

# Parameter choice strategies for regularized least squares approximation of noisy continuous functions on the unit circle

Congpei An<sup>\*†</sup> and Mou Cai<sup>‡§</sup>

September 16, 2024

## Abstract

In this paper, we consider a trigonometric polynomial reconstruction of continuous periodic functions from their noisy values at equidistant nodes of the unit circle by a regularized least squares method. We indicate that the constructed trigonometric polynomial can be determined in explicit due to the exactness of trapezoidal rule. Then a concrete error bound is derived based on the estimation of Lebesgue constants. In particular, we analyze three regularization parameter choice strategies: Morozov's discrepancy principal, L-curve and generalized cross-validation. Finally, numerical examples are given to perform that well chosen parameters by above strategies can improve the quality of approximation significantly.

**Keywords:** trigonometric polynomial approximation, periodic function, trapezoidal rule, choices of regularization parameters

**AMS subject classifications.** 65D15, 41A10, 41A27, 47A52, 65R99

## 1 Introduction

Periodic functions are vital in many fields such as science and engineering, and it is necessary to recover functions approximately from observational data—possibly with noise. For example, there are at least four frequently used periodic functions in digital synthesis: square wave, sawtooth wave, triangular wave, sin wave [1, 40]. In the process of approximating periodic functions, an algebraic polynomial should not be used to approximate periodic functions since algebraic polynomials are not periodic. Naturally, we focus on the approximation by trigonometric polynomials over the unit circle  $\mathbb{S}^1 := \{(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)^T \mid \theta \in [-\pi, \pi]\}$ , we are interested in finding a proper parameter for regularized trigonometric polynomial by given values of  $N$  different sampling points on  $\mathbb{S}^1$  to approximation  $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^1)$  well, where  $C(\mathbb{S}^1)$  is the space of continuous functions on  $\mathbb{S}^1$ .

As a matter of fact, the sampling procedure is often contaminated by noise in practice. Then the problem that gets good approximation from perturbed Fourier expansion is ill-posed [25, Section 1.2]. Hence we may introduce regularization techniques to handle this case. In [13][3, 4][19], the authors employ the Tikhonov regularization to reduce noise, which just adds an  $\ell_2^2$  penalty to classical least-squares strategy [42].

In this paper, we are interested in finding a class of trigonometric polynomial approximations of  $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^1)$ , that arise as minimizers of Tikhonov regularized least squares problem of the form

$$\min_{p \in \mathbb{P}_L} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N w_j (p(x_j) - f^\epsilon(x_j))^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathcal{R}_L p(x_j))^2 \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $f^\epsilon(x_j) := f(x_j) + \epsilon_j$  represent noisy values of a contaminated version  $f^\epsilon$  of the original function  $f$  calculated at the points of  $\mathcal{X}_N = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\} \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ ,  $w_j$  are related weights,  $\mathbb{P}_L := \mathbb{P}_L(\mathbb{S}^1)$  is polynomial space on circle of degree  $\leq L$ , and

$$\mathcal{R}_L : \mathbb{P}_L \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_L$$

<sup>\*</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, Guizhou University, Guiyang 550025, Guizhou, China (and-bachcp@gmail.com)

<sup>†</sup>Present address: Department of Mathematics, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China (anpcp@hku.hk)

<sup>‡</sup>School of Engineering, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-Ku, Tokyo (caimoumou@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp, caimou1230@163.com)

<sup>§</sup>Corresponding author

is a linear “penalization” operator which can be chosen in different ways, and  $\lambda > 0$  is a regularization parameter. We can choose the regularization operator  $\mathcal{R}_L$  in its most general rotationally invariant form by its action on  $p \in \mathbb{P}_L$ ,

$$\mathcal{R}_L p(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \beta_{\ell,1} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} p(x) \cos(\ell x) dx + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \beta_{\ell,2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} p(x) \sin(\ell x) dx, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\beta_{0,1}, \beta_{1,1}, \beta_{1,2}, \beta_{2,1}, \beta_{2,2}, \dots, \beta_{L,1}, \beta_{L,2}$  are a real nondecreasing sequence of nonnegative parameters. We shall assume that the point set  $\mathcal{X}_N$  consist of the points of the *trapezoidal rule* as

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} p(x) dx = \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N p(x_j), \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{P}_{N-1}, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $x_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$  be an equidistant subdivision on  $\mathbb{S}^1$  with step size  $2\pi/N$ . And  $f(x_0) = f(x_N)$  (periodicity). It is well-known that when the integrand is a periodic function with some smooth properties, the approximation by trapezoidal rule often enjoys exponential convergence [44].

Similar to the scenario on the unit sphere [2], we will construct the minimizer to the problem (1.1) in explicit. Moreover, determining a proper regularization parameter in a judicious way is the central task in this paper.

In particular, we can construct entry-wise closed form solutions to problem (1.1) with the help of trapezoidal rules. Consequently, we obtain a *regularized barycentric trigonometric interpolation* with a special parameter setting. Comparing this computation approach to the traditional trigonometric interpolation, it is both faster and more stable. Additionally, we examine the problem (1.1) approximation quality in terms of the uniform norm and the  $L_2$  norm, respectively, providing guidance for choosing parameters in barycentric approximation schemes.

Numerical experiments in [3] illustrates that a proper choice of regularization parameter  $\lambda$  can significantly improve the approximation quality. However, [3] does not give the specific parameter choice strategy. Hesse and Le Gia [21] adopt Morozov’s discrepancy principle [31] to find a proper parameter  $\lambda$  based on an  $\ell_2^2$  penalty model over the sphere. Even though the Morozov’s discrepancy principle is simple and stable to find a good parameter  $\lambda$ , it needs priori knowledge of noise level. As a complement, we also consider L-curve method [19] which is just an algorithm to find corner of a log-log plot. Generalized cross-validation [13], a popular statistics method for calculating a regularization parameter without noise level information. We study these three methods to determine the corresponding “optimal” parameter in our model (1.1). Their advantages and disadvantages are compared, and we are able to produce a good approximation of a noisy continuous function on the unit circle with these three parameter choice strategies.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section we present necessary preliminaries. In Section 3, we give the solution to the Tikhonov regularized least squares problem in close form and transform the solution in the form of regularized barycentric trigonometric interpolation. In Section 4, we theoretical analyze the error bounds of the approximation  $f \approx p$  in terms of  $L_2$  norm and uniform norm. In Section 5 we discuss parameter choice strategies about penalization parameter  $\beta_{\ell,1}, \beta_{\ell,2}$  and regularization parameter  $\lambda$ . Finally, we present some numerical experiments that test the theoretical results from previous sections in Section 6 and giving conclusion remarks in Section 7.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{S}^1$ . Denoting that  $x = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)^T, y = (\cos \phi, \sin \phi)^T, x \cdot y = \cos(\theta - \phi)$ . We introduce spherical harmonics \* for spherical polynomial space

$$\mathbb{P}_L := \text{span} \{Y_{0,1}, Y_{\ell,k}(x), \quad k = 1, 2, \ell = 1, \dots, L\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^1,$$

where

$$Y_{0,1} := 1/\sqrt{2\pi}, \quad Y_{\ell,1}(x) := \cos(\ell\theta)/\sqrt{\pi}, \quad Y_{\ell,2}(x) := \sin(\ell\theta)/\sqrt{\pi}.$$

---

\*The spherical harmonics are specialized terms for depicting the basis of spherical polynomial space  $\mathbb{S}^d$  ( $d \geq 1$ ). Although  $\mathbb{S}^1$  is just a circle, we still call the basis of circular polynomial space  $\mathbb{S}^1$  by spherical harmonics for consistency with  $\mathbb{S}^d$ .

Noting that the dimension of  $\mathbb{P}_L$  is  $d := \dim(\mathbb{P}_L) = 2L + 1$ . The spherical harmonics  $Y_{\ell,k}$  are assumed to be orthonormal with respect to the standard  $L_2$  inner product,

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{L_2} := \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} fg \, dx. \quad (2.1)$$

Then for  $p \in \mathbb{P}_L$  an arbitrary circular polynomial of degree  $\leq L$ , there exists a unique vector  $\alpha = (\alpha_{0,1}, \alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{1,2}, \dots, \alpha_{L,1}, \alpha_{L,2})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2L+1}$  such that

$$p(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma+1} \alpha_{\ell,k} Y_{\ell,k}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^1,$$

where

$$\gamma = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \ell = 0, \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The addition theorem for spherical harmonics [24] on  $\mathbb{S}^1$ , which asserts

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma+1} Y_{\ell,k}(x) Y_{\ell,k}(y) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\ell=-L}^L \exp(i\ell(\theta - \phi)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\sin((L + 1/2)(\theta - \phi))}{\sin((\theta - \phi)/2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Let  $G_L(x, y) := \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma+1} Y_{\ell,k}(x) Y_{\ell,k}(y)$ . One can verify  $G_L(x, y)$  is a reproducing kernel [6, 33], which suggests

①  $G_L(x, \cdot) \in \mathbb{P}_L$ ,

②  $G_L(x, y) = G_L(y, x)$ ,

③  $\langle p(x), G_L(x, y) \rangle_{L_2} = \left\langle \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma+1} \alpha_{\ell,k} Y_{\ell,k}(x), \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma+1} Y_{\ell,k}(x) Y_{\ell,k}(y) \right\rangle_{L_2}$   
 $= \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma+1} \alpha_{\ell,k} Y_{\ell,k}(y) = p(y), \quad p \in \mathbb{P}_L$ ,

where the second equality is from the orthogonality of spherical harmonics  $Y_{\ell,k}$  on  $\mathbb{S}^1$ .

