GENERALIZED FOURIER FRAMES IN TERMS OF BALAYAGE

ENRICO AU-YEUNG AND JOHN J. BENEDETTO

ABSTRACT. Based on Beurling's theory of balayage, we develop the theory of non-uniform sampling in the context of the theory of frames for the settings of the Short Time Fourier Transform and pseudo-differential operators. There is sufficient complexity to warrant new examples generally, and to resurrect the formulation of balayage in terms of covering criteria with an eye towards an expanded theory as well as computational implementation.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Background and theme.** There has been a great deal of work during the past quarter century in analyzing, formulating, validating, and extending sampling formulas,

$$f(x) = \sum f(x_n)s_n, \tag{1}$$

for non-uniformly spaced sequences $\{x_n\}$, for specific sequences of sampling functions s_n depending on x_n, and for classes of functions f for which such formulas are true. For glimpses into the literature, see the Journal of Sampling Theory in Signal and Image Processing, the influential book by Young [79], edited volumes such as [9], and specific papers such as those by Jaffard [45] and Seip [71]. This surge of activity is intimately related to the emergence of wavelet and Gabor theories and more general frame theory. Further, it is firmly buttressed by the profound results of Paley-Wiener [67], Levinson [57], Duffin-Schaeffer [27], Beurling-Malliavin [18], [19], Beurling (unpublished 1959-1960 lectures), and H. J. Landau [54], that themselves have explicit origins by Dini [26], as well as G. D. Birkhoff (1917), J. L. Walsh (1921), and Wiener (1927), see [67], page 86, for explicit references.

   The setting will be in terms of classical spectral criteria to prove non-uniform sampling formulas such as (1). Our theme is to generalize non-uniform sampling in this setting to the Gabor theory [37], [32], [52], as well as to the setting of time-varying signals and pseudo-differential operators. The techniques are based on Beurling's methods from 1959-1960, [15], [17], pages 299-315, [17], pages 341-350, which incorporate balayage, spectral synthesis, and strict multiplicity. Our formulation is in terms of the theory of frames.

1.2. **Definitions.** Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the Schwartz space of rapidly decreasing smooth functions on d-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$. We define the Fourier transform and inverse Fourier transform of $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by the formulas,

$$\widehat{f}(\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)e^{-2\pi ix\cdot\gamma} \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad (\widehat{f})^{\vee}(x) = f(x) = \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d} \widehat{f}(\gamma)e^{2\pi ix\cdot\gamma} \, d\gamma,$$

respectively. $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ denotes $\mathbb{R}^d$ considered as the spectral domain. If $F \in \mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$, then we write $F^{\vee}(x) = \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d} F(\gamma)e^{2\pi ix\cdot\gamma} \, d\gamma$. The notation "$\int$"' designates integration over $\mathbb{R}^d$ or $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. The Fourier transform extends to tempered distributions. If $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, where X is closed, then

---

$M_b(X)$ is the space of bounded Radon measures μ with support, $\text{supp}\,(\mu)$, contained in X. $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the space of complex valued bounded continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 1.1. (Frame) Let H be a separable Hilbert space. A sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \subseteq H$ is a *frame* for H if there are positive constants A and B such that

$$\forall\, f \in H, \quad A\|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} |\langle f, x_n\rangle|^2 \leq B\|f\|^2.$$

The constants A and B are lower and upper frame bounds, respectively. They are not unique. We choose B to be the infimum over all upper frame bounds, and we choose A to be the supremum over all lower frame bounds. If $A = B$, we say that the frame is a tight frame or an A-tight frame for H.

Definition 1.2. (Fourier frame) Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a sequence and let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be a compact set. Notationally, let $e_x(\gamma) = e^{2\pi i x\cdot\gamma}$. The sequence $\mathcal{E}(E) = \{e_{-x} : x \in E\}$ is a *Fourier frame* for $L^2(\Lambda)$ if there are positive constants A and B such that

$$\forall\, F \in L^2(\Lambda), \quad A\|F\|^2_{L^2(\Lambda)} \leq \sum_{x\in E} |\langle F, e_{-x}\rangle|^2 \leq B\|F\|^2_{L^2(\Lambda)}.$$

Define the *Paley-Wiener space*,

$$PW_\Lambda = \{f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : \text{supp}\,(\widehat{f}) \subseteq \Lambda\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{E}(E)$ is a Fourier frame for $L^2(\Lambda)$ if and only if the sequence,

$$\{(e_{-x}\,\mathbb{1}_\Lambda)^\vee : x \in E\} \subseteq PW_\Lambda,$$

is a frame for PW_Λ, in which case it is called a *Fourier frame* for PW_Λ. Note that $\langle F, e_{-x}\rangle = f(x)$ for $f \in PW_\Lambda$, where $\widehat{f} = F \in L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ can be considered an element of $L^2(\Lambda)$.

Remark 1.3. Frames were first defined by Duffin and Schaeffer [27], but appeared explicitly earlier in Paley and Wiener's book [67], page 115. See Christensen's book [21] and Kovačević and Chebira's articles [50], [51] for recent expositions of theory and applications. If $\{x_n\}_{n\in Z} \subseteq H$ is a frame, then there is a topological isomorphism $S : H \longrightarrow \ell^2(Z)$ such that

$$(2) \qquad \forall x \in H, \quad x = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle x, S^{-1}(x_n)\rangle\, x_n = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle x, x_n\rangle\, S^{-1}(x_n).$$

Equation (2) illustrates the natural role that frames play in studying non-uniform sampling formulas (1), see Example 1.16.

Beurling introduced the following definition in his 1959-1960 lectures.

Definition 1.4. (Balayage) Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be closed sets. *Balayage* is possible for $(E, \Lambda) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ if

$$\forall \mu \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \exists \nu \in M_b(E) \text{ such that } \widehat{\mu} = \widehat{\nu} \text{ on } \Lambda.$$

Remark 1.5. *a.* The set Λ is a collection of group characters in analogy to the Newtonian potential theoretic setting, e.g., [17], pages 341-350, [54].

b. The notion of balayage in potential theory is due to Christoffel (1871), e.g., see the remarkable book [20], edited by Butzer and Fehér, and the article therein by Brelot. Then, Poincaré (1890 and 1899) used the idea of balayage as a method of solving the Dirichlet

problem for the Laplace equation. Letting $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, be a bounded domain, a balayage or sweeping of the measure $\mu = \delta_y$, $y \in D$, to ∂D is a measure $\nu_y \in M_b(\partial D)$ whose Newtonian potential coincides outside of D with the Newtonian potential of δ_y. In fact, ν_y is unique and is the harmonic measure on ∂D for $y \in D$, e.g., [49], [24].

One then formulates a more general balayage problem: for a given mass distribution μ inside a closed bounded domain $\overline{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, find a mass distribution ν on ∂D such that the potentials are equal outside $\overline{D}$ [56], cf. [1].

Let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be a closed set. Define

$$\mathcal{C}(\Lambda) = \{f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d) : \operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f}) \subseteq \Lambda\},$$

cf. the role of $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda)$ in [74].

Definition 1.6. (Spectral synthesis) A closed set $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ is a set of *spectral synthesis (S-set)* if

$$(3) \qquad \forall f \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda) \text{ and } \forall \mu \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \widehat{\mu} = 0 \text{ on } \Lambda \Rightarrow \int f \, d\mu = 0,$$

see [5].

Remark 1.7. *a.* The problem of characterizing S-sets emanated from Wiener's Tauberian theorem ideas, and was developed by Beurling in the 1940s. It is "synthesis" in that one wishes to approximate $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in the $\sigma(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ (weak-$*$) topology by finite sums of characters $\gamma : L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{C}$, where γ can be considered an element of $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ and where $\operatorname{supp}(\delta_\gamma) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})$, which is the so-called spectrum of f. Such an approximation is elementary to achieve by convolutions of the measures δ_γ, but in this case we lose the essential property that the spectra of the approximants be contained in the spectrum of f. It is a fascinating problem whose complete resolution is equivalent to the characterization of the ideal structure of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, a veritable Nullstellensatz of harmonic analysis.

b. We obtain the annihilation property of (3) in the case that f and μ have balancing smoothness and irregularity. For example, if $\widehat{f} \in D'(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$, $\widehat{\mu} = \phi \in C_c^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$, and $\phi = 0$ on $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})$, then $\widehat{f}(\phi) = 0$, where $\widehat{f}(\phi)$ is sometimes written $\left\langle \widehat{f}, \phi \right\rangle$. The sphere $S^2 \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3$ is not an S-set (Laurent Schwartz, 1947), and every non-discrete locally compact abelian group $\widehat{G}$, e.g., $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$, contains non-S-sets (Paul Malliavin 1959). On the other hand, polyhedra are S-sets, whereas the 1/3-Cantor set is an S-set with non-S-subsets. We refer to [5] for an exposition of the theory.

Definition 1.8. (Strict multiplicity) A closed set $\Gamma \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ is a set of *strict multiplicity* if

$$\exists \mu \in M_b(\Gamma) \setminus \{0\} \text{ such that } \lim_{\|x\| \to \infty} |\mu^\vee(x)| = 0.$$

Remark 1.9. The study of sets of strict multiplicity has its origins in Riemann's theory of sets of uniqueness for trigonometric series, see [4], [80]. An early, important, and difficult result is due to Menchov (1916):

$$\exists \Gamma \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \exists \mu \in M_b(\Gamma) \setminus \{0\} \text{ such that } |\Gamma| = 0 \text{ and } \mu^\vee(n) = O((\log|n|)^{-1/2}), |n| \to \infty.$$

($|\Gamma|$ is the Lebesgue measure of Γ.) There are refinements of Menchov's result, aimed at increasing the rate of decrease, due to Bary (1927), Littlewood (1936), Salem (1942, 1950), and Ivašev-Mucatov (1952, 1956).

1.3. **Results of Beurling.** The results in this subsection stem from 1959-1960, and the proofs are sometimes sophisticated, see [17], pages 341-350. Throughout, $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is closed and $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ is compact. The following is a consequence of the open mapping theorem.

Proposition 1.10. *Assume balayage is possible for (E, Λ). Then*

$$\exists K > 0 \text{ such that } \forall \mu \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d), \inf\{\|\nu\|_1 : \nu \in M_b(E) \text{ and } \widehat{\nu} = \widehat{\mu} \text{ on } \Lambda\} \leq K \|\mu\|_1.$$

($\|\ldots\|_1$ designates the total variation norm.)

The smallest such K is denoted by $K(E, \Lambda)$, and we say that balayage is not possible if $K(E, \Lambda) = \infty$. In fact, *if Λ is a set of strict multiplicity, then balayage is possible for (E, Λ) if and only if $K(E, \Lambda) < \infty$*, e.g., see Lemma 1 of [17], pages 341-350. Let $J(E, \Lambda)$ be the smallest $J \geq 0$ such that

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda), \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)| \leq J \sup_{x \in E} |f(x)|.$$

$J(E, \Lambda)$ could be ∞.

The Riesz representation theorem is used to prove the following result. Part c is a consequence of parts a and b.

Proposition 1.11. *a. If Λ is a set of strict multiplicity, then $K(E, \Lambda) \leq J(E, \Lambda)$.*
   b. If Λ is an S-set, then $J(E, \Lambda) \leq K(E, \Lambda)$.
   c. Assume that Λ is an S-set of strict multiplicity and that balayage is possible for (E, Λ). If $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda)$ and $f = 0$ on E, then f is identically 0.

