SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR SAMPLING AND INTERPOLATION ON THE SPHERE

JORDI MARZO AND BHARTI PRIDHNANI

ABSTRACT. We obtain sufficient conditions for arrays of points, $Z = \{Z(L)\}_{L \geq 1}$, on the unit sphere $\mathcal{Z}(L) \subset S^d$, to be Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund and interpolating arrays for spaces of spherical harmonics. The conditions are in terms of the mesh norm and the separation radius of $\mathcal{Z}(L)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $L^p(S^d)$ the Banach space of measurable functions defined in the unit sphere $S^d$ with
\[ \|f\|_p^p = \int_{S^d} |f(z)|^p d\sigma(z) < \infty, \]
if $1 \leq p < \infty$, and
\[ \|f\|_\infty = \sup_{z \in S^d} |f(z)| < \infty, \]
when $p = \infty$. Here $\sigma$ stands for the Lebesgue surface measure in $S^d$.

For $l \geq 0$ an integer, let $\mathcal{H}_l$ be the space of spherical harmonics of degree $l$ in $S^d$ i.e. the space of eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $S^d$
\[ \Delta_{S^d} Y + l(l + d - 1)Y = 0, \quad Y \in \mathcal{H}_l. \]
We denote by $\Pi_L$, for $L$ a nonnegative integer, the space of spherical harmonics of degree not exceeding $L$
\[ \Pi_L = \text{span} \bigcup_{l=0}^{L} \mathcal{H}_l. \]
With respect to the inner product in $L^2(S^d)$ the spaces $\mathcal{H}_l$ are orthogonal. We denote by $h_l$ and $\pi_L$ the dimension of $\mathcal{H}_l$ and $\Pi_L$, respectively. By Stirling’s formula, $\pi_L \approx L^d$, when $L \to \infty$. Let $Y_1^l, \ldots, Y_{h_l}^l$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_l$. The reproducing kernel in $\Pi_L$ is given by
\[ K_L(u, v) = \sum_{l=0}^{L} \sum_{j=1}^{h_l} Y_l^j(u) Y_l^j(v) = C_{d,L} P_l^{(1+\lambda,\lambda)}(\langle u, v \rangle), \quad u, v \in S^d, \]
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where \( \langle u, v \rangle \) stands for the scalar product in \( \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \), \( d = 2\lambda + 2 \), \( C_{d,L}L^{-d/2} \) goes to a positive constant when \( L \to +\infty \) and \( P_{L}^{(\alpha,\beta)} \) are the Jacobi polynomials of degree \( L \) and index \( (\alpha, \beta) \), normalized so that

\[
P_{L}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(1) = \left( \frac{L + \alpha}{L} \right).
\]

To discretize the \( L^p \)-norms in the space of spherical harmonics, we consider arrays of points on the sphere. More precisely, for any degree \( L \) we take \( m_L \) points in \( \mathbb{S}^d \)

\[
Z(L) = \{ z_{L,j} \in \mathbb{S}^d : 1 \leq j \leq m_L \}, \quad L \geq 0.
\]

This yields an array of points \( Z = \{ Z(L) \}_{L \geq 0} \) in \( \mathbb{S}^d \). Denote \( d(u, v) = \arccos \langle u, v \rangle \) the geodesic distance between \( u, v \in \mathbb{S}^d \).

**Definition 1.1.** Let \( Z = \{ Z(L) \}_{L \geq 0} \) be an array with \( m_L \geq \pi_L \) for all \( L \). We call \( Z \) an \( L^p \)-Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund array, denoted by \( L^p \)-MZ, if there exists a constant \( C_p > 0 \) such that for all \( L \geq 0 \) and \( Q \in \Pi_L \),

\[
\frac{C_{p}^{-1}}{\dim \Pi_L} \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} |Q(z_{L,j})|^p \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} |Q(\omega)|^p d\sigma(\omega) \leq \frac{C_{p}}{\dim \Pi_L} \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} |Q(z_{L,j})|^p,
\]

if \( 1 \leq p < \infty \), and

\[
\sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^d} |Q(\omega)| \leq C \sup_{j=1, \ldots, m_L} |Q(z_{L,j})|,
\]

when \( p = \infty \).

