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#### Abstract

Let $\left\{e^{i \lambda_{n} t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exponential Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$, for $\lambda_{n} \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\left\{r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be its dual Schauder Basis. Let $A$ be a non-empty subset of the integers containing exactly $M$ elements. We prove that for $\alpha>0$ the weighted system $$
\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}
$$ is exact in the space $L^{2}(0,1)$, that is, it is complete and minimal in $L^{2}(0,1)$, if and only if $$
M-\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha<M+\frac{1}{2} .
$$

We also show that such a system is not a Riesz Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$. In particular, the weighted trigonometric system $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot e^{2 \pi i n t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ is exact in $L^{2}(0,1)$, if and only if $\alpha \in\left[M-\frac{1}{2}, M+\frac{1}{2}\right.$, but it is not a Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$.
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## 1 Introduction and our Result

In [2] Heil and Yoon investigated the properties of systems of weighted exponentials of the form $\left\{g(t) \cdot e^{2 \pi i n t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ where $g \in L^{2}(0,1) \backslash\{0\}$ and $A$ is a non-empty finite subset of the integers containing exactly $M$ elements. Amongst their results, they prove in [2, Theorem 4] that the system

$$
\left\{t^{J} \cdot e^{2 \pi i n t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}
$$

where $J$ is a positive integer, is complete and minimal in $L^{2}(0,1)$ if and only if $J=M$.
They also raise the interesting question [2, page 100] whether similar results hold for the system

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot e^{2 \pi i n t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha$ is a real positive number, not necessarily an integer.
Motivated by the above and the work of Shukurov [6], we provide the following answer: we prove that when the cardinality $|A|$ of the set $A$ is equal to $M$, then the system (1.1) is complete and minimal in $L^{2}(0,1)$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
M-\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha<M+\frac{1}{2} . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We also show that such a complete and minimal system is not a Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$.

Example 1.1. The system $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot e^{2 \pi i n t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ is complete and minimal in $L^{2}(0,1)$ if

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
|A|=1, & \text { and } \\
|A|=2, & \frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha<\frac{3}{2} \\
|A|=3, & \text { and } \\
\mid A & \frac{3}{2} \leq \alpha<\frac{5}{2} \\
\mid A n d & \frac{5}{2} \leq \alpha<\frac{7}{2}
\end{array}
$$

and so on, but no such system is a Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$.
We point out that the condition (1.2) is necessary and sufficient in order for more general systems of the form $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ to be complete and minimal in $L^{2}(0,1)$, where $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the dual Schauder basis for an exponential Schauder basis $\left\{e^{i \lambda_{n} t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ for $L^{2}(0,1)$. That is the content of our result which reads as follows.

Theorem 1.1. Let $\left\{e^{i \lambda_{n} t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exponential Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$, for $\lambda_{n} \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be its Dual Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$. Let $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ so that $|A|=M$ for some positive integer $M$. Then the system

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is complete and minimal in the space $L^{2}(0,1)$, if and only if $\alpha \in\left[M-\frac{1}{2}, M+\frac{1}{2}\right)$.
However, for such values of $\alpha$ the system (1.3) is not a Riesz Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$ and neither a frame. In particular, the weighted trigonometric system $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot e^{2 \pi i n t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ is complete and minimal in the space $L^{2}(0,1)$, if and only if $\alpha \in\left[M-\frac{1}{2}, M+\frac{1}{2}\right)$, but it is not even a Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$.

We point out that under the assumption that the elements of the set $A$ are consecutive integers, the non-basicity of the system (1.1) follows from the work of Kazarian [4, Corollary 1]. In such a case, a complete and minimal system (1.1) is a Markushevich Basis [5, Theorem 1].

Remark 1.1. The proof of Theorem 1.1 depends on the invertibility of Vandermonde matrices.