Proposition 1.12. *Assume that Λ is an S-set of strict multiplicity. Then, balayage is possible for $(E, \Lambda) \Leftrightarrow$*

$$\exists K(E, \Lambda) > 0 \text{ such that } \forall f \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda), \quad \|f\|_\infty \leq K(E, \Lambda) \sup_{x \in E} |f(x)|.$$

The previous results are used in the intricate proof of Theorem 1.13.

Theorem 1.13. *Assume that Λ is an S-set of strict multiplicity, and that balayage is possible for (E, Λ) and therefore $K(E, \Lambda) < \infty$. Let $\Lambda_\epsilon = \{\gamma \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d : dist(\gamma, \Lambda) \leq \epsilon\}$. Then,*

$$\exists \epsilon_0 > 0 \text{ such that } \forall 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0, K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) < \infty,$$

i.e., balayage is possible for (E, Λ_ϵ).

The following result for $\mathbb{R}^d$ is not explicitly stated in [17], pages 341-350, but it goes back to his 1959-1960 lectures, see [78], Theorem E in [54], Landau's comment on its origins [55], and Example 2.3. In fact, using Theorem 1.13 and Ingham's theorem (Theorem 2.1), Beurling obtained Theorem 1.15. We have chosen to state Ingham's theorem (Theorem 2.1) in Section 2 as a basic step in the proof of Theorem 2.2, which supposes Theorem 1.13 and which we chose to highlight as *A fundamental identity of balayage* and in terms of its quantitative conclusion, (6) and (7). In fact, Theorem 2.2 essentially yields Theorem 1.15, see Example 2.3.

Definition 1.14. A sequence $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is *separated* if

$$\exists r > 0 \text{ such that } \inf\{\|x - y\| : x, y \in E \text{ and } x \neq y\} \geq r.$$

Theorem 1.15. *Assume that $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ is an S-set of strict multiplicity and that $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a separated sequence. If balayage is possible for (E, Λ), then $\mathcal{E}(E)$ is a Fourier frame for $L^2(\Lambda)$, i.e., $\{(e_{-x} \mathbb{1}_\Lambda)^\vee : x \in E\}$ is a Fourier frame for PW_Λ.*

Example 1.16. The conclusion of Theorem 1.15 is the assertion

$$\forall f \in PW_\Lambda, \quad f = \sum_{x \in E} f(x) S^{-1}(f_x) = \sum_{x \in E} \langle f, S^{-1}(f_x) \rangle f_x,$$

where

$$f_x(y) = (e_{-x} \mathbb{1}_\Lambda)^\vee(\gamma)$$

and

$$S(f) = \sum_{x \in E} f(x)(e_{-x} \mathbb{1})^\vee,$$

cf. (1) and (2). Clearly, f_x is a type of sinc function. Smooth sampling functions can be introduced into this setup, e.g., Theorem 7.45 of [10], Chapter 7.

Remark 1.17. Theorem 1.15 and results in [15] led to the Beurling covering theorem, see Section 6.

1.4. **Outline.** Now that we have described the background and recalled the required definitions from harmonic analysis and Beurling's fundamental theorems, we proceed to Section 2, where we state a basic theorem due to Ingham, as well as what we have called Beurling's fundamental identity of balayage. This result is a powerful technical tool that we use throughout.

In Section 3, we prove two theorems, that are the basis for our frame theoretic non-uniform sampling theory for the Short Time Fourier Transform (STFT). The second of these theorems, Theorem 3.4, is compared with an earlier result of Gröchenig, that itself goes back to work of Feichtinger and Gröchenig. Section 4 is devoted to examples that we formulated as avenues for further development integrating balayage with other theoretical notions. In Section 5 we prove the frame inequalities necessary to provide a non-uniform sampling formula for pseudo-differential operators defined by a specific class of Kohn-Nirenberg symbols. We view this as the basis for a much broader theory.

Our last mathematical section, Section 6, is a brief recollection of Beurling's balayage results, but formulated in terms of covering criteria and due to a collaboration of one of the authors in 1990s with Dr. Hui-Chuan Wu. Such coverings in terms of polar sets of given band width are a natural vehicle for extending the theory developed herein. Finally, in the Epilogue, we note the important related contemporary research being conducted in terms of quasicrystals, as well as other applications

2. A FUNDAMENTAL IDENTITY OF BALAYAGE

By construction, and slightly paraphrased, Ingham [44] proved the following result for the case $d = 1$, see [15], page 115 for a modification which gives the $d > 1$ case. In fact, Beurling gave a version for $d > 1$ in 1953; it is unpublished. In 1962, Kahane [47] went into depth about the $d > 1$ case.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $\Omega : [0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ be a continuous function, increasing to infinity. Assume the following conditions:*

(4)
$$\int_1^\infty \Omega(r) \frac{dr}{r^2} < \infty,$$

$$(5) \qquad \int exp(-\Omega(\|x\|))\,dx < \infty,$$

and $\Omega(r) > r^a$ on some interval $[r_0, \infty)$ and for some $a < 1$. Then, there is $h \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which $h(0) = 1$, $supp\,(\widehat{h}) \subseteq \overline{B(0, \epsilon)}$, and

$$|h(x)| = O(e^{-\Omega\|x\|}), \quad \|x\| \to \infty.$$

Ingham also proved the converse, which, in fact, requries the Denjoy-Carleman theorem for quasi-analytic functions.

If balayage is possible for (E, Λ) and $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a closed sequence, e.g., if E is separated, then Proposition 1.10 allows us to write $\widehat{\mu} = \sum_{x \in E} a_x(\mu) \widehat{\delta_x}$ on Λ, where $\sum_{x \in E} |a_x(\mu)| \leq K(E, \Lambda) \|\mu\|_1$. In the case $\mu = \delta_y$, we write $a_x(\mu) = a_x(y)$.

We refer to the following result as *A fundamental identity of balayage*.

Theorem 2.2. *Let Ω satisfy the conditions of Ingham's Theorem 2.1. Assume that Λ is a compact S-set of strict multiplicity, that E is a separated sequence, and that balayage is possible for (E, Λ). Choose $\epsilon > 0$ from Beurling's Theorem 1.13 so that $K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) < \infty$. For this $\epsilon > 0$, take h from Ingham's Theorem 2.1. Then, we have*

$$(6) \qquad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \forall f \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda), \quad f(y) = \sum_{x \in E} f(x) a_x(y) h(x - y),$$

where

$$(7) \qquad \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{x \in E} |a_x(y)| \leq K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) < \infty.$$

In particular, we have

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \forall \gamma \in \Lambda, \quad e^{2\pi i y \cdot \gamma} = \sum_{x \in E} a_x(y) h(x - y) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \gamma}.$$

Proof. Since balayage is possible for (E, Λ_ϵ), we have that $(\delta_y)^\wedge = (\sum_{x \in E} a_x(y) \delta_x)^\wedge$ on Λ_ϵ and that

$$\sum_{x \in E} |a_x(y)| \leq K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) \|\delta_y\|_1$$

for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Thus, (7) is obtained. Next, for each fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define the measure,

$$\eta_y(w) = h_y(w) \left(\delta_y - \sum_{x \in E} a_x(y) \delta_x \right)(w) \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where $h_y(w) = h(w - y)$. Then, we have

$$(\eta_y)^\wedge(\gamma) = \left[(h_y)^\wedge * \left(\delta_y - \sum_{x \in E} a_x(y) \delta_x \right)^\wedge \right](\gamma)$$

$$= \int \widehat{h}(\gamma - \lambda) e^{-2\pi i y \cdot (\gamma - \lambda)} \left(\delta_y - \sum_{x \in E} a_x(y) \delta_x \right)^\wedge (\lambda)\,d\lambda$$

$$= \int_{(\Lambda_\epsilon)^c} \widehat{h}(\gamma - \lambda) e^{-2\pi i y \cdot (\gamma - \lambda)} \left(\delta_y - \sum_{x \in E} a_x(y) \delta_x \right)^\wedge (\lambda)\,d\lambda$$

on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. If $\gamma \in \Lambda$ and $\lambda \in (\Lambda_\epsilon)^c$, then $\widehat{h}(\gamma - \lambda) = 0$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \forall \gamma \in \Lambda, \quad (\eta_y)^\wedge(\gamma) = 0.$$

Thus, since Λ is an S-set and $h(0) = 1$, we obtain (6) from the definition of η_y. $\square$

Example 2.3. Theorem 2.2 can be used to prove Beurling's sufficient condition for a Fourier frame in terms of balayage (Theorem 1.15), see part b. For convenience, let Λ be symmetric about $0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$, i.e., $-\Lambda = \Lambda$.

a. Using the notation of Theorem 2.2, we have the following estimate.

$$\sum_{x \in E} |\int a_x(y)h(x-y)f(y)\,dy|^2 \leq \sum_{x \in E} \int |a_x(y)||h(x-y)|^2\,dy \int |a_x(y)||f(y)|^2\,dy$$

$$\leq C \,\|h\|_2^2 \int \left(\sum_{x \in E} |a_x(y)|\right) |f(y)|^2\,dy$$

$$\leq C \,\|h\|_2^2 \, K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) \,\|f\|_2^2,$$

where C is a uniform bound of $\{|a_x(y)| : x \in E, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$.

b. It is sufficient to prove the lower frame bound. Let $F \in L^2(\Lambda)$ be considered as an element of $(PW_\Lambda)^\wedge$, i.e., $\widehat{f} = F$ vanishes off of Λ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We shall show that

$$(8) \qquad\qquad A \,\|F\|_{L^2(\Lambda)} \leq \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2\right)^{1/2},$$

where A is independent of $F \in L^2(\Lambda)$.

$$\|F\|_{L^2(\Lambda)}^2 = \int_\Lambda \overline{F(\lambda)} \left(\int f(y)e^{-2\pi i y \cdot \lambda}\,dy\right) d\lambda$$

$$= \int_\Lambda \overline{F(\lambda)} \left(\int f(y)\left(\sum_{x \in E} a_x(y)h(x-y)e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \lambda}\right) dy\right) d\lambda$$

$$= \sum_{x \in E} \overline{f(x)} \left(\int a_x(y)h(x-y)f(y)\,dy\right)$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} \left|\int a_x(y)h(x-y)f(y)\,dy\right|^2\right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq \left[C \,\|h\|_2^2 \, K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon)\right]^{1/2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2\right)^{1/2} \|f\|_2,$$

and so we set $A = 1/[C \,\|h\|_2^2 \, K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon)]^{1/2}$ to obtain (8).