In other words, the \( L^p \)-norm in \( \mathbb{S}^d \) of a polynomial of degree \( L \) is comparable to the discrete version given by the weighted \( \ell^p \)-norm of its restriction to \( Z(L) \). For the unit circle, \( d = 1 \), the spherical harmonics are trigonometric polynomials. In this case, for \( m_L = \pi_L = 2L + 1 \), J. Marcinkiewicz and A. Zygmund proved that the array of roots of unity form an \( L^p \)-MZ array, [MZ37], observe that \( C_2 = 1 \). In higher dimensions the situation is more delicate. For \( m_L = \pi_L \) there are no \( L^p \)-MZ arrays when \( p \neq 2 \) and the case \( p = 2 \) is open, see [Mar07]. For \( m_L \) big enough there are always \( L^p \)-MZ arrays, see for example [MNW00, FM11].

**Definition 1.2.** Let \( Z = \{ Z(L) \}_{L \geq 0} \) be a triangular array with \( m_L \leq \pi_L \) for all \( L \). We say that \( Z \) is \( L^p \)-interpolating if, for arrays \( \{ c_{L,j} \}_{L \geq 0, 1 \leq j \leq m_j} \) of complex values such that

\[
\sup_{L \geq 0} \frac{1}{\pi_L} \sum_{j=1}^{m_j} |c_{L,j}|^p < \infty,
\]

there exists a sequence of polynomials \( Q_{L} \in \Pi_L \) uniformly bounded in \( L^p \) such that

\[
Q(z_{L,j}) = c_{L,j}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m_j.
\]

The concept of MZ and interpolating families is important in signal processing. Somehow these concepts are opposite in nature. MZ families are dense enough so that the \( L^p \)-norm in \( \mathbb{S}^d \) is comparable to a discrete version. On the other hand, interpolating families are sparse enough so that one can interpolate some given data.
Observe that $Z$ is $L^2$-MZ if and only if the normalized reproducing kernels of $\Pi_L$ at the points $Z(L)$ form a frame with frame bounds independent of $L$. Therefore, $Z$ is $L^2$-MZ when $Z(L)$ is a set of sampling for $\Pi_L$ with constants independent of $L$. Similarly, $Z$ is $L^2$-interpolating if and only if the normalized reproducing kernel of $\Pi_L$, $k_L$, at the points $Z(L)$ form a Riesz sequence i.e.

\[
C^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} |a_{Lj}|^2 \leq \int_{S^d} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} a_{Lj} k_L(z, z_{L,j}) \right|^2 d\sigma(z) \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} |a_{Lj}|^2,
\]

for any $\{a_{Lj}\}_{L,j}$ with $C > 0$ independent of $L$. When $Z$ is both $L^2$-interpolating and $L^2$-MZ the normalized reproducing kernels at the points $Z(L)$ form a Riesz basis, for more about these concepts see [Sei95].

We denote by $d(u, v) = \arccos \langle u, v \rangle$ the geodesic distance between $u, v \in S^d$.

**Definition 1.3.** An array $Z = \{Z(L)\}_{L \geq 0}$ is uniformly separated if there is a positive number $\epsilon > 0$ such that

\[
d(z_{Lj}, z_{Lk}) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{L + 1}, \text{ if } j \neq k,
\]

for all $L \geq 0$.

The left hand side inequality in (1) holds if and only if $Z$ is a finite union of uniformly separated arrays, also the $L^p$ version of the right hand side inequality in (2) holds if and only if $Z$ is uniformly separated, see [Mar07] or [OCP11] for the general case of a compact Riemannian manifold.

**Definition 1.4.** Let $X$ be a subset of $S^d$. The mesh norm of $X$ is

\[
\rho(X) = \sup_{u \in S^d} d(u, X) = \sup_{u \in S^d} \inf_{z \in X} d(u, z).
\]

The separation radius of $X$ is

\[
\delta(X) = \inf_{u \in X} \inf_{v \in X \setminus \{u\}} d(u, v).
\]

The mesh norm of $X \subset S^d$ is therefore the maximal radius of a spherical cap which does not contain points from $X$, and the separation radius is the minimal distance between points in $X$.

1.1. **Main results.** Our results in this paper are the following sufficient conditions for an array $Z$ to be $L^p$-MZ or $L^p$-interpolating.