The trapezoidal rule is often exponentially accurate for periodic continuous function [46], which would play an important role in this paper. With the help of exactness of trapezoidal rule (1.3), we define a “discrete inner product” which is first introduced by Sloan [37]

$$\langle v, z \rangle_N := \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N v(x_j) z(x_j), \quad (2.3)$$

corresponding to the “continuous” inner product (2.1). Analogously to trigonometric projection, Sloan gives the corresponding discrete inversion, named hyperinterpolation on the unit circle  $\mathbb{S}^1$  [37, Example B].

**Definition 2.1** For  $N \geq 2L + 1$ , the hyperinterpolation of  $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{S}^1)$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_L$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_L f := \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma+1} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}. \quad (2.4)$$

**Remark 2.1** We should also notice that the hyperinterpolation on  $\mathbb{S}^1$  and the trigonometric interpolation on an equidistant grid is equivalent when the dimension of  $\mathbb{P}_L$  is equal to the quadrature points  $N$ . This fact could be found in [22, 37].

The additional smoothness of  $f$  is determined by the convergence rate of its Fourier coefficients to zero. In [25, 34], this rate is usually measured by *smoothness index function*  $\phi(t)$ , a prescribed continuous nondecreasing function, which is defined by  $\phi : [a, b] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ ,  $\phi(0) = 0$ , tends to zero as  $t \rightarrow 0$ . Then standard assumption on the smoothness of a function  $f$  is expressed in terms of a Hilbert space  $W^{\phi, \beta}$ , namely,

$$f \in W^{\phi, \beta} := \left\{ g : \|g\|_{W^{\phi, \beta}} := \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma+1} \frac{|\langle g, Y_{\ell, k}(x) \rangle_{L_2}|^2}{\phi^2(\beta_{\ell, k}^{-2})} < \infty \right\},$$

where  $\beta = (\beta_{0,1}, \beta_{1,1}, \beta_{1,2}, \dots, \beta_{L,1}, \beta_{L,2})$  is the sequence of coefficients appearing in the regularizer (1.2).

We denote by  $f^\epsilon$  a noisy  $f$ , and regard both  $f$  and  $f^\epsilon$  as continuous for the following analysis. It is convenient to regard the noisy version  $f^\epsilon$  as continuous for theoretical analysis, and is always adopted by other scholars in the field of approximation, see, for example, [34]. The error of best approximation of  $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{S}^1)$  by an element  $p$  of  $\mathbb{P}_L$  is also involved, which is defined by

$$E_L(f) := \inf_{p \in \mathbb{P}_L} \|f - p\|_\infty. \quad (2.5)$$

It was known [23] that  $E_L(f) \rightarrow 0$ , as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $\epsilon = [\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_N]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\|\epsilon\|_\infty = \max |\epsilon_i|$ . Then, it is natural to assume that  $\|f - f^\epsilon\|_\infty = \|\epsilon\|_\infty$ , which allows the worst noise level at any point of  $\mathcal{X}_N$ .

### 3 Construction of solutions

#### 3.1 Regularized least squares approximation

For convenience we just consider the even length of the interval, i.e.,  $N$  is an odd positive integer. The function  $f$  sampled on  $\mathcal{X}_N$  generates

$$\mathbf{f} := \mathbf{f}(\mathcal{X}_N) = [f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_N)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and note that the rotationally invariant operator defined by (1.2) satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}_L Y_{\ell, k} = \beta_{\ell, k} Y_{\ell, k} \quad \text{for } Y_{\ell, k}(x) \in \mathbb{P}_L, \quad k = 1, 2, \ell = 0, 1, \dots, L.$$

Let  $\mathbf{A} := \mathbf{A}(\mathcal{X}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (2L+1)}$  be spherical harmonics  $Y_{\ell, k}(x)$  evaluated at the points set  $\mathcal{X}_N$ .

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_{0,1}(x_1) & Y_{1,1}(x_1) & Y_{1,2}(x_1) & \dots & Y_{L,1}(x_1) & Y_{L,2}(x_1) \\ Y_{0,1}(x_2) & Y_{1,1}(x_2) & Y_{1,2}(x_2) & \dots & Y_{L,1}(x_2) & Y_{L,2}(x_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ Y_{0,1}(x_N) & Y_{1,1}(x_N) & Y_{1,2}(x_N) & \dots & Y_{L,1}(x_N) & Y_{L,2}(x_N) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the problem (1.1) can be transformed into the discrete regularized least squares problem

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{2L+1}} \|\mathbf{W}^{1/2} (\mathbf{A}\alpha - \mathbf{f})\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{R}_L^T \alpha\|_2^2, \quad \lambda > 0, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\mathbf{R}_L := \mathbf{R}_L(\mathcal{X}_N) = \mathbf{B}_L \mathbf{A}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(2L+1) \times N}$  with  $\mathbf{B}_L$  a positive semidefinite diagonal matrix defined by

$$\mathbf{B}_L := \text{diag}(\beta_0, \beta_{1,1}, \beta_{1,2}, \dots, \beta_{L,1}, \beta_{L,2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(2L+1) \times (2L+1)},$$

and

$$\mathbf{W} := \text{diag}(2\pi/N, \dots, 2\pi/N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}.$$

Taking the first derivative of (3.1), we could obtain the following system of linear equations:

$$(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} + \lambda \mathbf{B}_L \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{B}_L^T) \alpha = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{f}, \quad \lambda > 0. \quad (3.2)$$

When we take the equal division points on unit circle, the solution to the first order condition (3.2) can be obtained in an entry-wise closed form with the special structure of  $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$ , which is just an identity matrix  $\mathbf{I}$ .

**Lemma 3.1** *Assume that the point set  $\mathcal{X}_N = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  consist of the points of a trapezoidal rule (see (1.3)) with  $2L + 1 \leq N$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2L+1) \times (2L+1)}. \quad (3.3)$$

*Proof.* By the structure of  $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$ , since the exactness property (1.3) of trapezoidal formula, we obtain

$$[\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}]_{\ell, \ell', k, j} = \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N Y_{\ell, k}(x_j) Y_{\ell', k}(x_j) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} Y_{\ell, k}(x) Y_{\ell', k}(x) dx = \delta_{\ell, \ell'},$$

where  $\ell, \ell' = 0, 1, \dots, L$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , and  $\delta_{\ell, \ell'}$  is the Kronecker delta. The second equality holds from  $Y_{\ell, k}(x) Y_{\ell', k}(x) \in \mathbb{P}_{2L} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_N(\mathbb{S}^1)$ , and the last equality holds because of the orthogonality of  $Y_{\ell, k}(x)$ .  $\square$

Consequently, we obtain following interesting results.

**Theorem 3.1** *Under the conditions of Lemma 3.1. Suppose  $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{f} \neq \mathbf{0}$ . The condition number for linear system (3.2)*

$$\text{cond}_2(\mathbf{G}) := \|\mathbf{G}\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}^{-1}\|_2$$

*is monotonic increasing for parameter  $\lambda > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$  is identity, we can simplify the coefficient matrix in (3.2)

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} + \lambda \mathbf{B}_L \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}_L^T = \mathbf{I} + \lambda \mathbf{B}_L \mathbf{B}_L^T.$$

It is clear that  $\mathbf{G}$  is diagonal. Then the condition number of  $\mathbf{G}$  is

$$\text{cond}_2(\mathbf{G}) = \frac{1 + \lambda \beta_{\max}^2}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\min}^2}, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\beta_{\max}, \beta_{\min}$  denotes the max and min value of  $\beta_{\ell, k}$  respectively. However,

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \left( \frac{1 + \lambda \beta_{\max}^2}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\min}^2} \right) = \frac{\beta_{\max}^2 - \beta_{\min}^2}{(1 + \lambda \beta_{\min}^2)^2} \geq 0.$$

Thus we finish the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.1** *From equation (3.4), we can also know that the increasing rate of penalization parameter  $\beta_{\ell, k}$  would effect the condition number for linear system (3.2). The more rapid increasing rate, the larger condition number.*

**Theorem 3.2** *Under the conditions of Lemma 3.1. For  $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^1)$ , the optimal solution to problem (3.1) can be expressed by*

$$\alpha_{\ell, k} = \frac{\langle f, Y_{\ell, k} \rangle_N}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell, k}^2}, \quad k = 1, 2; \ell = 0, 1, \dots, L. \quad (3.5)$$

*Consequently, the minimizer to the problem (1.1) is*

$$p_{\lambda, L, N}^{\beta}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\langle f, Y_{\ell, k} \rangle_N}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell, k}^2} Y_{\ell, k}(x). \quad (3.6)$$

*Proof.* This is immediately obtained from the first order condition (3.2) of the problem (3.1) and Lemma 3.1.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2** *When  $\lambda = 0$ , coefficients (3.5) reduce to  $\langle f, Y_{\ell, k} \rangle_N$ . Then*

$$p_{0, L, N}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \langle f, Y_{\ell, k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell, k}(x), \quad (3.7)$$

*which can be regarded as the hyperinterpolation [22, 37] on the unit circle (2.4). Besides, if  $2L+1 = N$ , (3.7) is also a trigonometric interpolation on an equidistant grid [47], i.e.,*

$$p_{0, L, N}(x_j) = f(x_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3.8)$$

**Remark 3.3** *The assumption  $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{f} \neq \mathbf{0}$  is important, which can ensure the coefficients  $\alpha_{\ell,k}$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ ,  $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, L$  are not all zero, as we want to avoid the case that approximation nonzero function  $f$  by zero polynomial.*

### 3.2 Regularized barycentric trigonometric interpolation

We emphasize a novel trigonometric polynomial in this subsection that could lead to a revolution in trigonometric polynomial approximation. This specific trigonometric polynomial can be obtained under the interpolation condition from (3.6) using barycentric trigonometric interpolation and a constant parameter  $\beta_{\ell,k}$ .