3. Short time Fourier transform (STFT) frame inequalities

Definition 3.1. a. Let $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The *short-time Fourier transform* (STFT) of f with respect to g is the function $V_g f$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ defined as

$$V_g f(x, \omega) = \int f(t)\overline{g(t-x)}\,e^{-2\pi i t \cdot \omega}\,dt,$$

see [39], [40].

b. The STFT is uniformly continuous on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Further, for a fixed "window" $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|g\|_2 = 1$, we can recover the original function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ from its STFT $V_g f$ by means of the vector-valued integral inversion formula,

$$(9) \qquad f = \int \int V_g f(x, \omega) \, e_\omega \tau_x g \, d\omega \, dx,$$

where modulation e_ω was defined earlier and translation τ_x is defined as $\tau_x g(t) = g(t - x)$. Explicitly, Equation (9) signifies that we have the vector-valued mapping, $(x, \omega) \mapsto e_\omega \tau_x g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and

$$\forall \, h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \ \langle f, h \rangle = \int \int \left[\int V_g f(x, \omega)(e_\omega \tau_x g(t)) \overline{h(t)} \, dt \right] d\omega dx.$$

Also, if $\widehat{f} = F$ and $\widehat{g} = G$, where $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then one obtains the *fundamental identity of time frequency analysis*,

$$(10) \qquad V_g f(x, \omega) = e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \omega} V_G F(\omega, -x).$$

c. Let $g_0(x) = 2^{d/4} e^{-\pi \|x\|^2}$. Then $G_0(\gamma) = \widehat{g}_0(\gamma) = 2^{d/4} e^{-\pi \|\gamma\|^2}$ and $\|g_0\|_2 = 1$, see [8] for properties of g_0. The *Feichtinger algebra*, $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is

$$\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) = \{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \colon \|f\|_{\mathcal{S}_0} = \|V_{g_0} f\|_1 < \infty \}.$$

For now it is useful to note that the Fourier transform of $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is an isometric isomorphism onto itself, and, in particular, $f \in \mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if $F \in \mathcal{S}_0(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$.

The following result can be compared with a theorem by Gröchenig (1993) [38] relating sampling theorems for band-limited functions with Gabor frames.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $E = \{x_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a separated sequence, that is symmetric about $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$; and let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be an S-set of strict multiplicity, that is compact, convex, and symmetric about $0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. Assume balayage is possible for (E, Λ). Further, let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\widehat{g} = G$, have the property that $\|g\|_2 = 1$.*
  a. We have that

$$\exists \, A > 0, \quad such \ that \quad \forall f \in PW_\Lambda \backslash \{0\}, \quad \widehat{f} = F,$$

$$(11) \qquad A\|f\|_2^2 = A\|F\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{x \in E} \int |V_G F(\omega, x)|^2 \, d\omega = \sum_{x \in E} \int |V_g f(x, \omega)|^2 \, d\omega.$$

  b. Let $g \in \mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We have that

$$\exists \, B > 0, \quad such \ that \quad \forall f \in PW_\Lambda \backslash \{0\}, \quad \widehat{f} = F,$$

$$(12) \qquad \sum_{x \in E} \int |V_g f(x, \omega)|^2 \, d\omega = \sum_{x \in E} \int |V_G F(\omega, -x)|^2 \, d\omega \leq B\|F\|_2^2 = B\|f\|_2^2,$$

where B can be taken as $2^{d/2} C \|V_{g_0} g\|_1^2$ and where

$$C = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{x \in E} e^{-\|x - u\|^2}.$$

see the technique in [34], Lemma 3.2.15, cf. [33], Lemma 3.2.

Proof. a.i. We first combine the *STFT* and balayage to compute

$$
(13) \qquad \|f\|_2^2 = \int_\Lambda F(\gamma)\, \overline{F(\gamma)}\, d\gamma
$$

$$
= \int_\Lambda F(\gamma) \left(\int \int \overline{V_G F(y,\omega)}\ \overline{e_\omega(\gamma)}\ \overline{G(\gamma-y)}\, d\omega\, dy \right) d\gamma
$$

$$
= \int_\Lambda F(\gamma) \left(\int \int \overline{V_G F(y,\omega)}\ \overline{G(\gamma-y)} \left(\sum_{x \in E} \overline{a_x(\omega)}\ \overline{h(x-\omega)}\, e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \right) d\omega\, dy \right) d\gamma
$$

$$
= \int \int \overline{V_G F(y,\omega)} \left(\sum_{x \in E} \overline{a_x(\omega)}\ \overline{h(x-\omega)} \int F(\gamma)\, \overline{G(\gamma-y)}\, e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma}\, d\gamma \right) d\omega\, dy
$$

$$
= \int \int \overline{V_G F(y,\omega)} \left(\sum_{x \in E} \overline{a_x(\omega)}\ \overline{h(x-\omega)}\, V_G F(y,x) \right) d\omega\, dy
$$

$$
= \int \left[\sum_{x \in E} \left(\int \overline{V_G F(y,\omega)}\ \overline{a_x(\omega)}\ \overline{h(x-\omega)}\, d\omega \right) V_G F(y,x) \right] dy
$$

$$
\leq \int \left(\sum_{x \in E} \left| \int a_x(\omega)\, h(x-\omega)\, V_G F(y,\omega)\, d\omega \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} |V_G F(y,x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} dy.
$$

a.ii. We shall show that there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of $f \in PW_\Lambda$, such that

$$
(14) \qquad \forall\, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ \sum_{x \in E} \left| \int a_x(\omega)\, h(x-\omega) V_G F(y,\omega)\, d\omega \right|^2 \leq C^2 \int |V_G F(y,\omega)|^2\, d\omega.
$$

The left side of (14) is bounded above by

$$
\sum_{x \in E} \left(\int |a_x(\omega)|\, |h(x-\omega)|^2\, d\omega \right) \left(\int |a_x(\omega)|\, |V_G F(y,\omega)|^2\, d\omega \right)
$$

$$
\leq \sum_{x \in E} \left(K_1 \int |h(x-\omega)|^2\, d\omega \right) \left(\int |a_x(\omega)|\, |V_G F(y,\omega)|^2\, d\omega \right)
$$

$$
= K_1\, \|h\|_2^2 \sum_{x \in E} \int |a_x(\omega)|\, |V_G F(y,\omega)|^2\, d\omega
$$

$$
= K_1\, \|h\|_2^2 \int \left(\sum_{x \in E} |a_x(\omega)| \right) |V_G F(y,\omega)|^2\, d\omega
$$

$$
\leq K_1\, K_2\, \|h\|_2^2 \int |V_G F(y,\omega)|^2\, d\omega,
$$

where we began by using Hölder's inequality and where K_1 and K_2 exist because of (7) in Theorem 2.2. Let $C^2 = K_1 K_2\, \|h\|_2^2$.

a.iii. Combining parts *a.i* and *a.ii*, we have from (13) and (14) that

$$\|f\|_2^2 = \int_\Lambda F(\gamma) \, \overline{F(\gamma)} \, d\gamma$$

$$\leq \int C \left(\int |V_G F(y,\omega)|^2 \, d\omega \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} |V_G F(y,x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} dy$$

$$\leq C \left(\int \int |V_G F(y,\omega)|^2 \, d\omega \, dy \right)^{1/2} \left(\int \sum_{x \in E} |V_G F(y,x)|^2 \, dy \right)^{1/2}$$

$$= C \left(\int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma \right)^{1/2} \left(\int \sum_{x \in E} |V_G F(y,x)|^2 \, dy \right)^{1/2},$$

where we have used Hölder's inequality and the fact that the STFT is an isometry from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ into $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. Consequently, by the symmetry of E, we have

$$\frac{1}{C^2}\|f\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{C^2} \int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma$$

$$\leq \int \sum_{x \in E} |V_G F(\omega,-x)|^2 \, d\omega = \int \sum_{x \in E} |V_g f(x,\omega)|^2 d\omega,$$

where we have used (10). Part *a* is completed by setting $A = 1/C^2$.

b.i. The proof of (12) will require the reproducing formula [33], page 412:

(15) $$V_g f(y,\gamma) = \langle V_{g_0} f, V_{g_0}(e_\gamma \tau_y g) \rangle,$$

where $\widehat{g_0} = G_0$. Equation (15) is a consequence of the inversion formula,

$$f = \int \int V_{g_0} f(x,\omega) e_\omega \tau_x g_0 \, d\omega \, dx,$$

and substituting the right side into the definition $\langle f, e_\gamma \tau_y g \rangle$ of $V_g f(y,\gamma)$. Equation (15) is valid for all $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

b.ii. Using Equation (15) from part *b.i* we compute

$$\sum_{x \in E} \int |V_g f(x,\omega)|^2 d\omega$$

$$= \int \sum_{x \in E} |\langle V_{g_0} f, V_{g_0}(e_\omega \tau_x g) \rangle|^2 d\omega$$

$$= \int \sum_{x \in E} | \int \int \overline{V_{g_0} f(y,\gamma)} \, V_{g_0}(e_\omega \tau_x g)(y,\gamma) \, dy \, d\gamma|^2 d\omega$$

$$\leq \int \sum_{x \in E} \left(\left(\int \int |V_{g_0} f(y,\gamma)|^2 |V_{g_0}(e_\omega \tau_x g)(y,\gamma)| \, dy \, d\gamma \right) \left(\int \int |V_{g_0}(e_\omega \tau_x g)(y,\gamma)| \, dy \, d\gamma \right) \right) d\omega.$$

b.iii. Since

$$V_{g_0}(e_\omega \tau_x)g)(y,\gamma) = \int g(t-x) \, \overline{g_0(t-y)} \, e^{-2\pi i t \cdot (\gamma-\omega)} dt$$

$$= e^{-2\pi i x \cdot (\gamma-\omega)} \int g(u) \, \overline{g_0(u+(x-y))} \, e^{-2\pi i u \cdot (\gamma-\omega)} du,$$

we have
$$|V_{g_0}(e_\omega \tau_x)g)(y,\gamma)| \le |V_{g_0}g(y-x,\gamma-\omega).$$

Inserting this inequality into the last term of part $b.ii$, the inequality of part $b.ii$ becomes

$$\sum_{x\in E}\int |V_g f(x,\omega)|^2 \, d\omega$$

$$\le \int \sum_{x\in E}\left(\left(\int\int |V_{g_0}f(y,\gamma)|^2|V_{g_0}g(y-x,\gamma-\omega)| \, dy \, d\gamma\right)\left(\int\int |V_{g_0}g)(y-x,\gamma-\omega)| \, dy \, d\gamma\right)\right)d\omega$$

$$= \|V_{g_0}g\|_1 \int \sum_{x\in E}\left(\int\int |V_{g_0}f(y,\gamma)|^2|V_{g_0}g(y-x,\gamma-\omega)| \, dy \, d\gamma\right) \, d\omega$$

$$\le \|V_{g_0}g\|_1 \int\int |V_{g_0}f(y,\gamma)|^2 \left(\int \sum_{x\in E}|V_{g_0}g(y-x,\gamma-\omega)| \, d\omega\right) \, dy \, d\gamma.$$

$b.iv.$ By the reproducing formula, Equation (15), the integral-sum factor in the last term of part $b.iii$ is

$$\int \sum_{x\in E}|V_{g_0}g(y-x,\gamma-\omega)| \, d\omega$$

$$= \int \sum_{x\in E}|\int\int V_{g_0}g(z,\zeta) \, \overline{V_{g_0}(e_{\gamma-\omega}\tau_{y-x}g_0)(z,\zeta)} \, dz \, d\zeta|d\omega$$

$$= \int \sum_{x\in E}|\int\int V_{g_0}g(z,\zeta) \left(\overline{\int g_0(u)\overline{g_0(u-(z+x-y))} \, e^{-2\pi i u\cdot(\zeta-\gamma+\omega)} \, du}\right) dz \, d\zeta| \, d\omega$$

$$= \int \sum_{x\in E}|\int\int V_{g_0}g(z,\zeta) \, \overline{V_{g_0}g_0(z+(x-y),\zeta+(\omega-\gamma))} \, dz \, d\zeta|d\omega$$

$$\le \int\int |V_{g_0}g(z,\zeta)| \left(\int \sum_{x\in E}|V_{g_0}g_0(z+(x-y),\zeta+(\omega-\gamma))|d\omega\right) \, dz \, d\zeta.$$