## 2 Preliminaries

For the terminology presented below, one may consult the books of Young [7], Heil [3], and Christensen [1].
Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space endowed with an inner product $\langle\cdot,$.$\rangle and a norm \|$.$\| . Let$ $F:=\left\{f_{n}\right\}_{n \in J}$ be a countable family of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$ with $J \subset \mathbb{Z}$. We say that $F$ is complete if the closed span of $F$ in $\mathcal{H}$ is equal to $\mathcal{H}$ and we say that $F$ is minimal if each element $f_{n}$ does not belong to the closed span of the remaining vectors of $F$ in $\mathcal{H}$. If $F$ is both complete and minimal then it is called exact. It is known that the minimality of $F$ is equivalent to the existence of a biorthogonal sequence $\left\{g_{n}\right\}_{n \in J}$ in $\mathcal{H}$, that is

$$
\left\langle f_{n}, g_{m}\right\rangle= \begin{cases}1, & n=m \\ 0, & n \neq m\end{cases}
$$

This biorthogonal family $\left\{g_{n}\right\}_{n \in J}$ is unique if $F$ is exact, but $\left\{g_{n}\right\}_{n \in J}$ itself does not have to be exact. If both $F$ and $\left\{g_{n}\right\}_{n \in J}$ are exact, we say that they are Markushevich bases for $\mathcal{H}$.

An exact system $F$ is a Schauder Basis for $\mathcal{H}$, if for any $f \in \mathcal{H}$, there exist unique numbers $d_{f, n}$ so that

$$
f=\sum_{n \in J} d_{f, n} f_{n}
$$

with convergence in the $L^{2}(0,1)$ norm. In this case, the unique biorthogonal family $\left\{g_{n}\right\}_{n \in J}$ is also a Schauder Basis for $\mathcal{H}$, called the dual Schauder basis of $F$, and for any $f \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$
f=\sum_{n \in J}\left\langle f, g_{n}\right\rangle f_{n}=\sum_{n \in J}\left\langle f, f_{n}\right\rangle g_{n}
$$

with convergence in the $L^{2}(0,1)$ norm (3, Theorem 5.12 and Corollary 5.22] and [2, relation (1)]). A Schauder basis may converge conditionally, whereas a Riesz Basis for $\mathcal{H}$ is a bounded Schauder basis that converges unconditionally ( 3 , Theorem 7.11]). We recall that $\left\{f_{n}\right\}_{n \in J}$ is a Riesz basis for $\mathcal{H}$ if $f_{n}=V\left(e_{n}\right)$ for all $n \in J$ where $\left\{e_{n}\right\}_{n \in J}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}$ and $V$ is a bounded bijective operator from $\mathcal{H}$ onto $\mathcal{H}$.

## 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

First we will show that the system (1.3) is complete in $L^{2}(0,1)$ if $\alpha \geq M-\frac{1}{2}$ and then show that it is minimal if $\alpha<M+\frac{1}{2}$. We then prove that for $\alpha \in\left[M-\frac{1}{2}, M+\frac{1}{2}\right.$ ) the exact system (1.3) is not a Riesz basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$, while the exact system (1.1) is not even a Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$.

### 3.1 If $\alpha \geq M-\frac{1}{2}$, the system (1.3) is Complete

Since $\left\{r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the dual Schauder Basis of $\left\{e^{i \lambda_{n} t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ for $L^{2}(0,1)$, then for any $f \in L^{2}(0,1)$ we have

$$
f(t)=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\langle f, r_{n}\right\rangle e^{i \lambda_{n} t}
$$

with the series converging in the $L^{2}(0,1)$ norm.
For notation purposes, let $t_{\alpha}(t):=t^{\alpha}$. Now, if the system (1.3) is not complete in $L^{2}(0,1)$, then there exists a non-zero function $h(t) \in L^{2}(0,1)$ so that

$$
\left\langle h, t_{\alpha} r_{n}\right\rangle=0, \quad \text { for all } \quad n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A .
$$