Barycentric trigonometric interpolation is introduced by Salzer [36] and later simplified by Henrici [20] and Berrut [9] and has been made popular by Berrut and Trefethen [10]. It has the interesting form as following

$$t_N(x) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N (-1)^j f(x_j) \csc \frac{x-x_j}{2}}{\sum_{j=1}^N (-1)^j \csc \frac{x-x_j}{2}}, \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\csc x := (\sin x)^{-1}$ . The name of barycentric is because they are formally identical with the formulas for the center of gravity (barycenter) of a system of masses  $(-1)^j \csc \frac{x-x_j}{2}$  attached to the points  $f(x_j)$ . Compared with classical trigonometric interpolation, computing (3.9) only requires  $O(N)$  operations (including evaluations of trigonometric functions). Meanwhile, (3.9) is stable in most cases of practical interest [7, 9, 20]. Base on their studies, we propose regularized barycentric trigonometric inetpolation, which just brings a multiplicative correction constant into barycentric trigonometric interpolation formula.

**Theorem 3.3** *Let  $2L + 1 = N$ . Adopt conditions in Lemma 3.1. Setting  $\beta_{\ell,k} = \tau \geq 0$ , for all  $\ell, k$ . Then (3.6) can be transformed into a regularized barycentric trigonometric interpolation formula (just for odd data scale  $N$ .)*

$$t_N^{\text{reg}}(x) = p_{\lambda,L,N}^{\beta}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda\tau} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N (-1)^j f(x_j) \csc \frac{x-x_j}{2}}{\sum_{j=1}^N (-1)^j \csc \frac{x-x_j}{2}}. \quad (3.10)$$

*Proof.* The approximation trigonometric polynomial (3.6) can be written as

$$p_{\lambda,L,N}^{\beta}(x) = \frac{2\pi}{(1 + \lambda\tau)N} \sum_{j=1}^N f(x_j) \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x).$$

Then we have following sum of geometric sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x) &= \sum_{\ell=-L}^L \exp(i\ell(x - x_j)) \\ &= \frac{[1 - \exp(iN(x - x_j))] \exp(-iL(x - x_j))}{\exp(ix) [\exp(-ix) - \exp(-ix_j)]}. \end{aligned}$$

By trigonometric formula  $\exp(i\alpha) - \exp(i\beta) = 2i \exp(\frac{i(\alpha+\beta)}{2}) \sin(\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2})$  and  $\exp(\frac{iN}{2}x_j) = i(-1)^j$ , we have

$$2\pi \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x) = \frac{\exp(-\frac{iN}{2}x)(-1)^j - \exp(\frac{iN}{2}x)(-1)^j}{2 \sin(\frac{x-x_j}{2})}.$$

However, the constant function  $f(x) \equiv 1$  has trigonometric interpolation

$$1 = \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x),$$

and cancel the common factor in  $p_{\lambda,L,N}^{\beta}(x)/1$ , we obtain (3.10).  $\square$

This new trigonometric polynomial (3.10) is combined with barycentric trigonometric interpolation and a correct constant, which will share the same computational benefits and stability properties with their classical versions, moreover, it can also inherit properties from Tikhonov regularization.

## 4 Error Analysis

In this section we estimate the error of approximation of  $f$  by  $p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta(x)$  in terms of  $L_2$  norm and uniform norm  $\|f\|_\infty = \max_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |f(x)|$  in the presence of noise.

### 4.1 $L_2$ error

The approximation trigonometric polynomial (3.6) can be deemed as an operator  $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta$  :

$$p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta(x) := \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f(x) := \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x). \quad (4.1)$$

The  $L_2$  norm of the operator is defined by

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_{L_2} := \sup_{f \neq 0} \frac{\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f\|_{L_2}}{\|f\|_\infty} = \sup_{f \neq 0} \frac{\|p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_{L_2}}{\|f\|_\infty}.$$

When  $\lambda = 0$ , the approximation polynomial reduces to the hyperinterpolation on the unit circle defined by (2.4):

$$\mathcal{L}_L f(x) := \mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} f(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x). \quad (4.2)$$

The estimation of  $L_2$  norm of operator  $\|\mathcal{U}_{0,L,N}\|_{L_2}$  can be found in [37], that is

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{0,L,N}\|_{L_2} \leq \sqrt{2\pi} \|f\|_\infty. \quad (4.3)$$

However, our regularized approximation operator  $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta$  would enlarge the  $L_2$  norm compared with classical version. At first, we suppose that the first penalization parameter  $\beta_{0,1}$  be zero.

**Proposition 4.1** *Suppose  $2L + 1 \leq N$  and  $\beta_{0,1} = 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f$  be defined by (4.1). Then*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f\|_{L_2} \leq \sqrt{2\pi} C(\lambda, \beta) \|f\|_\infty,$$

where

$$C(\lambda, \beta) = \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1}{\beta_{\ell,k}^4}}. \quad (4.4)$$

*Proof.* From the definition of (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f\|_{L_2}^2 &= |\langle f, Y_{0,1} \rangle_N|^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{|\langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N|^2}{(1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2)^2} \\ &\leq |\langle f, Y_{0,1} \rangle_N|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{|\langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N|^2}{\beta_{\ell,k}^4}. \end{aligned}$$

By using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N|^2 &= \frac{4\pi^2}{N^2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N f(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2\pi}{N} \left( \sum_{j=1}^N |f(x_j)|^2 \right) \left( \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N Y_{\ell,k}^2(x_j) \right) \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \left( \sum_{j=1}^N |f(x_j)|^2 \right) \|Y_{\ell,k}(x)\|_{L_2} \\ &\leq 2\pi \|f\|_\infty^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last second equality is due to the exactness of trapezoidal rule (1.3). Thus the bound

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f\|_{L_2} \leq \sqrt{2\pi} \|f\|_\infty \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1}{\beta_{\ell,k}^4}}.$$

is obtained, which is the required result.  $\square$

It is clear that  $\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_{L_2} \rightarrow \|\mathcal{U}_{0,L,N}\|_{L_2}$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .

Here we introduce a useful analysis tool named da la Vallée-Poussin approximation [12, Chapter 9]  $V_n f$  defined by

$$V_n f(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{2n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} h(\ell, k) \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2} Y_{\ell,k}(x) \in \mathbb{P}_n, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $n = \lfloor \frac{L}{2} \rfloor$  (In this paper, without any special explanation, we set all  $n = \lfloor \frac{L}{2} \rfloor$ ),  $h$  is a filter function which satisfies

$$h(\ell, k) = \begin{cases} 1 & |\ell| \leq n, \\ 1 - \frac{\ell - n}{n} & n + 1 \leq |\ell| \leq 2n - 1. \end{cases}$$

Inspired by [38], we obtain that

$$V_n p = p \text{ for all } p \in \mathbb{P}_n,$$

$$\langle V_n f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2} = h(\ell, k) \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2}, \quad \ell = 0, 1, \dots, L.$$

And the norm of  $V_n$  is bounded, that is  $\|V_n f\|_\infty \leq 3\|f\|_\infty$ . Moreover

$$\|V_n f - f\| \leq (1 + \|V_n\|_\infty) \|f - p^*\|_\infty = 4E_n(f).$$

With this bound, we could also make  $L$  large enough to ensure  $\|f - V_n f\|_\infty \leq \epsilon \|f\|_\infty$ , as  $E_L \rightarrow 0$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . At first, we estimate the  $L_2$  error between approximation trigonometric polynomial (3.6) and hyperinterpolation (2.4) for  $V_n f$ , which is useful for our next error analysis. In our next analysis, we always assume the smoothness index function  $\phi(t)$  is defined by  $\phi(t) = t^{1/2}$ .

**Lemma 4.1** *Suppose  $2L + 1 \leq N$  and  $\beta_{0,1} = 0$ . Then*

$$\left\| \left( \mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} - \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right) V_n f \right\|_{L_2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} \|f\|_{W^{\phi,\beta}}. \quad (4.6)$$

*Proof.* With the exactness of trapezoidal rule (1.3) and connection  $\langle V_n f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2} = h(\ell, k) \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2}$ , we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left( \mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} - \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right) V_n f \right\|_{L_2} &= \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2} \langle V_n f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2} Y_{\ell,k}(x) \right\|_{L_2} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 h(\ell, k) \frac{\lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2} Y_{\ell,k}(x) \right\|_{L_2} \\ &= \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 h^2(\ell, k) \left( \frac{\lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2} \right)^2 \left| \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$



the third equality is from Parseval's equality. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| \left( \mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} - \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right) V_n f \right\|_{L_2} &\leq \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \left( \frac{\lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2} \right)^2 \phi^2(\beta_{\ell,k}^{-2}) \frac{|\langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2}|^2}{\phi^2(\beta_{\ell,k}^{-2})} \right)^{1/2} \\
 &= \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\lambda^2}{\beta_{\ell,k}^2 (1/\beta_{\ell,k}^2 + \lambda)^2} \frac{|\langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2}|^2}{\phi^2(\beta_{\ell,k}^{-2})} \right)^{1/2} \\
 &\leq \sup_{u \in (0, \beta_{1,1}^{-1}]} \left| \frac{\lambda u}{\lambda + u^2} \right| \|f\|_{W^{\phi, \beta}} \\
 &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} \|f\|_{W^{\phi, \beta}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are going to estimate the  $L_2$  regularization error  $\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f - f\|_{L_2}$ .

