

EIGENVALUE ESTIMATES FOR FOURIER CONCENTRATION OPERATORS ON TWO DOMAINS

FELIPE MARCECA, JOSÉ LUIS ROMERO, AND MICHAEL SPECKBACHER

ABSTRACT. We derive eigenvalue estimates for concentration operators associated with the discrete Fourier transform and two concentration domains satisfying certain regularity conditions. These conditions are met, for example, when the discrete domain, contained in a lattice, is obtained by discretization of a suitably regular domain in the Euclidean space. As a limit, we obtain eigenvalue estimates for Fourier concentration operators associated with two suitably regular domains in the Euclidean space. The proof builds on Israel's work on one dimensional intervals: arXiv:1502.04404v1.

1. INTRODUCTION AND RESULTS

Fourier concentration operators act by incorporating a spatial cut-off and a subsequent frequency cut-off to the Fourier inversion formula. The chief example concerns the Fourier transform on the Euclidean space $\mathcal{F} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the cut-offs are given by the indicator functions of two compact domains $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and the concentration operator is

$$(1.1) \quad Sf = \chi_F \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi_E \mathcal{F} \chi_F f, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

These operators, and their analogues defined with respect to the discrete Fourier transform $L^2([-1/2, 1/2]^d) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ play a crucial role in many analysis problems and fields of application [18, 13, 14, 7], such as imaging, where the shapes of E, F are dictated by various acquisition constraints.

The basic intuition is that the concentration operator (1.1) is approximately a projection with rank $\text{tr}(S) = |E| \cdot |F|$. The error of such heuristic is encoded by the so-called *plunge region*

$$(1.2) \quad M_\varepsilon(S) = \{\lambda \in \sigma(S) : \varepsilon < \lambda < 1 - \varepsilon\}, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1/2),$$

consisting of intermediate eigenvalues. Asymptotics for the cardinality of $M_\varepsilon(S)$ go back to Landau and Widom [15, 12] for the case of one dimensional intervals $E = [-a, a]$, $F = [-b, b]$ and read

$$(1.3) \quad \#M_\varepsilon(S) = c \cdot \log(ab) \cdot \log\left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\right) + o(\log(ab)), \quad \text{as } ab \rightarrow \infty,$$

for an explicit constant c that depends on the normalization of the Fourier transform. The modern spectral theory of Wiener-Hopf operators gives similar asymptotics for concentration operators associated to rather general multi-dimensional domains subject to increasing isotropic dilations.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47B35, 47A75, 42B35, 42C40.

Key words and phrases. Discrete Fourier transform, concentration operator, Hankel operator, eigenvalue, spectrum.

The authors gratefully acknowledge support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): Y 1199.

While (1.3) precisely describes the cardinality of the set $M_\varepsilon(S)$ in the limit $ab \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic is often insufficient for many purposes because of the quality of the error terms. Indeed, the error term in (1.3) depends in an unspecified way on the spectral threshold ε , which precludes applications where ε is let to vary with the domains E, F . Such limitations have motivated a great amount of work aimed at deriving *upper bounds* for $\#M_\varepsilon(S)$ that are *threshold robust*, that is, bounds that are effective for concrete concentration domains and explicit in their dependence on the spectral threshold [8, 10, 20, 11, 3, 17], significantly improving on more classical results in this spirit [19].

With the exception of [8], the mentioned articles on threshold-robust spectral bounds for Fourier concentration operators concern only the one dimensional case, because they exploit a connection with a Sturm–Liouville equation which is specific of that setting. On the other hand, while [8] studies Fourier concentration operators associated with one dimensional intervals, the technique introduced by Israel is very general, as it relies on an explicit almost diagonalization of the concentration operator. In fact, as we were finishing this work, the preprint [9] provided an extension of [8] to higher dimensions (see Sections 1.1 and 1.5).

In this article we derive upper bounds for the number of intermediate eigenvalues (1.2) associated with either the continuous or discrete Fourier transforms. We obtain estimates that apply to two suitably regular multi-dimensional spatial and frequency domains. The proofs build on Israel’s technique [8] and combine it with arguments from geometric measure theory and operator theory.

1.1. The Euclidean space. Given two compact sets $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the *Fourier concentration operator* $S : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined by (1.1) where \mathcal{F} denotes the Fourier transform

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{F}f(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) e^{-2\pi i x \xi} dx.$$

A set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to have a *maximally Ahlfors regular boundary* if there exists a constant $\kappa_{\partial E} > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap B_r(x)) \geq \kappa_{\partial E} \cdot r^{d-1}, \quad 0 < r \leq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E)^{1/(d-1)}, \quad x \in \partial E.$$

Here, \mathcal{H}^{d-1} denotes the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. The term maximal in the definition refers to the range of r for which the estimate is required to hold. See Section 2 for more context on Ahlfors regularity. In what follows, we denote for short $|\partial E| = \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E)$.

In this article we prove the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, be compact domains with maximally Ahlfors regular boundaries with constants $\kappa_{\partial E}, \kappa_{\partial F}$ respectively, and assume that that $|\partial E||\partial F| \geq 1$. Consider the concentration operator (1.1) and its eigenvalues $\{\lambda_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.*

Then for every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists $A_{\alpha,d} \geq 1$ such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$:

$$\#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n \in (\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)\} \leq A_{\alpha,d} \cdot \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{|\partial E||\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1}.$$

A closely related result is presented in the recent preprint [9]. For $F = [0, 1]^d$ and $E = rK$, where $r > 0$ is a dilation parameter and $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *convex, coordinate symmetric domain* [9, Theorem 1.1] gives the following bound for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$:

$$(1.5) \quad \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n \in (\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)\} \leq C_d \cdot \max\{r^{d-1} \log(r/\varepsilon)^3, \log(r/\varepsilon)^{3d}\}.$$

For large r , the right-hand side of (1.5) becomes $O_d(r^{d-1} \log(r/\varepsilon)^3)$ while Theorem 1.1 gives the weaker bound $O_{\alpha,d}(r^{d-1} \log(r/\varepsilon)^{2d(\alpha+1)+1})$. On the other hand, Theorem 1.1 applies to possibly non-convex, non-coordinate-symmetric and non-dilated domains E , and other regular domains F besides cubes. (As pointed out in [9], when E and F are both cubes, even slightly stronger estimates hold, c.f. [9, Theorem 1.2].)

Our work is in great part motivated by applications where concentration domains may be non-convex. For example, noise statistics are often estimated from those pixels of a square image located outside a central disk, which is assumed to contain the signal of interest (see, e.g., [2]). Thus, the need to sample pure noise leads one to consider *the complement of a disk within a two dimensional square* as concentration domain (or, more realistically, the set of grid points within that domain; see below). Such a domain E is allowed by Theorem 1.1 (and Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 below) and has moreover a favorable regularity constant $\kappa_{\partial E}$.

1.2. Discretization of continuous domains. Theorem 1.1 is obtained by taking a limit on a more precise result concerning a discrete setting, which is our main focus.

We consider a *resolution parameter* $L > 0$ and define the *discrete Fourier transform* $\mathcal{F}_L : L^2((-L/2, L/2)^d) \rightarrow \ell^2(L^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^d)$ by

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{F}_L f(k/L) = \int_{(-L/2, L/2)^d} f(x) e^{-2\pi i x k / L} dx, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

We think of L as a discretization parameter for an underlying continuous problem.

Let us define the *discretization at resolution* $L > 0$ of a domain $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$E_L = L^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^d \cap E.$$

Given two compact domains $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $F \subseteq (-L/2, L/2)^d$, consider the *discretized concentration operator* $T : L^2(F) \rightarrow L^2(F)$ given by

$$(1.7) \quad T = \chi_F \mathcal{F}_L^{-1} \chi_{E_L} \mathcal{F}_L.$$

Our second result reads as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, be compact domains with maximally Ahlfors regular boundaries with constants $\kappa_{\partial E}, \kappa_{\partial F}$ respectively, and assume that that $|\partial E||\partial F| \geq 1$.*

Fix a discretization resolution $L \geq |\partial E|^{-1/(d-1)}$ such that $F \subseteq (-L/2, L/2)^d$ and consider the discretized concentration operator (1.7) and its eigenvalues $\{\lambda_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Then for every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ there exists $A_{\alpha,d} \geq 1$ such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$:

$$\#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n \in (\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)\} \leq A_{\alpha,d} \cdot \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{|\partial E||\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1}.$$

1.3. The discrete Fourier transform. Finally, we consider a discrete concentration problem associated with the usual *discrete Fourier transform*, denoted

$$\mathcal{F}_1 : L^2((-1/2, 1/2)^d) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$$

for consistency with (1.6).