Since $\left|t^{\alpha}\right| \leq 1$ for $t \in[0,1]$, then $h t_{\alpha}$ belongs to $L^{2}(0,1)$. Combining the above shows that

$$
h(t) \cdot t^{\alpha}=\sum_{n \in A}\left\langle h t_{\alpha}, r_{n}\right\rangle e^{i \lambda_{n} t},
$$

almost everywhere on $[0,1]$, and such that at least one of the coefficients $\left\langle h t_{\alpha}, r_{n}\right\rangle$ for $n \in A$ is not equal to zero.
Rewrite now the set $\left\{\lambda_{i}: i \in A\right\}$ as $\left\{\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}, \ldots, \Lambda_{M}\right\}$ such that $\Lambda_{1}<\Lambda_{2}<\cdots<\Lambda_{M}$. Then

$$
h(t) \cdot t^{\alpha}=\sum_{j=1}^{M} a_{j} e^{i \Lambda_{j} t}, \quad a_{j} \in \mathbb{C} .
$$

The analytic extension to the complex plane of the above right hand side is the entire function

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{\alpha}(z):=\sum_{j=1}^{M} a_{j} e^{i \Lambda_{j} z} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

so $H_{\alpha}(t)=h(t) \cdot t^{\alpha}$ for $t \in[0,1]$. We will prove below that $H_{\alpha}$ cannot vanish $M$ times or more at the point $z=0$. Suppose it does: then

$$
\begin{equation*}
0=H_{\alpha}(0)=H_{\alpha}^{\prime}(0)=H_{\alpha}^{\prime \prime}(0)=\cdots H_{\alpha}^{(M-1)}(0) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $H_{\alpha}^{(k)}(z)$ is the $k^{\text {th }}$ derivative of $H_{\alpha}$ with respect to the variable $z$. From (3.1) and (3.2), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & =a_{1}+a_{2}+a_{3}+a_{4}+\cdots+a_{M} \\
& =a_{1} \cdot \Lambda_{1}+a_{2} \cdot \Lambda_{2}+a_{3} \cdot \Lambda_{3}+a_{4} \cdot \Lambda_{4}+\cdots+a_{M} \cdot \Lambda_{M} \\
& =a_{1} \cdot \Lambda_{1}^{2}+a_{2} \cdot \Lambda_{2}^{2}+a_{3} \cdot \Lambda_{3}^{2}+a_{4} \cdot \Lambda_{4}^{2}+\cdots+a_{M} \cdot \Lambda_{M}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and so on, until the last equation $\left(0=H_{\alpha}^{(M-1)}(0)\right)$

$$
0=a_{1} \cdot \Lambda_{1}^{M-1}+a_{2} \cdot \Lambda_{2}^{M-1}+a_{3} \cdot \Lambda_{3}^{M-1}+a_{4} \cdot \Lambda_{4}^{M-1}+\cdots+a_{M} \cdot \Lambda_{M}^{M-1} .
$$

We can write this system of equations as

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
0
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
\Lambda_{1} & \Lambda_{2} & \Lambda_{3} & \Lambda_{4} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M} \\
\Lambda_{1}^{2} & \Lambda_{2}^{2} & \Lambda_{3}^{2} & \Lambda_{4}^{2} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{2} \\
\Lambda_{1}^{3} & \Lambda_{2}^{3} & \Lambda_{3}^{3} & \Lambda_{4}^{3} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{3} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \\
\Lambda_{1}^{M-1} & \Lambda_{2}^{M-1} & \Lambda_{3}^{M-1} & \Lambda_{4}^{M-1} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{M-1}
\end{array}\right) \cdot\left(\begin{array}{c}
a_{1} \\
a_{2} \\
a_{3} \\
a_{4} \\
\vdots \\
a_{M}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

The above square matrix is an invertible Vandermonde matrix since the $\Lambda_{i}$ 's are all different. Clearly now we have $a_{j}=0$ for all $j=1,2,3, \ldots, M$, thus $H_{\alpha}(z)$ is the Zero function. But $H_{\alpha}(t)=h(t) \cdot t^{\alpha}$ for $t \in[0,1]$, thus $h(t)$ is identically equal to zero, a contradiction. Therefore $H_{\alpha}(z)$ vanishes at the point $z=0$ at most $M-1$ times, hence $H_{\alpha}(z)=z^{k} \cdot g(z)$ for some integer $k$ in the set $\{0,1, \ldots, M-1\}$ and some entire function $g$ such that $g(0) \neq 0$. Since $H_{\alpha}(t)=h(t) \cdot t^{\alpha}$ for $t \in[0,1]$, we have

$$
h(t) \cdot t^{\alpha}=t^{k} \cdot g(t), \quad \text { for some } \quad k \in\{0,1,2, \cdots, M-1\}, \quad g \in C[0,1] \quad g(0) \neq 0 .
$$