$b.v.$ Substituting the last term of part $b.iv$ in the last term of part $b.iii$, the inequality of part $b.ii$ becomes

$$\sum_{x\in E}\int |V_g f(x,\omega)|^2 \, d\omega$$

$$\le \|V_{g_0}g\|_1 \int\int |V_{g_0}f(y,\gamma)|^2\times$$

$$\left(\int\int |V_{g_0}g(z,\zeta)| \left(\sum_{x\in E}\left(\int |V_{g_0}g_0(z+(x-y)),\zeta+(\omega-\gamma))|d\omega\right)\right) \, dz \, d\zeta\right) \, dy \, d\gamma$$

$$= \|V_{g_0}g\|_1 \int\int |V_{g_0}f(y,\gamma)|^2 \left(\int\int |V_{g_0}g(z,\zeta)| \left(\sum_{x\in E}K(x,y,z,\gamma,\zeta)\right) \, dz \, d\zeta\right) \, dy \, d\gamma,$$

where

$$K(x,y,z,\gamma,\zeta) = e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\|z+(x-y)\|^2} \int e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\|\zeta+(\omega-\gamma)\|^2}d\omega.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{x \in E} \int |V_g f(x, \omega)|^2 \, d\omega \leq 2^{\frac{d}{2}} \, C \, \|V_{g_0} g\|_1^2 \, \|V_{g_0} f\|^2,$$

where

$$C = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{x \in E} e^{-\|x-u\|^2}.$$

The fact, $C < \infty$, is straightforward to verify, but see [65] and [64], Lemma 2.1, for an insightful, refined estimate of C. The proof of part b is completed by a simple application of Equation (21). $\qquad\qquad\square$

We now recall a special case of a fundamental theorem of Gröchenig for non-uniform Gabor frames, see [37], Theorem S, and [39], Theorem 13.1.1, cf. [30] and [31] for a precursor of this result, presented in an almost perfectly disguised way for the senior author to understand. The general case of Gröchenig's theorem is true for the class of modulation spaces, $M_v^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where the Feichtinger algebra, $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is the case that the weight v is identically 1 on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The author's proof at all levels of generalization involves a significant analysis of convolution operators on the Heisenberg group. See [39] for an authoritative exposition of modulation spaces as well as their history.

Theorem 3.3. *Given any $g \in \mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There is $r = r(g) > 0$ such that if $E = \{(s_n, \sigma_n)\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ is a separated sequence with the property that*

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{B((s_n, \sigma_n), r(g))} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d,$$

then the frame operator, $S = S_{g,E}$, defined by

$$S_{g,E} f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle f, \tau_{s_n} e_{\sigma_n} g \rangle \, \tau_{s_n} e_{\sigma_n} g,$$

is invertible on $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
  Moreover, every $f \in \mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has a non-uniform Gabor expansion,

$$f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle f, \tau_{s_n} e_{\sigma_n} g \rangle S_{g,E}^{-1}(\tau_{s_n} e_{\sigma_n} g),$$

where the series converges unconditionally in $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
  (E depends on g.)

The following result can be compared with Theorem 3.3. It is also a theorem about Gabor expansions of certain band-limited functions with respect to a band-limited window, and as such can be compared to results about Gabor frames for subspaces.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $E = \{(s_n, \sigma_n)\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be a separated sequence; and let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be an S-set of strict multiplicity that is compact, convex, and symmetric about $0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume balayage is possible for (E, Λ). Further, let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\widehat{g} = G$, have the property that $\|g\|_2 = 1$. We have that*

$$\exists \, A, \, B > 0, \quad \text{such that} \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \text{for which} \quad \text{supp}(\widehat{V_g f}) \subseteq \Lambda,$$

(16) $$A \|f\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |V_g f(s_n, \sigma_n)|^2 \leq B \|f\|_2^2.$$

Consequently, the frame operator, $S = S_{g,E}$, is invertible in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$–norm on the subspace of $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathcal{R}^d)$, whose elements f have the property, $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{V_g f}) \subseteq \Lambda$.

Moreover, every $f \in \mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying the support condition, $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{V_g f}) \subseteq \Lambda$, has a non-uniform Gabor expansion,

$$f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle f, \tau_{s_n} e_{\sigma_n} g \rangle S_{g,E}^{-1}(\tau_{s_n} e_{\sigma_n} g),$$

where the series converges unconditionally in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(E does not depend on g.)

Proof. a. Using Theorem 2.2 for the setting $\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$, where $h \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ from Ingham's theorem has the property that $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{h}) \subseteq \overline{B(0,\epsilon)} \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we compute

$$(17) \qquad \int |f(x)|^2 \, dx = \int \int |V_g f(y,\omega)|^2 \, dy \, d\omega$$

$$= \int \int \overline{V_g f(y,\omega)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega) h(s_n - y, \sigma_n - \omega) V_g f(s_n, \sigma_n) \, dy \, d\omega,$$

where

$$V_g f(y,\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega) h(s_n - y, \sigma_n - \omega) V_g f(s_n, \sigma_n)$$

and

$$\sup_{(y,\omega)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega)| \le K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) < \infty.$$

Interchanging summation and integration on the right side of Equation (17), we use Hölder's inequality to obtain

$$\int |f(x)|^2 \, dx \le$$

$$(18)$$

$$\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |V_g f(s_n, \sigma_n)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \int \int a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega) h(s_n - y, \sigma_n - \omega) \, \overline{V_g f(y,\omega)} \, dy \, d\omega \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\le S_1^{1/2} \, S_2^{1/2}.$$

We bound the second sum S_2 using Hölder's inequality for the integrand,

$$[(a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega))^{1/2} h(s_n - y, \sigma_n - \omega)][(a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega))^{1/2} \overline{V_g f(y,\omega)}],$$

as follows:

$$S_2 \le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\int \int |a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega)| |h(s_n - y, \sigma_n - \omega)|^2 \, dy \, d\omega \int \int |a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega)| |V_g f(y,\omega)|^2 \, dy \, d\omega \right)$$

$$(19) \qquad \le K_1 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\int \int |h(s_n - y, \sigma_n - \omega)|^2 \, dy \, d\omega \int \int |a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega)| |V_g f(y,\omega)|^2 \, dy \, d\omega \right)$$

$$= K_1 \, \|h\|_2^2 \int \int \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega)| |V_g f(y,\omega)|^2 \right) \, dy \, d\omega \le K_1 K_2 \, \|h\|_2^2 \, \|f\|_2^2,$$

where K_1 is a uniform bound on $\{a_{s_n,\sigma_n}(y,\omega)\}$, K_2 invokes the full power of Theorem 2.2, and $\|f\|_2^2 = \|V_g f\|_2^2$.

Combining (18) and (19), we obtain

$$\|f\|_2^2 \leq (S_1 K_1 K_2)^{1/2} \|h\|_2 \|f\|_2,$$

and so the left hand inequality of (16) is valid for $1/(K_1 K_2 \|h\|_2^2)$.

b. The right hand inequality of (16) follows directly from the Pólya-Plancherel theorem, cf. Theorem 3.2*b*.

$\square$

Example 3.5. *a.* In comparing Theorem 3.3 with Theorem 3.4 a possible weakness of the former is the dependence of E on g, whereas a possible weakness of the latter is the hypothesis that $\mathrm{supp}(\widehat{V_g f}) \subseteq \Lambda$. We now show that this latter constraint is of no major consequence.

Let $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We know that $V_g f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$, and

$$\widehat{V_g f}(\zeta, z) = \int \int \left(\int f(t) \, g(t - x) \, e^{-2\pi i t \cdot \omega} \, dt \right) \, e^{-2\pi i (x \cdot \zeta + z \cdot \omega)} \, dx \, d\omega.$$

The right side is

$$\int \int f(t) \left(\int g(t - x) \, e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \zeta} \, dx \right) e^{-2\pi i t \cdot \omega} \, e^{-2\pi i z \cdot \omega} \, dt \, d\omega,$$

where the interchange in integration follows from the Fubini-Tonelli theorem and the hypothesis that $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This, in turn, is

$$\hat{g}(-\zeta) \int \left(\int f(t) \, e^{-2\pi i t \cdot \zeta} \, e^{-2\pi i t \cdot \omega} \, dt \right) e^{-2\pi i z \cdot \omega} \, d\omega$$

$$= \hat{g}(-\zeta) \int \hat{f}(\zeta + \omega) \, e^{-2\pi i z \cdot \omega} \, d\omega = e^{-2\pi i z \cdot \zeta} \, f(-z) \, \hat{g}(-\zeta).$$

Consequently, we have shown that if $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then

(20) $$f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \widehat{V_g f}(\zeta, z) = e^{-2\pi i z \cdot \zeta} \, f(-z) \, \hat{g}(-\zeta).$$

Let $d = 1$ and let $\Lambda = [-\Omega, \Omega] \times [-T, T] \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. We can choose $g \in PW_{[-\Omega, \Omega]}$, where $\hat{g}$ is even and smooth enough so that $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. For this window g, we take any even $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ which is supported in $[-T, T]$. Equation (20) applies.

b. Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 give non-uniform Gabor frame expansions. Generally, for $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, if $\{e_{\sigma_n} \tau_{s_n} g\}$ is a frame for $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, then $E = \{s_n, \sigma_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ is a finite union of separated sequences and $D^-(E) \geq 1$, where D^- denotes the lower Beurling density, [22]. (Beurling density has been analyzed deeply in terms of Fourier frames, e.g., [17], [54], [45], and [71], and it is defined as

$$D^-(E) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{n^-(r)}{r^2},$$

where $n^-(r)$ is the minimal number of points from $E \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ in a ball of radius $r/2$.) For perspective, in the case of $\{e_{mb} \tau_{na} g : m, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, this necessary condition is equivalent to the condition $ab \leq 1$. It is also well-known that if $ab > 1$, then $\{e_{mb} \tau_{na} g : m, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is not complete in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. As such, it is not unexpected that $\{e_{\sigma_n} \tau_{s_n} g\}$ is incomplete if $D^-(E) < 1$; however, this is not the case as has been shown by explicit construction, see [11], Theorem 2.6. Other sparse complete Gabor systems have been constructed in [69] and [77].