Given a finite set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $F \subseteq (-1/2, 1/2)^d$, the *discrete Fourier concentration operator* $T : L^2(F) \rightarrow L^2(F)$ is defined as

$$(1.8) \quad T = \chi_F \mathcal{F}_1^{-1} \chi_\Omega \mathcal{F}_1.$$

The discrete boundary of a set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ is given by

$$(1.9) \quad \partial\Omega = \{k \in \Omega : \min\{|j - k| : j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Omega\} = 1\}.$$

We say that $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ has a *maximally Ahlfors regular boundary* if there exists a constant $\kappa_{\partial\Omega}$ such that

$$\inf_{k \in \partial\Omega} \#(\partial\Omega \cap k + [-n/2, n/2]^d) \geq \kappa_{\partial\Omega} \cdot n^{d-1}, \quad 1 \leq n \leq (\#\partial\Omega)^{1/(d-1)}, \quad k \in \partial\Omega.$$

(Note the slight notational abuse: though $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the notions of boundary and boundary regularity are to be understood in the discrete sense.)

Our last result reads as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $d \geq 2$, $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ a finite set with maximally Ahlfors regular boundary and constant $\kappa_{\partial\Omega}$. Let $F \subseteq (-1/2, 1/2)^d$ be compact with maximally Ahlfors regular boundary and constant $\kappa_{\partial F}$. Assume that $\#\partial\Omega \cdot |\partial F| \geq 1$, and consider the concentration operator (1.8) and its eigenvalues $\{\lambda_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.*

Then for every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ there exists $A_{\alpha,d} \geq 1$ such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$:

$$\#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n \in (\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)\} \leq A_{\alpha,d} \cdot \frac{\#\partial\Omega}{\kappa_{\partial\Omega}} \cdot \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{\#\partial\Omega \cdot |\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial\Omega} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1}.$$

1.4. One sided estimates. Finally, we remark that bounds on the number of intermediate eigenvalues, as in Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, can be equivalently formulated in terms of the distribution function

$$N_\varepsilon := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n > \varepsilon\}, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Remark 1.4. *For example, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 we have*

$$(1.10) \quad \left| \#N_\varepsilon(S) - |E| \cdot |F| \right| \leq C_{\alpha,d} \cdot \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{|\partial E| |\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \min\{\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon\}} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1}.$$

See Section 8 for details.

1.5. Methods and related literature. We work for the most part with the discrete Fourier transform and then obtain consequences for the continuous one by a limiting argument. Theorem 1.2 is proved in two steps. We first revisit Israel's argument [8] and adapt it to prove eigenvalue estimates when one of the domains is a rectangle and the other is a general multi-dimensional domain (Theorem 4.1 below). These estimates are slightly stronger than those in Theorem 1.2, and

the extra precision is exploited in the subsequent step. We follow the method of almost diagonalization with wavepackets, which we achieve, unlike [8], through a redundant system (frame) instead of an orthonormal basis.

The second step is a decomposition, rescaling, and dyadic approximation argument, implemented by means of p -Schatten norm estimates for certain Hankel operators, and especially by quantifying those estimates as a function of p , as $p \rightarrow 0^+$.

Our intermediate result, Theorem 4.1, is close in spirit to Theorem 1.2 in [9] (which appeared as we were finishing this article). The estimates in [9], formulated in the context of the continuous Fourier transform and concerning dilated convex domains, are stronger than what follows from Theorem 4.1 in that regime, as [9, Theorem 1.2] involves smaller powers of a certain logarithmic factor (see also Section 1.1 and (1.5)). On the other hand, Theorem 4.1 concerns sufficiently regular, non-dilated and possibly non-convex domains, and covers the discrete Fourier transform.

We also mention our recent work on concentration operators for the short-time Fourier transform [16], that also makes use of Ahlfors regularity and Schatten norm estimates. Though the goals and results are philosophically similar to those in the present article, the settings are rather different from the technical point of view. Indeed, the arguments used in [16] rely on the rapid off-diagonal decay of the reproducing kernel of the range of the short-time Fourier transform, and do not seem to be applicable to Fourier concentration operators.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 sets up the notation and provides background on boundary regularity. Section 3 revisits the technique from [8] and implements certain adaptations. These are used in Section 4 to prove Theorem 4.1. Theorem 1.2 is proved in Section 5, Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 6, and Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 7. Remark 1.4 is proved in Section 8.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. We shall focus on Theorem 1.2 and set up the notation accordingly. Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 will be obtained afterwards as an application of Theorem 1.2.

We denote cubes by $Q_a = [-a/2, a/2]^d$. The Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^d is denoted $|\cdot|$. For two non-negative functions f, g we write $f \lesssim g$ if there exist a constant C such that $f(x) \leq Cg(x)$, and write $f \asymp g$ if $f \lesssim g$ and $g \lesssim f$. The implied constant is allowed to depend on the dimension d and the parameter α from Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, but not on other parameters.

We enumerate the eigenvalues of a compact self adjoint operator $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} as follows:

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda_k = \inf\{\|L - S\| : S \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)), \dim(\text{Range}(S)) < k\}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Then $\{\lambda_k : k \geq 1\} \setminus \{0\} = \sigma(L) \setminus \{0\}$ as sets with multiplicities — see, e.g., [5, Lemma 4.3].

For a set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we write

$$E_L^c = L^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus E_L$$

and ∂E_L for the points in E_L which are at distance L^{-1} of E_L^c . For $L = 1$ this is consistent with (1.9).

We will work with the discrete Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_L : L^2((-L/2, L/2)^d) \rightarrow \ell^2(L^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^d)$ given by (1.6) and reserve the notation $\mathcal{F}f$ or \widehat{f} for the continuous Fourier transform (1.4). Note that if $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq (-L/2, L/2)^d$, then $\mathcal{F}_L f(k/L) = \mathcal{F}f(k/L)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

We also write $P_{E,L} = \mathcal{F}_L^{-1} \chi_{E_L} \mathcal{F}_L$. For $F \subseteq (-L/2, L/2)^d$ we define the operator $T = T_{E,F,L} : L^2(F) \rightarrow L^2(F)$ by

$$T = T_{E,F,L} = \chi_F P_{E,L}$$

and let $\lambda_n = \lambda_n(T)$ denote its eigenvalues as in (2.1). An easy computation shows that

$$T_{t^{-1}E, tF, tL} = \mathcal{M}_{t^{-1}} T_{E,F,L} \mathcal{M}_t, \quad t > 0,$$

where \mathcal{M}_t denotes the *dilation operator*

$$\mathcal{M}_t f(x) = f(tx).$$

In particular,

$$(2.2) \quad \lambda_n(T_{t^{-1}E, tF, tL}) = \lambda_n(T_{E,F,L}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

2.2. Boundary regularity. Let us introduce regularity of sets in more generality and discuss a few properties.

An \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -measurable set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be *lower Ahlfors $(d-1)$ -regular* (regular for short) at scale $\eta_X > 0$ if there exists a constant $\kappa_X > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(X \cap B_r(x)) \geq \kappa_X \cdot r^{d-1}, \quad 0 < r \leq \eta_X, \quad x \in X.$$

Note that if $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is regular at scale $\eta_X > 0$ with constant $\kappa_X > 0$ and $t > 0$, then $tX \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is regular at scale $\eta_{tX} = t\eta_X$ with constant $\kappa_{tX} = \kappa_X$. By differentiation around a point of positive \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -density,

$$(2.3) \quad \kappa_X \leq c_d,$$

for any regular X of positive \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -measure. We also mention that if X is regular with parameters η_X and κ_X , then choosing an arbitrary $x \in X$ gives

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(X) \geq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(X \cap B_{\eta_X}(x)) \geq \kappa_X \cdot \eta_X^{d-1}.$$

We shall use the following basic result, derived from [4].