**Theorem 1.5.** Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $Z = \{Z(L)\}_{L \geq 0}$ be an array in $S^d$ such that for all $L \geq 0$

\[
\delta(Z(L)) > \frac{\theta}{L},
\]

where $\theta > 2j_\lambda$, $j_\lambda$ is the first zero of the Bessel function $J_\lambda(t)$, and $d = 2\lambda + 2$. Then $Z$ is $L^p$-interpolating family.
Theorem 1.6. Let \( 1 \leq p \leq \infty \) and \( \mathcal{Z} = \{ \mathcal{Z}(L) \}_{L \geq 0} \) be a uniformly separated array in \( \mathbb{S}^d \) such that for all \( L \geq 0 \)

\[
\rho(\mathcal{Z}(L)) \leq \frac{\pi}{2L},
\]

then \( \mathcal{Z} \) is an \( L^p \)-Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund array.

We want to point out that there are other results about sufficient conditions for \( L^p \)-MZ and interpolating families of points on compact manifolds, but such conditions do not provide precise constants, see [FM11, FM10, MNSW02, OCP12]. We observe that due to the result mentioned above about minimal \( L^p \)-MZ (or maximal \( L^p \)-interpolating) arrays, an array with \( m_L = \pi L \) cannot satisfy the conditions of Theorems 1.6, 1.5.

When \( \mathbb{S}^2 \) and for some particular arrays of points, there are some results about separation radius and mesh norm [Rei90, SW04, DM05]. The results we know are not very precise and we would just mention one to illustrate the use of our results.

The set \( X = \{ x_1, \ldots, x_N \} \subset \mathbb{S}^2 \) is said to be in \( s \)-extremal configuration if \( X \) maximizes the Riesz \( s \)-energy

\[
E(X) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \frac{1}{|x_i - x_j|^s}
\]

for subsets of \( N \) points on the sphere. In [KS98] it is assumed in order to get an estimate for the separation radius that the Voronoi cells around points in \( s \)-extremal configuration are all hexagons. Then it is obtained that

\[
\delta(X_N) \sim \left( \frac{8\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \right)^{1/2} N^{-1/2}.
\]

The same way it seems reasonable to estimate the mesh norm by the value of the maximal radius of the hexagon getting

\[
\rho(X_N) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left( \frac{8\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \right)^{1/2} N^{-1/2}
\]

Therefore, if we take \((kL)^2\) points for degree \( L \) in order to assure we get an \( L^p \)-interpolating array we need \( k < 0.792 \), and to get an \( L^p \)-MZ array we need \( k > 1.4 \).

1.2. Outline of the paper. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.5. We use the classical approach by Ingham to obtain sufficient conditions for interpolation, [Ing36]. Ingham idea has been used in different context, [OU10, KL05]. The main problem is the construction of appropriate pick functions, Lemma 2.1, which depend on an upper bound for the first eigenvalue of a spherical cap, [Pin81, BCG83]. Estimates for the first eigenvalue are known also in general Riemannian manifolds.

In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.6. Our approach follow the classical ideas of Beurling to study sampling sequences in Bernstein space, [Beu89]. We define weak limits of an array, and relate uniqueness sets with the \( L^\infty \)-MZ property. Our result is consequence of a uniqueness result due also to Beurling.

In what follows, when we write \( A \lesssim B, A \gtrsim B \) or \( A \simeq B \), we mean that there are constants independent of \( L \) such that \( A \leq CB, A \geq CB \) or \( C_1B \leq A \leq C_2B \), respectively. Also, the
value of the constants appearing during a proof may change but they will be still denoted with the same letter.

2. SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR INTERPOLATION

In this section we prove Theorem 1.5. We adapt a nice idea of Ingham for Dirichlet series, [Ing36]. The idea rely on the construction of some pick functions with appropriate spectral properties. The existence of such functions can be established studying the first eigenvalue/eigenfunction of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the sphere from which a spherical cap has been removed, see [KL05, OU10]. Estimates on this first eigenvalue, [FH76, Pin81, BCG83], together with a result about perturbation of interpolating arrays, [Mar07, Lemma 4.11], provide the result. For the unit circle, \( d = 1 \), the condition in Theorem 1.5 is \( \theta = \pi \), and the proof is technically simpler.