Thus

$$
|h(t)|^{2}=|g(t)|^{2} \cdot t^{2 k-2 \alpha}
$$

Since $g(0) \neq 0$, then there are $\epsilon>0$ and $\delta>0$, so that $|g(t)|>\epsilon$ for all $t \in[0, \delta]$. So, for any $0<\rho<\delta$, one has $|h(t)|^{2}>\epsilon^{2} \cdot t^{2 k-2 \alpha}$ for all $t \in[\rho, \delta]$. Therefore,

$$
\int_{\rho}^{\delta}|h(t)|^{2} d t>\epsilon^{2} \cdot \int_{\rho}^{\delta} t^{2 k-2 \alpha} d t .
$$

Since $k \leq M-1$ and $\alpha \geq M-\frac{1}{2}$, then $2 k-2 \alpha \leq-1$ and it follows that

$$
\int_{\rho}^{\delta} t^{2 k-2 \alpha} d t \rightarrow \infty \quad \text { as } \quad \rho \rightarrow 0^{+}
$$

Hence $\int_{0}^{1}|h(t)|^{2} d t=\infty$ which contradicts the assumption that $h \in L^{2}(0,1)$. Therefore, if $\alpha \geq M-\frac{1}{2}$ then the system (1.3) is complete in $L^{2}(0,1)$.

### 3.2 If $\alpha<M+\frac{1}{2}$, the system (1.3) is Minimal

Like before, the set $\left\{\lambda_{i}: i \in A\right\}$ is rewritten as $\left\{\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}, \ldots, \Lambda_{M}\right\}$ such that $\Lambda_{1}<\Lambda_{2}<\cdots<\Lambda_{M}$.
We will show that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A$, there exist real numbers $a_{n, j}$ for $j=1,2, \cdots, M$, so that the entire function

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{n}(z):=e^{i \lambda_{n} z}+a_{n, 1} e^{i \Lambda_{1} z}+a_{n, 2} e^{i \Lambda_{2} z}+\cdots+a_{n, M} e^{i \Lambda_{M} z} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

vanishes at the point $z=0$ at least $M$ times and

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{n}(t)=t^{M} \cdot g_{n}(t) \quad \text { for some continuous function } g_{n} \text { on }[0,1] . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The minimality of (1.3) follows from (3.3) and (3.4). Indeed, from (3.4) we have

$$
\frac{f_{n}(t)}{t^{\alpha}}=\frac{f_{n}(t)}{t^{M}} \cdot \frac{t^{M}}{t^{\alpha}}=g_{n}(t) \cdot \frac{t^{M}}{t^{\alpha}} .
$$

So

$$
\left|\frac{f_{n}(t)}{t^{\alpha}}\right|^{2}=\left|g_{n}(t)\right|^{2} \cdot t^{2 M-2 \alpha} .
$$

Since $g_{n}$ is continuous on $[0,1]$ and $\alpha<M+\frac{1}{2}$, thus $2 M-2 \alpha>-1$, it follows that $f_{n}(t) / t^{\alpha}$ belongs to $L^{2}(0,1)$. Then, for all positive integers $n, m$ which are not in the set $A$, we have

$$
\left\langle\frac{f_{n}}{t_{\alpha}}, t_{\alpha} r_{m}\right\rangle=\int_{0}^{1}\left(e^{i \lambda_{n} t}+a_{n, 1} e^{i \Lambda_{1} t}+a_{n, 2} e^{i \Lambda_{2} t}+\cdots+a_{n, M} e^{i \Lambda_{M} t}\right) \cdot \overline{r_{m}} d t=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
1, & n=m \\
0, & n \neq m
\end{array} .\right.
$$

Thus, the family $\left\{\frac{f_{n}(t)}{t^{\alpha}}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ is biorthogonal to the sequence $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$. This means that the system (1.3) is minimal.