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a universal constant $C_d > 0$ such that for every compact set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ that is regular at scale $\eta_X > 0$ with constant κ_X and every $s > 0$,*

$$|X + B_s(0)| \leq \frac{C_d}{\kappa_X} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(X) \cdot s \cdot \left(1 + \frac{s^{d-1}}{\eta_X^{d-1}}\right).$$

Proof. From [4, Theorems 5 and 6] it follows that

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\{x : d(x, X) = r\}) \leq \frac{C_d}{\kappa_X} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(X) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{r^{d-1}}{\eta_X^{d-1}}\right),$$

for almost every $r > 0$, and in addition, $|\nabla d(x, X)| = 1$, for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. From this and the coarea formula, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |X + B_s(0)| &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_{[0,s)}(d(x, X)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_{[0,s)}(d(x, X)) |\nabla d(x, X)| dx \\ &= \int_0^s \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\{x : d(x, X) = r\}) dr \leq \frac{C_d}{\kappa_X} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(X) \int_0^s \left(1 + \frac{r^{d-1}}{\eta_X^{d-1}}\right) dr \\ &\leq \frac{C_d}{\kappa_X} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(X) s \left(1 + \frac{s^{d-1}}{\eta_X^{d-1}}\right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.2. *For $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ a compact domain with regular boundary at scale $\eta_{\partial E} \geq 1$ with constant $\kappa_{\partial E}$ and a discretization resolution $L \geq 1$, we have*

$$L^{-d} \# E_L \lesssim |E| + \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E} L}.$$

In particular, for $d \geq 2$

$$L^{-d} \# E_L \lesssim \frac{\max\{|\partial E|^{d/(d-1)}, 1\}}{\kappa_{\partial E}}.$$

Proof. Recall that $Q_{L^{-1}} = L^{-1}[-1/2, 1/2]^d$ and define $E'_L = \{m \in E_L : m + Q_{L^{-1}} \subseteq E\}$. From Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} L^{-d} \# E_L &= \left| \bigcup_{m \in E'_L} m + Q_{L^{-1}} \right| + \left| \bigcup_{m \in E_L \setminus E'_L} m + Q_{L^{-1}} \right| \leq |E| + |\partial E + B_{L^{-1}\sqrt{d}}(0)| \\ &\lesssim |E| + \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E} L}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the second inequality follows from the isoperimetric inequality $|E| \lesssim |\partial E|^{d/(d-1)}$ and (2.3). \square

3. ISRAEL'S ARGUMENT REVISITED

We now revisit the core argument of [8] and make a few adaptations.

3.1. Israel's lemma. We need a slight generalization of Lemma 1 in [8], phrasing it in terms of frames rather than orthonormal bases. We include a proof for the sake of completeness.

Recall that a frame for a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is a subset of vectors $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ for which there exist constants $0 < A, B < \infty$ — called lower and upper frame bounds — such that

$$A \|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |\langle f, \phi_i \rangle|^2 \leq B \|f\|^2, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a positive, compact, self-adjoint operator on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with $\|T\| \leq 1$ and eigendecomposition $T = \sum_{n \geq 1} \lambda_n \langle \cdot, f_n \rangle f_n$.*

Let $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be a frame of unit norm vectors for \mathcal{H} with lower frame bound A . If $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_3$, and

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \|T \phi_i\|^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_3} \|(I - T) \phi_i\|^2 \leq \frac{A}{2} \varepsilon^2,$$

then $\#M_\varepsilon(T) \leq \frac{2}{A}\#\mathcal{I}_2$, where $M_\varepsilon(T)$ is defined as in (1.2).

Proof. Let $S_\varepsilon = \text{span}\{f_n : \lambda_n \in (\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)\}$ and let $P_\varepsilon : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow S_\varepsilon$ denote the orthogonal projection onto S_ε . For $f \in S_\varepsilon$ one has $\|f\| - \|(I - T)f\| \leq \|Tf\| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\|f\|$, which shows

$$\varepsilon\|f\| \leq \|Tf\|, \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon\|f\| \leq \|(I - T)f\|, \quad f \in S_\varepsilon.$$

Note that T and P_ε commute since S_ε is spanned by a collection of eigenvectors of T . Therefore, by (3.1) we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_3} \varepsilon^2 \|P_\varepsilon \phi_i\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \|TP_\varepsilon \phi_i\|^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_3} \|(I - T)P_\varepsilon \phi_i\|^2 \leq \frac{A}{2}\varepsilon^2,$$

which implies

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_3} \|P_\varepsilon \phi_i\|^2 \leq \frac{A}{2}.$$

Using the frame property we get for $f \in S_\varepsilon$:

$$A\|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |\langle f, \phi_i \rangle|^2 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |\langle f, P_\varepsilon \phi_i \rangle|^2.$$

Now assume that $\dim(S_\varepsilon) \geq 1$ (otherwise the result is trivial), take an orthonormal basis $\{\psi_k\}_{k=1}^{\dim(S_\varepsilon)}$ of S_ε , and sum the inequality above over all basis elements to derive

$$\begin{aligned} A \cdot \#M_\varepsilon(T) &= A \cdot \dim(S_\varepsilon) = A \sum_{k=1}^{\dim(S_\varepsilon)} \|\psi_k\|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\dim(S_\varepsilon)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |\langle \psi_k, \phi_i \rangle|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \|P_\varepsilon \phi_i\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \|\phi_i\|^2 + \frac{A}{2} = \#\mathcal{I}_2 + \frac{A}{2} \leq \#\mathcal{I}_2 + \frac{A}{2}\#M_\varepsilon(T), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we used (3.2). This shows that $\#M_\varepsilon(T) \leq \frac{2}{A}\#\mathcal{I}_2$. \square

3.2. Local trigonometric frames. In this section, we construct a tight frame that allows us to apply Lemma 3.1.

Let $\alpha > 0$, and $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that

- (i) $\theta(x) = 1$, for $x \geq 1$, and $\theta(x) = 0$, for $x \leq -1$,
- (ii) $\theta(-x)^2 + \theta(x)^2 = 1$, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$,
- (iii) $|D^k \theta(x)| \leq C_\alpha^k k^{(1+\alpha)k}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and a constant $C_\alpha > 0$.

See, for example, [8, Proposition 1] or [6, Chapter 1] for the existence of such a function.

Let $W > 0$. We decompose the interval $(-\frac{W}{2}, \frac{W}{2})$ into disjoint intervals

$$I_j = x_j + \frac{W}{3 \cdot 2^{|j|+1}}[-1, 1), \quad j \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where

$$x_j = \frac{\text{sign}(j)W}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{|j|}}\right).$$

Note that $|I_j| = |I_{|j|}| = 2|I_{|j|+1}|$ for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. We will also denote $D_j = I_j \cup I_{j+1}$. Now define

$$\theta_j(x) = \theta\left(\frac{2(x-x_j)}{|I_j|}\right) \theta\left(-\frac{2(x-x_{j+1})}{|I_{j+1}|}\right).$$

We have that $\theta_j(x) = 0$ for $x \notin D_j$, and furthermore by properties (i) and (ii)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_j\|_2^2 &= \int_{I_j} \theta\left(\frac{2(x-x_j)}{|I_j|}\right)^2 dx + \int_{I_{j+1}} \theta\left(-\frac{2(x-x_{j+1})}{|I_{j+1}|}\right)^2 dx \\ &= \frac{|I_j|}{2} \int_{-1}^1 \theta(x)^2 dx + \frac{|I_{j+1}|}{2} \int_{-1}^1 \theta(x)^2 dx = \frac{|D_j|}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the set of vectors

$$(3.3) \quad \phi_{j,k}(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{|D_j|}} \cdot \theta_j(x) \cdot \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{xk}{|D_j|}\right), \quad j, k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and note that $\|\phi_{j,k}\|_2 = 1$.

Lemma 3.2. *The family $\{\phi_{j,k}\}_{j,k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ defined in (3.3) forms a tight frame for $L^2(-W/2, W/2)$ with frame constants $A = B = 2$.*

Proof. We write $f_j := f|_{I_j}$ so that $f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} f_j$. Since $\text{supp}(\theta_j) \subseteq D_j = I_j \cup I_{j+1}$, we observe

$$\sum_{j,k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\langle f, \phi_{j,k} \rangle|^2 = \sum_{j,k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\langle f_j + f_{j+1}, \phi_{j,k} \rangle|^2.$$

As $\{|D_j|^{-1/2} \exp(2\pi i kx/|D_j|)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is an orthonormal basis for $L^2(D_j)$, we find that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\langle f_j + f_{j+1}, \phi_{j,k} \rangle|^2 = 2\|(f_j + f_{j+1})\theta_j\|_2^2 = 2\|f_j\theta_j\|_2^2 + 2\|f_{j+1}\theta_j\|_2^2.$$

Combining both identities and using property (ii), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j,k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\langle f, \phi_{j,k} \rangle|^2 &= 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\|f_j\theta_j\|_2^2 + \|f_{j+1}\theta_j\|_2^2 \right) = 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\|f_j\theta_j\|_2^2 + \|f_j\theta_{j-1}\|_2^2 \right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{I_j} |f(x)|^2 \left(\theta\left(\frac{2(x-x_j)}{|I_j|}\right)^2 + \theta\left(-\frac{2(x-x_j)}{|I_j|}\right)^2 \right) dx \\ &= 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_j\|_2^2 = 2\|f\|_2^2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 < W_i \leq L$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, and consider $\prod_{i=1}^d (-W_i/2, W_i/2)$. Set also

$$W_{\max} := \max_{i=1, \dots, d} W_i.$$

We define a frame for $L^2(\prod_{i=1}^d (-W_i/2, W_i/2))$ via the tensor product

$$\Phi_{j_1, k_1}(x) = \Phi_{j_1, \dots, j_d, k_1, \dots, k_d}(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \phi_{j_1, k_1}(x_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \phi_{j_d, k_d}(x_d),$$

where each family $\{\phi_{j_i, k_i}(x_i)\}_{j_i, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the frame for $L^2(-W_i/2, W_i/2)$ given by (3.3). This construction also yields a tight frame with frame bounds equal to 2^d .