To prove Theorem 1.5 we use the functions given by the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** Given \( L \) and \( \theta \) as in Theorem 1.5 there exists functions \( F_L \) such that

1. \( F_L \in L^2([-1, 1]) \).
2. \( \text{supp } F_L \subset [\cos(\theta/L), 1] \).
3. \( |F_L(\langle u, \cdot \rangle)|(\ell, j) \leq 0 \) for all \( \ell > L \) and \( |F_L(\langle u, \cdot \rangle)|(\ell, j) \lesssim \theta^{d/2} \) for all \( \ell \leq L \).
4. \( F_L(1) \approx \pi L \).

where \( F_L(\langle u, \cdot \rangle)|(\ell, j) \) stands for the Fourier coefficient \( \int_{S^d} F_L(\langle z_{Lj}, u \rangle) \overline{Y^j_\ell(u)} d\sigma(u) \).

Before establishing the existence of such functions we prove our main result.

**Proof.** [Theorem 1.5] Recall that the normalized reproducing kernel can be written as

\[
k_L(z, z_{Lj}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi L}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \sum_{k=1}^{h_\ell} Y^k_\ell(z) \overline{Y^k_\ell(z_{Lj})}.
\]

Let \( F_L(x) \) be given by Lemma 2.1 i.e. \( F_L \) is a continuous function defined in \(-1 \leq x \leq 1\) such that

\[
\text{supp } F_L \subset [\cos(\theta/L), 1],
\]

and \( F_L(1) \approx \pi L \approx d \). Moreover, the Fourier coefficients of \( F_L \) are negative for \( \ell > L \) and uniformly bounded by \( C\theta^{d/2} \) for \( \ell \leq L \). Thus by using these estimates and Funk-Hecke formula we get

\[
\int_{S^d} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} c_{Lj} k_L(z, z_{Lj}) \right|^2 d\sigma(z) = \frac{1}{\pi L} \int_{S^d} \left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \sum_{k=1}^{h_\ell} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} c_{Lj} \overline{Y^k_\ell(z_{Lj})} \right) Y^k_\ell(z) \right|^2 d\sigma(z)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\pi L} \sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \sum_{k=1}^{h_\ell} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} c_{Lj} \overline{Y^k_\ell(z_{Lj})} \right|^2
\]

\[
\gtrsim \frac{1}{\theta^{d/2}} \frac{1}{\pi L} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{h_\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} [F_L(\langle z_{Lj}, \cdot \rangle)](\ell, k)c_{Lj}c_{Li} \overline{Y^k_\ell(z_{Lj})} Y^k_\ell(z_{Li})
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&= \frac{1}{\theta^{d/2}} \frac{1}{\pi L} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_L} c_{Lj} c_{Li} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} h_k \sum_{k=1}^{h_k} \left| F_L(\langle z_{Lj}, \cdot \rangle) \right| (\ell, k) Y^k(\ell) Y^k(z_{Li}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\theta^{d/2}} \frac{1}{\pi L} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_L} c_{Lj} c_{Li} F_L(\cos d(z_{Li}, z_{Lj})) = \frac{1}{\theta^{d/2}} \frac{F_L(1)}{\pi L} \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} |c_{Lj}|^2 \geq \sum_{j=1}^{m_L} |c_{Lj}|^2,
\end{align*}
\]

and \( Z \) is therefore \( L^2 \)-interpolating, because the other inequality in (2) follows directly from the separation.

In order to prove the result for other \( p \neq 2 \) we define, for \( \delta > 0 \), the perturbed array \( Z_\delta = \{ Z(L_{1+\delta}) \}_L \), where \( L_{1+\delta} = [L(1 + \delta)] \). It was proved in [Mar07, Lemma 4.11] that if \( Z \) is \( L^2 \)-interpolating then \( Z_\delta \) is \( L^p \)-interpolating for all \( p \in [1, \infty] \). Therefore, assume that \( Z \) satisfies the geometric separation condition

\[ \eta := L \min_{i \neq j} d(z_{Li}, z_{Lj}) > \theta. \]

Let \( \delta > 0 \) be small enough so that \( \eta > \theta + \delta \theta \). We assume that \( L >> 1 \) so that \( L \delta > 1 \). Then

\[ Ld(z_{L_{1+\delta}i}, z_{L_{1+\delta}j}) > \frac{L}{L_{1+\delta}} \eta > \theta \frac{L}{L_{1+\delta}} (1 + \delta) \geq \theta. \]

Thus, the perturbed array \( Z_\delta \) satisfies the same separation condition as \( Z \), then \( Z_\delta \) is \( L^2 \)-interpolating and \( Z = (Z_\delta)_{-\delta} \) is \( L^p \)-interpolating for all \( 1 \leq p \leq \infty \).

