

CONVOLUTIONAL DYNAMICAL SAMPLING AND SOME NEW RESULTS

LONGXIU HUANG, A. MARTINA NEUMAN, SUI TANG, AND YUYING XIE

ABSTRACT. In this work, we explore the dynamical sampling problem on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ driven by a convolution operator defined by a convolution kernel. This problem is inspired by the need to recover a bandlimited heat diffusion field from space-time samples and its discrete analogue. In this book chapter, we review recent results in the finite-dimensional case and extend these findings to the infinite-dimensional case, focusing on the study of the density of space-time sampling sets.

1. INTRODUCTION

Dynamical sampling, inspired by the works of [27, 26], operates on the principle that spatial sampling limitations can be offset by utilizing temporal evolution during data recovery [3]. The time-dependent characteristics of signal evolution, driven by an external force, enhance the quality of the collected samples [23], distinguishing dynamical sampling from traditional static methods [13, 32, 28]. This suggests that a space-time trade-off is practical in many industrial settings where the limited availability of sampling devices can be compensated by their increased use, especially where cost or space constraints exist. The relevant works include the mobile sampling method developed in [36, 20, 35, 38, 24], which applies the space-time trade-off principle in time-varying bandlimited fields. In these methods, mobile sensors move along continuous paths through space, taking measurements along their trajectories. And wireless sensor networks represent a key application of this concept [22, 27, 30, 29, 31].

The mathematical framework of dynamical sampling has been thoroughly developed in recent literature and is divided into two main categories. The first category addresses the characterization of feasible space-time samples that can enable recovery by linking the spectral properties of driving operators with sampling locations. Initial results in this area were developed for convolution-driven operators in discrete time scenarios [3, 4, 1], with a complete characterization of the universal sampling set presented in [33]. A general framework for bounded linear operators was subsequently established [2, 12], which included extensions to phaseless sampling [9, 11], random sampling with low-rank constraints [23, 37], and continuous-time sampling [7, 5]. A comprehensive survey on this topic is available in [15]. The second category focuses on recovering driving operators from space-time samples. This includes methods for convolution operators and their generalization [8, 33, 6] to the general matrix case using Prony-type methods and their stabilized variants [14]. More recent studies [25] have employed a lifting technique by transforming the problem into a low-rank block Hankel matrix completion challenge.

A central challenge in dynamical sampling is how to choose space-time sampling locations so that the recovery process is stable. Although a general tool via spectral theory has been developed, more refined results are greatly anticipated, particularly in connecting the density theorem for classical sampling problems with dynamical sampling. Given that convolution underpins the physics of diffusion processes, many researchers have focused on temporal evolution driven by a convolution operator. A recurring theme is that simple sampling across a discrete subgroup may be inadequate for signal reconstruction. Instead, a careful balance

between sampling density and kernel profile is necessary for effective sampling. For instance, [4] introduced a convolution kernel construction that renders spatiotemporal sampling on a proper subgroup $m\mathbb{Z}$ of \mathbb{Z} unstable when $m \geq 2$, necessitating additional initial sampling. Similarly, [34] determined the necessary extra sample size for effective sampling on any subgroup of a finite Abelian group \mathbb{Z}_N , and [1] applied a similar approach to multidimensional torsion groups. These studies emphasize the critical interplay between the convolution kernel and sampling density, a dynamic also highlighted in [5] in the continuous domain, where the heat kernel profile dictates density thresholds on \mathbb{R} . Motivated by these insights, our study examines the intricate relationship between stability, spatial sampling density, and kernel profile during an evolution process on \mathbb{Z} , and explores the inherent nature of this stability. To begin, we formulate our problem as follows.

1.1. Problem statement. In dynamical sampling, data are collected repeatedly over time from the fixed spatial locations. This sampled data is represented by:

$$S(f) = \{\langle A^s f, g \rangle : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in T\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $f \in \mathcal{H}$ is the initial signal, A is the driving operator, $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ denotes the set of spatial locations, and T represents the sampling times. The goal of the dynamical sampling problem is to derive necessary and/or sufficient conditions that involve the driving operator A , the spatial set \mathcal{G} , and the sampling time set T , ensuring that the sampling set $S(f)$ sufficiently (and stably) reconstructs the initial signal f .

In this study, we focus on the scenario where $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \{e_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ the standard basis for $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, $T \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, and A is a convolution operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ characterized by the kernel $a = \{a(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$. This setting leads us to formulate the following question:

Question 1.1. *Under what conditions on the spatial set \mathcal{G} and the driving operator A , represented by the kernel a , should the sampling set*

$$S(f) = \{\langle A^s f, g \rangle : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in T\} \quad (1.2)$$

be sufficient for one to (stably) recover the initial state f ?

Due to the relationship between A and its adjoint A^* , Question 1.1 is equivalent to the question of under what condition(s) on \mathcal{G} the set $\{(A^*)^s g : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in \mathbb{T}\}$ is complete or forms a frame for $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. To simplify notation, we focus on answering the following question throughout this work.

