

Slepian spatio-spectral concentration problem on the d -dimensional ball for different notions of bandwidth

C. Gerhards^{*1} and X. Huang^{†1}

¹ *TU Bergakademie Freiberg, Institute of Geophysics and Geoinformatics,
Gustav-Zeuner-Str. 12, 09599 Freiberg, Germany*

Abstract. We study the asymptotic eigenvalue distribution of the Slepian spatio-spectral concentration problem within subdomains of the d -dimensional unit ball \mathbb{B}^d . The clustering of the eigenvalues near zero and one is a well-known phenomenon. Here, we provide an analytical investigation of this phenomenon for two different notions of bandlimit: (a) multivariate polynomials, with the maximal polynomial degree determining the bandlimit, (b) basis functions that separate into radial and spherical contributions (expressed in terms of Jacobi polynomials and spherical harmonics, respectively), with separate maximal degrees for the radial and spherical contributions determining the bandlimit. In particular, we investigate the number of relevant non-zero eigenvalues (the so-called Shannon number) and obtain distinct asymptotic results for both notions of bandlimit, characterized by Jacobi weights W_0 and a modification \widetilde{W}_0 , respectively. The analytic results are illustrated by numerical examples on the 3-d ball.

Keywords. Slepian concentration problem, Polynomials, Jacobi weights, Band-limited functions, Reproducing kernel Hilbert space, Eigenvalue decomposition, Ball

1 Introduction

The Paley–Wiener theorem prevents any non-zero square-integrable function from being spatially and spectrally localized simultaneously, i.e., the original function and its Fourier transform cannot both have compact supports. In the 1960s, Slepian, Landau and Pollak [55, 53, 27, 28] answered the question of how well the energy of a band-limited function can be concentrated in the spatial domain by studying the eigenvalue distribution of a corresponding composition operator of projections onto time and frequency domain. This is now known as the Slepian spatio-spectral concentration problem. Their research has spawned significant further analysis (see, e.g., [4, 20, 41, 63] for some more recent work and overviews) and has found various applications (e.g., [21, 30, 42]).

The spatio-spectral concentration problem was originally considered on the real line and in higher dimensions for the full Euclidean spaces \mathbb{R}^d , with the spectral domain naturally defined

^{*}christian.gerhards@geophysik.tu-freiberg.de

[†]xinpeng.huang@geophysik.tu-freiberg.de (corresponding author)

via the Fourier transform. But analogous problems have subsequently been discussed for other underlying geometries. On the two-sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , the spectral domain is commonly defined via spherical harmonics, and the bandlimit is given by a prescribed maximal spherical harmonic degree. For the scalar setup this has been discussed, e.g., in [2, 62, 50], for the vectorial, e.g., in [47, 46], and for the tensorial, e.g., in [37]. It has already proven a useful tool in various geoscientific applications (e.g., [9, 18, 23, 45]). The Slepian spatio-spectral concentration problem with respect to the d -dimensional unit ball \mathbb{B}^d has found less attention so far but has been considered, e.g., in [22, 32] for the three-dimensional ball. The latter should be understood in the sense that, for a subdomain $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$ and for bandlimited functions f in $L^2(\mathbb{B}^d)$, we are interested in the Rayleigh quotient

$$\lambda = \frac{\int_D |f(x)|^2 dx}{\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} |f(x)|^2 dx} \quad (1.1)$$

as a measure of spatial concentration. It is well-known that finding the critical points of the Rayleigh quotient is equivalent to solving an eigenvalue problem of the form

$$\mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D f = \lambda f, \quad (1.2)$$

where \mathcal{S}_D denotes the restriction operator on the spatial subdomain D and \mathcal{B}_n the projection onto a subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{B}^d)$ that reflects a certain prescribed bandlimit n . This framework offers potential applications in the geosciences as well as in medical imaging, whenever volumetric substructures within an ambient spherical geometry play a role (e.g., [31, 3, 35, 51]). We want to point out that (1.1) is distinct from the traditional spatial concentration measure $\lambda = \int_D |f(x)|^2 dx / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)|^2 dx$, for bandlimited functions f in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, in the sense that the ball \mathbb{B}^d serves as an ambient reference space and not as the space of prescribed spatial concentration. The latter would lead to the more frequently considered generalized prolate spheroidal wave functions (e.g., [52, 22]). In the numerical illustrations in Section 4, this fundamental distinction manifests itself by the observation that the ability of localizing a function within a given domain is not only affected by the size of the domain but also by the location of the domain within the ambient space (e.g., domains close to the boundary of the ball behave differently than domains close to the origin).

While the notion of bandlimit for the full Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d and for the two-sphere \mathbb{S}^2 arises fairly naturally, as already mentioned above, there is less agreement on the definition of bandlimit for the ball. For example, in [22] bandlimit is defined based on Fourier-Laguerre and Fourier-Bessel functions, respectively, while [32] base their notion of bandlimit on a set of Fourier-Jacobi functions that has favorable properties for applications to gravitational modeling and MEG/EEG imaging. Multivariate polynomials form another set of functions which allow a simple definition of bandlimit, namely, by restricting the maximal polynomial degree. A univariate polynomial analogue of the Slepian spatio-spectral concentration problem has already been discussed, e.g., in [43, 11, 6, 7, 16, 17, 15]. For a multivariate counterpart with respect to the unit ball, however, there seem to exist fairly few results.

In this chapter, we consider the following two setups on the d -dimensional ball \mathbb{B}^d : the space of multivariate polynomials, with the overall polynomial degree defining the bandlimit, and

the space of Fourier-Jacobi functions similar to [32], with two separate bandlimits for the radial and the spherical contributions. We analyse the asymptotic behaviour of the eigenvalue distribution of the corresponding composition operator $\mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D$ from (1.2) and prove clustering of the eigenvalues near zero and one (cf. Theorems 2.1 and 3.3). This is somewhat expected for a Slepian-type spatio-spectral concentration problem; however, previous works on the ball have focused on the construction of the eigenfunctions and could illustrate the clustering of the eigenvalues only numerically. Furthermore, we investigate the number of relevant non-zero eigenvalues (the so-called Shannon number). Asymptotically, for the bandlimit n tending to infinity and for any fixed lower bound $\tau > 0$, we obtain results of the following type for the number of significant eigenvalues:

$$\#\{i : \tau < \lambda_i \leq 1\} \sim \mathcal{N}_n^d \int_D W(x) dx, \quad (1.3)$$

with $1 \geq \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{N}_n^d} \geq 0$ denoting the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D$ and \mathcal{N}_n^d denoting the dimension of the underlying bandlimited function space. This clearly relates to well-known results for the real line, where the right-hand side of (1.3) would read $2\Omega T$ (with $[-\Omega, \Omega]$ describing the interval of bandlimitation and $[-T, T]$ the interval of spatial concentration; cf. [54]), and for the two-sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , where the right-hand side would read $(n+1)^2 \frac{|R|}{4\pi}$ (with n denoting the maximal spherical harmonic degree that defines the bandlimit and $|R| = \int_R 1 d\omega$ the surface area of the spatial concentration region $R \subset \mathbb{S}^2$; cf. [50]). The interesting outcome of our study is the variation of the Shannon number with respect to the notion of bandwidth: For the multivariate polynomial setup the weight function W in (1.3) resembles the Jacobi weight W_0 (cf. Theorem 2.1), while the weight has to be changed to a modified version \widetilde{W}_0 for the Fourier-Jacobi setup (cf. Theorem 3.3). Thus, (1.3) decouples into two factors of which one depends only on the bandwidth n and the other one only on the spatial concentration region $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$. However, as indicated before, the latter may change with the underlying notion of bandwidth. For the proof of the main results, universality limits involving orthogonal polynomials play a crucial role.

The chapter is structured as follows: Section 2 covers the results for the space of multivariate polynomials and in Section 3 we present an analogous study for the space of Fourier-Jacobi functions. Section 4 provides some numerical illustrations of the previous results for the 3-d ball. Although we are mainly interested in the overall distribution of the eigenvalues, in Appendix B, we very briefly comment on the problem of estimating the best possible spatio-spectral concentration for the setup of multivariate polynomials, i.e., the problem of estimating the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D$ or maximizing the Rayleigh quotient (1.1), respectively. Finally, in Appendix C and D, we will discuss some numerical phenomena and physical background on the diversity of bandwidth of the Zernike polynomials on the ball.

Notation Before closing the introduction, we would briefly like to introduce some notations. By $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbb{N}_0 we denote the set of real, d -dimensional real, positive integer and non-negative integer numbers. By $\mathbb{B}_r^d = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq r\}$ we mean the closed d -dimensional ball

of radius $r > 0$ and we use $\mathbb{B}^d = \mathbb{B}_1^d$ to abbreviate the closed unit ball. The $(d-1)$ -dimensional unit sphere is denoted by $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| = 1\}$. For a linear vector space X , $\dim(X)$ will denote the dimension of X , and for a set A , we use $\#A$ to denote the cardinality of A and χ_A to express the characteristic function on A .

2 Spatospectral concentration for multivariate polynomials

2.1 Multivariate orthogonal polynomials and the main statement

In this section, we are interested in function spaces defined via multivariate polynomials, whose maximal degree can be understood as bandwidth. Polynomials are frequently used as building blocks in multivariate approximation (e.g., in [44] for the construction of a needlet system on the ball), but in a Slepian context they rarely seem to be used.

Following conventional notations, let Π^d be the space of polynomials on \mathbb{R}^d , and Π_n^d be the subspace of polynomials of degree at most n :

$$\Pi_n^d = \left\{ \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n} c_\alpha x^\alpha : c_\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

where α is a d -dimensional non-negative multi-index, i.e., $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_d^{\alpha_d}$, and $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i$. The dimension $\dim(\Pi_n^d)$ of the space of polynomials of degree at most n will be denoted as \mathcal{N}_n^d throughout the course of this chapter. It is given by $\mathcal{N}_n^d = \binom{n+d}{d} = \frac{(n+d)!}{n!d!}$. For fixed d , it therefore holds $\mathcal{N}_n^d = n^d/d! + \mathcal{O}(n^{d-1})$, which yields $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}_n^d/n^d = \frac{1}{d!}$. Without further mentioning, we constrain the polynomials in Π_n^d to the unit ball \mathbb{B}^d and assume $d \geq 2$. For any non-trivial non-negative weight function $W : \mathbb{B}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, Π_n^d is a Hilbert space under the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle_W = \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(x)g(x)W(x)dx$. We only focus on the special case of Jacobi weights W_μ , with index $\mu \geq 0$, whose definition is given by (e.g., [65])

$$W_\mu(x) = W_{\mu,d}(x) = \omega_\mu (1 - \|x\|^2)^{\mu - \frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\|x\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2}$ denotes the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^d , and ω_μ is the normalization constant such that $\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} W_\mu(x)dx = 1$. Its explicit value is

$$\omega_\mu = \omega_{\mu,d} = \frac{2}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \frac{\Gamma(\mu + \frac{d+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\mu + \frac{1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} = \frac{\Gamma(\mu + \frac{d+1}{2})}{\pi^{d/2}\Gamma(\mu + \frac{1}{2})}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = \frac{2\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}$ is the volume of the $d-1$ -dimensional unit sphere and Γ denotes the Gamma function. In the course of the chapter, we often use the notation $d\sigma_\mu(x) = W_\mu(x)dx$ for abbreviation. As a special case, the Jacobi weight with index $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$ leads to the Lebesgue measure, up to a multiplicative constant.

Let $V_n^{d,\mu}$ be the orthogonal complementary space of Π_{n-1}^d in Π_n^d under the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{W_\mu}$, i.e., $\Pi_n^d = \Pi_{n-1}^d \oplus V_n^{d,\mu}$. Then we have

$$\dim(V_n^{d,\mu}) = \dim(\Pi_n^d) - \dim(\Pi_{n-1}^d) = \mathcal{N}_n^{d-1}.$$

Notice that, different from Π_n^d , the space $V_n^{d,\mu}$ actually varies with the choice of the weight W_μ . From the inner product structure, an orthogonal basis can always be constructed via Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization, or via separation into spherical and radial variable as described,

e.g., in [60]. The explicit expression of the basis system is not important in this section, so we just take $\{p_i^{n,\mu} : 1 \leq i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^{d-1}\}$ to be an arbitrary choice of orthonormal basis of $V_n^{d,\mu}$. For any $f \in \Pi_n^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$, we then get the reproducing property

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \sum_{k \leq n} \sum_{i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^{d-1}} p_i^{k,\mu}(x) \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(y) p_i^{k,\mu}(y) d\sigma_\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(y) \left(\sum_{k \leq n} \sum_{i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^{d-1}} p_i^{k,\mu}(x) p_i^{k,\mu}(y) \right) d\sigma_\mu(y), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

with the abbreviation $d\sigma_\mu(x) = W_\mu(x)dx$ that will be used throughout the course of this section. Furthermore, we use the notation

$$\hat{f}_{k,i} = \langle f, p_i^{k,\mu} \rangle_{W_\mu} = \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(y) p_i^{k,\mu}(y) d\sigma_\mu(y) \quad (2.4)$$

and we abbreviate the reproducing kernel by

$$\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y) = \sum_{k \leq n} \sum_{i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^{d-1}} p_i^{k,\mu}(x) p_i^{k,\mu}(y). \quad (2.5)$$

The latter depends on the weight function W_μ but not on the specific choice of a corresponding orthogonal basis $\{p_i^{k,\mu} : 1 \leq i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^{d-1}\}$ in $V_n^{d,\mu}$.