So, it remains to verify the existence of the numbers $a_{n, j}$ so that (3.4) is true. Now, if a trigonometric polynomial $f_{n}$ as in (3.3) vanishes at the point $z=0$ at least $M$ times, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
0=f_{n}(0)=f_{n}^{\prime}(0)=f_{n}^{\prime \prime}(0)=\cdots f_{n}^{(M-1)}(0) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f_{n}^{(k)}(z)$ is the $k^{t h}$ derivative of $f_{n}$ with respect to $z$. From (3.3) and (3.5) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & =1+a_{n, 1}+a_{n, 2}+a_{n, 3}+\cdots+a_{n, M} \\
& =\lambda_{n}+a_{n, 1} \cdot \Lambda_{1}+a_{n, 2} \cdot \Lambda_{2}+a_{n, 3} \cdot \Lambda_{3}+\cdots+a_{n, M} \cdot \Lambda_{M} \\
& =\lambda_{n}^{2}+a_{n, 1} \cdot \Lambda_{1}^{2}+a_{n, 2} \cdot \Lambda_{2}^{2}+a_{n, 3} \cdot \Lambda_{3}^{2}+\cdots+a_{n, M} \cdot \Lambda_{M}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and so on, until the last equation $\left(0=f_{n}^{(M-1)}(0)\right)$

$$
0=\lambda_{n}^{M-1}+a_{n, 1} \cdot \Lambda_{1}^{M-1}+a_{n, 2} \cdot \Lambda_{2}^{M-1}+a_{n, 3} \cdot \Lambda_{3}^{M-1}+\cdots+a_{n, M} \cdot \Lambda_{M}^{M-1}
$$

We rewrite this system of equations as

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
-1  \tag{3.6}\\
-\lambda_{n} \\
-\lambda_{n}^{2} \\
\vdots \\
-\lambda_{n}^{M-1}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
\Lambda_{1} & \Lambda_{2} & \Lambda_{3} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M} \\
\Lambda_{1}^{2} & \Lambda_{2}^{2} & \Lambda_{3}^{2} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\Lambda_{1}^{M-1} & \Lambda_{2}^{M-1} & \Lambda_{3}^{M-1} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{M-1}
\end{array}\right) \cdot\left(\begin{array}{c}
a_{n, 1} \\
a_{n, 2} \\
a_{n, 3} \\
\vdots \\
a_{n, M}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Since the $\Lambda_{i}$ 's are all different, then the above square Vandermonde matrix is invertible. Therefore, real numbers $a_{n, j}, j=1,2, \cdots, M$ do exist so that $f_{n}$ vanishes at $z=0$ at least $M$ times. Thus

$$
f_{n}(z)=z^{M} \cdot g_{n}(z) \quad \text { for some entire function } g_{n}(z)
$$

hence (3.4) holds.

### 3.3 The system (1.3) is Exact if and only if $M-\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha<M+\frac{1}{2}$

If $\alpha \in\left[M-\frac{1}{2}, M+\frac{1}{2}\right)$, then the system (1.3) is both complete and minimal in $L^{2}(0,1)$, hence it is exact.

Assume now that the system (1.3) is exact: we will show that $\alpha \in\left[M-\frac{1}{2}, M+\frac{1}{2}\right)$.
Suppose first that it is exact but $\alpha<M-\frac{1}{2}$, say $M-\frac{3}{2} \leq \alpha<M-\frac{1}{2}$. Then, if $B \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that $B=A \backslash\{\tau\}$ where $\tau$ is an integer not in the set $A$, then the cardinality of $B$ equals $M-1$. Hence the system $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash B}$ is exact. So the system $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ will have excess equal to -1 instead of zero. Similarly for other positive values of $\alpha$ when $\alpha<M-\frac{3}{2}$. So $\alpha$ cannot be less than $M-\frac{1}{2}$. Suppose now that it is exact but $\alpha \geq M+\frac{1}{2}$, say $M+\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha<M+\frac{3}{2}$. Then, if $C \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that $C=A \cup\{\tau\}$ where $\tau$ is an integer not in the set $A$, then the cardinality of $C$ equals $M+1$. Hence the system $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash C}$ is exact. So the system $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ will have excess equal to +1 instead of zero. Similarly for other positive values of $\alpha$ when $\alpha \geq M+\frac{3}{2}$. So $\alpha$ cannot be greater than or equal to $M+\frac{1}{2}$.
In this way we conclude that if the system (1.3) is exact, then $\alpha \in\left[M-\frac{1}{2}, M+\frac{1}{2}\right)$.