**Proof.** [Lemma 2.1] Let \( C_{\theta/2L} \) be the spherical cap of those \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{d+1}) \in S^d \) such that \( \cos \frac{\theta}{2L} < x_{d+1} \leq 1 \). We denote by \( f_0 \) the eigenfunction of the problem

\[ \Delta_{S^d} f_0 + \lambda_{0,L} f_0 = 0 \]

in \( C_{\theta/2L} \) corresponding to the first eigenvalue \( \lambda_{0,L} \) of the Laplace-Beltrami operator \( \Delta_{S^d} \). It is known, see [FH76], that \( f_0 \) belongs to the class of zonal functions, Lipschitzian, nonnegative, non identically zero and with support in \([0, \frac{\theta}{2L}]\).

We normalize \( \| f_0 \|_2^2 \simeq \pi_L \) and define the zonal function

\[ F_L = \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta_{S^d}}{L(L+d-1)} \right) (f_0 * f_0). \]

with support in \([\cos \frac{\theta}{2L}, 1]\).

Let \( \{ Y^j_\ell \}_{j, \ell} \) be the orthonormal basis in \( L^2(S^d) \) given by the spherical harmonics, then

\[ F_L(\langle u, v \rangle) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \sum_{j=1}^{h_k} [F_L(\langle u, \cdot \rangle)](\ell, j) Y^j_\ell(v), \]

where by Funk-Hecke

\[ [F_L(\langle u, \cdot \rangle)](\ell, j) = \int_{S^d} F_L(\langle u, v \rangle) Y^j_\ell(v) d\sigma(v) = \hat{F}_L(\ell) Y^j_\ell(u), \]
and

\[ \widehat{F}_L(\ell) = \frac{\sigma(S^d)}{C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(1)} \int_{-1}^{1} F_L(t) C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(t)(1 - t^2)^{(d-2)/2} dt, \]

here \( C_{\ell}^{\alpha} \) is the Gegenbauer polynomial of order \( \alpha \) and degree \( \ell \).

On the other hand

\[
[F_L(\langle u, \cdot \rangle)](\ell, j) = \int_{S^d} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{L(L + d - 1)} \right) (f_0 * f_0)(\langle u, v \rangle) Y^2_\ell(v) d\sigma(v) \\
= \int_{S^d} (f_0 * f_0)(\langle u, v \rangle) Y^2_\ell(v) d\sigma(v) + \int_{S^d} \frac{1}{L(L + d - 1)} \Delta_{S^d}(f_0 * f_0)(\langle u, v \rangle) Y^2_\ell(v) d\sigma(v) \\
= \widehat{f}_0(\ell)^2 Y^2_\ell(u) + \frac{1}{L(L + d - 1)} \int_{S^d} (f_0 * f_0)(\langle u, v \rangle) \Delta_{S^d} Y^2_\ell(v) d\sigma(v) \\
= \widehat{f}_0(\ell)^2 Y^2_\ell(u) - \frac{\ell(\ell + d - 1)}{L(L + d - 1)} \int_{S^d} (f_0 * f_0)(\langle u, v \rangle) Y^2_\ell(v) d\sigma(v) \\
= \left( 1 - \frac{\ell(\ell + d - 1)}{L(L + d - 1)} \right) \widehat{f}_0(\ell)^2 Y^2_\ell(u).
\]

So we have proved that

\[ \widehat{F}_L(\ell) = \left( 1 - \frac{\ell(\ell + d - 1)}{L(L + d - 1)} \right) \widehat{f}_0(\ell)^2. \]

Note that the coefficients \( \widehat{F}_L(\ell) \leq 0 \) for all \( \ell > L \). Now we are going to prove that the coefficients \( \widehat{f}_0(\ell) \) are bounded for \( \ell \leq L \).