**Theorem 4.1** *Suppose  $2L + 1 \leq N$  and  $\beta_{0,1} = 0$ . Given noisy version  $f^\epsilon \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ . Then*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f^\epsilon - f\|_{L_2} \leq \sqrt{2\pi} \left( 2C(\lambda, \beta) + 1 \right) \|\epsilon\|_\infty + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} \|f\|_{W^{\phi, \beta}}, \quad (4.7)$$

where  $C(\lambda, \beta)$  is defined by (4.4).

*Proof.* For any  $V_n f \in \mathbb{P}_n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f^\epsilon - f\|_{L_2} &\leq \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta (f^\epsilon - V_n f)\|_{L_2} + \|(\mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} - \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta) V_n f\|_{L_2} + \|f - V_n f\|_{L_2} \\
 &\leq \sqrt{2\pi} C(\lambda, \beta) \|f^\epsilon - V_n f\|_\infty + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} \|f\|_{W^{\phi, \beta}} + \sqrt{2\pi} \|f - V_n f\|_\infty,
 \end{aligned}$$

and by the decomposition  $\|f^\epsilon - V_n f\|_\infty \leq \|f^\epsilon - f\|_\infty + \|f - V_n f\|_\infty$ , we obtain (4.7). □

## 4.2 Uniform error

To estimate the uniform error  $\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f - f\|_\infty$ , we start with the Lebesgue constant of the operator  $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta$ , which can be defined as follows.

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_\infty := \sup_{f \neq 0} \frac{\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f\|_\infty}{\|f\|_\infty} = \sup_{f \neq 0} \frac{\|p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_\infty}{\|f\|_\infty},$$

and then we have

**Theorem 4.2** *Adopt conditions of Lemma 4.1. Then*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_\infty \leq 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1 + \lambda \beta_{\ell,k}^2}. \quad (4.8)$$

*Proof.* By the definition of the Lebesgue constant of  $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta$  and using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_\infty &= \max_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{2\pi}{N} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left( \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1}{1 + \lambda\beta_{\ell,k}^2} Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x) + Y_{0,1}(x_j) Y_{0,1}(x) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} 1 + \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1}{1 + \lambda\beta_{\ell,k}^2} |Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x)| \\ &\leq \max_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1}{1 + \lambda\beta_{\ell,k}^2} \left( \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N Y_{\ell,k}^2(x_j) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N Y_{\ell,k}^2(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1 + \lambda\beta_{\ell,k}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Inspired by [34, Theorem 4.2], we have Theorem 4.3 as following.

**Theorem 4.3** *Suppose  $2L + 1 \leq N$ . Given a noisy version  $f^\epsilon \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f \in \mathbb{P}_n$  be defined by (4.1). Then*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f^\epsilon - f\|_\infty \leq c \|\epsilon\|_\infty \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_\infty + \sqrt{\lambda L} \|f\|_{W^{\phi,\beta}}, \quad (4.9)$$

where  $c$  is a generic constant.

*Proof.* For  $V_n f \in \mathbb{P}_n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f - f\|_\infty &= \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta (f - V_n f + V_n f) - f - V_n f + V_n f\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta (f - V_n f)\|_\infty + \|f - V_n f\|_\infty + \left\| (\mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} - \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta) V_n f \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_\infty \|f - V_n f\|_\infty + \|f - V_n f\|_\infty + \left\| (\mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} - \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta) V_n f \right\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

To estimate the third term of (4.10), using the Nikolskii inequality for trigonometric polynomials [32] and (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} - \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta) V_n f \right\|_\infty &\leq 2\sqrt{L} \left\| (\mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} - \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta) V_n f \right\|_{L_2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\lambda L} \|f\|_{W^{\phi,\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

With the decomposition  $\|f^\epsilon - V_n f\|_\infty \leq \|f^\epsilon - f\|_\infty + \|f - V_n f\|_\infty$ , we obtain (4.9). □

## 5 Parameter choice strategies

In this section we are interested in the choice of parameters for trigonometric polynomial (3.6), namely, the regularization parameter  $\lambda$  and penalization parameters  $\beta_{\ell,k}$ . To make sure the error bound (4.9) being finite, we fix the penalization parameter  $\beta_{\ell,k}$  by two assumptions:

1.  $\beta_{\ell,k}$  is nondecreasing, and  $\beta_{0,1} = 0$ ,
2.  $\beta_{\ell,k}$  must follow that  $\|f\|_{W^{\phi,\beta}} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \beta_{\ell,k}^2 |\langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_{L_2}|^2 < \infty$ .

Obviously, to satisfy the second requirement, for different continuous functions  $f$  will have different increasing rate of penalization parameter since their Fourier coefficients have different decreasing rates [39, Exercises 18, Chapter 3]. With certainly penalization parameter, we could find reasonable regularization parameter.

As the second term of right hand of (4.9) is increasing about  $\lambda$ , whereas the upper bound of  $\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta\|_\infty$  in the first term is decreasing, the choice of the parameter  $\lambda$  has to be made through a compromise between these two parts. We denote the optimal parameter which lets the error bound (4.9) minimum by  $\lambda_{\text{opt}}$ .

In this paper, we adopt the heuristically motivated rules, that different regularization parameter  $\lambda_{\text{reg}}$  are often selected from some finite set, say

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\lambda_k = \zeta_0 q^k, k = 1, 2, \dots, T\}, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\zeta_0 > 0$ ,  $q \in (0, 1)$ , and  $T$  is large enough.

Note that the assumption  $L$  is large enough to keep  $\|f - V_n f\|_\infty \leq \|\epsilon\|_\infty$  in Section 4. Naturally, one would let  $\lambda_{\text{opt}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\|\epsilon\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, the idea of finding a reasonable parameter  $\lambda_{\text{reg}}$  using some algorithms is to let  $\lambda_{\text{reg}}$  inherit the asymptotic property of  $\lambda_{\text{opt}}$ , i.e.,  $\lambda_{\text{reg}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\|\epsilon\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ . Meanwhile, we always keep the designed  $\lambda_{\text{reg}}$  be related to the penalization parameter  $\beta_{\ell,k}$ . We summarize this idea by the following regular definition.

**Definition 5.1** *Let  $\lambda_{\text{reg}}$  be the parameter obtained by a parameter choice strategy, and  $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda_{\text{reg}},L,N}^\beta f^\epsilon$  be the noisy version approximation trigonometric polynomial (3.6). A parameter choice strategy is said regular in the sense that if  $\|\epsilon\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ , then*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda_{\text{reg}},L,N}^\beta f^\epsilon - \mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} f^\epsilon\|_\infty \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.2)$$

**Remark 5.1** *Definition 5.1 is important for a parameter choice strategy, as it can make this strategy still efficient for lower noise level, which could be regarded as the stability of a parameter choice strategy to some extent.*

## 5.1 Laplace operator $\mathcal{R}_L$

In this subsection, we obtain choice of penalization operator  $\mathcal{R}_L$  related to Laplace operator  $\Delta$  on the  $\mathbb{S}^1$ , since it can natural satisfy our above fixed first assumptions for penalization parameter  $\beta_{\ell,k}$ . For more penalization parameter choice strategies, we can find in [34]. The spherical harmonics on  $\mathbb{S}^1$  has an intrinsic characterization as the eigenfunctions of the Laplace operator  $\Delta$ , that is,

$$\Delta Y_{\ell,k}(x) = -\ell^2 Y_{\ell,k}(x).$$

It follows that  $-\Delta$  is semipositive operator, and for any  $s > 0$  we may define  $(-\Delta)^{s/2}$  by

$$(-\Delta)^{s/2} Y_{\ell,k}(x) = \ell^s Y_{\ell,k}(x). \quad (5.3)$$

The corresponding matrix

$$\mathbf{B}_L = \text{diag}(0^s, 1^s, 1^s, 2^s, 2^s, \dots, L^s, L^s) \in \mathbb{R}^{(2L+1) \times (2L+1)}.$$

In our next regularization parameter choice procession, we fixed the penalization parameter  $\beta_{\ell,k}$  by operator  $(-\Delta)^{s/2}$ , namely

$$\beta_{\ell,1} = \beta_{\ell,2} = \ell^s, \quad \ell = 0, 1, \dots, L.$$

As we emphasized  $\beta_{\ell,k}$  must make  $\|f\|_{W^{\phi,\beta}} < \infty$ , thus we give extra assumption for  $s$  that is

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \ell^{2s} |\langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle|^2 < \infty, f \in \mathbb{S}^1.$$

## 5.2 Morozov's discrepancy principal

As we already state the importance of regularization parameter  $\lambda > 0$  for approximation quality, we will apply Morozov's discrepancy principal, which is a posterior choice to finish the task that determine parameter  $\lambda$ . The main idea of this method is aimed at designing an algorithm to find unique parameter  $\lambda^*$  satisfied the following criterion

$$\left\| \mathbf{W}^{1/2} (\mathbf{A}\alpha_{\lambda^*} - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon) \right\|_2^2 = \|\epsilon\|_2. \quad (5.4)$$

For more details of Morozov's discrepancy principal, we refer the readers to [31]. We adopt criterion (5.4) as the parameter choice strategy of problem (3.1). Firstly, we introduce the *weighted 2-norm* for  $\mathbb{R}^N$  as an auxiliary result, which is also adopted by Hesse and Le Gia [21]

$$\|\mathbf{y}\|_{2,t_N} := \left( \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N y_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (5.5)$$

whose points  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N$  are the quadrature points of  $N$ -point trapezoidal rule. Then we have to study the monotonicity of function  $\|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\lambda - \mathbf{f})\|_2^2$  about variable  $\lambda$  for ensuring the uniqueness of parameter choice.