With the previous definitions, we can now specify the notation from (1.2) for the multivariate polynomial framework. Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a subset with Lipschitz boundary and let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be fixed. Then we define the space-limiting operator $\mathcal{S}_D : L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, d\sigma_\mu) \rightarrow L^2(D, d\sigma_\mu)$ via

$$\mathcal{S}_D f := \text{proj}_{L^2(D, d\sigma_\mu)} f = f \chi_D, \quad (2.6)$$

and the band-limiting operator $\mathcal{B}_n : L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, d\sigma_\mu) \rightarrow \Pi_n^d$ via

$$\mathcal{B}_n f := \text{proj}_{\Pi_n^d} f = \sum_{k \leq n} \sum_{i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^{d-1}} \hat{f}_{k,i} p_i^{k,\mu}. \quad (2.7)$$

Since orthogonal projections are self-adjoint and idempotent (i.e., for A denoting either \mathcal{S}_D or \mathcal{B}_n , we have $A^* = A$ and $AA = A$), we can define the required composition operators as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{S}_{D,n} = \mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D = \mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D = (\mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D)^* (\mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D) \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B}_{D,n} = \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n = \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n = (\mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n)^* (\mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (2.9)$$

Both operators are self-adjoint and non-negative definite, with operator norms bounded by one. In addition, since \mathcal{B}_n is of finite rank (and thus compact) and both \mathcal{B}_n and \mathcal{S}_D are bounded, we have that the compositions $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{S}_{D,n}$ and $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B}_{D,n}$ are also finite-rank (and compact) and, therefore, allow an eigenvalue decomposition. From the fact $(\mathcal{S}_D \mathcal{B}_n)^* = \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{S}_D$, one obtains that $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{S}_{D,n}$ and $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B}_{D,n}$ share the same non-zero eigenvalues. In consequence, for our purposes, it suffices to focus on $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{S}_{D,n}$.

Slepian spatio-spectral concentration problem. The spatio-spectral concentration problem can now be formulated as the investigation of the eigenvalue decomposition of $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$. For the remainder of this section, we denote the corresponding eigenvalues by

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_i(D; n), \quad 1 \leq i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^d,$$

and assume them to be arranged in descending order $1 \geq \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{N}_n^d} \geq 0$. One fundamental observation in Slepian theory is that the eigenvalues of the spatio-spectral concentration operators have a bimodal distribution, i.e., they cluster near zero and one. The main intention of this section is to prove analogous results for the polynomial setup on the ball. Furthermore, and again analogous to the traditional results on the entire Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d and the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , the number of significant non-zero eigenvalues (the so-called Shannon number) can be asymptotically characterized by the product of two quantities of which one solely depends on the bandwidth and the other one solely on the spatial concentration domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. However, note that one outcome of this chapter is that the second factor may depend on the underlying notion which is used for bandwidth. The above is summarized in the following first main theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$ be a subset with Lipschitz boundary. Then, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, it holds*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{i : \varepsilon < \lambda_i(D; n) < 1 - \varepsilon\}}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

and for any $0 < \tau < 1$, it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{i : \tau < \lambda_i(D; n) \leq 1\}}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} = \int_D W_0(x) dx. \quad (2.11)$$

The remainder of this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 2.1, which is given at the end and is based on the estimation of the trace and the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the composition operator $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$. Studying spatio-spectral concentration via operator traces and Hilbert-Schmidt norms is widely known and used, e.g., in the original work [26] for the case of Fourier transforms in \mathbb{R}^d , and for various further setups like spherical harmonics on the $(d-1)$ -dimensional sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} or Hankel transforms on the positive real axis, e.g., in [34, 1]. Most results in this direction are based on delicate estimations of reproducing kernels associated with the corresponding Hilbert spaces. Here, in this chapter, we do not directly use explicit expressions of the reproducing kernel but emphasize the use of some existing asymptotic analysis, namely associated Christoffel functions and universality limits, whose details are introduced in the next subsection.

The definition of $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$ in (2.8) can be rephrased as an integral operator

$$\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(y) [\chi_D(x)\chi_D(y)\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)] d\sigma_\mu(y), \quad (2.12)$$

with \mathcal{K}_n^μ the reproducing kernel given in (2.5). By such a reformulation of $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$, we can use the following identities that connect operator traces (denoted by $\text{tr}(\cdot)$) and Hilbert-Schmidt norms (denoted as $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HS}}$) to the corresponding integral kernel.

Proposition 2.2. [48, Chap. VI.6] Let $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$ be given as defined above. Then it holds

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_n^d} \lambda_i = \int_D \mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x) d\sigma_\mu(x), \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_n^d} \lambda_i^2 = \int_D \int_D |\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)|^2 d\sigma_\mu(x) d\sigma_\mu(y). \quad (2.14)$$

2.2 Reproducing kernel, universality limit, and auxiliary results

We firstly recapitulate the following well-known general properties of reproducing kernels, i.e., in particular of \mathcal{K}_n^μ from (2.5):

- (1) for any $x, y \in \mathbb{B}^d$, it holds $\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y) = \mathcal{K}_n^\mu(y, x)$,
- (2) for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$, it holds $\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(\cdot, x) \in \Pi_n^d$,
- (3) for any $f \in \Pi_n^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$, it holds $f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(y) \mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y) d\sigma_\mu(y)$.

The above directly implies that, for any $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$, it holds

$$\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x) = \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \mathcal{K}_n^\mu(y, x) \mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y) d\sigma_\mu(y) = \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} |\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)|^2 d\sigma_\mu(y) \geq 0. \quad (2.15)$$

In the case of univariate polynomials, the reproducing kernel of polynomial spaces admits closed-form expressions via the Christoffel-Darboux formula. The generalization to multivariate polynomials is not yet fully clear (see, e.g. the discussion in [10, Chap. 3.6]). Nevertheless, for Π_n^d equipped with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{W_\mu}$ with respect to Jacobi weights on the ball \mathbb{B}^d , a closed-form representation of \mathcal{K}_n^μ has been derived in [65]: For $\mu > 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y) &= \frac{2\Gamma(\mu + \frac{d+2}{2})\Gamma(n + 2\mu + d)}{\Gamma(2\mu + d + 1)\Gamma(n + \mu + \frac{d}{2})} \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\pi P_n^{\mu + \frac{d}{2}, \mu + \frac{d}{2} - 1}(x \cdot y + \sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2} \sqrt{1 - \|y\|^2} \cos \psi) \\ &\quad \times (\sin \psi)^{2\mu - 1} d\psi / \int_0^\pi (\sin \psi)^{2\mu - 1} d\psi, \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

and for $\mu = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_n^0(x, y) &= \frac{\Gamma(\mu + \frac{d+2}{2})\Gamma(n + d)}{\Gamma(d + 1)\Gamma(n + \frac{d}{2})} \left[P_n^{\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - 1}(x \cdot y + \sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2} \sqrt{1 - \|y\|^2}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + P_n^{\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - 1}(x \cdot y - \sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2} \sqrt{1 - \|y\|^2}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where $P_n^{\alpha, \beta}$ denotes the Jacobi polynomial of degree n on the interval $[-1, 1]$, normalized to satisfy $P_n^{\alpha, \beta}(1) = \binom{n + \alpha}{n}$ (cf. [58]; they are orthogonal with respect to the weight function

$(1-\cdot)^\alpha(1+\cdot)^\beta$). These explicit expression can be very useful but also very tedious to work with. Instead, the properties that are truly necessary in the proof of Theorem 2.1 are the upcoming two asymptotic properties of \mathcal{K}_n^μ . The first one is about the n -th Christoffel function, defined as the reciprocal of the diagonal reproducing kernel $\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)$. For our particular setup, the following result can be found, under different conditions, in [5, 64, 25].

Proposition 2.3. *For any x in the interior of \mathbb{B}^d (i.e., for $\|x\| < 1$), the following pointwise limit holds true:*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} = \frac{W_0(x)}{W_\mu(x)}. \quad (2.18)$$

Furthermore, the above limit holds uniformly on any compact set D contained in the interior of \mathbb{B}^d .

The other property that we need, proved also by [25, Thm. 1.7], is a multi-variate analogue of the universality law [33], which is a characterization of the asymptotic behaviour of $\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)$ near the diagonal line $x = y$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let D be a compact set contained in the interior of \mathbb{B}^d . Then, uniformly for $x \in D$ and for u, v in a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d , it holds*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x + \frac{w}{n}, x + \frac{v}{n})}{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)} = \frac{J_{d/2}^*(\sqrt{G(x, w, v)})}{J_{d/2}^*(0)}, \quad (2.19)$$

where $J_\alpha^*(z) = z^{-\alpha} J_\alpha(z)$, and J_α is the Bessel function of the first kind. The function G is defined as

$$G(x, w, v) = \|w - v\|^2 + \frac{|x \cdot (w - v)|^2}{1 - \|x\|^2}. \quad (2.20)$$

Remark 2.5. The invariance with respect to μ of the right-hand side in (2.19) and of the numerator of the right-hand side in (2.18) is a useful property. In the proof in [25], the explicit expression of (2.19) is calculated by applying Mehler-Heine's asymptotic formula to (2.17) for the case $\mu = 0$. Proving (2.19) for other $\mu > 0$ requires the so-called regularity condition (sometimes also called Bernstein–Markov condition) to be satisfied by the measure σ_μ , which allows Lubinsky's approach [33] for univariate polynomials to be adapted. We also note that in the univariate case, a counterpart of Proposition 2.4 exists (cf. [33, Theorem 1.1]) and will be used in the next section. A comprehensive discussion of regular measures would be of interest and necessity to extend the current results to more general setups (e.g., polynomial spaces in ambient domains other than the ball), but this is beyond the abilities of the chapter at hand.

With the above results in hand, we are now in the position to compute the asymptotic trace and Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the composition operator $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$ be a subset with Lipschitz boundary. Then, the following asymptotic relations hold true*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n})}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} = \int_D W_0(x) dx, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}\|_{\text{HS}}^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} = \int_D W_0(x) dx. \quad (2.22)$$

Proof. The proof of (2.21) follows from a combination of (2.13) and Proposition 2.3. The main issue that needs some care is that (2.18) does not hold on the boundary of \mathbb{B}^d . We start with the following estimate from below

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n})}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D \cap \mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon}^d} \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{D \cap \mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon}^d} \frac{W_0(x)}{W_\mu(x)} W_\mu(x) dx = \int_{D \cap \mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon}^d} W_0(x) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

and the following estimate from above

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n})}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x) - \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon}^d} \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x) + \int_{D \cap \mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon}^d} \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x) \right) \\ &= 1 - \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon}^d} W_0(x) dx + \int_{D \cap \mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon}^d} W_0(x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

The exchange of integral and limit is allowed due to the uniform convergence of $\frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d}$ on $\mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon}^d$, and the first term on the right-hand side of (2.24) holds because

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x) d\sigma_\mu(x) = \sum_{k \leq n} \sum_{i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^{d-1}} \langle p_i^{k, \mu}, p_i^{k, \mu} \rangle_{W_\mu} = \dim(\Pi_n^d) = \mathcal{N}_n^d \quad (2.25)$$

Letting ϵ tend to zero, the estimates (2.23), (2.24), and the observation $\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} W_0(x) dx = 1$ lead to (2.21).

The proof of (2.22) also follows from a two-sided estimate. The easier part is the upper bound. From (2.14) and (2.15), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}\|_{\text{HS}}^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} &= \int_D \int_D \frac{|\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)|^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(y) d\sigma_\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_D \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \frac{|\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)|^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(y) d\sigma_\mu(x) = \int_D \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x), \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

for which one can then argue as before in (2.24). We now turn to the estimate from below. We will show that, for any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$, it holds

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \int_D \frac{|\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)|^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x) d\sigma_\mu(y) \geq (1 - \epsilon_1) \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} W_0(x) dx, \quad (2.27)$$

with $D_{\epsilon_2} = \{x \in D : \|x - y\| \geq \epsilon_2 \text{ for all } y \in \partial D\} \subset \mathbb{B}_{1-\epsilon_2}^d$. Taking ϵ_1, ϵ_2 to zero, we get the desired lower bound, which finishes the proof of (2.22).