3.3. Energy estimates. Consider

$$\psi_j(x) = \theta_j \left(|D_j| x + x_j - \frac{W}{3 \cdot 2^{|j|+1}} \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

A straightforward computation shows that ψ_j is supported on $[0, 1]$ and satisfies $|D^k \psi_j(x)| \leq \widetilde{C}_\alpha^k k^{(1+\alpha)k}$ by property (iii). As shown in [8, Lemma 1] it thus follows that $|\widehat{\psi}_j(\xi)| \leq A_\alpha \cdot \exp\left(-a_\alpha |\xi|^{(1+\alpha)^{-1}}\right)$. Since $1 - \alpha \leq (1 + \alpha)^{-1}$, we derive that $t^{(1+\alpha)^{-1}} \geq t^{1-\alpha} - 1$ for $t \geq 0$. Adjusting the constant A_α , we therefore get

$$(3.4) \quad |\widehat{\theta}_j(\xi)| \leq A_\alpha \cdot |D_j| \cdot \exp\left(-a_\alpha (|D_j| \cdot |\xi|)^{1-\alpha}\right), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

With this at hand, we estimate the decay of

$$\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(\xi) = 2^{d/2} \prod_{i=1}^d |D_{j_i}|^{-1/2} \cdot \widehat{\theta}_{j_i} \left(\xi_i - \frac{k_i}{|D_{j_i}|} \right), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Define

$$M_j = \text{diag}(|D_{j_1}|, \dots, |D_{j_d}|) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}.$$

By (3.4) (possibly enlarging A_α) and $|\xi|^{1-\alpha} \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |\xi_i|^{1-\alpha}$, it follows

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(\xi)| &\leq A_\alpha^d \prod_{i=1}^d |D_{j_i}|^{1/2} \cdot \exp\left(-a_\alpha \left| |D_{j_i}| \xi_i - k_i \right|^{1-\alpha}\right) \\ &\leq A_\alpha^d \cdot \det(M_j)^{1/2} \cdot \exp\left(-a_\alpha |M_j(\xi - \xi_{j,k})|^{1-\alpha}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $(\xi_{j,k})_i = k_i |D_{j_i}|^{-1}$.

Consider now a compact domain $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $s \geq 1$ be a parameter that will be determined later. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ fixed, we cover the index set \mathbb{Z}^d with three subsets as follows

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{low}} &:= \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j E_L^c) \geq s\}; \\ \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{med}} &:= \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j E_L) < s, \text{ and } \text{dist}(k, M_j E_L^c) < s\}; \\ \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{high}} &:= \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j E_L) \geq s\}. \end{aligned}$$

(Here, dist is associated with the usual Euclidean distance.) We claim that

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{med}} \subseteq \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j \partial E_L) < s\};$$

let us briefly sketch an argument. Fix $k \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{med}}$ and let $k_0 \in M_j L^{-1} \mathbb{Z}^d$ minimize the distance to k . For any point $x \in M_j L^{-1} \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $|k - x| < s$ we can build a path of adjacent points in $M_j L^{-1} \mathbb{Z}^d$ from x to k_0 such that the distance to k is decreasing. In particular, choosing $x_1 \in M_j E_L$ and $x_2 \in M_j E_L^c$ at distance less than s from k , we can connect x_1 and x_2 through a path of adjacent points in $M_j L^{-1} \mathbb{Z}^d$ that stays at distance less than s from k . Necessarily, one of the points in the path must belong to $M_j \partial E_L$, which proves (3.7).

The indices (j, k) with $k \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{med}}$, and j satisfying a condition specified below (see (3.10)) will play the role of \mathcal{I}_2 in Lemma 3.1, so we need to estimate $\#(\mathcal{L}_j^{\text{med}})$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact domain with regular boundary at scale $\eta_{\partial E} \geq 1$ and constant $\kappa_{\partial E}$. Let $L \geq W_{\max}$ and $s \geq 1$. Then for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have*

$$\#\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j \partial E_L) < s\} \lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \cdot \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot s^d.$$

Proof. Since for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the cube $x + Q_1$ contains one point in \mathbb{Z}^d ,

$$(3.8) \quad \#\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j \partial E_L) < s\} \lesssim s^d \cdot \#\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : k \in M_j \partial E_L + Q_1\}.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote the unique integer in $x + [-1/2, 1/2)$ by x^* . For a set $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < a \leq 1$, we write $y_i = ax_i$. It is easy to check that if $x_i^* = x_j^*$, then $|y_i^* - y_j^*| \leq 1$. Using this, a straightforward argument shows that

$$\#\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k \in aX + [-1/2, 1/2)\} \leq 2\#\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k \in X + [-1/2, 1/2)\}.$$

From (3.8), if we apply the inequality above componentwise (noting that $(M_j)_{i,i} \leq W_{\max}$), we obtain for $s \geq 1$

$$\#\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j \partial E_L) < s\} \lesssim s^d \cdot \#\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : k \in W_{\max} \partial E_L + Q_1\}.$$

Since for every $x \in \partial E_L$ there exists $x' \in \partial E$ such that $|x - x'| \leq L^{-1}$, and $W_{\max}/L \leq 1$, it follows that

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \#\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j \partial E_L) < s\} &\lesssim s^d \cdot \#\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : k \in W_{\max} \partial E + Q_3\} \\ &=: s^d \cdot \#\mathcal{K}_{W_{\max}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let $k \in \mathcal{K}_{W_{\max}}$. There exists at least one point $x_k \in \partial E$ such that $k \in W_{\max} x_k + Q_3$. In particular, we have that $x_k \in W_{\max}^{-1} k + Q_{4/W_{\max}}$. Therefore, for every $k \in \mathcal{K}_{W_{\max}}$ we get by regularity of ∂E

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\partial E} \cdot \min\{W_{\max}^{-1}, \eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} &\leq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap B_{1/W_{\max}}(x_k)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap x_k + Q_{2/W_{\max}}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap W_{\max}^{-1} k + Q_{6/W_{\max}}). \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\partial E} \cdot \min\{W_{\max}^{-1}, \eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \cdot \#\mathcal{K}_{W_{\max}} &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{W_{\max}}} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap W_{\max}^{-1} k + Q_{6/W_{\max}}) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap W_{\max}^{-1} k + Q_{1/W_{\max}}) \\ &= \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this estimate into (3.9) completes the proof. \square

Next, for a compact domain $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and a parameter $s \geq 1$ we recall the sets (3.6), introduce a second auxiliary parameter $0 < \delta < 1$, and define the following covering of \mathbb{Z}^{2d} :

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma^{\text{low}} &:= \{(j, k) : \min_i |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta, k \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{low}}\}; \\ \Gamma^{\text{med}} &:= \{(j, k) : \min_i |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta, k \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{med}}\}; \\ \Gamma^{\text{high}} &:= \{(j, k) : \min_i |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta, k \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{high}}\} \cup \{(j, k) : \min_i |D_{j_i}| < \delta, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.4. *Under the conditions of Lemma 3.3, let $0 < \delta < 1$ and consider the set Γ^{med} from (3.10). Then*

$$\#(\Gamma^{\text{med}}) \lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \cdot \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d \cdot s^d.$$

Proof. By (3.7) and Lemma 3.3 it follows

$$\#(\Gamma^{\text{med}}) = \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta}} \#(\mathcal{L}_j^{\text{med}}) \lesssim \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta}} \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} s^d.$$