**Lemma 5.1** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2. Define*

$$J : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \quad J(\lambda) := \left\| \mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\lambda - \mathbf{f}) \right\|_2^2 = \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left[ p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta(x_j) - f(x_j) \right]^2 \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$K : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \quad K(\lambda) := \left\| \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}_\lambda \right\|_2^2 = \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left[ \left( (-\Delta)^{s/2} p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta(x_j) \right) \right]^2, \quad (5.7)$$

where  $p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta$  is the unique minimizer of problem (3.1), see (3.6). Assume further that  $[\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{f}]_{2;2L+1}$  is non-zero vector. Then

(i)  $K$  is continuous and strictly monotonic decreasing with  $\lambda$ .

(ii)  $J$  is continuous and strictly monotonic increasing with  $\lambda$ .

*Proof.* Since  $p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \in \mathbb{P}_L$ , from (5.3),  $(-\Delta)^{s/2} p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \in \mathbb{P}_L$ , and the exactness of trapezoidal rule for  $\left( (-\Delta)^{s/2} p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right)^2 \in \mathbb{P}_{2L}$  yields

$$K(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{2\pi}{N} \left[ \left( (-\Delta)^{s/2} p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta(x_j) \right) \right]^2 = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[ \left( (-\Delta)^{s/2} p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta(x) \right) \right]^2 dx = \left\| (-\Delta)^{s/2} p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right\|_{L_2}^2, \quad (5.8)$$

and computing  $\left\| (-\Delta)^{s/2} p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right\|_{L_2}^2$  in (5.8) with the help of Parseval's equality yields

$$K(\lambda) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1 + \lambda \ell^{2s})^2} \left( \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right)^2, \quad (5.9)$$

and the continuity of  $K$  and monotonic immediately follows (5.9).

We show that  $J$  is strictly monotonic increasing with a proof by derivation, taking the first order condition of  $J(\lambda)$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} J'(\lambda) &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N 2 \left[ \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda \ell^{2s}} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right) - f(x_j) \right] \times \\ &\quad \left[ \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} - \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1 + \lambda \ell^{2s})^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right] \\ &= J_1(\lambda) + J_2(\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(\lambda) &= -\frac{4\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left[ \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda \ell^{2s}} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right] \left[ \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1 + \lambda \ell^{2s})^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right], \\ J_2(\lambda) &= \frac{4\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f(x_j) \left[ \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1 + \lambda \ell^{2s})^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $J_1(\lambda)$  can be rewritten by the discrete inner of two trigonometric polynomial  $p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta$ ,  $t_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \in \mathbb{P}_{2L}$ , i.e.,

$$J_1(\lambda) = -2 \left\langle p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta, t_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right\rangle_N,$$

where  $t_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x)$ . Using the exactness of trapezoidal rule (1.3), it is clear that

$$J_1(\lambda) = -2 \left\langle p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta, t_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right\rangle_N = -2 \left\langle p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta, t_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta \right\rangle_{L_2} = -2 \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^3} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N^2. \quad (5.11)$$

Substitute (5.11) into (5.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J'(\lambda) &= -2 \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^3} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N + 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{2\pi}{N} f(x_j) \left[ \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right] \\ &= -2 \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^3} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N^2 + 2 \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{2\pi}{N} f(x_j) Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \\ &= -2 \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^3} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N^2 + 2 \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\ell^{2s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^2} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N^2 \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{2\lambda\ell^{4s}}{(1+\lambda\ell^{2s})^3} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Since we have already assumed that  $[\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{f}]_{2:2L+1}$  is non-zero vector, it follows that  $J'(\lambda) > 0$ , which shows the strictly monotonic increasing of  $J(\lambda)$ .  $\square$

It is worth pointing out that the choice of the parameter  $\lambda$  has to be made through a compromise between  $J(\lambda)$  and  $K(\lambda)$ . Let  $f^\epsilon \in \mathcal{C}([-\pi, \pi])$ , and  $\mathbf{f}^\epsilon$  be the vector  $[f^\epsilon(x_1), f^\epsilon(x_2), \dots, f^\epsilon(x_N)]^T$ . In the following theorem, we need to add more conditions to ensure the noise level  $\|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}$  could enter the range of  $J(\lambda)$ .

**Theorem 5.1** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2. Assume*

$$\|\mathcal{L}_L f^\epsilon - f^\epsilon\|_{2,t_N} \leq \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N} \leq \|f^\epsilon - \sigma\|_{2,t_N}, \quad (5.13)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the mean value of  $\{f^\epsilon(x_j)\}_{j=1}^N$ , i.e.,  $\sigma = \left( \sum_{j=1}^N f^\epsilon(x_j) \right) / N$ . Then there exists a unique  $\lambda^* > 0$  such that the unique solution  $\alpha_{\lambda^*}$  of (3.1) satisfies

$$\left\| \mathbf{W}^{1/2} (\mathbf{A} \alpha_{\lambda^*} - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon) \right\|_2 = \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}.$$

*Proof.* We have to show that the function  $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$F(\lambda) = \left\| \mathbf{W}^{1/2} (\mathbf{A} \alpha_{\lambda^*} - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon) \right\|_2^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 \quad (5.14)$$

has a unique zero. From the representation (5.6), we find that

$$F(\lambda) = J(\lambda) - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 = \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left[ \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{1}{1+\lambda\ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) - f^\epsilon(x_j) \right]^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2.$$

Therefore,  $F(\lambda)$  has following limits by the continuous of  $J(\lambda)$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} F(\lambda) &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{0,1} \rangle_N Y_{0,1}(x_j) - f^\epsilon(x_j) \right)^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N f^\epsilon(x_k)}{N} - f^\epsilon(x_j) \right)^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 \\ &= \|f^\epsilon - \sigma\|_{2,t_N}^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} F(\lambda) &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) - f^\epsilon(x_j) \right)^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathcal{L}_L f^\epsilon(x_j) - f^\epsilon(x_j))^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 \\ &= \|\mathcal{L}_L f^\epsilon - f^\epsilon\|_{2,t_N} - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

while  $J(\lambda)$  is strictly monotonically increasing, hence,  $F$  has exactly one zero  $\lambda^*$ .  $\square$

As we state that the hyperinterpolation  $\mathcal{L}_L f$  is also a trigonometric interpolation on an equidistant grid for  $2L + 1 = N$ , which would still keep the interpolation condition with noisy case [1, Remark 3.3], that is

$$\mathcal{L}_L f^\epsilon(x_j) = f^\epsilon(x_j), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

Thus, the lower bound of  $\|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}$  in assumption (5.13) would equal to zero naturally. While in [21], it is difficult to estimate the certain lower bound of  $\|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}$  on the sphere, which is the main difference from the unit circle case. With this special case, the Morozov's discrepancy principal is regular.

**Corollary 5.1** *Let  $\lambda_{\text{mor}}$  be the root of the discrepancy function  $F(\lambda)$  and  $2L + 1 = N$ . The Morozov's discrepancy principal is regular in the sense that if  $\|\epsilon\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ . Then*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda_{\text{mor}},L,N}^\beta f^\epsilon - \mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} f^\epsilon\|_\infty \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.15)$$

*Proof.* By the expression (3.6) and (3.7), it follows that

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta f^\epsilon - \mathcal{U}_{0,L,N} f^\epsilon\|_\infty = \max_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left| \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}}{1 + \lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x) \right|,$$

and from the Morozov's discrepancy principal, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 &= \left\| \mathbf{W}^{1/2} (\mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\lambda_{\text{mor}}} - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon) \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) - f^\epsilon(x_j) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) - \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{\lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}}{1 + \lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \left( \frac{\lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}}{1 + \lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

the second equality is from the interpolation condition (3.8), and the last equality is from the exactness of trapezoidal rule (1.3). Hence, when  $\|\epsilon\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $\|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N} \rightarrow 0$  and

$$\frac{\lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}}{1 + \lambda_{\text{mor}} \ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N \rightarrow 0,$$

which shows (5.15).  $\square$

**Remark 5.2** *If the Morozov's discrepancy principal is not regular, the variation of the regularization parameter is unduly large. Thus, we always adapt this method under the regular assumption  $2L + 1 = N$ .*

In practice, we do not need to determine  $\lambda_{\text{mor}}$  satisfying  $F(\lambda_{\text{mor}}) = 0$  exactly. Usually we can also choose moderately sized  $\lambda_{\text{mor}}$  from parameter set (5.1) by stopping criterion  $F(\lambda_{\text{mor}}) < 0$ .