Thus, it remains to prove (2.27). We shall make use of the universality limit to guarantee that the energy of $\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)$ concentrates close enough to the diagonal line $x = y$ as n tends to infinity. Before proceeding to that, we need two auxiliary observations. First, we fix a point x in the interior of \mathbb{B}^d and set $u = 0$ in (2.20). The set $G(x, L) = \{v \in \mathbb{B}^d : G(x, 0, v) \leq L^2\}$, for some $L > 0$, is then bounded by an ellipsoid centered at x with the shortest axis of length $L\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}$ and all other axes of length L . This allows the integral transformation

$$\int_{G(x, L)} \left| \frac{J_{d/2}^*(\sqrt{G(x, 0, v)})}{J_{d/2}^*(0)} \right|^2 dv = \sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_L^d} \left| \frac{J_{d/2}^*(\|t\|)}{J_{d/2}^*(0)} \right|^2 dt. \quad (2.28)$$

In the following, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, x in the interior of \mathbb{B}^d , and $L > 0$, we define the set

$$G_n(x, L) = \{y \in \mathbb{B}^d : G(x, 0, n(y - x)) \leq L^2\}.$$

It is a subset of $x + \mathbb{B}_{L/n}^d$ and, therefore, if additionally x is in the interior of D and n sufficiently large, a subset of D . The second auxiliary observation concerns the quantity

$$e_d = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{J_{d/2}^*(\|t\|)}{J_{d/2}^*(0)} \right|^2 dt.$$

If e_d were finite, then the following would hold true: given any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$, one can choose a constant $L > 0$ large enough such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_L^d} \left| \frac{J_{d/2}^*(\|t\|)}{J_{d/2}^*(0)} \right|^2 dt > e_d - \epsilon_1. \quad (2.29)$$

And given such an L , it holds that $G_n(x, L) \subset x + \mathbb{B}_{L/n}^d \subset D$ for all $n > L/\epsilon_2$ and $x \in D_{\epsilon_2}$. We continue by showing that, indeed, e_d takes a finite value. Applying a polar coordinate transformation and using $J_{d/2}^*(0) = 2^{-d/2}\Gamma^{-1}(\frac{d}{2} + 1)$, we directly get

$$\begin{aligned} e_d &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{J_{d/2}^*(\|x\|)}{J_{d/2}^*(0)} \right|^2 dx \\ &= \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) \int_0^\infty \left| t^{-\frac{d}{2}} 2^{\frac{d}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1) J_{d/2}(t) \right|^2 t^{d-1} dt \\ &= \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) 2^d |\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)|^2 \int_0^\infty t^{-1} |J_{d/2}(t)|^2 dt \\ &= \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) 2^{d-1} \Gamma(\frac{d}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1), \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

where the equality (see, e.g. [61, Chap. 13.42, Eq. (1)] or [14, Eq. (2.7)])

$$\int_0^\infty t^{-1} |J_{d/2}(t)|^2 dt = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}{2\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)} = \frac{1}{d} \quad (2.31)$$

has been used in the last line of (2.30). From (2.30), we already get that e_d is finite, but using the Legendre duplication formula and some basic computations for the Gamma function one further obtains

$$\frac{\omega_0}{d!} e_d = 1. \quad (2.32)$$

With these auxiliary observations, we can proceed to showing that (2.27) holds true. For an $L > 0$ such that (2.29) is satisfied and for $n > L/\epsilon_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_D \int_D \frac{|\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)|^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x) d\sigma_\mu(y) \\
& \geq \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} \int_{G_n(x, L)} \frac{|\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)|^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(y) d\sigma_\mu(x) \\
& = \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} \int_{G_n(x, L)} \left| \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)}{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)} \right|^2 \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(y) d\sigma_\mu(x) \tag{2.33} \\
& = \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} \int_{G_n(x, L)} \mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x) \left| \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)}{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)} \right|^2 \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(y) d\sigma_\mu(x) \\
& = \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} \int_{G(x, L)} \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{n^d} \left| \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x + \frac{v}{n})}{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)} \right|^2 \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} W_\mu \left(x + \frac{v}{n} \right) dv d\sigma_\mu(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where the substitution $v = n(y - x)$ has been used in the last line. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}_n^d/n^d = \frac{1}{d!}$, Proposition 2.3 implies uniform convergence of $\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)/n^d$ and $\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)/\mathcal{N}_n^d$ with respect to $x \in D_{\epsilon_2}$ as n tends to infinity. Additionally, Proposition 2.4 implies uniform convergence of $\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x + \frac{v}{n})/\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)$ with respect to $x \in D_{\epsilon_2}$ and $v \in G(x, L)$ as n tends to infinity. Thus, we may interchange the order of limit and integration in the last line of (2.33) and get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \int_D \frac{|\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, y)|^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} d\sigma_\mu(x) d\sigma_\mu(y) \\
& \geq \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} \int_{G(x, L)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{n^d} \left| \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x + \frac{v}{n})}{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)} \right|^2 \frac{\mathcal{K}_n^\mu(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} W_\mu \left(x + \frac{v}{n} \right) dv d\sigma_\mu(x) \\
& = \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} \int_{G(x, L)} \frac{W_0(x)}{d! W_\mu(x)} \left| \frac{J_{d/2}^*(\sqrt{G(x, 0, v)})}{J_{d/2}^*(0)} \right|^2 \frac{W_0(x)}{W_\mu(x)} W_\mu(x) dv d\sigma_\mu(x) \tag{2.34} \\
& = \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} \frac{W_0(x)}{d!} \sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_L^d} \left| \frac{J_{d/2}^*(\|v\|)}{J_{d/2}^*(0)} \right|^2 dv W_0(x) dx \\
& \geq \frac{\omega_0}{d!} (e_d - \epsilon_1) \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} W_0(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The second to last line follows from (2.28) and the last line from (2.29). Finally, observing (2.32) and possibly modifying ϵ_1 by a factor $\frac{d!}{\omega_0}$, (2.34) provides the desired proof for (2.27). \square

2.3 Proof of the main statement

With Theorem 2.6 at hand, one can directly derive Theorem 2.1, which stated the desired concentration properties of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{SBS}_{D, n}$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For any $0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1$, we use the abbreviation

$$N_n(a, b) = \#\{i : a < \lambda_i(D; n) \leq b\}.$$

We begin with the proof of (2.10) and first observe that, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$ and $\varepsilon < t < 1 - \varepsilon$, it holds

$$t - t^2 \geq \min\{\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2, (1 - \varepsilon) - (1 - \varepsilon)^2\} = C_\varepsilon > 0.$$

Thus, by use of Proposition 2.2 and Theorem 2.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} C_\varepsilon \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_n(\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^d} \frac{\lambda_i(D; n) - \lambda_i^2(D; n)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n})}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}\|_{\text{HS}}^2}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

which is precisely the desired statement. Next, we turn to the proof of (2.11). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$(1 - \varepsilon)N_n(1 - \varepsilon, 1) \leq \sum_{i \leq \mathcal{N}_n^d} \lambda_i(D; n) = \text{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}) \leq N_n(\varepsilon, 1) + \varepsilon \mathcal{N}_n^d \quad (2.36)$$

For $\varepsilon < \tau < 1 - \varepsilon$, one can further split $N_n(1 - \varepsilon, 1)$ and $N_n(\varepsilon, 1)$ to reformulate (2.36) in the following form:

$$(1 - \varepsilon)(N_n(\tau, 1) - N_n(\tau, 1 - \varepsilon)) \leq \text{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}) \leq (N_n(\tau, 1) + N_n(\varepsilon, \tau)) + \varepsilon \mathcal{N}_n^d. \quad (2.37)$$

Since (2.35) implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N_n(\varepsilon, \tau)/\mathcal{N}_n^d = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N_n(\tau, 1 - \varepsilon)/\mathcal{N}_n^d = 0$, the previous estimate and Theorem 2.6 yields

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(\tau, 1)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n})}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} = \int_D W_0(x) dx \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(\tau, 1)}{\mathcal{N}_n^d} + \varepsilon.$$

Taking the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ concludes the proof. \square

3 Spatiospectral concentration for Fourier-Jacobi functions

We consider the same spatiospectral concentration problem as before, but with a different underlying function space. We apply basis functions that are separated into radial and spherical contributions, of which the spherical contributions are expressed in terms of spherical harmonics. For the radial contributions, several options have been suggested previously, e.g., Bessel and Laguerre functions (cf. [22]) or certain Jacobi polynomials (cf. [32]). A bandlimit is then prescribed by separate restrictions on the spherical and radial contribution, respectively. Here, we consider the Jacobi polynomial-based setup for the radial contributions.

3.1 Orthonormal functions on the unit ball and the main statement

We follow the notational setup of Section 2.1. However, to distinguish the notations and for the convenience of the reader, the setup in the current section will typically be indicated by the use of a tilde. We note that we only consider the space $L^2(\mathbb{B}^d)$ equipped with the Lebesgue

measure (i.e., we use the notation $L^2(\mathbb{B}^d) = L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, dx) = L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, \omega_{1/2}^{-1} W_{1/2}(x) dx)$ with the Jacobi weight W_μ from before fixed to $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$, and we further abbreviate $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \omega_{1/2}^{-1} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{W_{1/2}}$ in the course of this section).

Let $H_j^d = \text{span}\{Y_{j,\ell}\}_{\ell=1,\dots,\dim(H_j^d)}$ denote the space spanned by orthonormalized spherical harmonics $Y_{j,\ell}$ of degree j on the $(d-1)$ -dimensional unit sphere (see, e.g., [38]), with $\dim(H_j^d) = \binom{j+d-1}{j} - \binom{j+d-3}{j-2}$. Now, let $\{\rho_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $\inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2} > -1$. Then we set, for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\ell = 1, \dots, \dim(H_j^d)$,

$$Z_{i,j,\ell}(x) = \gamma_{ij} P_i^{0,\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}}(2r^2 - 1) r^{\rho_j} Y_{j,\ell}(\xi), \quad r = \|x\| \in [0, 1], \quad \xi = \frac{x}{\|x\|} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \quad (3.1)$$

with γ_{ij} being the normalization constant

$$\gamma_{ij} = \sqrt{4i + 2\rho_j + d}, \quad (3.2)$$

such that $\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} |Z_{i,j,\ell}(x)|^2 dx = 1$. The function system above has been introduced, e.g., in [36, Chap. 3] for the 3-d ball. The generalization to the d -dimensional case, $d \geq 2$, does not require any major modifications. Using this orthonormal basis, we can formally define an alternative version of band-limited function space, characterized by two parameters $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, as

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^d = \text{span}\{Z_{i,j,\ell} : i \leq m, j \leq n, \ell = 1, \dots, \dim(H_j^d)\}.$$

Intuitively, m and n determine the bandwidth for the radial and spherical contributions separately. It holds

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d = \dim(\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^d) = (m+1)\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}), \quad (3.3)$$

with

$$\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \dim(H_j^d) = \binom{n+d-1}{n} + \binom{n+d-2}{n-1}. \quad (3.4)$$

Thus, we get $\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = \frac{2n^{d-1}}{(d-1)!} + \mathcal{O}(n^{d-2})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d = \frac{(m+1)2n^{d-1}}{(d-1)!} + \mathcal{O}(mn^{d-2})$.

Remark 3.1. We want to mention that for the choice $\rho_j = j + 2t_j$, with $t_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the space $\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^d$ is actually composed solely of multivariate polynomials. In that case, we can write $Z_{i,j,\ell}(x) = \left((r^2)^{t_j} P_i^{0,\rho_j + d-2/2}(2r^2 - 1) \right) (r^j Y_{j,\ell}(\xi))$, where $r^j Y_{j,\ell}(\xi)$ is a homogeneous harmonic polynomial of degree j with respect to x , and $(r^2)^{t_j} P_i^{0,\rho_j + d-2/2}(2r^2 - 1)$ is a polynomial of degree $2i + 2t_j$ with respect to x . Thus, $Z_{i,j,\ell}$ is a polynomial of degree $2i + \rho_j$. In particular, for the choice $\rho_j = j$, by counting the dimension of the space Π_n^d (see Appendix A), we get

$$\Pi_n^d = \text{span}\{Z_{i,j,\ell} : 2i + j \leq n\}. \quad (3.5)$$

However, for the remainder of this section, it is not of importance if $\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^d$ is a space of multivariate polynomials or not.

Remark 3.2. In the case of $\rho_j = j$, the functions $Z_{i,j,\ell}$ coincide with the so-called Zernike polynomials that have been used, e.g., in lenses aberration correction problems and biological imaging (cf. [59, 19]). In dimension $d = 3$, the functions $Z_{i,j,\ell}$ are suitable for modeling certain gravimetric and magnetic problems, with corresponding parameters $\rho_j = j$ and $\rho_j = j - 1$, respectively (e.g., [36]).

Now, we can define the band-limiting operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{mn} : L^2(\mathbb{B}^d) \rightarrow \Pi_{mn}^d$ via

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{mn} f = \text{proj}_{\Pi_{mn}^d} f = \sum_{i \leq n} \sum_{j \leq m} \sum_{\ell \leq \dim(H_j^d)} \hat{f}_{i,j,\ell} Z_{i,j,\ell}, \quad (3.6)$$

with expansion coefficients $\hat{f}_{i,j,\ell} = \langle f, Z_{i,j,\ell} \rangle$. The spatial projection $\mathcal{S}_D : L^2(\mathbb{B}^d) \rightarrow L^2(D)$ can be kept identical to the one in (2.6) in the previous section. The associated compositional operators become

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{S}_{D,mn} = \mathcal{S}_D \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{mn} \mathcal{S}_D \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{S}_{D,mn} = \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{mn} \mathcal{S}_D \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{mn} \quad (3.7)$$

By an argumentation as before, $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{S}_{D,mn}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{S}_{D,mn}$ share the same eigenvalues, so that we can focus on $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{S}_{D,mn}$ for our considerations. We denote the eigenvalues of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{S}_{D,mn}$ by

$$\widetilde{\lambda}_i = \widetilde{\lambda}_i(D; m, n), \quad 1 \leq i \leq \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d,$$

and arrange them in descending order $1 \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_1 \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_2 \geq \dots \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} \geq 0$. The analogue of Theorem 2.1 can then be phrased in the following form.

Theorem 3.3. *Let D be a subset of \mathbb{B}^d with a Lipschitz boundary. Then, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, it holds*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{i : \varepsilon < \widetilde{\lambda}_i(D; m, n) < 1 - \varepsilon\}}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

and for any $0 < \tau < 1$, it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{i : \tau < \widetilde{\lambda}_i(D; m, n) \leq 1\}}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} = \int_D \widetilde{W}_0(x) dx, \quad (3.9)$$

where the weight function \widetilde{W}_0 takes the form

$$\widetilde{W}_0(x) = \frac{2}{\pi \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \frac{1}{\|x\|^{d-1} \sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}}. \quad (3.10)$$

It needs to be emphasized that the limits in (3.8) and (3.9) should be interpreted as sequential limits, i.e., first taking the limit over m and then taking the limit over n .