Example 3.6. *a.* Let $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a measure space, i.e., X is a set, $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\sigma-$algebra in the power set $\mathcal{P}(X)$, and μ is a measure on $\mathcal{A}$, see [8]. Let H be a complex, separable Hilbert space. Assume

$$\mathcal{F} \colon X \to H$$

is a weakly measurable function in the sense that for each $f \in H$, the complex-valued mapping $x \mapsto \langle f, \mathcal{F}(x) \rangle$ is measurable. $\mathcal{F}$ is a $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$–*frame* for H if

$$\exists\, A, B > 0 \text{ such that } \forall\, f \in H, \quad A\|f\|^2 \leq \int_X |\langle f, \mathcal{F}(x)\rangle|^2 \, d\mu(x) \leq B\|f\|^2.$$

Typically, $\mathcal{A}$ is the Borel algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z})$ for $X = \mathbb{Z}$. In these cases we use the terminology, (X, μ)-frame.

b. Continuous and discrete wavelet and Gabor frames are special cases of $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$-frames and could have been formulated as such from the time of [23] (1986) and [41] (1989). In mathematical physics the idea was introduced in [48], [2], and [3]. Recent mathematical contributions are found in [36] and [35]. $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$-frames are sometimes referred to as *continuous frames*. Also, in a slightly more concrete way we could have let X be a locally compact space and μ a positive Radon measure on X.

c. Let $X = \mathbb{Z}, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z})$, and $\mu = c$, where c is counting measure, $c(Y) = \mathrm{card}(Y)$. Define $\mathcal{F}(n) = x_n \in H, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, for a given complex, separable Hilbert space, H. We have

$$\forall\, f \in H, \quad \int_{\mathbb{Z}} |\langle f, x_n\rangle|^2 \, d\, c(n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\{n\}} |\langle f, x_n\rangle|^2 \, d\, c(n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\langle f, x_n\rangle|^2.$$

Thus, *frames* $\{x_n\}$ for H, as defined in Definition 1.1, are $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}), c)$–frames. For the present discussion we also refer to them as *discrete frames*.

d. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $\mu = p$ a probability measure, i.e. $p(\mathbb{R}^d) = 1$; and let $H = \mathbb{R}^d$. The measure p is a *probabilistic frame* for $H = \mathbb{R}^d$ if

$$\exists\, A, B > 0 \text{ such that } \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \, (= H), \quad A\|x\|^2 \leq \int_X |\langle x, y\rangle|^2 \, d\, p(y) \leq B\|x\|^2,$$

see [28], [29]. Define

$$\mathcal{F} \colon X = \mathbb{R}^d \to H = \mathbb{R}^d$$

by $\mathcal{F}(x) = x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d), p)$-frame for $H = \mathbb{R}^d$. Then

$$\forall\, x \in H, \quad A\|x\|^2 \leq \int_X |\langle x, y\rangle|^2 \, d\, p(y) \leq B\|x\|^2,$$

and this is precisely the same as saying that p is a probabilistic frame for $H = \mathbb{R}^d$.

Suppose we try to generalize probabilistic frames to the setting that X is locally compact, as well as being a vector space because of probabilistic applications. This simple extension can not be effected since Hausdorff, locally compact vector spaces are, in fact, finite dimensional (F. Riesz).

e. Let $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a measure space and let H be a complex, separable Hilbert space. A *positive operator-valued measure* $(POVM)$ is a function $\pi \colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{L}(H)$, where $\mathcal{L}(H)$ is the space of the bounded linear operators on H, such that $\pi(\emptyset) = 0, \pi(X) = I$ (Identity), $\pi(A)$ is a positive, and therefore self-adjoint (since H is a complex vector space), operator on H

for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and

$$\forall \text{ disjoint } \{A_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{A}, \quad x, y \in H \implies \langle \pi \left(\cup_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j \right) x, y \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \pi(A_j)x, y \rangle.$$

POVMs are a staple in quantum mechanics, see [3], [12] for rationale and references. If $\{x_n\} \subseteq H$ is a 1-tight discrete frame for H, then it is elementary to see that the formula,

$$\forall \, x \in H \text{ and } \forall \, A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}), \, \pi(A)x = \sum_{n \in A} \langle x, x_n \rangle x_n,$$

defines a *POVM*. Conversely, if $H = \mathbb{C}^d$ and π is a *POVM* for X countable, then by the spectral theorem there is a corresponding 1-tight discrete frame. This relationship between tight frames and *POVMs* extends to more general $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$-frames, e.g., [3], Chapter 3.

In this setting, and related to *probability of quantum detection error, P_e*, which is defined in terms of *POVMs*, Kebo and one of the authors have proved the following for $H = \mathbb{C}^d, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^{N} \subseteq H$, and $\{\rho_j > 0\}_{j=1}^{N}, \sum_{j=1}^{N} \rho_j = 1$: there is a 1-tight discrete frame $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{N} \subseteq H$ for H that minimizes P_e, [12], Theorem A.2.

f. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and let $H = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Given $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and define the function

$$\mathcal{F} : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$$
$$(x, \omega) \mapsto e^{2\pi i t \cdot \omega} \, g(t - x).$$

$\mathcal{F}$ is a $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}), m)$-frame for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, where m is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$; and, in fact, it is a tight frame for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with frame constant $A = B = \|g\|_2^2$. To see this we need only note the following consequence of the orthogonality relations for the *STFT*:

$$(21) \qquad\qquad \|V_g f\|_2 = \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Equation (21) is also used in the proof of (9).

g. Clearly, Theorems 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 can be formulated in terms of (X, μ)–frames.

4. Examples and modifications of Beurling's method

4.1. **Generalizations of Beurling's Fourier frame theorem.** Using more than one measure, we can extend Theorem 1.15 to more general types of Fourier frames. For clarity we give the result for three simple measures.

Lemma 4.1. *Given the notation and hypotheses of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. Then,*

$$\forall f \in PW_\Lambda \setminus \{0\}, \, \widehat{f} = F,$$

$$\sum_{x \in E} \left| \int a_x(y) h(x - y) f(y) \, dy \right|^2 \leq [K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) \, \|h\|_2]^2 \int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma.$$

Proof. We compute:

$$\sum_{x \in E} \left| \int a_x(y) h(x-y) f(y) \, dy \right|^2$$

$$\leq \sum_{x \in E} \left| \left(\int |a_x(y)^{1/2} h(x-y)|^2 \, dy \right)^{1/2} \left(\int |a_x(y)^{1/2} f(y)|^2 \, dy \right)^{1/2} \right|^2$$

$$\leq \sup_{x \in E} \left(\int |a_x(y)| |h(x-y)|^2 \, dy \right) \left(\sum_{x \in E} \int |a_x(y)| |f(y)|^2 \, dy \right)$$

$$\leq K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) \sup_{x \in E} \left(\int |a_x(y)| |h(x-y)|^2 \, dy \right) \int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma$$

$$\leq K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon)^2 \, \|h\|_2^2 \int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma,$$

where we have used the Plancherel theorem to obtain the third inequality. $\qquad \square$

Theorem 4.2. *Let $E = \{x_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a separated sequence, and let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be a compact S-set of strict multiplicity. Assume that Λ is a compact, convex set, that is symmetric about $0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. If balayage is possible for (E, Λ), then*

$$\exists \, A, B > 0 \ \ \text{such that} \ \forall f \in PW_\Lambda \setminus \{0\}, \ F = \widehat{f},$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
A^{1/2} \frac{\int_\Lambda |F(\gamma) + F(2\gamma) + F(3\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma}{\left(\int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma \right)^{1/2}} \\
(22) \qquad \leq \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(\tfrac{1}{2}x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{3} \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(\tfrac{1}{3}x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
\leq B^{1/2} \left(\int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. By hypothesis, we can invoke Theorem 1.13 to choose $\epsilon > 0$ so that balayage is possible for (E, Λ_ϵ), i.e., $K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) < \infty$. For this $\epsilon > 0$ and appropriate Ω, we use Theorem 2.1 to choose $h \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which $h(0) = 1, \text{supp} \, (\widehat{h}) \subseteq \overline{B(0, \epsilon)}$, and $|h(x)| = O(e^{-\Omega(\|x\|)}), \|x\| \to \infty$.

Therefore, for a fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda)$, Theorem 2.2 allows us to assert that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&g(y) + g(2y) + g(3y) \\
&= \sum_{x \in E} g(x) \left(a_x(y) h(x-y) + a_x(2y) h(x-2y) + a_x(3y) h(x-3y) \right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$\sum_{x \in E} |a_x(jy)| \leq K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon), \ \ j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Hence, if $\gamma \in \Lambda$ is fixed and $g(w) = e^{-2\pi i w \cdot \gamma}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{-2\pi i y \cdot \gamma} + e^{-2\pi i (2y) \cdot \gamma} + e^{-2\pi i (3y) \cdot \gamma} \\
& = \sum_{x \in E} \left(a_x(y) h(x-y) + a_x(2y) h(x-2y) + a_x(3y) h(x-3y) \right) e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma},
\end{aligned}
$$

which we write as

$$
\sum_{x \in E} b_x(y) e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma}.
$$

Since $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap PW_\Lambda$ is dense in PW_Λ, we take $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap PW_\Lambda$ in the following argument without loss of generality. We compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{x \in E} e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \int b_x(y) f(y) \, dy \\
& = \int f(y) \left(\sum_{x \in E} b_x(y) e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \right) dy \\
& = \int f(y) \left(e^{-2\pi i y \cdot \gamma} + e^{-2\pi i (2y) \cdot \gamma} + e^{-2\pi i (3y) \cdot \gamma} \right) dy \\
& = F(\gamma) + F(2\gamma) + F(3\gamma) = J_F(\gamma).
\end{aligned}
$$

As such, we have

$$
J_F(\gamma) = \sum_{x \in E} \widetilde{f}(x) e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma}, \quad \text{where } \widetilde{f}(x) = \int b_x(y) f(y) \, dy.
$$

Next, we compute the following inequality for the inner product $\langle J_F, J_F \rangle_\Lambda$:

$$
\int_\Lambda J_F(\gamma) \overline{J_F(\gamma)} \, d\gamma = \int_\Lambda J_F(\gamma) \left(\sum_{x \in E} \overline{\widetilde{f}(x)} e^{2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \right) d\gamma
$$

$$
(23) \quad = \sum_{x \in E} \overline{\widetilde{f}(x)} \left(\int_\Lambda J_F(\gamma) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \, d\gamma \right) = \sum_{x \in E} \overline{\widetilde{f}(x)} \left(f(x) + \frac{1}{2} f(\frac{x}{2}) + \frac{1}{3} f(\frac{x}{3}) \right)
$$

$$
\leq \left(\sum_{x \in E} |\widetilde{f}(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} \left| f(x) + \frac{1}{2} f(\frac{x}{2}) + \frac{1}{3} f(\frac{x}{3}) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}
$$

$$
\leq \left(\sum_{x \in E} |\widetilde{f}(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left[\left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(\frac{x}{2})|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{3} \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(\frac{x}{3})|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right]
$$

by Hölder's and Minkowski's inequalities. Further, there is $A > 0$ such that

$$
(24) \quad \sum_{x \in E} |\widetilde{f}(x)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{A} \int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma.
$$

This is a consequence of Lemma 4.1. Combining the definition of J_F with the inequalities (23) and (24) yield the first inequality of (22).

The second inequality of (22) only requires the assumption that E be separated, and, as such, it is a consequence of the Plancherel-Pólya theorem, which asserts that if E is separated, then

$$\exists\, B_j \text{ such that } \forall\, f \in PW_\Lambda,$$

$$\sum_{x \in E} \left| f\left(\frac{x}{j}\right) \right|^2 \le B_j \, \|f\|_2^2, \ j = 1, 2, 3,$$

see [6], pages 474-475, [54], [76], pages 109-113. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Theorem 4.2 can be generalized extensively.