### 5.3 L-curve

Although the Morozov's discrepancy principal is an efficient parameter selection strategy, from Theorem 5.1 we know that it requires noise level  $\|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}$  prior. In fact, the noise level is often unknown, we need other method which is not depend on the noise information to select parameter.

A famous regularization parameter choice strategy which does not require noise knowledge is L-curve [18, 19]. Considering our least squares model (3.1), the L-curve is a parametric log-log plot for two parts:  $\hat{\rho}(\lambda) = \log J(\lambda)$  and  $\hat{\eta}(\lambda) = \log K(\lambda)$ . Surprisingly the resulting curve  $(\hat{\rho}(\lambda), \hat{\eta}(\lambda))$  is L-shaped, and the parameter is chosen corresponding to the corner of the L-curve. We usually determine the corner by the maximal curvature  $\kappa(\lambda)$ ,  $\lambda > 0$  of this curve, which is defined as follows

$$\kappa(\lambda) := \frac{|\hat{\rho}'(\lambda)\hat{\eta}''(\lambda) - \hat{\eta}'(\lambda)\hat{\rho}''(\lambda)|}{(\hat{\rho}'^2(\lambda) + \hat{\eta}'^2(\lambda))^{3/2}}. \quad (5.16)$$

It is very important to find the corner of L-curve by a practical algorithm. There are several algorithms to find this corner [11, 35], we adopt the most direct method by computing its curvature [17]. In the following theorem we give the maximal curvature of curve  $(\log J(\lambda), \log K(\lambda))$ .

The following theorem is similar to [17, Section 5]. However, our proof method is based on the exactness of trapezoidal rule, rather than the one in [17] is based on singular value decomposition.

**Theorem 5.2** *Adopt conditions of Lemma 5.1. Then the curvature  $\kappa(\lambda)$  of curve  $(\log \rho, \log \eta)$  is given by*

$$\kappa(\lambda) = \frac{\rho\eta}{\eta'} \frac{\lambda\eta'\rho' + \rho\eta' + \lambda^2\eta'^2\eta}{(\lambda^2\eta'^2 + \rho^2)^{3/2}}, \quad (5.17)$$

where  $\rho = J(\lambda)$ ,  $\eta = K(\lambda)$ , respectively.

*Proof.* As we already finish the computation of  $J'(\lambda)$ (see (5.12)), it follows that

$$\rho' = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{2\lambda\ell^{4s}}{(1 + \lambda\ell^{2s})^3} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N^2.$$

From the representation of  $K(\lambda)$  (5.9), then

$$\eta' = - \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{2\ell^{4s}}{(1 + \lambda\ell^{2s})^3} \langle f, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N^2.$$

Note that  $\rho' = -\lambda\eta'$ , thus

$$\rho'' = -\lambda\eta'' - \eta'.$$

Since  $(\log \rho)' = \frac{\rho'}{\rho}$ ,  $(\log \eta)' = \frac{\eta'}{\eta}$ , we have curvature by insert  $\rho, \eta, \eta', \eta''$  into the curvature formula (5.16), we then obtain (5.17).  $\square$

Obviously, the L-curve plot does not depend on any knowledge of noise level, i.e.,  $\|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}$ . However, there are various nonregular results have been established for the L-curve criterion [15, 16, 45].

### 5.4 Generalized Cross-Validation

If the noise level is unknown, one can adopt generalized cross-validation (GCV) [13] to obtain a proper parameter  $\lambda$ . The GCV estimate of  $\lambda$  is the minimizer of  $V(\lambda)$  given by

$$V(\lambda) = \frac{\|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\lambda - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon)\|_2^2}{[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}(\lambda))]^2}, \quad (5.18)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}(\lambda) = \mathbf{W}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A} + \lambda\boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{W}^{1/2}$ , and  $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$  denotes the trace of a matrix.

Although generalized cross-validation is a popular tool for calculating a regularization parameter, there exists difficulties to evaluate the trace of an inverse matrix in  $V(\lambda)$  for large scale problem. Since  $\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}$  is an identity matrix (see (3.3)), we can compute to the trace in  $V(\lambda)$  directly and thus simply it.

**Theorem 5.3** *For the regularized least squares problem (3.1). If  $N = 2L + 1$ , then the generalized cross-validation function  $V(\lambda)$  can be expressed as follows*

$$V(\lambda) = \frac{\sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \left( \frac{\lambda \ell^{2s}}{1+\lambda \ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N \right)^2}{\left[ \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{2\lambda \ell^{2s}}{1+\lambda \ell^{2s}} \right]^2}. \quad (5.19)$$

*Proof.* By direct computing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}(\lambda)) &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} + \lambda \boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W}^{1/2}) \\ &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{I}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I} + \lambda \boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1}) \\ &= 2L + 1 - \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda \ell^{2s})} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{2\lambda \ell^{2s}}{(1 + \lambda \ell^{2s})}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the equivalent form of  $\|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\lambda - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon)\|_2^2$  in the proof of Corollary 5.1, and with above trace, we have (5.19).  $\square$

From (5.19), we could also give the lower and upper bounds for  $V(\lambda)$ .

**Corollary 5.2** *Let  $z_{\min}$  and  $z_{\max}$  be the maximum value and minimum value of  $\langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N$ , respectively. Then*

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\lambda z_{\min}}{1 + \lambda} \right)^2 \leq V(\lambda) \leq \frac{(1 + \lambda)^2 z_{\max}^2}{2\lambda^2}. \quad (5.20)$$

*Proof.* For the bounds of numerator in (5.19), we have

$$2L \left( \frac{\lambda z_{\min}}{1 + \lambda} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=1}^{1+\gamma} \left( \frac{\lambda \ell^{2s}}{1 + \lambda \ell^{2s}} \langle f^\epsilon, Y_{\ell,k} \rangle_N \right)^2 \leq 2L z_{\max}^2.$$

Similarly, we have the estimation of denominator in (5.19),

$$4L \left( \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda} \right)^2 \leq \left[ \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{2\lambda \ell^{2s}}{1 + \lambda \ell^{2s}} \right]^2 \leq 4L,$$

thus we could obtain the estimation (5.20).  $\square$

**Remark 5.3** *In [14], it can be seen that there is no exact value for GCV function with different parameter  $\lambda$ , since this function involves the solution of linear systems (see the inverse matrix in (5.18)). In that case, the authors adopt several iteration algorithms to estimate GCV function. However, thanks to the special properties of trapezoidal rule nodes, we could compute the new GCV function  $V(\lambda)$  (5.19) directly which could reduce the computation costs.*

From our above analyses, similar to L-curve, GCV also does not require the norm of noise level  $\epsilon$ . Of course, there are other parameter choice strategies which dose not require noise level information, e.g., quasi-optimality criterion [41], unfortunately, by a theorem of Bakushinskii [8] the regular result like (5.2) cannot hold for any parameter selection method that is noise level free, which means that these methods are also unstable like L-curve.

**Remark 5.4** *We have to point out that Bakushinskii's result does not imply that the L-curve and GCV will always fail to (5.2). Thus, we verify the efficiency and stability of L-curve and GCV for our regularization problem by numerical experiments instead of theoretical analysis.*



## 5.5 Algorithms

According to above results, we could design corresponding algorithms of these three parameter choice strategies. We set Laplace operator as our regularization operator  $\mathcal{R}_L$ . For contrast, we first find the optimal parameter  $\lambda_{\text{opt}}$  from finite set (5.1). Note that we always fix  $L = (N - 1)/2$  in our algorithms as the degree is not regarded as parameter. Let  $x^*$  be discrete sample vector in  $[-\pi, \pi]$  and  $f^\epsilon$  be corresponding noisy version function.

For Morozov's discrepancy principle, this method requires us to find  $\lambda$  such that the value  $J(\lambda)$  defined by (5.6) satisfies  $J(\lambda) = \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2$ . When the relation of points number and the degree of approximation trigonometric polynomial (3.6) satisfy  $2L + 1 = N$ , this method is regular from Corollary 5.1. To find the zero point of  $J(\lambda) = \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2$ , we just need to compute the value of  $J(\lambda_k)$  until  $F(\lambda_k) = J(\lambda_k) - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2$  become negative.

The algorithm of finding  $\lambda_{\text{mor}}$  is listed in Algorithm.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Calculate parameter  $\lambda_{\text{mor}}$  from  $\mathcal{S}$

---

**Input:**  $x^*$ ,  $f^\epsilon$ , points number  $N$ , penalization parameter  $\beta$ , the cardinal number  $T$  of

parameter set  $\mathcal{S}$ , noise level  $\|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}$ ;

1 Stopping criterion :  $\|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}\alpha_k - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon)\|_{2,t_N}^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2 > 0$  or  $k > T$ ;

2 Initialization : Degree  $L = (N - 1)/2$ ,  $k = 0$ ;

3 **while**  $F_k < 0$  &  $k \leq T$  **do**

4      $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_k \beta^2} \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{f}^\epsilon$ ;

5      $F_k = \|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}\alpha_k - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon)\|_{2,t_N}^2 - \|\epsilon\|_{2,t_N}^2$ ;  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ;

6 **end**

**Output:**  $\lambda_{\text{mor}} = \lambda_k$ .

---

Another strategy is L-curve method, may recommend us to find the maximal curvature of the log-log plot:  $(J(\lambda), K(\lambda))$ . This plot is L shaped, and the maximal curvature is usually called "corner" of this curve. To find this corner, we compute the maximal value of curvature formula  $\kappa(\lambda)$  defined by (5.17). This method does not require concrete noise level and we do not give further assumptions to it, which makes it might fail to some models. Also, since we do not consider any theoretical analysis of this method, we find the maximum value of (5.17) by comparing all parameters in finite set  $\mathcal{S}$ .