The proof is completely analogous to that of Theorem 2.1 and needs not be repeated once we have derived the proper asymptotics for the trace and the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the

compositional operator. The latter will be provided in Theorem 3.7. We first remember Proposition 2.2 and observe the integral representation, analogous to (2.12),

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{SBS}}_{D,mn}f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(y) [\chi_D(y)\chi_D(x)\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x,y)] dy, \quad (3.11)$$

with the reproducing kernel given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x,y) = \sum_{i \leq m} \sum_{j \leq n} \sum_{\ell \leq \dim(H_j^d)} Z_{i,j,\ell}(x)Z_{i,j,\ell}(y). \quad (3.12)$$

The latter will be investigated in more detail in the next subsection.

3.2 Analysis of the reproducing kernel of $\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^d$ and auxiliary results

Substituting the explicit expression of $Z_{i,j,\ell}$ from (3.1), we can rewrite the reproducing kernel from above in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x,y) & \quad (3.13) \\ &= \sum_{j \leq n} \left(\sum_{i \leq m} \gamma_{ij}^2 (r_x r_y)^{\rho_j} P_i^{0,\rho_j+\frac{d-2}{2}}(2r_x^2-1) P_i^{0,\rho_j+\frac{d-2}{2}}(2r_y^2-1) \right) \left(\sum_{\ell \leq \dim(H_j^d)} Y_{j,\ell}(\xi_x) Y_{j,\ell}(\xi_y) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $r_x = \|x\|, r_y = \|y\|$ and $\xi_x = \frac{x}{\|x\|}, \xi_y = \frac{y}{\|y\|}$ denote the radial and spherical components of x and y , respectively. One notices that the radial and spherical contributions decouple with respect to sums over i and k , but they are coupled by summation over the degree j . The sum over k can be treated fairly easily via the addition theorem for spherical harmonics (see, e.g., [38]), namely,

$$\sum_{\ell \leq \dim(H_j^d)} Y_{j,\ell}(\xi_x) Y_{j,\ell}(\xi_y) = \frac{\dim(H_j^d)}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} P_j^{(d)}(\xi_x \cdot \xi_y), \quad (3.14)$$

where $P_j^{(d)}$ denotes the Legendre polynomial of degree j for a d -dimensional setup, normalized to satisfy $P_j^{(d)}(1) = 1$. Thus, the main effort for our purposes lies in the analysis of the radial contribution of $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}$. Here, we do this for the case of the Fourier-Jacobi setup, but our discussions might possibly also be useful for the understanding of further function systems that decouple into spherical and radial contributions, like the Fourier-Bessel or Fourier-Laguerre setup in [22]. The following observation can be seen as an analogue of Proposition 2.3.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\{\rho_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $\inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2} > -1$. Then, for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and for any x in the interior of $\mathbb{B}^d \setminus \{0\}$ (i.e., for $0 < \|x\| < 1$), the following pointwise limit holds true:*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x,x)}{\mathcal{N}_{mn}^d} = \widetilde{W}_0(x), \quad (3.15)$$

with \widetilde{W}_0 given as in (3.10). Furthermore, the above limit holds uniformly for any compact subset D in the interior of $\mathbb{B}^d \setminus \{0\}$.

Remark 3.5. The previous theorem implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x) / \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d = \widetilde{W}_0(x)$, but we cannot guarantee convergence if one exchanges the order of the limits (this is because, in the upcoming proof, we rely on a result for one-dimensional universality limits [33] that does not provide further information on the behaviour of the limit with respect to the ambient parameter n).

Proof of Proposition 3.4. We set $r = \|x\|$ and $\xi = x/\|x\|$. Substituting $z = 2r^2 - 1$ and observing (3.2), (3.13), (3.14), as well as $P_j^{(d)}(\xi \cdot \xi) = P_j^{(d)}(1) = 1$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x) \tag{3.16} \\ &= \sum_{j \leq n} \left(\sum_{i \leq m} \frac{4i + 2\rho_j + d}{2^{\rho_j + \frac{d}{2} + 1}} P_i^{0, \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}}(2r^2 - 1) P_i^{0, \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}}(2r^2 - 1) \right) 2^{\rho_j + \frac{d}{2} + 1} (r^2)^{\rho_j} \frac{\dim(H_j^d)}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \\ &= \sum_{j \leq n} R_m^j(z, z) (1+z)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} 4r^{2-d} \frac{\dim(H_j^d)}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}, \end{aligned}$$

with the auxiliary function

$$R_m^j(u, v) = \sum_{i \leq m} \frac{4i + 2\rho_j + d}{2^{\rho_j + \frac{d}{2} + 1}} P_i^{0, \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}}(u) P_i^{0, \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}}(v). \tag{3.17}$$

From [58, Eq. (4.3.3)] we know that

$$\int_{-1}^1 P_i^{0, \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}}(z) P_i^{0, \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}}(z) (1+z)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} dz = \frac{2^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2} + 1}}{2i + \rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2} + 1}.$$

The above is precisely the inverse of the prefactor in the sum of (3.17), which means that R_m^j is the reproducing kernel of the Hilbert space Π_m^1 of univariate polynomials on the interval $[-1, 1]$ of degree at most m , equipped with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_W$ for $W(z) = (1+z)^{\rho_j + d-2/2}$. Hence, from [33, Theorem 2.1, Remark (c)] and the regularity of the corresponding measure σ_W (e.g., [57, P. 101]), we get

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m+1} R_m^j(z, z) (1+z)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} = \frac{1}{\pi \sqrt{1-z^2}}, \tag{3.18}$$

where the convergence holds pointwise for $-1 < z < 1$ and uniformly for z in any compact subset of $(-1, 1)$. The latter corresponds to pointwise convergence for $0 < r < 1$ and uniform convergence for r in any compact subset of $(0, 1)$.

Combining (3.16) and (3.18), and remembering (3.3), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} &= \sum_{j \leq n} \frac{4}{r^{d-2}} \frac{1}{\pi \sqrt{1-z^2}} \frac{\dim(H_j^d)}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \frac{1}{r^{d-1} \sqrt{1-r^2}} = \widetilde{W}_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

The conditions on pointwise and uniform convergence in the statement of the Proposition follow directly from the corresponding conditions after (3.18). \square

We are not able provide a universality law analogous to that of Proposition 2.4, but we can show the following weaker result that suffices for the proof of the desired estimate on the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of $\widetilde{\mathcal{SBS}}_{D,mn}$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let D be a compact set contained in the interior of $\mathbb{B}^d \setminus \{0\}$. Furthermore, for some given $x \in D$, we define $x_{t,\xi}^m = (\|x\| + \frac{t}{m+1})\xi$, with $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, uniformly for $x \in D$, for $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, and for t in a compact subset of \mathbb{R} , it holds*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x_{t,\xi}^m)}{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)} = \frac{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \text{sinc} \left(\frac{2t}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}} \right) \mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n} \left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}, \xi \right), \quad (3.19)$$

where $\text{sinc}(x) = \sin(x)/x$ and

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}(\eta, \xi) = \sum_{j \leq n} \frac{\dim(H_j^d)}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} P_j^{(d)}(\eta \cdot \xi), \quad (3.20)$$

which is the reproducing kernel of $\text{Harm}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = \oplus_{0 \leq j \leq n} H_j^d$.

Proof. Similar to (3.13) and (3.16), we can express $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}$ as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, y) = \sum_{j \leq n} \frac{\dim(H_j^d)}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} P_j^{(d)}(\xi_x \cdot \xi_y) R_m^j(x, y) [(1 + z_x)(1 + z_y)]^{\frac{\rho_j}{2} + \frac{d-2}{4}} 4(r_x r_y)^{\frac{2-d}{2}}, \quad (3.21)$$

with $z_x = 2r_x^2 - 1$, $z_y = 2r_y^2 - 1$. Some basic calculations yield

$$z_x - z_y = 2r_x^2 - 2r_y^2 = 2(r_x - r_y)(r_x + r_y) = 4r_x(r_x - r_y) - 2(r_x - r_y)^2. \quad (3.22)$$

To keep the upcoming calculations a bit clearer, we write $x_{t,\xi}^m = y$ (noting that y now depends on t , ξ , and m , without stating this explicitly via indices). In particular, it holds $r_y = r_x + \frac{t}{m+1}$. For a fixed j , the relations (3.18) and (3.22) yield

$$(z_y - z_x) \left((1 + z_x)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^j(z_x, z_x) \right) = \frac{4r_x t}{\pi \sqrt{1 - z_x^2}} + \mathcal{O}(m^{-1}), \quad (3.23)$$

which holds uniformly for x in D and for t in a compact subset of \mathbb{R} , as m tends to infinity. This implies that $z_y = z_x + b / [(1 + z_x)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^j(z_x, z_x)]$, for $b = 4r_x t / (\pi \sqrt{1 - z_x^2}) + \mathcal{O}(m^{-1})$, and that such b lies in a compact subset of \mathbb{R} if x is in D and t is in a compact subset of \mathbb{R} . Application of the univariate universality limit from [33, Thm. 1.1] (choosing $a = 0$ and b as above) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{[(1 + z_x)(1 + z_y)]^{\frac{\rho_j}{2} + \frac{d-2}{4}} R_m^j(z_x, z_y)}{(1 + z_x)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^j(z_x, z_x)} \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \text{sinc} \left(\pi \left(\frac{4r_x t}{\pi \sqrt{1 - z_x^2}} + \mathcal{O}(m^{-1}) \right) \right) = \text{sinc} \left(\frac{4r_x t}{\sqrt{1 - z_x^2}} \right) = \text{sinc} \left(\frac{2t}{\sqrt{1 - r_x^2}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

where the second equality follows from the continuity of the sinc function and the last equality comes from the substitution $z_x = 2r_x^2 - 1$. Furthermore, we can invoke (3.18) to obtain, for any $j, j' \in \mathbb{N}_0$, that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(1+z_x)^{\rho_{j'} + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^{j'}(z_x, z_x)}{(1+z_x)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^j(z_x, z_x)} = 1, \quad (3.25)$$

uniformly for z_x in a compact subset of $(-1, 1)$, i.e., uniformly for x in D .

We again want to point out that, due our notation $x_{t,\xi}^m = y$, the variable y actually depends on m . In particular, it holds $r_y = r_x + t/m+1$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} r_y/r_x = 1$, uniformly for x in D and for t in a compact subset of \mathbb{R} . The latter together with (3.21), (3.24), and (3.25) eventually yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, y)}{\mathcal{K}_{mn}(x, x)} \quad (3.26) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{r_y}{r_x} \right)^{\frac{2-d}{2}} \frac{\sum_{j \leq n} [(1+z_x)(1+z_y)]^{\frac{\rho_j}{2} + \frac{d-2}{4}} R_m^j(z_x, z_y) \dim(H_j^d) P_j^{(d)}(\xi_x \cdot \xi)}{\sum_{j \leq n} (1+z_x)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^j(z_x, z_x) \dim(H_j^d)} \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{r_y}{r_x} \right)^{\frac{2-d}{2}} \sum_{j \leq n} \left\{ \frac{[(1+z_x)(1+z_y)]^{\frac{\rho_j}{2} + \frac{d-2}{4}} R_m^j(z_x, z_y) \dim(H_j^d) P_j^{(d)}(\xi_x \cdot \xi)}{(1+z_x)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^j(z_x, z_x)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \left(\sum_{j' \leq n} \frac{(1+z_x)^{\rho_{j'} + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^{j'}(z_x, z_x) \dim(H_{j'}^d)}{(1+z_x)^{\rho_j + \frac{d-2}{2}} R_m^j(z_x, z_x)} \right)^{-1} \right\} \\ &= \text{sinc} \left(\frac{2t}{\sqrt{1-r_x^2}} \right) \frac{\sum_{j \leq n} \dim(H_j^d) P_j^{(d)}(\xi_x \cdot \xi)}{\sum_{j' \leq n} \dim(H_{j'}^d)} \\ &= \text{sinc} \left(\frac{2t}{\sqrt{1-r_x^2}} \right) \frac{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi). \end{aligned}$$

The above is exactly the desired relation (3.19), with $r_x = \|x\|$ and $\xi_x = x/\|x\|$. \square

Theorem 3.7. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$ be a subset with Lipschitz boundary. Then, the following asymptotic relations hold true*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{tr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{SBS}}_{D,mn})}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} = \int_D \widetilde{W}_0(x) dx, \quad (3.27)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\widetilde{\mathcal{SBS}}_{D,mn}\|_{\text{HS}}^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} = \int_D \widetilde{W}_0(x) dx, \quad (3.28)$$

with \widetilde{W}_0 given as in (3.10). It needs to be emphasized that the limits in (3.8) and (3.9) should be interpreted as sequential limits, i.e., first taking the limit of m to infinity and then taking the limit of n .

Proof. Having Proposition 3.4 at hand, the proof of (3.27) is identical to the corresponding proof in Theorem 2.6. The same holds true for the upper bound

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\widetilde{\mathcal{SBS}}_{D,mn}\|_{\text{HS}}^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} \leq \int_D \widetilde{W}_0(x) dx. \quad (3.29)$$

However, the corresponding lower bound

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\widetilde{\mathcal{SBS}}_{D,mn}\|_{\text{HS}}^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} \geq \int_D \widetilde{W}_0(x) dx \quad (3.30)$$

requires some more effort. This will be elaborated in the remainder of the proof.