In each coordinate, we have that the number of intervals D_{j_i} for which $|D_{j_i}| \geq \delta$ is bounded by $C \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}$. Hence, we arrive at

$$\#(\Gamma^{\text{med}}) \lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d s^d. \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $d \geq 2$, $L \geq \max\{W_{\max}, 1\}$, and $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact domain with regular boundary at scale $\eta_{\partial E} \geq 1$ with constant $\kappa_{\partial E}$ and such that $|\partial E| \geq 1$. Let $s \geq 1$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be parameters and consider the sets from (3.10). Then there exists a constant $c = c_\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$(3.11) \quad \sum_{(j,k) \in \Gamma^{\text{low}}} L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L^c} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(m)|^2 \lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \cdot \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \exp(-cs^{1-\alpha}) \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d,$$

and

$$(3.12) \quad \sum_{(j,k) \in \Gamma^{\text{high}}} L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(m)|^2 \lesssim \frac{\max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1}}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \left(|\partial E|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \cdot \delta + |\partial E| \cdot \exp(-cs^{1-\alpha}) \cdot \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d \right).$$

Proof. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we set

$$\mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{low}} = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j E_L^c) \in [s2^l, s2^{l+1})\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{high}} = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j E_L) \in [s2^l, s2^{l+1})\}.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{low}} \cup \mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{high}} &\subseteq \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j E_L) < s2^{l+1}, \text{ and } \text{dist}(k, M_j E_L^c) < s2^{l+1}\} \\ &\subseteq \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{dist}(k, M_j \partial E_L) < s2^{l+1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows as in (3.7). From Lemma 3.3 we get

$$(3.13) \quad \#(\mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{low}}), \#(\mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{high}}) \lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} s^d 2^{dl}.$$

From (3.5) it follows that if $k \in \mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{low}}$

$$L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L^c} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(m)|^2 \leq L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L^c} A_\alpha^{2d} \det(M_j) \exp(-2a_\alpha |M_j(m - \xi_{j,k})|^{1-\alpha})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq A_\alpha^{2d} L^{-d} \det(M_j) \sum_{m' \in M_j E_L^c} \exp(-2a_\alpha |m' - k|^{1-\alpha}) \\
&\lesssim \int_{\{|x| \geq s2^l\}} \exp(-2a_\alpha |x|^{1-\alpha}) dx \\
(3.14) \quad &\lesssim \exp(-c(s2^l)^{1-\alpha}),
\end{aligned}$$

where c can for example be chosen as a_α . A similar argument also shows that for $k \in \mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{high}}$,

$$L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(m)|^2 \lesssim \exp(-c(s2^l)^{1-\alpha}).$$

As $\mathcal{L}_j^{\text{low}} = \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{low}}$, it follows from (3.13) and (3.14) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{(j,k) \in \Gamma^{\text{low}}} L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L^c} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(m)|^2 &= \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{L}_{j,l}^{\text{low}}} L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L^c} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(m)|^2 \\
&\lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0} (s2^l)^d \exp(-c(s2^l)^{1-\alpha}) \\
&\lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta}} \exp(-c's^{1-\alpha}) \\
&\lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \exp(-c's^{1-\alpha}) \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (3.11). Again, we can use an analogous reasoning to show

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| \geq \delta}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{high}}} L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(m)|^2 \\
&\lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \exp(-c's^{1-\alpha}) \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d.
\end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is such that $\min_{1 \leq i \leq d} |D_{j_i}| < \delta$. For every $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we can uniformly bound the subsequent series

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \exp(-2a_\alpha |M_j(m - \xi_{j,k})|^{1-\alpha}) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \exp(-2a_\alpha |M_j m - k|^{1-\alpha}) \leq C.$$

Since $\det(M_j) = |D_j|$, where $D_j = D_{j_1} \times \dots \times D_{j_d}$, we thus get by (3.5)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| < \delta}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L} |\mathcal{F}(\Phi_{j,k})(m)|^2 &\leq C \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| < \delta}} L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L} \det(M_j) \\
&\leq CL^{-d} \#E_L \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| < \delta}} |D_j|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \frac{|\partial E|^{d/(d-1)}}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| < \delta}} |D_j|,$$

where in the last inequality we used Corollary 2.2. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \min |D_{j_i}| < \delta}} |D_j| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ |D_{j_i}| < \delta}} |D_j| \leq \sum_{i=1}^d W_{\max}^{d-1} 4\delta \\ &\lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that each interval D_{j_i} is at most at $|D_{j_i}| < \delta$ distance from the boundary of $(-W_i/2, W_i/2)$. This concludes the proof of (3.12). \square

4. GENERAL DOMAIN VS. RECTANGLE

In this section, we prove the following variant of Theorem 1.2 for F a rectangle.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $L \geq 1$ be a discretization resolution, $d \geq 2$, and $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact domain with regular boundary at scale $\eta_{\partial E} \geq 1$ with constant $\kappa_{\partial E}$ and such that $|\partial E| \geq 1$. For $0 < W_i \leq L$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, take $F = \prod_{i=1}^d (-W_i/2, W_i/2)$ and denote $W_{\max} = \max_i W_i$. For every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ there exists $A_{\alpha, d} \geq 1$ such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n \in (\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)\} \\ &\leq A_{\alpha, d} \cdot \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \cdot \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{\max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} |\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We adopt all the notation of Section 3. Fix parameters $s \geq 1$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and consider the sets from (3.10).

Observe that for $f \in L^2(F)$ one has

$$\|Tf\|_2^2 = \|\chi_F P_{E, L} f\|_2^2 \leq \|P_{E, L} f\|_2^2 = L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L} |\widehat{f}(m)|^2.$$

and

$$\|f - Tf\|_2^2 = \|\chi_F f - \chi_F P_{E, L} f\|_2^2 \leq \|(I - P_{E, L})f\|_2^2 = L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L^c} |\widehat{f}(m)|^2.$$

By Lemma 3.5 it thus follows

$$\begin{aligned} (4.1) \quad &\sum_{(j, k) \in \Gamma^{\text{low}}} \|(I - T)\Phi_{j, k}\|_2^2 + \sum_{(j, k) \in \Gamma^{\text{high}}} \|T\Phi_{j, k}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq C \frac{\max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1}}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \left(|\partial E| \exp(-cs^{1-\alpha}) \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\partial E|^{d/(d-1)} \delta \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the constants depend only on α and d .

At last, we can now specify the parameters δ and s in order for the sets Γ^{low} , Γ^{med} and Γ^{high} to play the role of \mathcal{I}_1 , \mathcal{I}_2 and \mathcal{I}_3 in Lemma 3.1. We take

$$\delta = \frac{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon^2}{C \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} |\partial E|^{d/(d-1)}}.$$

This ensures that

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{C \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} |\partial E|^{d/(d-1)}}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \delta \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

Also, we select s such that

$$(4.3) \quad C \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \exp(-cs^{1-\alpha}) \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

This condition on s is equivalent to

$$s \geq \left(\frac{1}{c} \log \left(\frac{C \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} |\partial E| \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon^2} \right) \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)},$$

and is satisfied if

$$s = A_{\alpha,d} \log \left(\frac{\max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} |\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)},$$

for an adequate constant $A_{\alpha,d}$. Moreover, we can guarantee that $s \geq 1$, since by (2.4), the term inside the logarithm is ≥ 2 . From (4.1), (4.2), (4.3), Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \#M_\varepsilon(T) &\leq 2^{1-d} \#(\Gamma^{\text{med}}) \\ &\lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \max\{\log(W_{\max}/\delta), 1\}^d s^d \\ &\lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \log \left(\frac{\max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} |\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{d/(1-\alpha)+d} \\ &\lesssim \max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \log \left(\frac{\max\{W_{\max}, 1/\eta_{\partial E}\}^{d-1} |\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5. EIGENVALUE ESTIMATES FOR TWO DOMAINS

5.1. Schatten quasi-norm estimates. For $0 < p \leq 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, define the auxiliary function $g = g_{p,\varepsilon} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$g(t) = \left(\frac{t - t^2}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2} \right)^p.$$

Note that since $\chi_{(\varepsilon, 1-\varepsilon)} \leq g$, for a positive operator $0 \leq S \leq 1$,

$$\#M_\varepsilon(S) = \text{tr}(\chi_{(\varepsilon, 1-\varepsilon)} S) \leq \text{tr}(g(S)) = \frac{\|S - S^2\|_p^p}{(\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)^p},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_p$, $0 < p \leq 1$, denotes the Schatten quasi-norm. The next lemma shows that upper bounds for the left-hand side of the last inequality can be transferred to the right-hand side without much loss.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that for a positive operator $0 \leq S \leq 1$ there are constants $C, D, a > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$,*

$$\#M_\varepsilon(S) \leq C(D + \log(\varepsilon^{-1}))^a.$$

Then, for every $0 < p \leq 1$ there is a constant $C_a > 0$ such that

$$\|S - S^2\|_p^p \leq C_a C(D + p^{-1})^a.$$

Proof. By the symmetry of the function $h(x) = x - x^2$ around $1/2$, for $0 \leq x \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} h(x)^p &= \int_0^{\min\{x, 1-x\}} (h^p)'(t) dt = \int_0^{1/2} \chi_{(t, 1-t)}(x) p h^{p-1}(t) h'(t) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^{1/2} \chi_{(t, 1-t)}(x) p t^{p-1} dt. \end{aligned}$$