### 3.4 The exact system (1.3) is not a Riesz Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$

Suppose that for $\alpha \in\left[M-\frac{1}{2}, M+\frac{1}{2}\right)$ the exact system $\left\{t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{n}(t)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ is a Riesz Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$ and hence a Schauder Basis as well. Let $f_{n}$ be as in (3.3): since the family $\left\{f_{n} / t_{\alpha}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ is biorthogonal
to the Schauder Basis (1.3), then $\left\{f_{n} / t_{\alpha}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}$ is the dual Schauder basis, hence for any $f \in L^{2}(0,1)$, we have

$$
f(t)=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}\left\langle f, \frac{f_{n}}{t_{\alpha}}\right\rangle \cdot t^{\alpha} r_{n}(t)
$$

with convergence in the $L^{2}(0,1)$ norm. This implies that $\left|\left\langle f, \frac{f_{n}}{t_{\alpha}}\right\rangle\right| \cdot\left\|t_{\alpha} r_{n}\right\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
In particular, for each integer $m$ belonging to the set $A$ which has been excluded from $\mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
t^{\alpha} \cdot r_{m}(t)=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A}\left\langle t_{\alpha} r_{m}, \frac{f_{n}}{t_{\alpha}}\right\rangle \cdot t^{\alpha} r_{n}(t) \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

with convergence in the $L^{2}(0,1)$ norm. Fix such an $m \in A$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left\langle t_{\alpha} r_{m}, \frac{f_{n}}{t_{\alpha}}\right\rangle\right| \cdot\left\|t_{\alpha} r_{n}\right\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty . \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In (3.3) we have for every $n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A, f_{n}(t)=e^{i \lambda_{n} t}+a_{n, 1} e^{i \Lambda_{1} t}+a_{n, 2} e^{i \Lambda_{2} t}+\cdots+a_{n, M} e^{i \Lambda_{M} t}$. Since $m \in A$ and $\left\{\lambda_{i}: i \in A\right\}$ is rewritten as $\left\{\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}, \ldots, \Lambda_{M}\right\}$ such that $\Lambda_{1}<\Lambda_{2}<\cdots<\Lambda_{M}$, then $\lambda_{m}=\Lambda_{j}$ for some $j \in\{1,2, \cdots, M\}$, and $e^{i \lambda_{m} t}=e^{i \Lambda_{j} t}$. Since the family $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is biorthogonal to the family $\left\{e^{i \lambda_{n} t}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, we get

$$
\left\langle t_{\alpha} r_{m}, \frac{f_{n}}{t_{\alpha}}\right\rangle=\overline{a_{n, j}} \quad \text { for all } \quad n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A \text {. }
$$

Replacing into (3.8) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|a_{n, j}\right| \cdot\left\|t_{\alpha} r_{n}\right\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty . \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, if the system (1.3) is a Riesz basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$, then there are positive constants $p$ and $q$ so that $p<\left\|t_{\alpha} r_{n}\right\|<q$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A$ ([1, Lemma 3.6.9]). We will show that there is a positive number $\delta$, independent of $n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A$ and $j \in\{1,2, \ldots, M\}$, so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta \cdot\left|\lambda_{n}\right|^{M-1} \leq\left|a_{n, j}\right| \quad \text { finally for all } n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A, \quad \text { and } \quad j \in\{1,2, \ldots, M\} . \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

But then, combining the above with $p<\left\|t_{\alpha} r_{n}\right\|<q$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A$, gives

$$
p \cdot \delta \cdot\left|\lambda_{n}\right|^{M-1} \leq\left|a_{n, j}\right| \cdot\left\|\mid t_{\alpha} r_{n}\right\| \quad \text { for all } n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A, \quad \text { and } \quad j \in\{1,2, \ldots, M\}
$$