We start with some auxiliary notation. The spherical cap with center $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and (polar) radius $\epsilon_2 > 0$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi) = \{\eta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : 1 - \xi \cdot \eta < \epsilon_2\}$. Furthermore, by $\mathcal{U}_m(x, L, \epsilon_2) = \{y \in \mathbb{B}^d : r_x - \frac{L}{m+1} < r_y < r_x + \frac{L}{m+1}, \xi_y \in \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)\}$ we denote a truncated spherical cone with additional parameters $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$ and $L > 0$. We assume $\epsilon_2 > 0$ to be arbitrary but fixed. For any $x \in D$ with $\mathcal{U}_m(x, L, \epsilon_2) \subset D \setminus \{0\}$, we can then estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, y)|^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} dy &\geq \int_{\mathcal{U}_m(x, L, \epsilon_2)} \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, y)|^2}{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)|^2} \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)|^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} dy \\ &= \int_{-L}^L \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)} \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x_{t,\xi}^m)|^2}{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)|^2} \frac{1}{m+1} \left(\|x\| + \frac{t}{m+1} \right)^{d-1} \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)|^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} d\omega(\xi) dt \\ &= \int_{-L}^L \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)} \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x_{t,\xi}^m)|^2}{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)|^2} \left(\|x\| + \frac{t}{m+1} \right)^{d-1} \mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)|^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} d\omega(\xi) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

where $d\omega$ denotes the surface measure on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . For the equality in the second line, we have used the co-area formula and $\mathcal{U}_m(x, \epsilon_2) = \{x_{t,\xi}^m : t \in [-L, L], \xi \in \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)\}$, with $x_{t,\xi}^m = (\|x\| + \frac{t}{m+1})\xi$ as in Proposition 3.6. When taking the limit m to infinity, we are allowed to interchange the order of integral and limit in the last line of (3.31) due to the uniform convergence of the integrand for $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and for t in a compact subset of \mathbb{R} , as indicated in Proposition 3.6. Additionally remembering Proposition 3.4, we can continue from there to

further estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, y)|^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} dy \tag{3.32} \\
& \geq \int_{-L}^L \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)} \left| \operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{2t}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}} \right) \frac{\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \mathcal{K}_{\operatorname{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi) \right|^2 \\
& \quad \times \|x\|^{d-1} \mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) |\widetilde{W}_0(x)|^2 d\omega(\xi) dt \\
& = \int_{-L}^L \left| \operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{2t}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}} \right) \right|^2 \operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) \|x\|^{d-1} |\widetilde{W}_0(x)|^2 dt \\
& \quad \times \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)} \frac{\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} |\mathcal{K}_{\operatorname{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 d\omega(\xi) \\
& = \int_{-\frac{2L}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}}}^{\frac{2L}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}}} |\operatorname{sinc}(s)|^2 \frac{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}}{2} \operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) \|x\|^{d-1} |\widetilde{W}_0(x)|^2 ds \\
& \quad \times \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)} \frac{\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} |\mathcal{K}_{\operatorname{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 d\omega(\xi) \\
& = \int_{-\frac{2L}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}}}^{\frac{2L}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}}} |\operatorname{sinc}(s)|^2 ds \frac{\widetilde{W}_0(x)}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)} \frac{\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} |\mathcal{K}_{\operatorname{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 d\omega(\xi),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have substituted $s = 2t/\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}$ in the fourth line. Next, we choose an arbitrary but fixed $\epsilon_1 > 0$. It is well-known that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\operatorname{sinc}(s)|^2 ds = \pi$; so we can choose a sufficiently large $L > 0$ such that

$$\int_{-L}^L |\operatorname{sinc}(s)|^2 ds \geq (1 - \epsilon_1)\pi.$$

Since it holds $2L/\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2} \geq L$, we can apply the above to the last line in (3.32) and get

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, y)|^2}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} dy \geq (1 - \epsilon_1) \widetilde{W}_0(x) \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)} \frac{\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} |\mathcal{K}_{\operatorname{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 d\omega(\xi). \tag{3.33}$$

It remains to investigate the integral over the spherical cap $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)$ as we take the limit n to infinity. In fact, it holds uniformly for $\xi_x \in \mathbb{S}$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_2}(\xi_x)} |\mathcal{K}_{\operatorname{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 \frac{\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} d\omega(\xi) = 1. \tag{3.34}$$

The above seems like a rather expected localization property of the reproducing kernel $\mathcal{K}_{\operatorname{Harm}_n}$ in the space of spherical harmonics up to degree n ; however, it was difficult to find an explicit reference in the literature. Therefore, we prove it in the Appendix A, based on a modified calculation from [34].

Finally, combining (3.32) and (3.34), and additionally integrating over $x \in D$, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \int_D \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, y)|^2 dy dx}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} \geq (1 - \epsilon_1) \int_{D_{\epsilon_2}} \widetilde{W}_0(x) dx, \tag{3.35}$$

where $D_{\epsilon_2} = \{x \in D : \|x - y\| \geq \epsilon_2 \text{ for all } y \in \partial D\}$. The restriction to this subset on the right-hand side is necessary in order to guarantee the interchangeability of the limit and the outer integral (uniform convergence in Propositions 3.4 and 3.6 is only guaranteed for x in compact subsets of the interior of $\mathbb{B}^d \setminus \{0\}$). Letting ϵ_1, ϵ_2 tend to zero and observing Proposition 2.2 leads to the desired lower bound (3.30). \square

Remark 3.8. For the particular case of the domain $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$ being a spherical shell with outer radius $0 < r_2 \leq 1$ and inner radius $0 < r_1 < r_2$, i.e., for $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : r_1 \leq \|x\| \leq r_2\}$, one can compute $\int_D \widetilde{W}_0(x) dx = \frac{2}{\pi}(\arcsin(r_2) - \arcsin(r_1))$, independent of the dimension d . In other words, the additional factor $1/\|x\|^{d-1}$ in \widetilde{W}_0 , opposed to W_0 , cancels the influence of the dimension d on the Shannon number.

4 Numerical experiments

Two numerical experiments are performed to illustrate the obtained results in the 3-d case. The first setup refers to Section 2 and Π_n^3 , equipped with the Lebesgue measure (i.e., choosing $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$), and the second one refers to Section 3 and $\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^3$ with $\rho_j = j$. As underlying orthogonal basis functions for our computations, we choose the $Z_{i,j,\ell}$ from (3.1), i.e.,

$$\Pi_n^3 = \text{span}\{Z_{i,j,\ell} : 2i + j \leq n\}, \quad \widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^3 = \text{span}\{Z_{i,j,\ell} : i \leq m, j \leq n\}.$$

The weights W_0 and \widetilde{W}_0 that determine the respective Shannon numbers take the form

$$W_0(x) = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}}, \quad \widetilde{W}_0(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{1}{\|x\|^2 \sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}}.$$

Their different behaviour is illustrated in Figure 1. As regions of spatial concentration we choose tesseroids

$$D = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{B}^3 : r_1 \leq r_x \leq r_2 \text{ and } \xi_x = \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta \cos \phi \\ \sin \theta \sin \phi \\ \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \theta_1 \leq \theta \leq \theta_2, \phi_1 \leq \phi \leq \phi_2 \right\},$$

with two different sets of parameters $r_1, r_2, \theta_1, \theta_2, \phi_1, \phi_2$. The first region D_1 is represented by parameters $r_1 = 0.1, r_2 = 0.8, \theta_1 = 0.3\pi, \theta_2 = 0.9\pi, \phi_1 = -0.6\pi, \phi_2 = 0.9\pi$, the second region D_2 by parameters $r_1 = 0.7, r_2 = 0.9, \theta_1 = 0.3\pi, \theta_2 = 0.9\pi, \phi_1 = -0.6\pi, \phi_2 = 0.9\pi$ (i.e., D_2 is a thinner version of D_1 that is localized closer to the boundary of the unit ball). Both tesseroids are illustrated in Figure 1.

The eigenvalues of the operators $\mathcal{BSB}_{D,n}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{BSB}}_{D,mn}$ are obtained by computing the eigenvalues of the matrices

$$K_{D,n} = \left(\int_D Z_{i_1, j_1, \ell_1}(x) Z_{i_2, j_2, \ell_2}(x) dx \right)_{\substack{0 \leq 2i_1 + j_1 \leq n, 1 \leq \ell_1 \leq 2j_1 + 1 \\ 0 \leq 2i_2 + j_2 \leq n, 1 \leq \ell_2 \leq 2j_2 + 1}}$$




Figure 1: Illustration of $W_0(x)$ and $\widetilde{W}_0(x)$ for dimension $d = 3$ (left). Illustration of the two subdomains D_1 in blue and D_2 in red (right).

and

$$\widetilde{K}_{D,mn} = \left(\int_D Z_{i_1,j_1,\ell_1}(x) Z_{i_2,j_2,\ell_2}(x) dx \right)_{\substack{0 \leq i_1 \leq m, 0 \leq j_1 \leq n, 1 \leq \ell_1 \leq 2j_1+1 \\ 0 \leq i_2 \leq m, 0 \leq j_2 \leq n, 1 \leq \ell_2 \leq 2j_2+1}},$$

respectively. For the case of $\mathcal{BSB}_{D,n}$ we run the computations for various bandlimits up to a maximum of $n = 48$, for the case of $\widetilde{\mathcal{BSB}}_{D,mn}$ we choose various bandlimits up to a maximum of $m = 50, n = 15$.

The results are shown in Figure 2. For each setup, it indicates the eigenvalue distributions of $\lambda_i(D;n)$ and $\widetilde{\lambda}_i(D;m,n)$ as well as the corresponding (empirical) relative Shannon numbers $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_n^d} \lambda_i(D;n) / \mathcal{N}_n^d$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d} \widetilde{\lambda}_i(D;m,n) / \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{mn}^d$, respectively. Furthermore, our asymptotic results $\int_D W_0(x) dx$ and $\int_D \widetilde{W}_0(x) dx$ are indicated. One can observe the steplike behaviour of the eigenvalue distribution and the suitability of the asymptotic results for predicting the (empirical) relative Shannon number. For region $D = D_1$, the relative Shannon number for the Π_n^3 -setup is almost half of the relative Shannon number for the $\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^3$ -setup. For region $D = D_2$, however, the relative Shannon number for the $\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^3$ -setup is actually smaller than the relative Shannon number for the Π_n^3 -setup. This outcome is not surprising if one observes the different behaviour of W_0 and \widetilde{W}_0 near the origin and near the boundary of the unit sphere (cf. Figure 1), but it illustrates the influence of the used notion of bandwidth. Additionally, for the Π_n^3 -setup, one can observe that the relative Shannon number for the smaller region D_2 is actually slightly larger than the relative Shannon number for the larger region D_1 . This illustrates a fundamental difference of our setup, with the unit ball denoting the ambient space, to more traditional setups, where the entire \mathbb{R}^d denotes the ambient space: the ability of localizing a function within a given domain D not only depends on the size of the domain but it also depends on the location of the domain within the ambient space.

Remark 4.1. Figure 3 illustrates the total number and the relative number of eigenvalues of $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$ within a prescribed interval $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. Namely, we plotted $\#\{i : \lambda_i(D;n) \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\}$




Figure 2: Illustration of the eigenvalue distributions $\lambda_i(D; n)$ (top row) and $\tilde{\lambda}_i(D; m, n)$ (bottom) for the subdomains $D = D_1$ (left column) and $D = D_2$ (right column). Dashed vertical lines indicate the (empirical) relative Shannon numbers $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_n^d} \lambda_i(D; n)/\mathcal{N}_n^d$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{mn}^d} \tilde{\lambda}_i(D; m, n)/\mathcal{N}_{mn}^d$. Continuous vertical lines indicate the asymptotic relative Shannon numbers (asymptotic rSN) $\int_D W_0(x)dx$ and $\int_D \widetilde{W}_0(x)dx$.




Figure 3: Total number $\#\{i : \lambda_i(D; n) \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\}$ and relative number $\#\{i : \lambda_i(D; n) \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\} / \mathcal{N}_n^d$ of eigenvalues within the interval $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, for different choices of ε and different choices of bandwidth n . The left figure illustrates the outcome for subdomain $D = D_1$, the right figure the outcome for subdomain $D = D_2$.

and $\#\{i : \lambda_i(D; n) \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\} / \mathcal{N}_n^d$ for various bandlimits n , and D being the tesseract D_1 from before. While, unsurprisingly, the total number increases, the relative number decreases towards zero as the bandlimit increases, reflecting the clustering of eigenvalues of $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$ near zero and one. The latter is what has been shown in Theorem 2.1. However, we did not provide a decay rate with respect to the bandwidth n , as has been done for the univariate case, e.g., in [29]. A quantification of the decay rate would require a refined estimation of $\text{tr}(\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}) - \|\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}\|_{\text{HS}}^2$ as, e.g., in [26]. Both the previous studies focus on the definition of bandlimit via the Fourier transform and both consider the entire \mathbb{R}^d as ambient space. The contribution of the chapter at hand is the use of tools like universality limits for the proof of Theorems 2.1 and 3.3, the study of notions of bandlimit other than via the Fourier transform, and the particular setup with the d -dimensional ball unit ball describing the ambient space. A more thorough investigation of the decay rate for the latter setup is an interesting task for further research. Figure 3 simply serve as an illustration of the decay for our setup.

