermitian kernels”. In: *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique* 28.1 (1975), pp. 335–357.
- [Lan93] H. J. Landau. “On the Density of Phase-Space Expansions”. In: *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory* 39.4 (1993), pp. 1152–1156.

- [Led17] R. Lederman. *Numerical algorithms for the computation of generalized prolate spheroidal functions*. 2017. eprint: [arXiv:1710.02874](https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.02874).
- [LP61] H.J. Landau and H. O. Pollak. “Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis, and uncertainty – II”. In: *Bell Systems Tech. J.* 40.1 (1961), pp. 65–84.
- [LP62] H.J. Landau and H. O. Pollak. “Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis, and uncertainty – III : The dimension of the space of essentially time- and band-limited signals”. In: *Bell Systems Tech. J.* 41.4 (1962), pp. 1295–1336.
- [LS17a] B. Landa and Y. Shkolnisky. “Approximation scheme for essentially bandlimited and space-concentrated functions on a disk”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 43.3 (2017), pp. 381–403.
- [LS17b] B. Landa and Y. Shkolnisky. “Steerable principal components for space-frequency localized images”. In: *SIAM J. Imaging Sc.* 10.2 (2017), pp. 508–534.
- [LS17c] R. Lederman and A. Singer. *Continuously heterogeneous hyper-objects in cryo-EM and 3-D movies of many temporal dimensions*. 2017. eprint: [arXiv:1704.02899](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.02899).
- [LS20] R. Lederman and A. Singer. “A representation theory perspective on simultaneous alignment and classification”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 49.3 (2020), pp. 1001–1024.
- [LW80] H. J. Landau and H. Widom. “Eigenvalue distribution of time and frequency limiting”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 77.2 (1980), pp. 469–481.
- [Osi13] A. Osipov. “Certain upper bounds on the eigenvalues associated with prolate spheroidal wave functions”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 35.2 (2013), pp. 309–340.
- [Rob55] H. Robbins. “A Remark on Stirling’s Formula”. In: *The American Mathematical Monthly* 62.1 (1955), pp. 26–29.
- [Rod93] L. Rodino. *Linear Partial Differential Operators in Gevrey Spaces*. World Scientific, 1993.
- [Sch13] R. Schneider. *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*. Cambridge U. Press, 2013.
- [Shk07] Y. Shkolnisky. “Prolate spheroidal wave functions on a disc—Integration and approximation of two-dimensional bandlimited functions”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 22.2 (2007), pp. 235–256.
- [Sle64] D. Slepian. “Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis, and uncertainty – IV: Extensions to many dimensions; generalized prolate spheroidal functions”. In: *Bell Systems Tech. J.* 43.6 (1964), pp. 3009–3058.

- [Sle78] D. Slepian. “Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis, and uncertainty – V: The discrete case”. In: *Bell Systems Tech. J.* 57.5 (1978), pp. 1371–1430.
- [SP61] D. Slepian and H. O. Pollak. “Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis, and uncertainty – I”. In: *Bell Systems Tech. J.* 40.1 (1961), pp. 43–64.
- [Yan+02] Q. X. Yang et al. “Two dimensional prolate spheroidal wave functions for MRI”. In: *Journal of Magnetic Resonance* 158 (2002), pp. 43–51.