However, $M-1 \geq 0$ and $\left|\lambda_{n}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, thus the above shows that (3.9) is not true. Hence the exact system (1.3) is not a Riesz Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$.
So it remains to verify (3.10). Returning to the relation (3.6), consider the invertible Vandermonde matrix

$$
\Lambda:=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
\Lambda_{1} & \Lambda_{2} & \Lambda_{3} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M} \\
\Lambda_{1}^{2} & \Lambda_{2}^{2} & \Lambda_{3}^{2} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\Lambda_{1}^{M-1} & \Lambda_{2}^{M-1} & \Lambda_{3}^{M-1} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{M-1}
\end{array}\right)
$$

and denote by $\Lambda^{-1}, \operatorname{det}(\Lambda)$, and $\operatorname{adj}(\Lambda)$, the inverse, determinant and adjoint of $\Lambda$ respectively. Then we have

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
-1 \\
-\lambda_{n} \\
-\lambda_{n}^{2} \\
\vdots \\
-\lambda_{n}^{M-1}
\end{array}\right)=\Lambda \cdot\left(\begin{array}{c}
a_{n, 1} \\
a_{n, 2} \\
a_{n, 3} \\
\vdots \\
a_{n, M}
\end{array}\right)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\begin{array}{c}
a_{n, 1} \\
a_{n, 2} \\
a_{n, 3} \\
\vdots \\
a_{n, M}
\end{array}\right) & =\Lambda^{-1} \cdot\left(\begin{array}{c}
-1 \\
-\lambda_{n} \\
-\lambda_{n}^{2} \\
\vdots \\
-\lambda_{n}^{M-1}
\end{array}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{\operatorname{det}(\Lambda)} \cdot \operatorname{adj}(\Lambda) \cdot\left(\begin{array}{c}
-1 \\
-\lambda_{n} \\
-\lambda_{n}^{2} \\
\vdots \\
-\lambda_{n}^{M-1}
\end{array}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We now claim that all the entries of the far right column of $\operatorname{adj}(\Lambda)$ are non-zero real numbers. So we need to check for the cofactors of the entries of the bottom row of $\Lambda$. For example, for the entry $\Lambda_{2}^{M-1}$, its cofactor is equal to $(-1)^{2+M}$ times the determinant of the matrix that remains when we delete the second column and the last row. That matrix is

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
\Lambda_{1} & \Lambda_{3} & \Lambda_{4} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M} \\
\Lambda_{1}^{2} & \Lambda_{3}^{2} & \Lambda_{4}^{2} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \\
\Lambda_{1}^{M-2} & \Lambda_{3}^{M-2} & \Lambda_{4}^{M-2} & \cdots & \Lambda_{M}^{M-2}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Clearly this is again an invertible Vandermonde matrix. The same is true for the cofactors of the other elements of the last row of $\Lambda$, thus we conclude that all the entries of the far right column of $\operatorname{adj}(\Lambda)$ are non-zero real numbers. This means that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash A$ and all $j=1,2, \ldots, M$, we have

$$
a_{n, j}=\sum_{k=1}^{M-1} c_{j, k}\left(-\lambda_{n}\right)^{k-1}+c_{j, M}\left(-\lambda_{n}\right)^{M-1}
$$

where all the $c_{j, k}$ are real numbers, and especially $c_{j, M} \neq 0$ for all $j=1,2, \ldots, M$. This implies the existence of some positive $\delta$ so that (3.10) holds.

### 3.5 The exact system (1.1) is not a Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$

If the exponential Schauder basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$ is the family $\left\{e^{i 2 \pi n t}\right\}_{n \mathbb{Z}}$, then its dual Schauder basis is the same family, thus $r_{n}=e^{i 2 \pi n t}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In this case, we have $\left\|t_{\alpha} r_{n}\right\|=1$, thus (3.9) becomes

$$
\left|a_{n, j}\right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty
$$

Clearly this is false due to (3.10), therefore the exact system (1.1) is not a Schauder Basis for $L^{2}(0,1)$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is now finished.
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