Acknowledgments The authors are grateful to Dr. Alexander Kegeles for constructive comments on various drafts of this manuscript and to Prof. Volker Michel for pointing out the function system considered in Section 3 as well as for his hospitality during the second author’s visit to the University of Siegen. Furthermore, we want to thank Prof. Heping Wang and Prof. Yongping Liu for useful suggestions. The computations were performed on the cluster of Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg, operated by the Universitätsrechenzentrum (URZ) and funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) grant ref. 397252409 and partially funded by the Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie (BMWi) grant ref. 03EE4002B.

References

- [1] L. D. Abreu and A. S. Bandeira. “Landau’s necessary density conditions for the Hankel transform”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 262 (4 2012), pp. 1845–1866. ISSN: 00221236. DOI: [10.1016/j.jfa.2011.11.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2011.11.024).

- [2] A. Albertella, F. Sansò, and N. Sneeuw. “Band-limited functions on a bounded spherical domain: the Slepian problem on the sphere”. In: *Journal of Geodesy* 73 (1999), pp. 436–447.
- [3] L. Baratchart et al. “Unique reconstruction of simple magnetizations from their magnetic potential”. In: *Inverse Problems* 37 (2021), p. 105006. DOI: [10.1088/1361-6420/ac1e82](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/ac1e82).
- [4] A. Bonami and A. Karoui. “Approximations in Sobolev spaces by prolate spheroidal wave functions”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 42 (2017), pp. 361–377.
- [5] L. Bos. “Asymptotics for the Christoffel function”. In: *New Zealand Journal of Mathematics* 23 (1994), pp. 99–109.
- [6] M. Castro and F. A. Grünbaum. “The Darboux process and time-and-band limiting for matrix orthogonal polynomials”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 487 (2015), pp. 328–341. ISSN: 0024-3795. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2015.09.012>.
- [7] M. Castro, F. A. Grünbaum, and I. Zurrián. “Time and band limiting for exceptional polynomials”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 68 (2024), p. 101600. ISSN: 1063-5203. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2023.101600>.
- [8] F. Dai. “Multivariate polynomial inequalities with respect to doubling weights and A_∞ weights”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 235 (1 2006), pp. 137–170. ISSN: 00221236. DOI: [10.1016/j.jfa.2005.09.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2005.09.009).
- [9] S. Das, A. Hajian, and D. N. Spergel. “Efficient power spectrum estimation for high resolution CMB maps”. In: *Physical Review D* 79 (2009), p. 083008.
- [10] C. F. Dunkl and Y. Xu. *Orthogonal Polynomials of Several Variables*. 2nd ed. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [11] W. Erb. “An orthogonal polynomial analogue of the Landau-Pollak-Slepian time-frequency analysis”. In: *Journal of Approximation Theory* 166 (1 2013), pp. 56–77. ISSN: 00219045. DOI: [10.1016/j.jat.2012.10.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jat.2012.10.009).
- [12] M. I. Ganzburg. “Polynomial Inequalities on Measurable Sets and Their Applications II. Weighted Measures”. In: *Journal of Approximation Theory* 106 (1 Sept. 2000), pp. 77–109. ISSN: 00219045. DOI: [10.1006/jath.2000.3484](https://doi.org/10.1006/jath.2000.3484).
- [13] M. I. Ganzburg. “Sharp constants of approximation theory. III. Certain polynomial inequalities of different metrics on convex sets”. In: *Journal of Approximation Theory* 252 (Apr. 2020), p. 105351. ISSN: 00219045. DOI: [10.1016/j.jat.2019.105351](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jat.2019.105351).
- [14] M. L. Glasser and E. Montaldi. “Some integrals involving Bessel functions”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 183 (1994), pp. 577–590. ISSN: 14697750. DOI: [10.1112/jlms/s1-3.1.22](https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/s1-3.1.22).
- [15] F. A. Grünbaum. “A new property of reproducing kernels for classical orthogonal polynomials”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 95.2 (1983), pp. 491–500. ISSN: 0022-247X. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X\(83\)90123-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(83)90123-3).
- [16] F. A. Grünbaum, I. Pacharoni, and I. Zurrián. “Time and band limiting for matrix valued functions, an example”. In: *SIGMA. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications* 11 (2015), p. 044.

- [17] F. A. Grünbaum, I. Pacharoni, and I. Zurrián. “Time and band limiting for matrix valued functions: an integral and a commuting differential operator”. In: *Inverse Problems* 33.2 (Jan. 2017), p. 025005. DOI: [10.1088/1361-6420/aa53b8](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/aa53b8).
- [18] S.-C. Han and P. Ditmar. “Localized spectral analysis of global satellite gravity fields for recovering time-variable mass redistributions”. In: *Journal of Geodesy* 82 (2007), pp. 423–430.
- [19] D. Herreros et al. “Approximating deformation fields for the analysis of continuous heterogeneity of biological macromolecules by 3D Zernike polynomials”. In: *IUCrJ* 8 (2021), pp. 992–1005.
- [20] J. A. Hogan and J. D. Lackey. *Duration and bandwidth limiting: Prolate functions, sampling, and applications*. Birkhäuser, 2012.
- [21] C. van Hoorickx and E. P. B. Reynders. “Numerical realization of diffuse sound pressure fields using prolate spheroidal wave functions”. In: *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 151 (2022), pp. 1710–1721.
- [22] Z. Khalid, R. A. Kennedy, and J. D. McEwen. “Slepian spatial-spectral concentration on the ball”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 40 (3 2016), pp. 470–504. ISSN: 1096603X. DOI: [10.1016/j.acha.2015.03.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2015.03.008).
- [23] H. R. Kim and R. R. B. von Frese. “Utility of Slepian basis functions for modeling near-surface and satellite magnetic anomalies of the Australian lithosphere”. In: *Earth, Planets and Space* 69 (2017), p. 53. DOI: [10.1186/s40623-017-0636-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40623-017-0636-0).
- [24] A. Kroó. “Classical Polynomial Inequalities in Several Variables”. In: *Proceedings of the International Conferences Constructive Theory of Functions*. Ed. by B. Bojanov. Darba, Sofia, 2002, pp. 19–32.
- [25] A. Kroó and D. S. Lubinsky. “Christoffel functions and universality in the bulk for multivariate orthogonal polynomials”. In: *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* 65 (3 2013), pp. 600–620. ISSN: 0008414X. DOI: [10.4153/CJM-2012-016-x](https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-2012-016-x).
- [26] H. J. Landau. “Necessary density conditions for sampling and interpolation of certain entire functions”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 117 (1 1967), pp. 37–52. ISSN: 00015962. DOI: [10.1007/BF02395039](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02395039).
- [27] H. J. Landau and H. O. Pollak. “Prolate Spheroidal Wave Functions, Fourier Analysis and Uncertainty - II”. In: *Bell System Technical Journal* 40 (1 Jan. 1961), pp. 65–84. ISSN: 00058580. DOI: [10.1002/j.1538-7305.1961.tb03977.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1961.tb03977.x).
- [28] H. J. Landau and H. O. Pollak. “Prolate Spheroidal Wave Functions, Fourier Analysis and Uncertainty - III: The Dimension of the Space of Essentially Time- and Band-Limited Signals”. In: *Bell System Technical Journal* 41 (4 July 1962), pp. 1295–1336. ISSN: 00058580. DOI: [10.1002/j.1538-7305.1962.tb03279.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1962.tb03279.x).
- [29] H. J. Landau and H. Widom. “Eigenvalue Distribution of Time and Frequency Limiting”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 77 (1980), pp. 469–481.
- [30] R. R. Lederman, J. Andén, and A. Singer. “Hyper-molecules: on the representation and recovery of dynamical structures for applications in flexible macro-molecules in cryo-EM”. In: *Inverse Problems* 36 (2020), p. 044005.

- [31] S. Leweke, V. Michel, and A. S. Fokas. “Electro-magnetoencephalography for a spherical multiple-shell model: novel integral operators with singular-value decompositions”. In: *Inverse Problems* 36 (2020), p. 035003. DOI: [10.1088/1361-6420/ab291f](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/ab291f).
- [32] S. Leweke, V. Michel, and N. Schenider. “Vectorial Slepian Functions on the Ball”. In: *Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization* 39 (2018), pp. 1120–1152.
- [33] D. S. Lubinsky. “A new approach to universality limits involving orthogonal polynomials”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 170 (2 2009), pp. 915–939. ISSN: 0003486X. DOI: [10.4007/annals.2009.170.915](https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2009.170.915).
- [34] J. Marzo. “Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequalities and interpolation by spherical harmonics”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 250 (2 2007), pp. 559–587. ISSN: 00221236. DOI: [10.1016/j.jfa.2007.05.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2007.05.010).
- [35] V. Michel and A. S. Fokas. “A unified approach to various techniques for the non-uniqueness of the inverse gravimetric problem and wavelet-based methods”. In: *Inverse Problems* 24 (2008), p. 045019. DOI: [10.1088/0266-5611/24/4/045019](https://doi.org/10.1088/0266-5611/24/4/045019).
- [36] V. Michel and S. Orzłowski. “On the null space of a class of Fredholm integral equations of the first kind”. In: *Journal of Inverse and Ill-posed Problems* 24.6 (2016), pp. 687–710. DOI: [doi:10.1515/jiip-2015-0026](https://doi.org/10.1515/jiip-2015-0026).
- [37] V. Michel, A. Plattner, and K. Seibert. “A unified approach to scalar, vector, and tensor Slepian functions on the sphere and their construction by a commuting operator”. In: *Analysis and Applications* 20.05 (2022), pp. 947–988. DOI: [10.1142/S0219530521500317](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219530521500317).
- [38] C. Müller. *Analysis of Spherical Symmetries in Euclidean Spaces*. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer New York, NY, 1997. ISBN: 978-1-4612-0581-4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0581-4>.
- [39] K. Niu and C. Tian. “Zernike polynomials and their applications”. In: *Journal of Optics* 24.12 (Nov. 2022), p. 123001. ISSN: 2040-8986. DOI: [10.1088/2040-8986/ac9e08](https://doi.org/10.1088/2040-8986/ac9e08).
- [40] R. J. Noll. “Zernike polynomials and atmospheric turbulence”. In: *Journal of the Optical Society of America* 66.3 (Mar. 1976), pp. 207–211. DOI: [10.1364/JOSA.66.000207](https://doi.org/10.1364/JOSA.66.000207).
- [41] A. Osipov, V. Rokhlin, and H. Xiao. *Prolate Spheroidal Wave Functions of Order Zero: Mathematical Tools for Bandlimited Approximation*. Springer, 2013.
- [42] S.-C. Pei and J. J. Ding. “Generalized prolate spheroidal wave functions for optical finite fractional Fourier and linear canonical transforms”. In: *Journal of the Optical Society of America A* 22 (2005), pp. 460–474.
- [43] M. Perlstadt. “Polynomial Analogues of Prolate Spheroidal Wave Functions and Uncertainty”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 17 (1 1986), pp. 240–248. ISSN: 0036-1410. DOI: [10.1137/0517022](https://doi.org/10.1137/0517022).
- [44] P. Petrushev and Y. Xu. “Localized polynomial frames on the ball”. In: *Constructive Approximation* 27 (2 2008), pp. 121–148. ISSN: 01764276. DOI: [10.1007/s00365-007-0678-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00365-007-0678-9).
- [45] A. Plattner and F. J. Simons. “Highresolution local magnetic field models for the Martian south pole from Mars global surveyor data”. In: *Journal of Geophysical Research* 120 (2015), pp. 1543–1566.

- [46] A. Plattner and F. J. Simons. “Internal and external potential-field estimation from regional vector data at varying satellite altitude”. In: *Geophysical Journal International* 211.1 (2017), pp. 207–238. ISSN: 0956-540X. DOI: [10.1093/gji/ggx244](https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggx244).
- [47] A. Plattner and F. J. Simons. “Spatiospectral concentration of vector fields on a sphere”. In: *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 36 (1 2014), pp. 1–22. ISSN: 10635203. DOI: [10.1016/j.acha.2012.12.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2012.12.001).
- [48] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. I: Functional Analysis*. Elsevier Science, 1981. ISBN: 9780080570488.
- [49] J. Schwiegerling. “Review of Zernike polynomials and their use in describing the impact of misalignment in optical systems”. In: *Optical System Alignment, Tolerancing, and Verification XI*. Ed. by José Sasián and Richard N. Youngworth. Vol. 10377. International Society for Optics and Photonics. SPIE, 2017, p. 103770D. DOI: [10.1117/12.2275378](https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2275378).
- [50] F. J. Simons, F. A. Dahlen, and M. A. Wieczorek. “Spatiospectral concentration on a sphere”. In: *SIAM Review* 48 (3 2006), pp. 504–536. ISSN: 00361445. DOI: [10.1137/S0036144504445765](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036144504445765).
- [51] F. J. Simons et al. “Solving or resolving global tomographic models with spherical wavelets, and the scale and sparsity of seismic heterogeneity”. In: *Geophysical Journal International* 187.2 (Nov. 2011), pp. 969–988. ISSN: 0956-540X. DOI: [10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05190.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05190.x).
- [52] D. Slepian. “Prolate Spheroidal Wave Functions, Fourier Analysis and Uncertainty - IV: Extensions to Many Dimensions; Generalized Prolate Spheroidal Functions”. In: *Bell System Technical Journal* 43 (1964), pp. 3009–3057.
- [53] D. Slepian. “Prolate Spheroidal Wave Functions, Fourier Analysis, and Uncertainty - V: The Discrete Case”. In: *Bell System Technical Journal* 57 (5 1978), pp. 1371–1430. ISSN: 15387305. DOI: [10.1002/j.1538-7305.1978.tb02104.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1978.tb02104.x).
- [54] D. Slepian. “Some comments on Fourier Analysis, Uncertainty, and Modeling”. In: *SIAM Review* 25 (1983), pp. 379–393.
- [55] D. Slepian and H. O. Pollak. “Prolate Spheroidal Wave Functions, Fourier Analysis and Uncertainty - I”. In: *Bell System Technical Journal* 40 (1 Jan. 1961), pp. 43–63. ISSN: 00058580. DOI: [10.1002/j.1538-7305.1961.tb03976.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1961.tb03976.x).
- [56] M. Speckbacher and T. Hrycak. “Concentration Estimates for Band-Limited Spherical Harmonics Expansions via the Large Sieve Principle”. In: *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications* 26 (3 June 2020), p. 38. ISSN: 1069-5869. DOI: [10.1007/s00041-020-09744-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00041-020-09744-8).
- [57] H. Stahl and V. Totik. *General Orthogonal Polynomials*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 1992. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511759420](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511759420).
- [58] G. Szegő. *Orthogonal Polynomials*. Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, 1975. ISBN: 9780821810231.
- [59] B. Tatian. “Aberration balancing in rotationally symmetric lenses”. In: *Journal of the Optical Society of America* 64 (1974), pp. 1083–1091.