\[
|\widehat{f}_0(\ell)| \approx \frac{1}{C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(1)} \left| \int_{-1}^{1} f_0(t) C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(t)(1 - t^2)^{(d-2)/2} dt \right| \\
\approx \frac{1}{C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(1)} \|f_0\|_2 \left( \int_0^{\pi/2L} C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(\cos \theta)^2 \sin^{d-1} \theta d\theta \right)^{1/2} \\
\approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi L}}{C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(1)} \left( \int_0^{\pi/2L} C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(\cos \theta)^2 \sin^{d-1} \theta d\theta \right)^{1/2} \lesssim \theta^{d/2},
\]

where we have used that \( C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(1) \approx \ell^{(d-1)/2} \) and \( C_{\ell}^{(d-1)/2}(t) \leq C \ell^{\max\left(\frac{d}{2} - 1, -\frac{1}{2}\right)} \) (see [Sze39, Section 7.32]).

On the other hand, note that

\[
(f_0 * f_0)(1) = (f_0 * f_0)(\langle N, N \rangle) = \int_0^{\pi} f_0^2(\cos \theta) \sin^{d-1} \theta d\theta \approx \pi L.
\]
Thus,

\[ F_L(1) = (f_0 \ast f_0)(1) + \frac{1}{L(L + d - 1)} \Delta S^d (f_0 \ast f_0)(1) \]

\[ = (f_0 \ast f_0)(1) + \frac{1}{L(L + d - 1)}(f_0 \ast \Delta S^d f_0)(1) \]

\[ = \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda_{0,L}}{L(L + d - 1)} \right) (f_0 \ast f_0)(1) \simeq \pi_L \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda_{0,L}}{L(L + d - 1)} \right). \]

So we need to find the smallest \( \theta \) so that the quantity

\[ 1 - \frac{\lambda_{0,L}}{L(L + d - 1)} > 0. \]

Equivalently, we need the smallest \( \theta \) so that \( \lambda_{0,L} < L(L + d - 1) \). Using the upper bound from [BCG83], we get that

\[ \lambda_{0,L} \frac{\theta^2}{4L^2} < j_{d-2}^2, \]

where \( j_{(d-2)/2} \) is the first zero of the Bessel function \( J_{(d-2)/2} \). So taking \( \theta \) as in the hypothesis we have the result.

### 3. Sufficient Condition for Sampling

In this section we follow the classical approach used by Beurling to study sampling sequences in the space of bounded bandlimited functions, [Beu89]. First we identify the space of spherical harmonics composed with the exponential map as a subspace of the space of bounded bandlimited functions. Then we define the concept of weak limit of an array, and relate uniqueness sets with \( L_\infty \)-MZ arrays. Finally, we get Theorem [6] by using a result of Beurling about uniqueness sets and a result about perturbation of MZ arrays, [Mar07, Lemma 4.9].

Let \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and denote \( \phi(x) = (x_1^2 + \cdots + x_d^2)^{1/2} \). The exponential map in \( \mathbb{S}^d \) is defined by

\[ \exp(x) = \left( x_1 \sin \phi(x) / \phi(x), \ldots, x_d \sin \phi(x) / \phi(x), \cos \phi(x) \right) \in \mathbb{S}^d. \]

Observe that \( \exp(z) \) is defined also for \( z \in \mathbb{C}^d \) and is an entire function.

Given \( Q_L \in \Pi_L \) we define the function

\[ \widetilde{Q}_L(z) = Q_L(\exp(z/L)), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^d, \]

and the corresponding space \( \widetilde{\Pi}_L \). Observe that

\[ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |Q_L(x)| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{C}^d} |\widetilde{Q}_L(x)|. \]

The following result shows that functions in \( \widetilde{\Pi}_L \) are entire in \( \mathbb{C}^d \) with Fourier-Laplace transform supported in the unit ball.