By a monotone convergence argument we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|S - S^2\|_p^p &\leq \int_0^{1/2} M_t(S) p t^{p-1} dt \leq C \int_0^1 (D + \log(t^{-1}))^a p t^{p-1} dt \\ &= C \int_0^\infty (D + u/p)^a e^{-u} du \\ &\leq C(D + 1/p)^a + C \int_1^\infty (D + u/p)^a e^{-u} du \\ &\leq C(D + 1/p)^a + C(D + 1/p)^a \int_1^\infty u^a e^{-u} du \\ &\leq (1 + \Gamma(a + 1)) C(D + 1/p)^a. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5.2. Decomposition of the domain and Hankel operators. In what follows, we let $F \subseteq (-L/2, L/2)^d$ be a compact domain with regular boundary at scale $\eta_{\partial F} = |\partial F|^{1/(d-1)} \geq 1$ with constant $\kappa_{\partial F}$. We construct two auxiliary sets $F^- \subseteq F \subseteq F^+$ which will be dyadic approximations of F from above and below by cubes of length at least 1. More precisely, let

$$F = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigcup_{j \in J_k} Q_{k,j}$$

be a dyadic decomposition of F in piecewise disjoint cubes of the form $Q_{k,j} = Q_{2^k} + 2^k j$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in J_k \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, that are maximal (they are not contained in a larger dyadic cube included in F). We define

$$F^- = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \bigcup_{j \in J_k} Q_{k,j}.$$

For F^+ we add cubes of length 1 to fully cover F and intersect them with $(-L/2, L/2)^d$. The result is a covering of F that combines the cubes from F^- with rectangles of maximal side-length ≤ 1 . More precisely, define

$$V = \{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d : (F \setminus F^-) \cap (Q_1 + v) \neq \emptyset\},$$

and

$$F^+ = F^- \cup \bigcup_{v \in V} \left((Q_1 + v) \cap (-L/2, L/2)^d \right) =: F^- \cup \bigcup_{v \in V} R_v.$$

Note that Theorem 4.1 can be applied to each rectangle in the decomposition of F^- and F^+ . This follows from a translation argument and the fact that the boundaries of the rectangles have null measure, so we can replace them by their interior. We write T^\pm for $T_{E,F^\pm,L}$.

For a set $K \subseteq (-L/2, L/2)^d$ define the *Hankel operator* on $L^2((-L/2, L/2)^d)$ by

$$H_K = (I - P_{E,L})\chi_K P_{E,L}$$

and write $H^\pm = H_{F^\pm}$. Note that

$$(H_K)^* H_K = P_{E,L}\chi_K P_{E,L} - P_{E,L}\chi_K P_{E,L}\chi_K P_{E,L} = P_{E,L}\chi_K P_{E,L} - (P_{E,L}\chi_K P_{E,L})^2.$$

Since $P_{E,L}\chi_K P_{E,L}$ and T_K share the same non-zero eigenvalues, for $p > 0$,

$$\|T_K - (T_K)^2\|_p^p = \|H_K\|_{2p}^{2p}.$$

Recall that for two operators S_1, S_2 in the p -Schatten class, $0 < p \leq 1$, one has

$$\|S_1 + S_2\|_p^p \leq \|S_1\|_p^p + \|S_2\|_p^p.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let $L \geq 1$, $d \geq 2$, and $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be compact domains with regular boundaries at scales $\eta_{\partial E} \geq 1$, $\eta_{\partial F} = |\partial F|^{1/(d-1)} \geq 1$, with constants $\kappa_{\partial E}$, $\kappa_{\partial F}$ respectively. Assume also that $|\partial E| \geq 1$ and $F \subseteq (-L/2, L/2)^d$. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, we have*

$$\#M_\varepsilon(T^\pm) \lesssim \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{|\partial E| \max\{|\partial F|, 1\}}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1}.$$

Proof. If $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is such that $J_k \neq \emptyset$, then there is a cube of length 2^k included in F . In particular, the projection of ∂F onto the hyperplane $\{x_1 = 0\}$ contains a $(d-1)$ -dimensional cube of length 2^k and therefore $2^{k(d-1)} \leq |\partial F|$. The maximality of the dyadic decomposition of F implies that $Q_{j,k} \subseteq \partial F + B_{\sqrt{d}2^{k+1}}(0)$ for $j \in J_k$. From Lemma 2.1 and the fact that $\eta_{\partial F} = |\partial F|^{1/(d-1)}$, we thus derive

$$(5.1) \quad 2^{dk} \#J_k \leq |\partial F + B_{\sqrt{d}2^{k+1}}(0)| \lesssim 2^k \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \left(1 + \frac{2^{k(d-1)}}{|\partial F|} \right) \lesssim 2^k \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}}.$$

Similarly,

$$(5.2) \quad \#V \leq |\partial F + B_{\sqrt{d}}(0)| \lesssim \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}}.$$

For $0 < 2p \leq 1$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, we thus get

$$\begin{aligned} \#M_\varepsilon(T^+) &\leq \frac{\|T^+ - (T^+)^2\|_p^p}{(\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)^p} = \frac{\|H^+\|_{2p}^{2p}}{(\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)^p} \\ &\leq (2/\varepsilon)^p \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j \in J_k} \|H_{Q_{k,j}}\|_{2p}^{2p} + (2/\varepsilon)^p \sum_{v \in V} \|H_{R_v}\|_{2p}^{2p} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-p} \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j \in J_k} \|T_{Q_{k,j}} - T_{Q_{k,j}}^2\|_p^p + \varepsilon^{-p} \sum_{v \in V} \|T_{R_v} - T_{R_v}^2\|_p^p. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.1 shows that when applying Lemma 5.1 to $T_{Q_{k,j}}$ one can take

$$C \lesssim 2^{k(d-1)} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}}, \quad \text{and} \quad D = \log \left(2^{k(d-1)} \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \right).$$

Similarly, the same holds for T_{R_v} with $k = 1$. Choosing $p = \log(2)(2\log(\varepsilon^{-1}))^{-1}$ (which ensures that $2p \leq 1$ for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$) thus yields

$$\begin{aligned} \#M_\varepsilon(T^+) &\lesssim \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j \in J_k} 2^{k(d-1)} \log \left(\frac{|\partial E| 2^{k(d-1)}}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)} + \#V \cdot \log \left(\frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ 2^{k(d-1)} \leq \max\{|\partial F|, 1\}}} \log \left(\frac{|\partial E| 2^{k(d-1)}}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)} \\ &= \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{\log(\max\{|\partial F|, 1\})}{\log(2)(d-1)} \rfloor} \left(\log \left(\frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right) + (d-1) \log(2)k \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second to last step we used (5.1), (5.2), and the fact that $2^{k(d-1)} \leq |\partial F|$ whenever $J_k \neq \emptyset$. Finally, noting that for $C, D, a > 0$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^N (C + Dk)^a \leq \int_0^{N+1} (C + Dx)^a dx \leq \frac{(C + D(N+1))^{a+1}}{D(a+1)},$$

we get,

$$\#M_\varepsilon(T^+) \lesssim \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \log \left(\frac{|\partial E| \max\{|\partial F|, 1\}}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1}.$$

The same argument works for $\#M_\varepsilon(T^-)$. \square

5.3. The transition index. The following estimate is part of the proof of [1, Theorem 1.5] (see also [16, Lemma 4.3]) and allows us to find the index where eigenvalues cross the $1/2$ threshold. We include a proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 5.3. *For any trace class operator $0 \leq S \leq 1$,*

- (i) $\lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{2}$, for every $n \geq \lceil \text{tr}(S) \rceil + \max\{2 \text{tr}(S - S^2), 1\}$;
- (ii) $\lambda_n \geq \frac{1}{2}$, for every $1 \leq n \leq \lceil \text{tr}(S) \rceil - \max\{2 \text{tr}(S - S^2), 1\}$.

Proof. First notice that if S is an orthogonal projection, then the result holds trivially, so we can assume otherwise. In particular, we have that $\text{tr}(S - S^2) > 0$.