- [60] S. Waldron. “Continuous and discrete tight frames of orthogonal polynomials for a radially symmetric weight”. In: *Constructive Approximation* 30 (1 2009), pp. 33–52. ISSN: 01764276. DOI: [10.1007/s00365-008-9021-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00365-008-9021-3).
- [61] G. N. Watson. *A Treatise on the Theory of Bessel Functions*. Cambridge University Press, 1944. ISBN: 9780521093828.
- [62] M. A. Wiecek and F. J. Simons. “Localized spectral analysis on the sphere”. In: *Geophysical Journal International* 162 (3 Sept. 2005), pp. 655–675. ISSN: 0956540X. DOI: [10.1111/j.1365-246X.2005.02687.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2005.02687.x).
- [63] H. Xiao, V. Rokhlin, and N. Yarvin. “Prolate spheroidal wavefunctions, quadrature and interpolation”. In: *Inverse Problems* 17 (2001), pp. 805–838.
- [64] Y. Xu. “Asymptotics for orthogonal polynomials and Christoffel functions on a ball”. In: *Methods and Applications of Analysis* 2 (3 1996), pp. 257–272. ISSN: 1945743X. DOI: [10.1216/rmj/1181072115](https://doi.org/10.1216/rmj/1181072115).
- [65] Y. Xu. “Summability of Fourier orthogonal series for Jacobi weight on a ball in \mathbb{R}^d ”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 351 (6 1999), pp. 2439–2458. ISSN: 0002-9947. DOI: [10.1090/S0002-9947-99-02225-4](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-99-02225-4).

A Proofs of auxiliary results

Proof of (3.5): Since, for $\rho_j = j$, it holds that $Z_{i,j,\ell}$ is a polynomial of degree $2i + j$, we first get $\text{span}\{Z_{i,j,\ell} : 2i + j \leq n\} \subset \Pi_n^d$. To prove the opposite inclusion, we only need to show that the dimensions of the spaces are the same. We know that the dimension of Π_n^d is $\binom{n+d}{n}$. The dimension of $\text{span}\{Z_{i,j,\ell} : 2i + j \leq n\}$ can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dim(\text{span}\{Z_{i,j,\ell} : 2i + j \leq n\}) &= \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^{n-2i} \dim(H_j^d) \\
 &= \sum_{j=0}^n \left(\left\lfloor \frac{n-j}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \left[\binom{j+d-1}{j} - \binom{j+d-3}{j-2} \right] \\
 &= \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{j+d-1}{j} = \binom{n+d}{n},
 \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Proof of (3.34). We first gather some preliminary properties. Using $\lambda = (d-3)/2$ as an abbreviation, $\mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}$ is known to have the closed form representation (e.g., [34, P. 565])

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi) = \frac{C_{d,n}}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} P_n^{1+\lambda, \lambda}(\xi_x \cdot \xi), \tag{A.2}$$

for $\xi_x, \xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $C_{d,n} = \binom{n+d-2}{n} / \binom{n+\frac{d-3}{2}}{n}$. Asymptotically, it holds $C_{d,n} \simeq n^{(d-1)/2}$. Letting $c > 0$ be some fixed constant, we furthermore get from [58, P. 198] that, for $\frac{c}{n} \leq \theta \leq$

$$\pi - \frac{c}{n},$$

$$P_n^{\lambda+1,\lambda}(\cos \theta) = \frac{k(\theta)}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\cos \left((n + \lambda + 1)\theta - \frac{\pi}{2} \left(\lambda + \frac{3}{2} \right) \right) + \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{n \sin \theta} \right) \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $k(\theta) = \pi^{-1/2}(\sin \frac{\theta}{2})^{-\lambda-3/2}(\cos \frac{\theta}{2})^{-\lambda-1/2}$. Finally, by the symmetry relation of Jacobi polynomials and the Mehler-Heine formula (e.g., [58, Thm. 8.1.1]), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n n^{-\lambda} P_n^{\lambda+1,\lambda} \left(\cos \left(\pi - \frac{z}{n} \right) \right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\lambda} P_n^{\lambda,\lambda+1} \left(\cos \left(\frac{z}{n} \right) \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{z}{2} \right)^{-\lambda} J_\lambda(z) = 2^\lambda J_\lambda^*(z), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

uniformly for z in a bounded subset of \mathbb{R} .

Now we can begin with the actual proof. To remind the reader: We want to prove (3.34), which states

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon(\xi_x)} |\mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 \frac{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} d\omega(\xi) = 1. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

From the reproducing kernel property of $\mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}$, we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 \frac{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} d\omega(\xi) = \frac{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi_x) = 1.$$

Thus, in order to prove (A.5), it suffices to show

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_\epsilon(\xi_x)} |\mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 \frac{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} d\omega(\xi) = 0. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This is what we will do next. Observing (3.4) and the asymptotic behaviour of $C_{d,n}$, we get $C_{d,n}^2/\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$, as n tends to infinity. The equality (A.2) and a parametrization of the integral in terms of spherical coordinates then lead us to

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\arccos(1-\epsilon)}^\pi |P_n^{1+\lambda,\lambda}(\cos \theta)|^2 (\sin \theta)^{d-2} d\theta \\ &\sim c_d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_\epsilon(\xi_x)} |\mathcal{K}_{\text{Harm}_n}(\xi_x, \xi)|^2 \frac{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{\mathcal{N}_n(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} d\omega(\xi), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Throughout this proof, $c_d > 0$ denotes some generic constant that only depends on the dimension d and that may change at every appearance. The constant $c > 0$, however, that has already been mentioned in the beginning, is fixed throughout. We split the integration over $[\arccos(1-\epsilon), \pi]$ on the left-hand side of (A.7) into three subintervals $[\arccos(1-\epsilon), \frac{\pi}{2}]$, $[\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{c}{n}]$, and $[\pi - \frac{c}{n}, \pi]$. For θ in $[\arccos(1-\epsilon), \frac{\pi}{2}]$, the function $k(\theta)$ in (A.3) is bounded and, therefore, it holds uniformly that $|P_n^{1+\lambda,\lambda}(\cos(\theta))|^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, as n tends to infinity. We get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\arccos(1-\epsilon)}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} |P_n^{1+\lambda,\lambda}(\cos \theta)|^2 (\sin \theta)^{d-2} d\theta = 0. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

On the interval $[\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{c}{n}]$, we have $k(\theta) \leq c_d (\cos \frac{\theta}{2})^{-\lambda - \frac{1}{2}} \leq c_d (\pi - \theta)^{-\lambda - \frac{1}{2}}$ and $\sin \theta \leq \pi - \theta$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\pi - \frac{c}{n}} |P_n^{1+\lambda, \lambda}(\cos \theta)|^2 (\sin \theta)^{d-2} d\theta &\leq c_d \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\pi - \frac{c}{n}} \frac{(\pi - \theta)^{-2\lambda - 1}}{n} (\pi - \theta)^{d-2} d\theta \\ &= c_d \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\pi - \frac{c}{n}} \frac{1}{n} d\theta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

On the interval $[\pi - \frac{c}{n}, \pi]$, we substitute $\theta = \pi - \frac{z}{n}$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\pi - \frac{c}{n}}^{\pi} |P_n^{1+\lambda, \lambda}(\cos \theta)|^2 (\sin \theta)^{d-2} d\theta &= \int_0^c \left| P_n^{1+\lambda, \lambda} \left(\cos \left(\pi - \frac{z}{n} \right) \right) \right|^2 \left(\sin \frac{z}{n} \right)^{d-2} \frac{1}{n} dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \int_0^c \frac{1}{n^{d-3}} \left| P_n^{1+\lambda, \lambda} \left(\cos \left(\pi - \frac{z}{n} \right) \right) \right|^2 z^{d-2} dz. \end{aligned}$$

The relation (A.4) yields that the integrand uniformly converges to $2^{2\lambda} z^{-1} |J_\lambda(z)|^2$ as n tends to infinity. The latter is integrable by [61, Chap. 13.42, Eq. (1)]. Thus, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\pi - \frac{c}{n}}^{\pi} |P_n^{1+\lambda, \lambda}(\cos \theta)|^2 (\sin \theta)^{d-2} d\theta = 0. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Combining the results (A.7)-(A.10) leads to the desired statement (A.6), which eventually concludes the proof. \square

B Best concentration and Remez-type inequalities

Throughout the chapter, we were mainly interested in the asymptotic clustering of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{SBS}}_{D,mn}$, respectively. In this section, we very briefly want to comment on bounds for the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{SBS}_{D,n}$. By the Courant-Fischer-Weyl min-max principle, this is equivalent to maximizing the Rayleigh coefficient (1.1), or in other words, finding the bandlimited function with the best spatial concentration in the subregion $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$. Assuming the eigenvalues to be in descending order, i.e., $1 \geq \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{N_n^d} \geq 0$, this means

$$\lambda_1(D; n) = \sup_{f \in \Pi_n^d; \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} |f(x)|^2 dx = 1} \int_D |f(x)|^2 dx. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We only discuss the case, where Π_n^d is equipped with the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{B}^d (i.e., with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \omega_{1/2}^{-1} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{W_{1/2}}$). It is clear that the sequence $\{\lambda_1(D; n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ monotonically increases with n and that it converges to one by Theorem 2.1. Providing a good bound on $\lambda_1(D; n)$ and its variation with respect to the localization domain D and bandwidth n is a question of its own interest. For the case of the two-sphere \mathbb{S}^2 and spherical harmonics as the underlying function system, this has been studied, e.g., in [56].

Here, we indicate a possible estimate for our setup on the ball \mathbb{B}^d . For brevity, we denote by $E = \mathbb{B}^d \setminus D$ the complement of the concentration domain $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$ and observe the relation

$\lambda_1(D; n) = 1 - \lambda_{\mathcal{N}_n^d}(E, n)$. From the relation to the Rayleigh coefficient, it follows that it must hold, for any $C \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{N}_n^d}(E, n)^{-1}$,

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d)}^2 \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \quad \text{for all } f \in \Pi_n^d. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Relations of that form are called Remez-type inequalities. Since $C = \lambda_{\mathcal{N}_n^d}(E, n)^{-1}$ gives a sharp bound, knowledge of a more explicit dependence of C on the domain E and the bandwidth n would provide estimates on the maximal eigenvalue $\lambda_1(D; n)$. Remez-type inequalities are discussed among others, e.g., in [8, 24]. For our purposes, we observe the following two results.

Proposition B.1. [12, Thm. 2.1] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded and convex, and $E \subset \Omega$ be a Lebesgue measurable set with $|E| = \int_E 1 \, d\sigma > 0$. Then, for any $f \in \Pi_n^d$, it holds that*

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq T_n \left(\frac{1 + \left(1 - \frac{|E|}{|\Omega|}\right)^{1/d}}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{|E|}{|\Omega|}\right)^{1/d}} \right) \|f\|_{L^\infty(E)}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $T_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left((x + \sqrt{x^2 - 1})^n + (x - \sqrt{x^2 - 1})^n \right)$ is the Chebyshev polynomial.

Proposition B.2. [13, Remark. 1.8] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain satisfying the cone condition, and let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ (possibly depending on Ω , p , and d) such that, for all $f \in \Pi_n^d$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,*

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C n^{\frac{2d}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Now, choose $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^d$ in Proposition B.1 and $\Omega = E$, $p = 2$ in Proposition B.2. Noticing $\omega_{1/2} |\mathbb{B}^d| = 1$ (with $\omega_{1/2}$ as in (2.2)), we get the following chain of inequalities for $f \in \Pi_n^d$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\omega_{1/2}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d)} &\leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}^d)} \leq T_n \left(\frac{1 + (1 - \omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/d}}{1 - (1 - \omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/d}} \right) \|f\|_{L^\infty(E)} \\ &\leq C n^d T_n \left(\frac{1 + (1 - \omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/d}}{1 - (1 - \omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/d}} \right) \|f\|_{L^2(E)}. \end{aligned}$$

This directly yields the next corollary.