The algorithm of finding  $\lambda_{\text{corner}}$  is listed in Algorithm.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Calculate corner of L-curve  $\lambda_{\text{corner}}$  from  $\mathcal{S}$

---

**Input:**  $x^*$ ,  $f^\epsilon$ , points number  $N$ , penalization parameter  $\beta$ , the cardinal number  $T$  of

parameter set  $\mathcal{S}$ .

1 Stopping criterion :  $k > T$ ;

2 Initialization : Degree  $L = (N - 1)/2$ ,  $k = 0$ ;

3 **if**  $k \leq T$  **then**

4      $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_k \beta^2} \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{f}^\epsilon$ ;

5      $\rho_k = \log(\|\mathbf{A}\alpha_k - \mathbf{f}^\epsilon\|_{2,t_N})$

6      $\eta_k = \log(\|\mathbf{A}(\beta\alpha_k)\|_{2,t_N})$

7     Computing  $\kappa_k$  by (5.17)

8      $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ;

9 **end**

**Output:**  $\lambda_{\text{corner}} = \arg \min_{\lambda_k} \kappa_k$ .

---

Without noise information, the GCV estimate is popular for selection of parameter  $\lambda$ , which is also just minimizer of GCV function  $V(\lambda)$ . However, we use the same searching method as L-cure due to the lack of theory support.

The algorithm of finding  $\lambda_{\text{gcv}}$  is listed in Algorithm.

---

**Algorithm 3:** Calculate the minimizer of GCV function  $\lambda_{\text{gcv}}$  from  $\mathcal{S}$

---

**Input:**  $x^*$ ,  $\mathbf{f}^\epsilon$ , points number  $N$ , penalization parameter  $\beta$ , the cardinal number  $T$  of parameter set  $\mathcal{S}$ ;

- 1 Stopping criterion :  $k > T$ ;
- 2 Initialization : Degree  $L = (N - 1)/2$ ,  $k = 0$ ;
- 3 **if**  $k \leq T$  **then**
- 4      $\alpha_k = \frac{\lambda_k \beta^2}{1 + \lambda_k \beta^2} \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{f}^\epsilon$ ;
- 5     Computing  $\text{trace}_k$  by (5.19)
- 6      $v_k = \|\alpha_k\|_2^2 / \text{trace}_k^2$
- 7      $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ;
- 8 **end**

**Output:**  $\lambda_{\text{gcv}} = \arg \min_{\lambda_k} v_k$ .

---

## 6 Numerical experiments

In this section, we report numerical results to illustrate the theoretical results derived above and test the approximation quality of (3.6). There are two testing functions as follows:

periodic entire function [44]

$$f_1(x) = \exp(\cos x),$$

and periodic entire function with high frequency oscillation

$$f_2(x) = \exp(\cos x) + \sin 30x.$$

The level of noise is measured by *signal-to-noise radio (SNR)*, which is defined as the ratio of signal to the noisy data, and is often expressed in decibels (dB). For given clean signal  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$ , we add noise to this data

$$\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{f} + \alpha \epsilon,$$

where  $\alpha$  is a scalar used to yield a predefined SNR,  $\epsilon$  is a vector following Gaussian distribution with mean value 0. Then we give the definition of SNR:

$$\text{SNR} := 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{P_{\text{signal}}}{\alpha P_{\text{noise}}} \right),$$

where  $P_{\text{signal}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N f^2(x_k)}$ ,  $P_{\text{noise}}$  is the standard deviation of  $\epsilon$ . A lower scale of SNR suggests more noisy data. To test the approximation quality, we use equidistant point set  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  to (approximately) determine the  $L_2$  error and uniform error, which is estimated as follows:

$$L_2 \text{ error} \approx \left( \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{j=1}^K (p_{\lambda, L, N}^\beta(x_j) - f(x_j))^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad x_j \in \mathcal{X},$$

$$\text{Uniform error} \approx \max_{j=1, \dots, K} \left| p_{\lambda, L, N}^\beta(x_j) - f(x_j) \right|, \quad x_j \in \mathcal{X}.$$

In all our experiments, we assume that the set of points is the set of equidistant points on  $\mathbb{S}^1$ , and when we choose parameters by three algorithms in Section 5, we keep the relation of points number  $N$  and the degree of approximation trigonometric polynomial (3.6)  $L$  satisfy  $2L + 1 = N$ . On the one hand, we wish fix degree  $L$  so that we could compare these algorithms conveniently. On the other hand, the Morozov's discrepancy principle is regular under the relation  $2L + 1 = N$  from Corollary 5.1.

For each value of  $\lambda$ , we compute the the approximation  $L_2$  error and uniform error using  $p_{\lambda, L, N}^\beta$  from (3.6) for  $f_1(x)$ ,  $f_2(x)$ . We plot these error curves in Figure 1. It is evident that a proper choice of the parameter can significantly improve the approximation quality.

In our second experiment, we tested the approximation quality of  $f_1(x)$  and  $f_2(x)$  by classical trigonometric interpolation and regularized barycentric trigonometric interpolation. We fixed the noise level  $\epsilon = 10$  dB and determined the parameter  $\lambda$  by the Morozov's discrepancy principal. The constant  $\tau$  in (3.10) was set to  $0.1n + 1$ , where  $n$  represents the noise level in dB. Figure 2 shows that regularized barycentric trigonometric interpolation can indeed reduce noise demonstrating greater robustness compared to classical trigonometric interpolation.

Then we present the complete log-log plot of  $(J(\mathcal{S}), K(\mathcal{S}))$  for  $f_1(x)$ ,  $f_2(x)$  with 20 dB noise. Figure 3 illustrates that both plots exhibit an L shaped, with the L-corner of  $f_1(x)$  being more prominent than that of  $f_2(x)$ .

To test the denoising ability of these three parameter choice strategies for different noise levels, we employed the same settings as in the previous experiments and added a decreasing sequence of noise levels from 10 dB to 100 dB with a step of 5 dB to  $f_1(x)$  and  $f_2(x)$ . We semilog the corresponding parameter values  $\lambda_{\text{opt}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{mor}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{corner}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{gcv}}$  respectively. Figure 4 indicates that Morozov's discrepancy principle is regular for both functions, which verifies the conclusion of Corollary 5.1. However, L-curve method and GCV can only work for relative higher noise. In practice, we should avoid using the L-curve method for cases of low noise levels; instead, Morozov's discrepancy principle is stable under those conditions. In summary, we need to choose among these three strategies based on the approximate noise level.

At last, we compare the recovery efficiency of continuous periodic functions using the approximation trigonometric polynomial  $p_{\lambda, L, N}^\beta$  with  $\lambda_{\text{gcv}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{corner}}$  against  $p_{\lambda, L, N}^\beta$  with a randomized parameter  $\lambda_{\text{random}}$ , which follows a normalized distribution on  $(0, 0.1)$ . Note that we do not consider comparing the Morozov's discrepancy, as it requires verifying assumption (5.13) and noise level information, making it typically used for theoretical analysis. To achieve this goal, we selected more general examples from CHEBFUN 5.7.0 [43]. In this tool, the command `cheb.gallerytrig('name')` provides several classical periodic functions, and we chose 'tsunami' as our testing example. For more details about gallery functions, refer to [46]. We added Gaussian white noise at 10 dB to the above function. Figure 5 demonstrates that the approximation scheme (3.6) with parameters  $\lambda_{\text{gcv}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{corner}}$  can effectively recover general continuous periodic functions compared to randomized parameter selection.




Figure 1:  $L_2$  errors (left) and uniform errors (right) as a function of  $\lambda$  for the trigonometric polynomial (3.6) approximation to  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  with  $N = 501$ ,  $L = 250$  and 20 dB noise.




Figure 2:  $L_2$  errors for the trigonometric interpolation and regularized trigonometric interpolation (3.10) approximation to  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  with different interpolation points number  $N$  and 10 dB noise.




Figure 3: L-curve method: log-log plot of  $K(\lambda)$  against  $J(\lambda)$  for  $f_1$ ,  $f_2$  with  $N = 501$ ,  $L = 250$  and 20 dB noise.




Figure 4: Convergence rates of  $\lambda_{\text{opt}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{mor}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{corner}}$  for  $f_1(x)$  and  $f_2(x)$  as noise  $\epsilon$  tent to zero.




Figure 5: Recovery efficiency of gallery periodic function 'tsunami' comes from CHEBFUN with 10 dB Gaussian white noise by approximation scheme  $p_{\lambda,L,N}^\beta$  (3.6) with parameter  $\lambda_{\text{random}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{gcv}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{corner}}$ .

## 7 Concluding remarks

In this paper, an  $\ell_2^2$ -regularized least squares approximation is studied for recovering periodic functions with contaminated data on the unit circle  $\mathbb{S}^1$ . The factor  $1/(1 + \lambda\beta_{\ell,k}^2)$ , which is stated in the explicit solution emphasizes the importance of determining the regularization parameter. A regularized barycentric trigonometric interpolation scheme is proposed under the interpolation condition. It offers an innovative technique for recovering periodic functions from noisy data using trigonometric interpolation. The nodes used in approximation are  $N$ th roots of unity [44] which can formulate a trapezoidal rule. In future study, one may relax the trapezoidal rule by Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund measure [26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. This relaxation makes more nodes could be candidates to construct quadrature rules [5, 28] and then realize approximation.