Example 4.3. Given the setting of Theorem 4.2.

 a. Define the set $\{e_{j,x}^\vee : j = 1, 2, 3 \text{ and } x \in E\}$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$e_{j,x}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{j} \mathbb{1}_\Lambda(\gamma) e^{-2\pi i (1/j) x \cdot \gamma},$$

and define the mapping $S : PW_\Lambda \to PW_\Lambda$ by

$$Sf = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{x \in E} \langle f, e_{j,x}^\vee \rangle \, e_{j,x}^\vee.$$

We compute

$$\forall f \in PW_\Lambda, \quad \langle Sf, f \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \frac{1}{j^2} \sum_{x \in E} \left| f\left(\frac{x}{j}\right) \right|^2.$$

 b. Let $f \in PW_\Lambda$, $\widehat{f} = F$, and define $J_F(\gamma) = F(\gamma) + F(2\gamma) + F(3\gamma)$. Since $(a+b+c)^2 \le 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$ for $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$, Theorem 4.2 and part *a* allow us to write the frame-type inequality,

$$(25) \qquad \frac{A}{3} \frac{\langle J_F, J_F \rangle^2}{\|F\|_2} \le \langle Sf, f \rangle = \|Lf\|_{\ell^2}^2 \le B \, \|f\|_2^2,$$

where $Lf = \{\langle f, e_{j,x}^\vee \rangle : j = 1, 2, 3 \text{ and } x \in E\}$ so that $S = L^*L$. The inequalities (25) do not a priori define a frame for PW_Λ. However, $\{e_{j,x} : j = 1, 2, 3 \text{ and } x \in E\}$ is a frame for PW_Λ with frame operator S. This is a consequence of Theorem 1.15.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $E = \{x_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a separated sequence, and let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be an S-set of strict multiplicity. Assume that Λ is a compact, convex set, that is symmetric about $0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. Further, let $G \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be non-negative on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. If balayage is possible for (E, Λ), then*

$$\exists\, A, B > 0, \text{ such that } \forall\, f \in PW_\Lambda \setminus \{0\}, F = \widehat{f},$$

$$(26) \qquad A \frac{\left(\int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, G(\gamma) \, d\gamma \right)^2}{\int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma} \le \sum_{x \in E} |(F\,G)^\vee (x)|^2$$

$$\le B \int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 \, d\gamma.$$

We can take $A = 1/\left(K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) \, \|h\|_2^2 \right)$ and $B = B_1 \, \|G\|_\infty^2$, where B_1 is the Bessel bound in the Plancherel-Pólya theorem for PW_Λ.

Proof. By hypothesis, we can invoke Theorem 1.13 to choose $\epsilon > 0$ so that balayage is possible for (E, Λ_ϵ), i.e., $K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) < \infty$. For this $\epsilon > 0$ and appropriate Ω, we use Theorem 2.1 to choose $h \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which $h(0) = 1$, $\operatorname{supp} \widehat{h} \subseteq \overline{B(0, \epsilon)}$, and $|h(x)| = O(e^{-\Omega(\|x\|)}), \|x\| \to \infty$. Consequently, we have

$$\forall\ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \forall\ \gamma \in \Lambda,$$

$$e^{-2\pi i y \cdot \gamma} = \sum_{x \in E} a_x(y) h(x - y) e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma}, \text{ where } \sum_{x \in E} |a_x(y)| \leq K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon).$$

If $f \in PW_\Lambda$, $\widehat{f} = F$, and noting that $F \in L^1(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$, we have the following computation:

$$\int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2 G(\gamma)\ d\gamma$$

$$= \int_\Lambda F(\gamma) G(\gamma) \left(\int \overline{f(w)} \left(\sum_{x \in E} a_x(w) h(x - w) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \right) dw \right) d\gamma$$

(27)
$$= \sum_{x \in E} \left(\int_\Lambda F(\gamma) G(\gamma) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \gamma}\ d\gamma \right) \left(\int \overline{f(w)} a_x(w) h(x - w)\ dw \right)$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{x \in E} |(FG)^\vee(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} \left| \int \overline{f(w)} a_x(w) h(x - w)\ dw \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq K(E, \Lambda_\epsilon) \|h\|_2 \left(\int_\Lambda |F(\gamma)|^2\ d\gamma \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{x \in E} |(FG)^\vee(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where the last step is a consequence of Lemma 4.1. Clearly, (27) gives the first inequality of (26). As in Theorem 4.2, the second inequality of (26) only requires the assumption that E be separated, and, as such, it is a consequence of the Plancherel-Pólya theorem for PW_Λ. $\square$

Theorem 4.4 is an elementary generalization of the classical result for the case $G = 1$ on $\mathbb{R}$, and itself has significant generalizations to other weights G. We have not written $(FG)^\vee$ as a convolution since for such generalizations there are inherent subtleties in defining the convolution of distributions, e.g., [70], Chapitre VI, [61], see [7], pages 99-102, for contributions of Hirata and Ogata, Colombeau, et al. Even in the case of Theorem 4.4, $G^\vee = g$ is in the class of pseudo-measures, which themselves play a basic role in spectral synthesis [5].

4.2. **A bounded operator** $B : L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \to l^p(E),\ p > 1$. *a.* In Example 2.3*b* we proved the lower frame bound assertion of Theorem 1.15. This can also be achieved using Beurling's generalization of balayage to so-called linear balayage operators B, see [17], pages 348-350.

In fact, with this notion and assuming the hypotheses of Theorem 2.2, Beurling proved that the mapping,

$$L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \longrightarrow \quad l^p(E), \quad p > 1,$$
$$k \quad \mapsto \quad \{k_x\}_{x \in E},$$

where

$$\forall\ x \in E, \quad k_x = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a_x(y) h(x - y) k(y)\ dy,$$

has the property that

$$\exists\ C_p > 0 \text{ such that } \forall\ k \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

$$(28) \qquad \sum_{x \in E} |k_x|^p \leq C_p \int |k(y)|^p dy.$$

Let $p = 2$ and fix $f \in PW_\Lambda$. We shall use (28) and the definition of norm to obtain the desired lower frame bound. This is H.J. Landau's idea. Set

$$I_k = \int_\Lambda F(\gamma) \overline{K(\gamma)} d\gamma, \qquad \widehat{f} = F,$$

where $K^\vee = k \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By balayage, we have

$$K(\gamma) = \sum_{x \in E} k_x e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \quad \text{on } \Lambda;$$

and so,

$$I_k = \sum_{x \in E} f(x) \overline{k_x},$$

allowing us to use (28) to make the estimate,

$$|I_k|^2 \leq C \|K\|_2^2 \sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2.$$

By definition of $\|f\|_2$, we have

$$\|f\|_2 = \sup_K \frac{|I_K|}{\|K\|_2} \leq C \left(\sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

and this is the lower frame bound inequality with bound $A = 1/C^2$.

Because of this approach we can think of balayage as "$l^2 - L^2$ balayage".

b. Motivated by part a, we shall say that $l^1 - L^2$ *balayage is possible* for (E, Λ), where E is separated and Λ is a compact set of positive measure $|\Lambda|$, if

$$\exists\, C > 0 \text{ such that } \forall\, k \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \widehat{k} = K,$$

$$\sum_{x \in E} |k_x| \leq C \int_\Lambda |K(\gamma)|^2 d\gamma$$

and

$$K(\gamma) = \sum_{x \in E} k_x e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \quad \text{on } \Lambda.$$

For fixed $f \in PW_\Lambda$ and using the notation of part a, we have

$$(29) \qquad |I_k|^2 \leq \sum_{x \in E} |k_x|^2 \sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2.$$

An elementary calculation gives

$$\sum_{x \in E} |k_x|^2 \leq C^2 |\Lambda| \int_\Lambda |K(\gamma)|^2 d\gamma,$$

which, when substituted into (29), gives

$$\frac{1}{C^2 |\Lambda|} \left(\frac{|I_K|^2}{\int_\Lambda |K(\gamma)|^2 d\gamma} \right) \leq \sum_{x \in E} |f(x)|^2.$$

We obtain the desired lower frame inequality with bound $A = 1/(C^2|\Lambda|)$.

5. Pseudo-differential operator frame inequalities

Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$. The operator, K_σ, formally defined as

$$(K_\sigma f)(x) = \int \sigma(x, \gamma)\widehat{f}(\gamma)e^{2\pi i x \cdot \gamma} \, d\gamma,$$

is the *pseudo-differential operator* with Kohn-Nirenberg symbol, σ, see [39] Chapter 14, [40] Chapter 8, [43], and [75], Chapter VI. For consistency with the notation of the previous sections, we shall define pseudo-differential operators, K_s, with tempered distributional Kohn-Nirenberg symbols, $s \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$, as

$$(K_s \widehat{f})(\gamma) = \int s(y, \gamma)f(y)e^{-2\pi i y \cdot \gamma} \, dy.$$

Further, we shall actually deal with Hilbert-Schmidt operators, $K \colon L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d) \to L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$; and these, in turn, can be represented as $K = K_s$, where $s \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$. Recall that $K \colon L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d) \to L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ is a *Hilbert-Schmidt operator* if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|Ke_n\|_2^2 < \infty$$

for some orthonormal basis, $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, for $L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$, in which case the *Hilbert-Schmidt norm* of K is defined as

$$\|K\|_{HS} = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|Ke_n\|_2^2\right)^{1/2},$$

and $\|K\|_{HS}$ is independent of the choice of orthonormal basis. The first theorem about Hilbert-Schmidt operators is the following [68]:

Theorem 5.1. *If $K \colon L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d) \to L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ is a bounded linear mapping and $(K\widehat{f})(\gamma) = \int m(\gamma, \lambda)\widehat{f}(\lambda) \, d\lambda$, for some measurable function m, then K is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator if and only if $m \in L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^{2d})$ and, in this case, $\|K\|_{HS} = \|m\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})}$.*

The following is our result about pseudo-differential operator frame inequalities.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $E = \{x_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a separated sequence, that is symmetric about $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$; and let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be an S-set of strict multiplicity, that is compact, convex, and symmetric about $0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. Assume balayage is possible for (E, Λ). Further, let K be a Hilbert-Schmidt operator on $L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ with pseudo-differential operator representation,*

$$(K\widehat{f})(\gamma) = (K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma) = \int s(y, \gamma)f(y)e^{-2\pi i y \cdot \gamma} \, dy,$$

where $s_\gamma(y) = s(y, \gamma) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ is the Kohn-Nirenberg symbol and where we make the further assumption that

(30) $$\forall \gamma \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d, \quad s_\gamma \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad and \quad \mathrm{supp}\,(s_\gamma e_{-\gamma})\widehat{} \subseteq \Lambda.$$

Then,

$$\exists A, B > 0 \quad such \ that \quad \forall f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\backslash\{0\},$$

$$
(31) \qquad A\frac{\|K_s\widehat{f}\|_2^4}{\|f\|_2^2} \leq \sum_{x\in E} |\langle (K_s\widehat{f})(\cdot), \overline{s(x,\cdot)}\, e_x(\cdot)\rangle|^2 \leq B\, \|s\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)}^2 \|K_s\widehat{f}\|_2^2.
$$

Proof. a. In order to prove the assertion for the lower frame bound, we first combine the pseudo-differential operator K_s, with Kohn-Nirenberg symbol s, and balayage to compute

$$
(32) \qquad \int |(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)|^2\, d\gamma = \int \overline{(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)}(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)\, d\gamma
$$
$$
= \int \overline{(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)}\left(\int s(y,\gamma)f(y)e^{-2\pi i y\cdot\gamma}\, dy\right) d\gamma
$$
$$
= \int \overline{(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)}\left(\int f(y)k(y,\gamma)\, dy\right) d\gamma
$$
$$
= \int \overline{(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)}\left(\int f(y)\left(\sum_{x\in E} k(x,\gamma)a_x(y,\gamma)h(x-y)\right) dy\right) d\gamma,
$$

where $k_\gamma(y) = k(y,\gamma) = s(y,\gamma)e^{-2\pi i y\cdot\gamma}$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $k_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda)$ for each fixed $\gamma \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$, and where

$$
(33) \qquad \sup_{\gamma\in\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d}\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}\sum_{x\in E} |a_x(y,\gamma)| \leq K(E,\Lambda_\epsilon) = C < \infty.
$$

Because of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, we do not need to have the function h depend on $\gamma \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. Further, because of (33) and estimates we shall make, we can write $a_x(y,\gamma) = a_x(y)$.