Corollary B.3. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{B}^d$ be convex and $E = \mathbb{B}^d \setminus D$. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ (possibly depending on E and d) such that*

$$1 - \lambda_1(D; n) = \lambda_{\mathcal{N}_n^d}(E, n) \geq \frac{C}{n^{2d}} \left(T_n \left(\frac{1 + (1 - \omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/d}}{1 - (1 - \omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/d}} \right) \right)^{-2}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Remark B.4. Chebyshev polynomials asymptotically perform like $T_n\left(\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \sim e^{cn\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$ as n tends to infinity (see, e.g., [24]). Since the polynomial decrease of n^{-2d} is negligible compared to the exponential decrease of the Chebyshev polynomial, (B.5) implies a $e^{-2cn(1-\omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/2d}}$ -type

lower bound on $1 - \lambda_1(D; n)$. Similar lower bounds with the exponent depending on n and E via $n(1 - \omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/2d}$ can be shown in general L^p -spaces if $\omega_{1/2}|E| \geq 1/2$ (see, e.g., [8, Thm. 8.3]). Furthermore, the dependence of the exponent on $|E|$ can be improved with increased regularity of E . For example, if E has smooth boundary, the dependence of the exponent on $|E|$ becomes $(1 - \omega_{1/2}|E|)^{1/d+1}$ (see, e.g., the discussion in [24, Sec. 4]).

C Conjectures on Zernike polynomials

As we have emphasized, Proposition 3.4 (thus also Theorem 3.3) only holds in the sense of taking sequential limits. One now may ask what happens for connected sequences $\{m_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ that approach infinity?

This question must link to the structure of ρ_j in the definition of $Z_{i,j,\ell}$. In the simplest case, if ρ_j is constant (with respect to j), then Proposition 3.4 holds regardless of the particular choice of m_k and n_k . For other setups, we have no concrete results yet. However, there are some numerical phenomena that are worthy to be demonstrated here.

C.1 Fourier-Jacobi bandlimit for Zernike polynomials

The most important example for ρ_j corresponds to $\rho_j = j$. As already mentioned (see Remark 3.1), in this setup each single $Z_{i,j,\ell}$ is an algebraic polynomial and this system is named the *Zernike polynomials*. Numerical evidence (see Figure 4) shows $\frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x,x)}{\mathcal{N}_{mn}^d}$ reaches a kind of equilibrium state when m is proportional to n . This equilibrium state depends significantly on the ratio between n and m . Based on the numerical experiments, we have the following conjectures:

C1: If there exists a $0 < \kappa < \infty$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} n_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m_k = \infty$ and $\frac{n_k}{m_k} = \kappa$, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{m_k n_k}(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_{m_k n_k}^d} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

exists for $\|x\| < 1$ and the limit function depends on κ .

C2: the weight function $\widetilde{W}_0(x)$ and the zero function represent the limiting cases of (C.1) corresponding to $\kappa = 0$ and $\kappa = \infty$, that is

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{m_k n_k}(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_{m_k n_k}^d} = \widetilde{W}_0(x) \quad \text{for } 0 < \|x\| < 1, \quad \text{if } n_k = o(m_k) \quad (\text{C.2})$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{m_k n_k}(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_{m_k n_k}^d} = 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \|x\| < 1, \quad \text{if } m_k = o(n_k) \quad (\text{C.3})$$

C.2 On the role of spectral shape

Lets consider the following generalization of Polynomial degree bandlimit and Fourier-Jacobi bandlimit:




Figure 4: Illustration of $\frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_{mn}^d}$ for different ratios (κ) between m and n , on the unit ball \mathbb{B}^d with dimension $d = 2$ (left column) and $d = 3$ (right column). The top, middle and bottom rows are corresponding to $\kappa = n/m = 1/1$, $\kappa = n/m = 1/2$ and $\kappa = n/m = 1/3$, respectively. The solid lines indicate $\frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{mn}(x, x)}{\mathcal{N}_{mn}^d}$ for different m and n , and the dashed lines indicate the reference line $\widetilde{W}_0(x)$ (which differs for $d = 2$ and 3).

Definition C.1. Let $\Omega \subset [0, \infty)^2$, we call Ω is *simple low-pass* if Ω is a compact set with a piece-wise smooth boundary, and satisfies

$$(x_0, y_0) \in \Omega \Rightarrow [0, x_0] \times [0, y_0] \subset \Omega. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Basically, this means Ω is the area surrounded by the x, y axes and a piece-wise smooth decreasing function f (this f must cross the positive half x axis).

Now for Ω being a simple low-pass set, and for N being a positive real number, we define:

$$\Pi_N^{\Omega, d} := \text{span} \left\{ Z_{i,j,\ell} : \left(\frac{i}{N}, \frac{j}{N} \right) \in \Omega, \ell = 1, \dots, \dim(H_j^d) \right\}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

And we call N and Ω the *bandwidth* and *spectral shape* of $\Pi_N^{\Omega, d}$, respectively. This definition contains both the previously discussed spaces of polynomials and of Fourier-Jacobi functions:

- Π_n^d has a triangle spectral shape:

$$\Pi_n^d = \Pi_N^{\Omega, d} \quad \text{with} \quad \Omega = \left\{ (x, y) : 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}, 0 \leq y \leq 1 - 2x \right\}, \quad N = n. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

- $\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^d$ with $n/m = \kappa$ has a rectangular spectral shape

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_{mn}^d = \Pi_N^{\Omega, d} \quad \text{with} \quad \Omega = \left\{ (x, y) : 0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq \kappa \right\}, \quad N = m. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Similar to (2.5), the reproducing kernel of $\Pi_N^{\Omega, d}$ is

$$\mathcal{K}_N^{\Omega}(x, y) = \sum_{(i/N, j/N) \in \Omega} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\dim(H_j^d)} Z_{i,j,\ell}(x) Z_{i,j,\ell}(y). \quad (\text{C.8})$$

We conjecture that:

C3: The spectral shape Ω determines the limit of $\frac{\mathcal{K}_N^{\Omega}(x, x)}{\dim(\Pi_N^{\Omega, d})}$, in the sense:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{K}_N^{\Omega}(x, x)}{\dim(\Pi_N^{\Omega, d})} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

exists for $\|x\| < 1$ and the limit function depends only on Ω and dimension d , and blows up when $\|x\| \rightarrow 1$.

C4: Conjectures C1-C3 also hold for the system of $Z_{i,j,\ell}$ with $\rho_j = j + c$ for a fixed c , but the convergence domain might exclude $x = 0$.

A numerical example of (C.9) with Ω taking for different choices of Ω and d is shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Illustration of $\frac{\mathcal{K}_N^{\Omega}(x, x)}{\dim(\Pi_N^{\Omega, d})}$ for two different Ω . Left panel: $\Omega_1 = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : x^2 + y^2 \leq 1\}$; Right panel: $\Omega_2 = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : (1-x)^2 + (1-y)^2 \geq 1\}$. Top row: shapes of Ω_1 and Ω_2 ; middle and bottom row: plots of $\frac{\mathcal{K}_N^{\Omega}(x, x)}{\dim(\Pi_N^{\Omega, d})}$ for different N on the unit ball \mathbb{B}^d with dimension $d = 2$ (middle row) and dimension $d = 3$ (bottom row).

Remark C.2. If conjecture C1 is true and if we can characterize the limit function of (C.1) for every κ , we can probably derive the convergence and limit function of (C.9) using the Abel transformation (summation by parts). However, this might involve technical issues like uniformity of convergence of (C.1) respect to κ .

Remark C.3. The condition (C.4), as its name, is simply an intuition of enforcing $\text{porj}_{\Pi_N^{\Omega,d}}$ to perform like a low-pass filter (e.g., this implies $\Pi_{N_1}^{\Omega,d} \subset \Pi_{N_2}^{\Omega,d}$ if $N_1 \leq N_2$). We even guess, for all simple low-pass sets, the shape of Ω *uniquely* determines the limit function of (C.9) (assuming the limit exists).

D Bandlimits for Zernike polynomials in Optics

In the end of this Chapter, we want to give an interesting example on the diversity of the definition of bandlimit for Zernike polynomials in real world application.

The 2-D Zernike polynomials, as an orthogonal system on the disc, are widely used in optics. There are different index systems to arrange the countable many basis functions, and the natural way is to index them in two two-dimensional arrays. For example, in the Noll indices (cf. [40]), the Zernike polynomials (which is normalized under weight $W_{1/2}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}$) are denoted as

$$Z_n^m := \begin{cases} \left. \begin{array}{l} \sqrt{n+1} R_n^m(r) \sqrt{2} \cos m\theta, \\ \sqrt{n+1} R_n^m(r) \sqrt{2} \sin m\theta, \end{array} \right\} & m \neq 0 \\ \sqrt{n+1} R_n^0(r), & m = 0 \end{cases}$$

with n, m being non-negative integers, and $m \leq n$ and $n - m$ is even, where

$$R_n^m(r) = \sum_{s=0}^{(n-m)/2} \frac{(-1)^s (n-s)!}{s! [(n+m)/2 - s]! [(n-m)/2 - s]!} r^{n-2s}.$$

Notice every Z_n^m with $m \neq 0$ contains two functions: the azimuthal sine variant and cosine variant. The index m stands for azimuthal frequency and n is called radial degree (but note that m and n are actually coupled in the radial part function).

However, for very practical reasons, people tend to have a one-dimensional system to order all Zernike polynomials, e.g., Noll himself has a one-dimensional sorting method to denote $Z_j = Z_n^m$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, where the transferring between j and m, n is given by:

$$n = \lfloor \sqrt{(2j+0.5)} - 1 \rfloor,$$

$$m = \begin{cases} 2 \times \lfloor \frac{2j+1-n(n+1)}{4} \rfloor, & (\text{for even } n), \\ 2 \times \lfloor \frac{2j+1-n(n+1)}{4} \rfloor - 1, & (\text{for odd } n), \end{cases}$$

and Z_j with an even j takes the azimuthal sine function and Z_j with an odd j takes the cosine function.

In practice, such single index sorting system naturally give a way to define the low-pass/band-limited space for the Zernike polynomials, because in any application, we can only treat finite basis functions and typically the first several would be used. Thus the low-order Zernike polynomials (with lower index j) can be interpreted as more important, stable or significant modes, just like low frequency terms in Fourier analysis and spherical harmonic analysis. We also note, the bandlimit given by Noll's indices of Z_j is *compatible with* the polynomial degree band-limited space $\{\Pi_n^2\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. Here by saying an indexed sequence of function spaces $\{A_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ and an indexing scheme $\{Z_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are compatible, we mean

$$A_n = \text{span}\{Z_j : 1 \leq j \leq \dim(A_n)\} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

The interesting part is, there exist several different indexing schemes. In the review [39], the author listed six indexing schemes of 2-D Zernike polynomials used in optics. There are several technical differences between these six indexing schemes, e.g, whether the functions are normalized, the direction of θ is clockwise/anticlockwise or the indexing starts from 0/1. In particular, the so-called Fringe/U of Arizona indices only contains 37 elements. However, we will not dive into these details and only focus on the bandlimit implied in these schemes. It turns out, they can be grouped into two categories: a), being compatible with the band-limited space $\{\Pi_n^2\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$; and b), being compatible with $\{\check{\Pi}_n^2\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, where

$$\check{\Pi}_n^2 := \text{span}\{Z_{i,j,\ell} : i + j \leq n\}. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

More specifically, the classification is give in the following diagram

$$\text{Indexing scheme of } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Noll} \\ \text{OSA/ANSI} \\ \text{Born and Wolf} \\ \text{Malacara} \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{compatible with } \{\Pi_n^2\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ISO-14999} \\ \text{Fringe/U of Arizona} \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{compatible with } \{\check{\Pi}_n^2\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$$

For the explicit definition of these indices and the discussion on their difference we refer to the topical reviews [39] and [49] and references therein.

A comparison of $\frac{\mathcal{K}_{\Pi_n^2}(x,x)}{\dim(\Pi_n^2)}$ and $\frac{\mathcal{K}_{\check{\Pi}_n^2}(x,x)}{\dim(\check{\Pi}_n^2)}$ is given in Figure 6. For the case of Π_n^2 , we know (see Proposition 2.3, and see references [5, 64, 25] for the proof)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{K}_{\Pi_n^2}(x,x)}{\dim(\Pi_n^2)} = W_0(x) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \|x\|^2}} \quad (\text{for } \|x\| < 1). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

For the bandlimited space defined as $\check{\Pi}_n^2$, we also conjecture $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{K}_{\check{\Pi}_n^2}(x,x)}{\dim(\check{\Pi}_n^2)}$ converges, which is numerically underpinned in Figure 6. However, we have neither a proof nor a closed expression of the limit function yet.

The two families of graphs of $\frac{\mathcal{K}_{\Pi_n}(x,x)}{\dim(\Pi_n)}$ cross roughly at $\|x\| \approx 0.8$. Therefore we somehow expect the following consequences: when we take the same amount of (low-order) Zernike




Figure 6: Illustration of $\frac{\mathcal{K}_{\Pi_n^2}(x, x)}{\dim(\Pi_n^2)}$ and $\frac{\mathcal{K}_{\check{\Pi}_n^2}(x, x)}{\dim(\check{\Pi}_n^2)}$.

polynomials in the two categories of indexing schemes, the systems that are compatible with $\check{\Pi}_n^2$ (e.g., ISO-14999 and Fringe/U of Arizona indices) probably perform better for representing spatial patterns in the more interior domain (i.e., for $\|x\| < \approx 0.8$) and worse in the boundary domain ($\|x\| > \approx 0.8$), compared to the schemes compatible with Π_n^2 (e.g., Noll, OSA/ANSI, Born and Wolf, and Malacara indices). In other words, they might have comparably better spatial resolution close to the center but worse resolution near the boundary. Unfortunately, we are not aware if this is known/confirmed/studied or rejected in the related communities.