**Proposition 3.1.** If \( Q \in \Pi_L \) then the Fourier transform of \( \widetilde{Q} \) has support in the unit ball of \( \mathbb{R}^d \).
Proof. The reproducing kernel of \( u \)\(^m\)ial \( u \in \mathbb{R}^d \) be such that \( \exp(y/L) = v \). Consider the entire function
\[
\mathbb{C}^d \ni z \mapsto P_L^{(1 + \lambda, \lambda)}(\langle \exp(z/L), \exp(y/L) \rangle).
\]
It is enough to see that for \( \ell \leq L \) and for some constants \( C, N \geq 0 \) (that may depend on \( L \))
\[
|\langle \exp(z/L), \exp(y/L) \rangle|^{\ell} \leq C(1 + |z|)^N e^{|\Im z|}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^d.
\]
For any \( \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \) one has \( 2(\Im \zeta)^2 = |\zeta|^2 - |\Re \zeta|^2 \). Therefore for any \( z = (z_1, \ldots, z_d) \in \mathbb{C}^d \)
\[
\sum_{i=1}^d \Re z_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^d (\Im z_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d |z_i|^2,
\]
and we get by the triangle inequality that
\[
|\Im (z_1^2 + \cdots + z_d^2)|^{1/2} \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^d (\Im z_i)^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\]
Finally
\[
|\langle \exp(z/L), \exp(y/L) \rangle| = \left| \frac{\langle z, y \rangle \sin \phi(z)/L}{L|y|} \frac{\phi(z)/L}{\sin \phi(z)/L} \right| \leq \left( 1 + \left| \frac{\langle z, y \rangle \sin \frac{|y|}{L}}{L|y|} \right| e^{2\phi(z)/L} \leq C_y, L(1 + |z|) e^{\phi(z)/L},
\]
and \( \tilde{Q} \) is the Fourier-Laplace transform of a distribution supported in the unit ball of \( \mathbb{R}^d \).

Let \( \mathcal{B} \) be the Bernstein space of entire functions in \( \mathbb{C}^d \), bounded in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with Fourier transform supported in the unit ball of \( \mathbb{R}^d \), endowed with the uniform norm.

Given an array \( \mathcal{L} \) we send the points in \( \mathcal{L} \) to \( \mathbb{R}^d \) via the exponential map and define the corresponding family of weak limits. The Fréchet distance between the closed sets \( A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is given by
\[
[A, B] = \inf_{t > 0} \{ A \subset B + B(0, t), B \subset A + B(0, t) \}.
\]

Definition 3.2. Let \( \mathcal{L} = \{ \mathcal{L}(L) \}_{L \geq 0} \) be an array in \( \mathbb{S}^d \). We say that \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is a weak limit of \( \mathcal{L} \), denoted as \( \Lambda \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L}) \), if there exist rotations \( \rho_L \in SO(d + 1) \), such that
\[
L \exp^{-1}(\rho_L \mathcal{L}(L)) \to \Lambda,
\]
where the above expression means that for any \( K \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) compact
\[
[(L \exp^{-1}(\rho_L \mathcal{L}(L))) \cap K] \cup \partial K, (\Lambda \cap K) \cup \partial K \to 0, \quad L \to \infty.
\]

Proposition 3.3. If any \( \Lambda \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L}) \) is a uniqueness set for \( \mathcal{B} \) then \( \mathcal{L} \) is a \( L^\infty \)-MZ array.

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Suppose that \( \Lambda \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L}) \) is a uniqueness set for \( \mathcal{B} \) but \( \mathcal{L} \) is not \( L^\infty \)-MZ. For any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists \( Q_n \in \Pi_{L_n} \) such that \( Q_n(N) = \|Q_n\|_\infty = 1 \) and
\[
\frac{1}{n} > \sup_{j=1, \ldots, mL_n} \|Q_n(z_{L_n})\|.
\]
From the sequence \((\tilde{Q}_n)_n\) defined as in (4) it is possible to select a subsequence (see [Nik75 3.3.6.]) converging uniformly on compact sets of \(\mathbb{C}^d\) to some function \(f \in B\) with \(f(N) = 1\). We denote this subsequence as before. For any \(\lambda \in \Lambda\) there exists a sequence \(z_{L_n,j_n} \in \mathcal{Z}(L_n)\) such that
\[
\mathbb{R}^d \ni w_{L_n} = L_n \exp^{-1}(z_{L_n,j_n}) \to \lambda, \quad k \to \infty.
\]
We denote this subsequence as before and we get
\[
|f(\lambda)| \leq |f(\lambda) - \tilde{Q}_n(\lambda)| + |\tilde{Q}_n(\lambda) - \tilde{Q}_n(w_{L_n,j_n})| + |\tilde{Q}_n(w_{L_n,j_n})|.
\]
The first term on the right side clearly goes to zero. Also the last term goes to zero because of (5). For the second term, using Bernstein’s inequality we get
\[
|\tilde{Q}_n(\lambda) - \tilde{Q}_n(z_{L_n,j_n})| = |Q_n(\exp(\lambda/L_n)) - Q_n(z_{L_n,j_n})| \leq L_n d(\exp(\lambda/L_n), z_{L_n,j_n})\|Q_n\|_\infty \to 0, \quad n \to \infty,
\]
because, see [BC73, p. 229],
\[
d(\exp(x/L), \exp(y/L)) = \frac{|x - y|}{L} + o(L^{-1}), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.
\]
We get that \(f\) vanish in \(\Lambda\), but \(f \in B\) and therefore \(f = 0\).