Thus, the right side of (32) is

$$
(34) \qquad \int f(y)\left[\sum_{x\in E} a_x(y)h(x-y)\left(\int \overline{(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)}k(x,\gamma)\, d\gamma\right)\right] dy
$$
$$
= \sum_{x\in E}\left(\int f(y)a_x(y)h(x-y)\, dy \int \overline{(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)}k(x,\gamma)\, d\gamma\right)
$$
$$
\leq \left(\sum_{x\in E}\left|\int f(y)a_x(y)h(x-y)\, dy\right|^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{x\in E}\left|\overline{(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)}k(x,\gamma)\right|^2\right)^{1/2}.
$$

Note that, by Hölder's inequality applied to the integral, we have

$$
(35) \qquad \sum_{x\in E}\left|\int f(y)a_x(y)h(x-y)\, dy\right|^2
$$
$$
\leq \sum_{x\in E}\left|\left(\int |a_x(y)||h(x-y)|^2\, dy\right)^{1/2}\left(\int |f(y)|^2|a_x(y)|\, dy\right)^{1/2}\right|^2
$$
$$
\leq \sum_{x\in E}\left(C\int |h(x-y)|^2\, dy\right)\left(\int |f(y)|^2|a_x(y)|\, dy\right)
$$
$$
\leq C\|h\|_2^2\int\left((\sum_{x\in E}|a_x(y)|)\,|f(y)|^2\, dy\right)
$$
$$
\leq C^2\|h\|_2^2\|f\|_2^2.
$$

Combining (32), (34), and (35), we obtain

$$\|K_s\widehat{f}\|_2^2 \le C\|h\|_2\|f\|_2 \left(\sum_{x\in E}\left|\int (K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)k(x,\gamma)\,d\gamma\right|^2\right)^{1/2}.$$

Consequently, setting $A = 1/(C\|h\|_2)^2$, we have

$$\forall f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\backslash\{0\}, \quad A\frac{\|K_s\widehat{f}\|_2^4}{\|f\|_2^2} \le \sum_{x\in E}\left|\int (K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)s(x,\gamma)e^{-2\pi ix\cdot\gamma}\,d\gamma\right|^2$$

$$= \sum_{x\in E}|\langle (K_s\widehat{f})(\cdot), \overline{s(x,\cdot)}e_x(\cdot)\rangle|^2$$

and the assertion for the lower frame bound is proved.

b.i. In order to prove the assertion for the upper frame bound, we begin by formally defining

$$\forall f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad (I_s\widehat{f})(x) = \int s(x,\gamma)(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)e^{-2\pi ix\cdot\gamma}\,d\gamma,$$

which is the inner product in (31).

Note that $I_s\widehat{f} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In fact, we know $K_s\widehat{f} \in L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ and $s \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ so that

$$|I_s\widehat{f}(x)|^2 \le \int |s(x,\gamma)|^2\,d\gamma \int |K_s\widehat{f}(\gamma)|^2\,d\gamma$$

by Hölder's inequality, and, hence,

(36) $$\|I_s\widehat{f}\|_2^2 \le \|s\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)}^2\|K_s\widehat{f}\|_2^2.$$

b.ii. We shall now show that $\text{supp}((I_s\widehat{f})^\wedge) \subseteq \Lambda$, and to this end we use (30). We begin by computing

$$(I_s\widehat{f})^\wedge(\omega) = \int \left(\int s(y,\gamma)(K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)\,e^{-2\pi iy\cdot\gamma}\,d\gamma\right)e^{-2\pi iy\cdot\omega}\,dy$$

$$= \int (K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)\left(\int k_\gamma(y)e^{-2\pi iy\cdot\omega}\,dy\right)\,d\gamma$$

$$= \int (K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)(k_\gamma)\widehat{\,}(\omega)\,d\gamma,$$

where

$$k_\gamma(y) = k(y,\gamma) = s(y,\gamma)e^{-2\pi iy\cdot\gamma} = (s_\gamma e_{-\gamma})(y),$$

as in part *a*. Also, $\text{supp}(k_\gamma)\widehat{\,} \subseteq \Lambda$ by our assumption, (30); that is, for each $\gamma \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d, (k_\gamma)\widehat{\,} = 0$ a.e. on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d\backslash\Lambda$.

Since $\text{supp}(I_s\widehat{f})^\wedge$ is the smallest closed set outside of which $(I_s\widehat{f})^\wedge$ is 0 a.e., we need only show that if $\text{supp}(L) \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d\backslash\Lambda$ then

$$\int L(\omega)(I_s\widehat{f})^\wedge(\omega)\,d\omega = 0.$$

This follows because

$$\int L(\omega)(I_s\widehat{f})^\wedge(\omega)\,d\omega = \int (K_s\widehat{f})(\gamma)\left(\int L(\omega)(k_\gamma)\widehat{\,}(\omega)\,d\omega\right)\,d\gamma$$

and $(k_\gamma)\widehat{\ } = 0$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d\backslash\Lambda$.

$b.iii.$ Because of parts $b.i$ and $b.ii$, we can invoke the Pólya-Plancherel theorem to assert the existence of $B > 0$ such that

$$\forall f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \sum_{x \in E} |(I_s\widehat{f})(x)| \le B\|I_s\widehat{f}\|_2^2,$$

and the upper frame inequality of (31) follows from (36). $\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Example 5.3. We shall define a Kohn-Nirenberg symbol class whose elements s satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 5.2, cf. the discrete symbol calculus of Demanet and Ying [25].

Choose $\{\lambda_j\} \subseteq \text{int}(\Lambda), a_j \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $b_j \in C_b(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d) \cap L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ with the following properties:

   $i.$ $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |a_j(y)b_j(\gamma)|$ is uniformly bounded and converges uniformly on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$;

   $ii.$ $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|a_j\|_2\|b_j\|_2 < \infty$;

   $iii.$ $\forall j = 1, \ldots,\ \exists \epsilon_j > 0$ such that $\overline{B(\lambda_j, \epsilon_j)} \subseteq \Lambda$ and $\text{supp}(\widehat{a}_j) \subseteq \overline{B(0, \epsilon_j)}$.

These conditions are satisfied for a large class of functions a_j and b_j.

The Kohn-Nirenberg symbol class consisting of functions, s, defined as

$$s(y, \gamma) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j(y)b_j(\gamma)e^{-2\pi i y\cdot\lambda_j}$$

satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 5.2. To see this, first note that condition i tells us that, if we set $s_\gamma(y) = s(y, \gamma)$, then

$$\forall \gamma \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d, \quad s_\gamma \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Condition ii allows us to assert that $s \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$ since we can use Minkowski's inequality to make the estimate,

$$\|s\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)} \le \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\int \int \left|b_j(\gamma)a_j(y)e^{-2\pi i y\cdot(\lambda_j - \gamma)}\right|^2\ dy\ d\gamma \right)^{1/2} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|a_j\|_2\|b_j\|_2.$$

Finally, using condition iii, we obtain the support hypothesis, $\text{supp}(s_\gamma e_{-\gamma})\widehat{\ } \subseteq \Lambda$, of Theorem 5.2 for each $\gamma \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$, because of the following calculations:

$$(s_\gamma e_{-\gamma})\widehat{\ }(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j(\gamma)(\widehat{a}_j * \delta_{-\lambda_j})(\omega)$$

and, for each j,

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{a}_j * \delta_{-\lambda_j}) \subseteq \overline{B(0, \epsilon_j)} + \{\lambda_j\} \subseteq \overline{B(\lambda_j, \epsilon_j)} \subseteq \Lambda.$$

6. The Beurling covering theorem

Let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be a convex, compact set which is symmetric about the origin and has non-empty interior. Then $\|\cdot\|_\Lambda$, defined by

$$\forall \gamma \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d, \quad \|\gamma\|_\Lambda = \inf\{\rho > 0 : \gamma \in \rho\Lambda\},$$

is a norm on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ equivalent to the Euclidean norm. The polar set $\Lambda^* \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of Λ is defined as

$$\Lambda^* = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \cdot \gamma \leq 1, \text{ for all } \gamma \in \Lambda\}.$$

It is elementary to check that Λ^* is a convex, compact set which is symmetric about the origin, and that it has non-empty interior.

Example 6.1. Let $\Lambda = [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$. Then, for $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^2$,

$$\|(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\|_\Lambda = \inf\{\rho > 0 : |\gamma_1| \leq \rho, |\gamma_2| \leq \rho\} = \|(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\|_\infty.$$

The polar set of Λ is

$$\Lambda^* = \{(x_1, x_2) : |x_1| + |x_2| \leq 1\} = \{(x_1, x_2) : \|(x_1, x_2)\|_1 \leq 1\}.$$

Theorem 6.2. *(Beurling covering theorem) Let $\Lambda \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be a convex, compact set which is symmetric about the origin and has non-empty interior, and let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a separated set satisfying the covering property,*

$$\bigcup_{y \in E} \tau_y \Lambda^* = \mathbb{R}^d.$$

If $\rho < 1/4$, then $\{(e_{-x} \, \mathbb{1}_\Lambda)^\vee : x \in E\}$ is a Fourier frame for $PW_{\rho\Lambda}$.

Theorem 6.2 [13], [14] involves the Paley-Wiener theorem and properties of balayage, and it depends on the theory developed in [17], pages 341-350, [15], and [54]. For a recent development, see [66].

7. Epilogue

This paper is rooted in Beurling's deep ideas and techniques dealing with balayage, that themselves have spawned wondrous results in a host of areas ranging from Kahane's creative formulation and theory exposited in [46] to the setting of various locally compact abelian groups with surprising twists and turns and many open problems, e.g., [72], [73], to the new original chapter on quasi-crystals led by Yves Meyer, e.g., [42], [62], [53], [58], [59], [60], [63] as well as the revisiting by Beurling [16].

Even with the focused theme of this paper, there is the important issue of implementation and computation vis a vis balayage and genuine applications of non-uniform sampling.

Acknowledgements

Finally, the second named author has had the unbelievably good fortune through the years to learn from Henry J. Landau, a grand master in every way. His explicit contributions for this paper are noted in Section 4.2.