Set $K = \lceil \text{tr}(S) \rceil$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(S) - \text{tr}(S^2) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n(1 - \lambda_n) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n(1 - \lambda_n) + \sum_{n=K+1}^{\infty} \lambda_n(1 - \lambda_n) \\ &\geq \lambda_K \sum_{n=1}^K (1 - \lambda_n) + (1 - \lambda_K) \sum_{n=K+1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lambda_K K - \lambda_K \sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n + (1 - \lambda_K) \left(\operatorname{tr}(S) - \sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n \right) \\
&= \lambda_K K + (1 - \lambda_K) \operatorname{tr}(S) - \sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n \\
&= \operatorname{tr}(S) - \sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n + \lambda_K (K - \operatorname{tr}(S)).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(5.3) \quad \sum_{n=K+1}^{\infty} \lambda_n = \operatorname{tr}(S) - \sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n \leq \operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=1}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_n) = \operatorname{tr}(S) - \sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n + \lambda_K (K - \operatorname{tr}(S)) - (1 - \lambda_K)(1 + \operatorname{tr}(S) - K) \\
(5.4) \quad &\leq \operatorname{tr}(S) - \sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n + \lambda_K (K - \operatorname{tr}(S)) \leq \operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $j \geq 2(\operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2))$ and consider $k = K + j$. It follows from (5.3) that

$$2(\operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2)) \cdot \lambda_k \leq j \cdot \lambda_{K+j} \leq \sum_{n=K+1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \leq \operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2),$$

which shows $\lambda_k \leq 1/2$ as $0 < \operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2) < \infty$; this proves part (i).

For part (ii), if $1 \leq k = K - j \leq K - 2(\operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2))$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, then (5.4) implies

$$2(\operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2)) \cdot (1 - \lambda_k) \leq j \cdot (1 - \lambda_{K-j}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_n) \leq \operatorname{tr}(S) - \operatorname{tr}(S^2),$$

yielding $\lambda_k \geq 1/2$. This completes the proof. \square

5.4. Proof of the main result. With all the preparatory work at hand, we are ready to prove the main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Recall from (2.2) that the eigenvalues of the concentration operator remain the same if we replace E, F and L with $t^{-1}E, tF$ and tL respectively. We choose $t = |\partial E|^{1/(d-1)}$ and notice that $t^{-1}E$ satisfies $|\partial t^{-1}E| = 1$, $\eta_{\partial t^{-1}E} = t^{-1}\eta_{\partial E} = 1$, and $\kappa_{\partial t^{-1}E} = \kappa_{\partial E}$. Furthermore, we also have that tF has regular boundary at scale $\eta_{\partial tF} = t\eta_{\partial F} = (|\partial E||\partial F|)^{1/(d-1)} \geq 1$ with constant $\kappa_{\partial tF} = \kappa_{\partial F}$, and $tL \geq 1$ by assumption on L .

Note that for $F' \subseteq (-tL/2, tL/2)^d$, the operator T has integral kernel

$$K(x, y) = \chi_{F'}(x) \chi_{F'}(y) \frac{1}{(tL)^d} \sum_{k \in (t^{-1}E)_{tL}} e^{-2\pi i k(x-y)}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathrm{tr}(T) = \int K(x, x) dx = \int_{F'} \frac{1}{(tL)^d} \sum_{k \in (t^{-1}E)_{tL}} 1 dx = \frac{\#(t^{-1}E)_{tL}}{(tL)^d} |F'|.$$

On the other hand, from Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}(T^\pm - (T^\pm)^2) &\lesssim \frac{|\partial t^{-1}E|}{\kappa_{\partial t^{-1}E}} \frac{|\partial tF|}{\kappa_{\partial tF}} \log \left(\frac{e|\partial t^{-1}E||\partial tF|}{\kappa_{\partial t^{-1}E}} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1} \\ &= \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \log \left(\frac{e|\partial E||\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1} =: C_{E,F}. \end{aligned}$$

So from Lemma 5.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_n(T^+) &\leq \frac{1}{2}, & n &\geq \left\lceil \frac{\#(t^{-1}E)_{tL}}{(tL)^d} |(tF)^+| \right\rceil + 2C_{E,F}; \\ \lambda_n(T^-) &\geq \frac{1}{2}, & n &\leq \left\lfloor \frac{\#(t^{-1}E)_{tL}}{(tL)^d} |(tF)^-| \right\rfloor - 2C_{E,F}. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 2.2 and $|\partial t^{-1}E| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n(T^-) < 1/2, \lambda_n(T^+) > 1/2\} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\kappa_{\partial E}} |(tF)^+ \setminus (tF)^-| + C_{E,F} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa_{\partial E}} |\partial tF + B_{\sqrt{d}}(0)| + C_{E,F} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \frac{t^{d-1}|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} + C_{E,F} \lesssim C_{E,F}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second to last step we used Lemma 2.1. Since $\lambda_n(T^-) \leq \lambda_n(T) \leq \lambda_n(T^+)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, again by Lemma 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \#M_\varepsilon(T) &\leq \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : 1/2 \leq \lambda_n(T^-) < 1 - \varepsilon\} + \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \varepsilon < \lambda_n(T^+) \leq 1/2\} \\ &\quad + \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n(T^-) < 1/2, \lambda_n(T^+) > 1/2\} \\ &\lesssim \#M_\varepsilon(T^-) + \#M_\varepsilon(T^+) + \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n(T^-) < 1/2, \lambda_n(T^+) > 1/2\} \\ &\lesssim \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \log \left(\frac{|\partial E||\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \varepsilon} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

6. THE CONTINUOUS FOURIER TRANSFORM

In this section we deduce Theorem 1.1 by taking $L \rightarrow \infty$ in Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Fix E and F as in the statement of Theorem 1.1. We consider a sufficiently large resolution such that $L \geq |\partial E|^{-1/(d-1)}$ and $F \subseteq (-L/2, L/2)^d$.

Let $S_L : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the operator given by

$$S_L f = T_{E,F,L}(\chi_F f) = \chi_F \mathcal{F}_L^{-1} \chi_{E_L} \mathcal{F}_L \chi_F f, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

An easy computation shows that S_L and $T_{E,F,L}$ share the same non-zero eigenvalues. Also, recall the operator S from (1.1).

Step 1. We show that

$$(6.1) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \|S_L - S\| = 0.$$

Recall that $Q_{L^{-1}} = L^{-1}[-1/2, 1/2]^d$ and define the auxiliary set

$$\Gamma_L = \bigcup_{m \in E_L} m + Q_{L^{-1}}.$$

Note that the symmetric difference $E\Delta\Gamma_L$ is included in $\partial E + B_{L^{-1}\sqrt{d}}(0)$. From Lemma 2.1,

$$|E\Delta\Gamma_L| \leq |\partial E + B_{L^{-1}\sqrt{d}}(0)| \lesssim \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa L} (1 + (L\eta_{\partial E})^{-(d-1)}) \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Using this and setting $R_L = \chi_F \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi_{\Gamma_L} \mathcal{F} \chi_F$, for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(R_L - S)f\|_2^2 &\leq \|(\chi_{\Gamma_L} - \chi_E) \mathcal{F}(\chi_F f)\|_2^2 \leq |E\Delta\Gamma_L| \|\mathcal{F}(\chi_F f)\|_\infty^2 \\ &\leq |E\Delta\Gamma_L| \|\chi_F f\|_1^2 \leq |E\Delta\Gamma_L| \|F\| \|f\|_2^2 \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

To prove (6.1), it only remains to show that

$$(6.2) \quad \|R_L - S_L\| \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

To this end, let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_L f - R_L f\|_2^2 &= \int_F \left| \int_{\Gamma_L} \mathcal{F}(\chi_F f)(w) e^{2\pi i w x} dw - L^{-d} \sum_{m \in E_L} \mathcal{F}(\chi_F f)(m) e^{2\pi i m x} \right|^2 dx \\ &= \int_F \left| \sum_{m \in E_L} \int_{m+Q_{L^{-1}}} \mathcal{F}(\chi_F f)(w) e^{2\pi i w x} - \mathcal{F}(\chi_F f)(m) e^{2\pi i m x} dw \right|^2 dx \\ &= \int_F \left| \sum_{m \in E_L} \int_{m+Q_{L^{-1}}} \int_F f(t) (e^{2\pi i w(x-t)} - e^{2\pi i m(x-t)}) dt dw \right|^2 dx \\ &\lesssim \int_F \left(\sum_{m \in E_L} \int_{m+Q_{L^{-1}}} \int_F |f(t)| |w - m| |x - t| dt dw \right)^2 dx \\ &\lesssim \int_F \left(\sum_{m \in E_L} L^{-(d+1)} \int_F |f(t)| |x - t| dt \right)^2 dx \\ &\lesssim (\#E_L)^2 L^{-2(d+1)} \int_F \|f\|_2^2 \int_F |x - t|^2 dt dx \\ &\lesssim L^{-2} \frac{\max\{|\partial E|^{2d/(d-1)}, 1\}}{\kappa_{\partial E}^2} |F|^2 \text{diam}(F)^2 \|f\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the inequality step we used Corollary 2.2. Hence (6.2) holds.