Based on numerical examples, it is shown that a suitable selection of the regularization parameter  $\lambda$  matching to the type of noise can significantly improve the quality of the approximation. Three well-known techniques are examined for various noise information. It is important to note that since we have the closed-form solution to (3.1), the computation and realization of three parameter choice approaches are more straightforward and effective. The primary benefit of the Morozov’s discrepancy principle is its ability to handle cases with lower noise levels due to its unique regular property; nonetheless, this approach requires particular assumptions and depends on the actual noise level of polluted data prior to use. On the other hand, L-curve and GCV do not require any information about noise level; instead, they are merely based on function data  $f^\epsilon(x_j)$ , albeit they may not work in low noise situations, which is inconsistent with the stability of the Morozov’s discrepancy principle. Hence, we need to select parameter choice strategy skillfully by using practical noise information.

## Acknowledgment

The first author is grateful to Professor Xiaoming Yuan for his helpful comments and suggestions. The first author (C. An) of the research is partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.12371099).

## References

- [1] AN, C., AND CAI, M. Lasso trigonometric polynomial approximation for periodic function recovery in equidistant points. *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 194 (2023), 115–130.
- [2] AN, C., CHEN, X., SLOAN, I. H., AND WOMERSLEY, R. S. Regularized least squares approximations on the sphere using spherical designs. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 50, 3 (2012), 1513–1534.
- [3] AN, C., AND WU, H.-N. Tikhonov regularization for polynomial approximation problems in Gauss quadrature points. *Inverse Problems* 37, 1 (2020), 015008.
- [4] AN, C., AND WU, H.-N. Lasso hyperinterpolation over general regions. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 43, 6 (2021), A3967–A3991.
- [5] AN, C., AND WU, H.-N. On the quadrature exactness in hyperinterpolation. *BIT Numerical Mathematics* 62, 4 (Dec 2022), 1899–1919.
- [6] ARONSZAJN, N. Theory of reproducing kernels. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 68, 3 (1950), 337–404.
- [7] AUSTIN, A. P., AND XU, K. On the numerical stability of the second barycentric formula for trigonometric interpolation in shifted equispaced points. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 37, 3 (08 2016), 1355–1374.
- [8] BAKUSHINSKII, A. Remarks on choosing a regularization parameter using the quasi-optimality and ratio criterion. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics* 24, 4 (1984), 181–182.
- [9] BERRUT, J. P. Baryzentrische formeln zur trigonometrischen interpolation (i). *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik ZAMP* 35, 1 (1984), 91–105.

- [10] BERRUT, J.-P., AND TREFETHEN, L. N. Barycentric Lagrange interpolation. *SIAM Review* 46, 3 (2004), 501–517.
- [11] CULTRERA, A., AND CALLEGARO, L. A simple algorithm to find the L-curve corner in the regularisation of ill-posed inverse problems. *IOP SciNotes* 1, 2 (aug 2020), 025004.
- [12] DEVORE, R., AND LORENTZ, G. *Constructive Approximation*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [13] GOLUB, G. H., HEATH, M., AND WAHBA, G. Generalized cross-validation as a method for choosing a good ridge parameter. *Technometrics* 21, 2 (1979), 215–223.
- [14] GOLUB, G. H., AND VON MATT, U. Generalized cross-validation for large-scale problems. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 6, 1 (1997), 1–34.
- [15] HANKE, M. Limitations of the L-curve method in ill-posed problems. *BIT Numerical Mathematics* 36, 2 (1996), 287–301.
- [16] HANSEN, P. C. Analysis of discrete ill-posed problems by means of the L-curve. *SIAM Review* 34, 4 (1992), 561–580.
- [17] HANSEN, P. C. The L-curve and its use in the numerical treatment of inverse problems. *Computational Inverse Problems in Electrocardiology* 4 (01 2001), 119–142.
- [18] HANSEN, P. C. Regularization tools version 4.0 for matlab 7.3. *Numerical Algorithms* 46, 2 (2007), 189–194.
- [19] HANSEN, P. C., AND O’ LEARY, D. P. The use of the L-curve in the regularization of discrete ill-posed problems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 14, 6 (1993), 1487–1503.
- [20] HENRICI, P. Barycentric formulas for interpolating trigonometric polynomials and their conjugates. *Numerische Mathematik* 33, 2 (1979), 225–234.
- [21] HESSE, K., AND LE GIA, Q. T.  $L_2$  error estimates for polynomial discrete penalized least-squares approximation on the sphere from noisy data. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 408 (2022), 114118.
- [22] HESSE, K., AND SLOAN, I. H. Hyperinterpolation on the sphere. In: *Frontiers in Interpolation and Approximation (Dedicated to the Memory of Ambikeshwar Sharma)* (eds.: N. K. Govil, H. N. Mhaskar, Ram N. Mohapatra, Zuhair Nashed and J. Szabados). *Chapman & Hall/CRC* (2006), 213–248.
- [23] JACKSON, D. *Über die Genauigkeit der Annäherung stetiger Funktionen durch ganze rationale Funktionen gegebenen Grades und trigonometrische summen gegebener Ordnung*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1911.
- [24] K. ATKINSON, W. H. Spherical harmonics and approximations on the unit sphere: An introduction, in: *Lecture notes in mathematics*, vol. 2044, springer, heidelberg, p. x+244.
- [25] LU, S., AND PEREVERZEV, S. *Regularization Theory for Ill-posed Problems: Selected Topics*. Inverse and ill-posed problems series. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Company KG, 2013.
- [26] MHASKAR, H. N. Polynomial operators and local smoothness classes on the unit interval, ii. *Jaen Journal on Approximation Theorem* 1 (2005), 1–25.
- [27] MHASKAR, H. N. A direct approach for function approximation on data defined manifolds. *Neural Networks* 132 (2020), 253–268.
- [28] MHASKAR, H. N., NARCOWICH, F. J., AND WARD, J. D. Spherical Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund inequalities and positive quadrature. *Mathematics of Computation* 70, 235 (2001), 1113–1130.
- [29] MHASKAR, H. N., NAUMOVA, V., AND PEREVERZYEV, S. V. Filtered Legendre expansion method for numerical differentiation at the boundary point with application to blood glucose predictions. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 224 (2013), 835–847.

- [30] MHASKAR, H. N., PEREVERZYEV, S. V., AND VAN DER WALT, M. D. A deep learning approach to diabetic blood glucose prediction. *Frontiers in Applied Mathematics and Statistics* 3 (2017), 14.
- [31] MOROZOV, V. A. On the solution of functional equations by the method of regularization. *Doklady Mathematics* 7 (1966), 414–417.
- [32] NURSULTANOV, E. D. Nikol'skii's inequality for different metrics and properties of the sequence of norms of the Fourier sums of a function in the Lorentz space. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics* 255, 1 (2006), 185–202.
- [33] PEREVERZYEV, S. *An introduction to artificial intelligence based on reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces*. Springer Nature, 2022.
- [34] PEREVERZYEV, S. V., SLOAN, I. H., AND TKACHENKO, P. Parameter choice strategies for least-squares approximation of noisy smooth functions on the sphere. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 53, 2 (2015), 820–835.
- [35] RODRIGUEZ, G., AND THEIS, D. An algorithm for estimating the optimal regularization parameter by the L-curve. *Rendiconti di Matematica, Serie VII* 25 (01 2005), 69–84.
- [36] SALZER, H. E. Coefficients for facilitating trigonometric interpolation. *Journal of Mathematics and Physics* 27 (1948), 274–278.
- [37] SLOAN, I. Polynomial interpolation and hyperinterpolation over general regions. *Journal of Approximation Theory* 83, 2 (1995), 238–254.
- [38] SLOAN, I. H. Polynomial approximation on spheres - generalizing de la Vallée-Poussin. *Computational Methods in Applied Mathematics* 11, 4 (2011), 540–552.
- [39] STEIN, E., AND SHAKARCHI, R. *Fourier Analysis: An Introduction*. Princeton Lectures in Analysis. Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [40] STILSON, T. S., AND SMITH, J. O. Alias-free digital synthesis of classic analog waveforms. In *International Conference on Mathematics and Computing* (1996).
- [41] TIKHONOV, A., AND GLASKO, V. Use of the regularization method in non-linear problems. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics* 5, 3 (1965), 93–107.
- [42] TIKHONOV, A. N., AND ARSENIN, V. J. *Solutions of ill-posed problems*. Winston & Sons, Washington, D.C., 1977.
- [43] TREFETHEN, L. N., ET AL. *Chebfun Version 5.7.0*. Chebfun Development Team, 2017.
- [44] TREFETHEN, L. N., AND WEIDEMAN, J. A. C. The exponentially convergent trapezoidal rule. *SIAM Review* 56, 3 (2014), 385–458.
- [45] VOGEL, AND R, C. Non-convergence of the L-curve regularization parameter selection method. *Inverse Problems* 12, 4 (1996), 535–547.
- [46] WRIGHT, G. B., JAVED, M., MONTANELLI, H., AND TREFETHEN, L. N. Extension of chebfun to periodic functions. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 37, 5 (2015), C554–C573.
- [47] ZYGMUND, A. *Trigonometric Series*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 2002.