To prove our main result we use the following result about uniqueness due to Beurling, [Beu89, p. 310].

**Theorem 3.4** (Beurling). Let \(f\) be an entire function in \(\mathbb{C}^d\). Assume that
\[
\limsup_{|\xi| \to \infty} \frac{\log |f(\xi)|}{|\xi|} = r < \infty, \quad \int_1^\infty \max_{|\xi| \leq t, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \log |f(\xi)| \frac{dt}{t^2} < \infty.
\]
Assume \(f = 0\) on a discrete set \(\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d\) such that
\[
r \limsup_{\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \to \infty} \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |x - \lambda| < \frac{\pi}{2}.
\]
Then \(f = 0\).

**Proof.** [Theorem 1.6] Let \(Z\) be such that for all \(L\) big enough
\[
\rho(Z(L)) < \frac{\pi}{2L}.
\]
Let \(\Lambda \in W(Z)\) and \(X_L = L \exp^{-1}(\rho_L Z(L)) \subset \mathbb{R}^d\) with \(X_L \to \Lambda\). We want to see that \(\Lambda\) is a uniqueness set for \(B\).

For \(f \in B\) and \(\epsilon > 0\) there exists \(A_\epsilon > 0\) such that
\[
|f(\xi)| \leq A_\epsilon e^{(1+\epsilon)|\xi|}, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d.
\]
Also \(|f(x)| \leq M < \infty\) for \(x \in \mathbb{R}^d\), so we can apply Beurling’s result (with \(r = 1\)) getting that any \(\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d\) such that
\[
(6) \quad \limsup_{\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \to \infty} \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |x - \lambda| < \frac{\pi}{2},
\]
is a uniqueness set for \(B\).
If
\[ \sup_{|x| < \pi L} \inf_{z \in X_L} |x - z| < \frac{\pi}{2}, \]
for any \( L \) big enough, then we can deduce (6) which is equivalent to
\[ \sup_{\omega \in S_d} \min_{z \in L \exp^{-1}(\rho_L Z(L))} |L \exp^{-1}(\omega) - z| < \frac{\pi}{2}. \]

But this follows from the condition on the mesh norm the property
\[ d(\exp \frac{x}{L}, \exp \frac{y}{L}) = \frac{|x - y|}{L} + o(L^{-1}), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \]

Therefore the condition on \( Z \) implies that it is an \( L^\infty \)-MZ array. In order to deduce the result for \( 1 \leq p < \infty \) we define, for \( \delta > 0 \), the associated arrays \( Z_\delta, Z_{-\delta} \) by \( Z_\delta(L) = Z([1 + \delta)L]), Z_{-\delta}(L) = Z([(1 - \delta)L]). \)

It was proved in [Mar07, Lemma 4.9.] that if \( Z \) is an \( L^\infty \)-MZ array then \( Z_\delta \) is an \( L^p \)-MZ array for all \( 1 \leq p < \infty \).

Suppose that
\[ \eta = \sup_{L \geq 0} L \rho(Z(L)) < \frac{\pi}{2}, \]
and \( \delta > 0 \) be such that
\[ \eta < \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta \pi. \]

For \( L \) big enough with \( L\delta > 1 \) and any \( u \in S^d \) we have
\[ Ld(u, Z_{L_{1-\delta}}) \leq \frac{L}{L_{1-\delta}} \eta < \frac{\pi}{2}, \]
therefore \( Z_{-\delta} \) is \( L^\infty \)-MZ and \( (Z_{-\delta})_\delta = Z \) is \( L^p \)-MZ.

\[ \blacksquare \]
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