Step 2. Since S_L and $T_{E,F,L}$ share the same non-zero eigenvalues, the estimates in Theorem 1.2 apply also to S_L for all sufficiently large L . By the Fischer-Courant formula, operator convergence of positive compact operators implies convergence of their eigenvalues. Hence, by (6.1), the estimate satisfied by the spectrum of S_L extends to the spectrum of S . \square

7. THE DISCRETE FOURIER TRANSFORM

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let us define $E := \Omega + \overline{Q_1}$. Then $\Omega = E_L$ for $L = 1$. Let us apply Theorem 1.2 with $L = 1$ to E, F . We check the relevant hypotheses.

For each point $k \in \partial\Omega$, there exist at least one face and at most $2d$ faces of the cube $k + \overline{Q_1}$ that are contained in ∂E . Therefore,

$$(7.1) \quad \#\partial\Omega \leq |\partial E| \leq 2d \cdot \#\partial\Omega,$$

and consequently

$$|\partial E| |\partial F| \geq \#\partial\Omega \cdot |\partial F| \geq 1.$$

Moreover, (7.1) shows that the choice $L = 1$ satisfies $L \geq |\partial E|^{-1/(d-1)}$ as $\partial\Omega$ contains at least one point.

Now fix $0 < r \leq \sqrt{d} \cdot (\#\partial\Omega)^{1/(d-1)}$ and let us show that ∂E is regular at maximal scale. If $r < 2\sqrt{d}$, and $x \in \partial E$ we clearly have $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap B_r(x)) \gtrsim r^{d-1}$ as E is a union of cubes of length 1. If $r \geq 2\sqrt{d}$, set $n = \lfloor r/\sqrt{d} \rfloor$ and let $x \in \partial E$. There exist $k_x \in \partial\Omega$ such that $|k_x - x| \leq \sqrt{d}/2$. Note that for $y \in k_x + \overline{Q_n}$,

$$|y - x| \leq \frac{\sqrt{d}n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2} \leq \frac{r}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2} < r.$$

Hence, $k_x + \overline{Q_n} \subseteq B_r(x)$ and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap B_r(x)) &\geq \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E \cap k_x + \overline{Q_n}) \geq \#(\partial\Omega \cap k_x + Q_n) \\ &\geq \kappa_{\partial\Omega} n^{d-1} \gtrsim \kappa_{\partial\Omega} r^{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that ∂E is regular at scale $\sqrt{d} \cdot (\#\partial\Omega)^{1/(d-1)}$ with constant $C_d \cdot \kappa_{\partial\Omega}$. Note that if a set X is regular at scale η_X and constant κ_X , then it is also regular at scale $\alpha\eta_X$ and constant $\min\{1, \alpha^{1-d}\}\kappa_X$, for every $\alpha > 0$. By (7.1) we therefore see that ∂E is regular at scale $\eta_{\partial E} = |\partial E|^{1/(d-1)}$ and constant $\kappa_{\partial E} \asymp \kappa_{\partial\Omega}$.

The desired estimates now follow by applying Theorem 1.2 to E and F , with $L = 1$. \square

8. PROOF OF REMARK 1.4

First we combine Lemma 5.3, Lemma 5.1 (for $p = 1$) and Theorem 1.1 to conclude that there exist a constant $C = C_{\alpha,d} > 0$ such that if

$$n \geq [|E| \cdot |F|] + C \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{e|\partial E| |\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1} =: C_1,$$

then $\lambda_n \leq 1/2$, and if

$$n \leq [|E| \cdot |F|] - C \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{e|\partial E| |\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1} =: C_2,$$

then $\lambda_n \geq 1/2$.

For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, define $\varepsilon_0 := \min\{\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon\} \leq 1/2$ and let $0 < \tau < \varepsilon_0$. Observe that

$$\{1, \dots, \lfloor C_2 \rfloor\} \setminus M_\tau(S) \subseteq N_{1-\varepsilon_0}(S) \subseteq N_\varepsilon(S) \subseteq N_{\varepsilon_0}(S) \subseteq \{1, \dots, \lfloor C_1 \rfloor\} \cup M_\tau(S),$$

where we understand $\{1, \dots, \lfloor C_2 \rfloor\}$ to be \emptyset if $C_2 < 1$. Consequently,

$$C_2 - 1 - \#M_\tau(S) \leq \#N_\varepsilon(S) \leq C_1 + 1 + \#M_\tau(S).$$

Rearranging the last expression and using Theorem 1.1 for τ gives

$$|N_\varepsilon(S) - |E| \cdot |F|| \lesssim \frac{|\partial E|}{\kappa_{\partial E}} \cdot \frac{|\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial F}} \cdot \log \left(\frac{|\partial E| |\partial F|}{\kappa_{\partial E} \tau} \right)^{2d(1+\alpha)+1}.$$

Letting $\tau \nearrow \varepsilon_0$ yields (1.10).

REFERENCES

- [1] L. D. Abreu, J. M. Pereira, and J. L. Romero. Sharp rates of convergence for accumulated spectrograms. *Inverse Problems*, 33(11):115008, 12, 2017.
- [2] J. Anden and J. L. Romero. Multitaper estimation on arbitrary domains. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 13(3), 2021.
- [3] A. Bonami, P. Jaming, and A. Karoui. Non-asymptotic behavior of the spectrum of the sinc-kernel operator and related applications. *J. Math. Phys.*, 62(3):Paper No. 033511, 20, 2021.
- [4] D. G. Caraballo. Areas of level sets of distance functions induced by asymmetric norms. *Pacific J. Math.*, 218(1):37–52, 2005.
- [5] J. Diestel, H. Jarchow, and A. Tonge. *Absolutely summing operators*, volume 43 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [6] E. Hernández and G. Weiss. *A first course on wavelets*. Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1996. With a foreword by Yves Meyer.
- [7] J. A. Hogan and J. D. Lakey. *Duration and bandwidth limiting*. Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012. Prolate functions, sampling, and applications.
- [8] A. Israel. The eigenvalue distribution of time-frequency localization operators. *arXiv:1502.04404v1*, 2015.
- [9] A. Israel and A. Mayeli. On the eigenvalue distribution of spatio-spectral limiting operators in higher dimensions. *arXiv:2301.09616v1*, 2023.
- [10] S. Karnik, J. Romberg, and M. A. Davenport. Improved bounds for the eigenvalues of prolate spheroidal wave functions and discrete prolate spheroidal sequences. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 55:97–128, 2021.
- [11] S. Karnik, Z. Zhu, M. B. Wakin, J. Romberg, and M. A. Davenport. The fast Slepian transform. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 46(3):624–652, 2019.
- [12] H. J. Landau. On Szegő’s eigenvalue distribution theorem and non-Hermitian kernels. *J. Analyse Math.*, 28:335–357, 1975.
- [13] H. J. Landau and H. O. Pollak. Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis and uncertainty. II. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 40:65–84, 1961.
- [14] 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. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 41:1295–1336, 1962.
- [15] H. J. Landau and H. Widom. Eigenvalue distribution of time and frequency limiting. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 77(2):469–481, 1980.
- [16] F. Marceca and J. L. Romero. Spectral deviation of concentration operators for the short-time Fourier transform. *Studia Math. To appear. ArXiv:2104.06150*, 2021.
- [17] A. Osipov. Certain upper bounds on the eigenvalues associated with prolate spheroidal wave functions. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 35(2):309–340, 2013.
- [18] D. Slepian and H. O. Pollak. Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis and uncertainty. I. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 40:43–63, 1961.
- [19] H. Widom. Asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues of certain integral equations. II. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 17:215–229, 1964.

- [20] Z. Zhu, S. Karnik, M. B. Wakin, M. A. Davenport, and J. Romberg. ROAST: Rapid orthogonal approximate Slepian transform. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 66(22):5887–5901, 2018.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1,
A-1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA

Email address: felipe.marceca@univie.ac.at

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1,
A-1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA, AND ACOUSTICS RESEARCH INSTITUTE, AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF
SCIENCES, WOHLLEBENGASSE 12-14, VIENNA, 1040, AUSTRIA

Email address: jose.luis.romero@univie.ac.at

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1,
A-1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA

Email address: michael.speckbacher@univie.ac.at