References

1. David R. Adams and Lars I. Hedberg, *Function Spaces and Potential Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
2. Syed Twareque Ali, Jean-Pierre Antoine, and Jean-Pierre Gazeau, *Continuous frames in Hilbert space*, Ann. Phys. (NY) **222** (1993), 1–37.
3. _____ , *Coherent States, Wavelets and Their Generalizations*, Graduate Text in Contemporary Physics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
4. Nina Bary, *A Treatise on Trigonometric Series, Volumes I and II*, The MacMillan Company, New York, 1964.
5. John J. Benedetto, *Spectral Synthesis*, Academic Press, Inc., New York-London, 1975.
6. John J. Benedetto, *Irregular sampling and frames*, Wavelets: a Tutorial in Theory and Applications (Charles K. Chui, ed.), Academic Press Inc., San Diego, CA, USA, 1992, pp. 445–507.
7. John J. Benedetto, *Harmonic Analysis and Applications*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1997.
8. John J. Benedetto and Wojciech Czaja, *Integration and Modern Analysis*, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts, Springer-Birkhäuser, New York, 2009.
9. John J. Benedetto and Paulo J. S. G. Ferreira (eds.), *Modern Sampling Theory*, Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2001.
10. John J. Benedetto and Michael W. Frazier (eds.), *Wavelets: Mathematics and Applications*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1994.
11. John J Benedetto, Christopher Heil, and David Walnut, *Differentiation and the Balian–Low theorem*, J. Fourier Anal. and Appl. **1** (1995), 355–402.
12. John J. Benedetto and Andrew Kebo, *The role of frame force in quantum detection*, J. Fourier Analysis and Applications **14** (2008), 443–474.
13. John J. Benedetto and Hui-Chuan Wu, *A Beurling covering theorem and multidimensional irregular sampling*, SampTA (Loen), 1999.
14. _____ , *Non-uniform sampling and spiral MRI reconstruction*, SPIE (2000).
15. Arne Beurling, *Local harmonic analysis with some applications to differential operators*, Some Recent Advances in the Basic Sciences, Vol. 1 (Proc. Annual Sci. Conf., Belfer Grad. School Sci., Yeshiva Univ., New York, 1962–1964) (1966), 109–125.
16. Arne Beurling, *On interpolation, blaschke products, and balayage of measures*, The Bieberbach Conjecture: Proceedings of the Symposium on the Occasion of the Proof, 1985, pp. 33–49.
17. _____ , *The Collected Works of Arne Beurling. Vol. 2. Harmonic Analysis.*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1989.
18. Arne Beurling and Paul Malliavin, *On Fourier transforms of measures with compact support*, Acta Mathematica **107** (1962), 291–309.
19. _____ , *On the closure of characters and the zeros of entire functions*, Acta Mathematica **118** (1967), 79–93.
20. Paul L. Butzer and F. Fehér, *E. B. Christoffel - The Influence of his Work on Mathematics and the Physical Sciences*, Springer-Birkhäuser, New York, 1981.
21. Ole Christensen, *An Introduction to Frames and Riesz Bases*, Springer-Birkhäuser, Boston, 2003.
22. Ole Christensen, B. Deng, and Christopher Heil, *Density of Gabor frames*, Appl. Comp. Harm. Anal. **7** (1999), 292–304.
23. Ingrid Daubechies, *Ten Lectures on Wavelets*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1992.
24. Charles J. de la Vallée-Poussin, *Le Potentiel Logarithmique, Balayage, et Répresentation Conforme*, (1949).
25. Laurent Demanet and Lexing Ying, *Discrete symbol calculus*, SIAM Review **53** (2011).
26. Ulisse Dini, *Sugli sviluppi in serie ... dove le λ_n sono radici equazione trascendente $f(z)cos(\pi z) + f_1(z)sen(\pi z) = 0$*, Annali di Mat. Pure ed Appl. **26** (1917), 261–284.
27. Richard J. Duffin and A. C. Schaeffer, *A class of nonharmonic Fourier series*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **72** (1952), 341–366.

28. Martin Ehler, *Random tight frames*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **18** (2012), 1–20.

29. Martin Ehler and Kasso Okoudjou, *Probabilistic frames: an overview*, Finite Frames: Theory and Applications (Peter G. Casazza and Gitta Ktyniok, eds.), Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis, Springer-Birkhäuser, New York, 2013, Chapter 12.

30. Hans G. Feichtinger and Karlheinz H. Gröchenig, *A unified approach to atomic decompositions via integrable group representations*, Function Spaces and Applications (Lund 1986), Springer Lecture Notes 1302 (1988), 52–73.

31. _____, *Banach spaces related to integrable group representations and their atomic decompositions*, J. Funct. Anal. **86** (1989), 307–340.

32. Hans G. Feichtinger and Wenchang Sun, *Stability of Gabor frames with arbitrary sampling points*, Acta Mathematica Hungarica **113** (2006), 187–212.

33. _____, *Sufficient conditions for irregular Gabor frames*, Advances in Computational Math. **26** (2007), 403–430.

34. Hans G. Feichtinger and Georg Zimmermann, *A Banach space of test functions for Gabor analysis.*, Gabor analysis and algorithms,, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., Birkhäuser, Boston, 1998, pp. 123–170.

35. Massimo Fornasier and Holger Rauhut, *Continuous frames, function spaces, and the discretization problem*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **11** (2005), no. 3, 245–287.

36. Jean-Pierre Gabardo and Deguang Han, *Frames associated with measurable spaces. frames.*, Adv. Comput. Math. **18** (2003), no. 2-4, 127–147.

37. Karlheinz Gröchenig, *Describing functions: atomic decompositions versus frames*, Monatsh. Math. **112** (1991), 1–42.

38. Karlheinz Gröchenig, *Irregular sampling of wavelet and short-time Fourier transforms*, Constr. Approx. **9** (1993), 283–297.

39. _____, *Foundations of Time-Frequency Analysis*, Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2001.

40. Karlheinz Gröchenig, *A pedestrian's approach to pseudodifferential operators*, Harmonic Analysis and Applications, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., Birkhäuser, Boston, 2006, pp. 139–169.

41. Christopher Heil and David F. Walnut, *Continuous and discrete wavelet transforms*, SIAM Review **31** (1989), 628–666.

42. A. Hof, *On diffraction by aperiodic structures*, Commun. Math. Phys. **169** (1995), 25–43.

43. Lars Hörmander, *The Weyl calculus of pseudo differential operators*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **32** (1979), 360–444.

44. A. E. Ingham, *A note on Fourier transforms*, J. London Math. Soc. **9(1)** (1934), 29–32.

45. Stéphane Jaffard, *A density criterion for frames of complex exponentials*, Michigan Math. J. **38** (1991), 339–348.

46. J.-P. Kahane, *Sur certaines classes de séries de Fourier absolument convergentes*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **35** (1956), 249–259.

47. Jean-Pierre Kahane, *Pseudo-périodicité et séries de Fourier lacunaires*, Annales Scientifiques de É.N.S. **79** (1962), 93–150.

48. Gerald Kaiser, *Quantum Physics, Relativity, and Complex Space Time*, North Holland Mathematical Studies, vol. 163, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.

49. Oliver D. Kellogg, *Foundations of Potential Theory*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1929.

50. J. Kovacevic and A. Chebira, *Life beyond bases: The advent of frames (part I)*, Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE **24** (2007), no. 4, 86–104.

51. J. Kovacevic and A. Chebira, *Life beyond bases: The advent of frames (part II)*, Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE **24** (2007), 115–125.

52. D. Labate, G. Weiss, and E. Wilson, *An Approach to the Study of Wave Packet Systems*, Contemporary Mathematics, Wavelets, Frames, and Operator Theory **345** (2004), 215–235.

53. Jeffrey C. Lagarias, *Mathematical quasicrystals and the problem of diffraction*, in Directions in Mathematical Quasicrystals, M. Baake and R. V. Moody, eds., CRM Monograph Series, vol. 13, AMS, Providence, RI (2000), 61–93.

54. Henry J. Landau, *Necessary density conditions for sampling and interpolation of certain entire functions*, Acta Mathematica **117** (1967), 37–52.

55. Henry J. Landau, Personal Communication, 2011.

56. Naum S. Landkof, *Foundations of Modern Potential Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972, Translated from Russian.
57. Norman Levinson, *Gap and Density Theorems*, Amer. Math. Society Colloquium Publications, vol. XXVI, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1940.
58. Basarab Matei and Yves Meyer, *A variant of compressed sensing*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **25** (2009), 669–692.
59. _____, *Simple quasicrystals are sets of stable sampling*, Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations **55** (2010), no. 8-10, 947–964.
60. Basarab Matei, Yves Meyer, and Ortega-Cerda, *Stable sampling and Fourier multipliers*, (2013).
61. Yves Meyer, *Multiplication of distributions*, Mathematical Analysis and Applications, Adv. in Math, Suppl. Stud. **7** (1981), 603–615.
62. Yves Meyer, *Quasicrystals, Diophantine approximation, and algebraic numbers*, in Beyond Quasicrystals, F. Axel and D. Gratias, eds., Les Editions de Physique, Springer, NY (1995), 3–16.
63. _____, *Quasicrystals, almost periodic patterns, mean-periodic functions, and irregular sampling*, Afr. Diaspora J. Math. **13** (2012), 1–45.
64. Francis J. Narcowich, N. Sivakumar, and Joseph D. Ward, *On condition numbers associated with radial-function interpokation*, J. Math. Analysis and Appl. **186** (1994), 457–485.
65. Francis J. Narcowich and Joseph D. Ward, *Norms of inverses and condition numbers for matrices associated with scattered data*, J. Approx. Theory **64** (1991), 69–94.
66. Alexander Olevskii and Alexander Ulanovskii, *On multi-dimensional sampling and interpolation*, Anal. Math. Phys. **2** (2012), 149–170.
67. Raymond E. A. C. Paley and Norbert Wiener, *Fourier Transforms in the Complex Domain*, Amer. Math. Society Colloquium Publications, vol. XIX, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1934.
68. Frigyes Riesz and Béla Sz.-Nagy, *Functional Analysis*, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1955.
69. Eduardo Romero, *A complete Gabor system of zero Beurling density*, Sampling Theory in Signal and Image Processing **1** (2002), 299–304.
70. Laurent Schwartz, *Théorie des Distributions*, Hermann, Paris, 1966 (1950, 1951).
71. K. Seip, *On the connection between exponential bases and certain related sequences in $L^2(-\pi, \pi)$*, J. Funct. Anal. **130** (1995), 131–160.
72. George S. Shapiro, *Balayage in Fourier transforms: general results, perturbation, and balayage with sparse frequencies*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **225** (1977), 183–198.
73. _____, *Unique balayage in Fourier transforms on compact abelian groups*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **70** (1978), no. 2, 146–150.
74. Harold S. Shapiro, *Bounded functions with one-sided spectral gaps*, Michigan. Math. J. **19** (1972), 167–172.
75. Elias M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1993.
76. Elias M. Stein and Guido Weiss, *Introduction to Fourier Analysis on Euclidean Spaces*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1971.
77. Yang Wang, *Sparse complete Gabor systems on a lattice*, Applied and Comp. Harm. Analysis **16** (2004), 60–67.
78. Hui-Chuan Wu, *Multidimensional Irregular Sampling in terms of Frames*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, 1998.
79. Robert Young, *An Introduction to Nonharmonic Fourier Series*, Academic Press, New York, 1980, revised edition 2001.
80. Antoni Zygmund, *Trigonometric Series, Volumes I and II combined*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1959, revised edition 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC V6T–1Z4, CANADA

E-mail address: `enricoauy@math.ubc.ca`

NORBERT WIENER CENTER, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742, USA

E-mail address: `jjb@math.umd.edu`

URL: `http://www.math.umd.edu/~jjb`