Question 1.2. *Under what condition(s) on $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \{e_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and the driving convolution operator A , does the set*

$$\Omega = \{A^s g : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in T\} \quad (1.3)$$

form a complete set or a frame for $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$?

1.2. Review on Finite Dimensional Case. The finite dimensional version of Question 1.2 was studied in [3, 1], where the sampling set is a sub-lattice of \mathbb{Z}^d and their cosets. The major tool used in these studies is the Poisson summation formula, which transforms the sampling problem into a linear system. Analysis of the null space of the corresponding system allows for the construction of stable sampling sets. This approach was fully developed in [34], where universal sampling sets for a class of convolution operators were determined based on their eigenvalues and symmetric properties.

The dynamical sampling problem in the infinite dimensional case is more challenging [4, 2]. Although some results exist when the driving operators are self-adjoint (or more generally,

normal operators), convolution operators deserve special attention since more refined results are possible for them.

1.3. Contributions and organizations. The objective of this study is to analyze the interplay between the sampling set \mathcal{G} and the driving operator A to determine whether the set Ω defined in (1.3) can form a complete or frame set for $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. Our first result, summarized in Theorem 1, demonstrates that \mathcal{G} must be infinite to ensure Ω forms a frame for $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. This finding parallels the case where A is a bounded self-adjoint operator, as studied in [7]. Further details are provided in Section 3.

We then examine a sampling set \mathcal{G} of a sub-lattice form, specifically $\mathcal{G} = \{e_k : k \in \Lambda\}$ with $\Lambda = \{mj + c : j \in \mathbb{Z}, c = 0, 1, \dots, L - 1\}$ for some $m \geq 2$ and $1 \leq L \leq m$, referring to non-uniform periodic sampling in the literature. In this setup, we provide a characterization of the relationship among L , m , and the kernel a necessary for Ω to be complete in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. Our result builds upon findings in the finite-dimensional case (see [1, 34]). Specifically, we demonstrate the equivalence of completeness and the frame property of Ω in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ when the kernel $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ and $L = 1$, which is non-trivial in the infinite-dimensional case. More details can be found in Section 4.

Finally, we present a result characterizing the sampling density of Λ required for stable sampling and reveal how it depends on the convolution kernel a . We show that the maximal gap between spatial samples cannot be arbitrarily large. This investigation draws inspiration from [5], which studied continuous-time heat diffusion in a bandlimited space, as described in (1.1). For more detailed results, refer to Section 5.

2. PRELIMINARY AND NOTATION

Throughout this paper, the symbol $[N]$ denotes the set of integers $\{0, 1, \dots, N - 1\}$. We employ the notation $|\cdot|$ in multiple ways: it can indicate the absolute value of a scalar, the cardinality of a set, or the length of an interval, depending on the context. This work focuses on the Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, equipped with the inner product defined as: $\langle f, g \rangle := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f(k) \overline{g(k)}$. The convolution operator $A : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, which employs a kernel $a = \{a(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$, is defined by:

$$A(f)(j) := (a * f)(j) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a(k) f(j - k), \text{ for } f \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (2.1)$$

Successive applications of A produce a series evolution of f , expressed as:

$$A^s f = \underbrace{(a * \dots * a)}_{s \text{ times}} * f =: a^{(s)} * f, \quad (2.2)$$

where $s \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. To assist the reader, we will introduce some fundamental concepts below that are pivotal to our analysis. The Fourier transform plays a central role in our analysis, particularly the one on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

Definition 1 (Fourier transformation). *The Fourier transform on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, denoted by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, is defined as:*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}(f)(\omega) = \hat{f}(\omega) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f(k) e^{-i2\pi k\omega} \in L^2(\mathbb{T}). \quad (2.3)$$

For instance, if $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$, then \hat{a} belongs to $C(\mathbb{T})$ and is also a subset of $L^2(\mathbb{T})$. Its inverse Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-1}$, operating on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$, is given by:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-1}(g)(k) = \check{g}(k) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(\omega) e^{i2\pi k\omega} d\omega \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}).$$

Example 2.1. Let $g \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ be defined by

$$g(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & n = 0 \\ \frac{2 \sin(n\pi/2)}{n\pi}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

then we have

$$\hat{g}(\omega) = \begin{cases} 0, & \omega \in [-1/2, -1/4) \cup (1/4, 1/2] \\ 1/2, & \omega = \pm 1/4 \\ 1, & \omega \in (-1/4, 1/4) \end{cases}.$$

The cyclic group \mathbb{T} is identified with either $[0, 1)$ or $[-1/2, 1/2)$, as context dictates. The inner product on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ is defined as:

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\omega) \overline{g(\omega)} d\omega, \text{ for } f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{T}).$$

Definition 2 (Banach density). Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$.

$$\bar{d}(\Lambda) := \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \sup_K \frac{|\{\lambda \in [K-l, K+l] \cap \Lambda\}|}{2l} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\text{and } \underline{d}(\Lambda) := \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \inf_K \frac{|\{\lambda \in [K-l, K+l] \cap \Lambda\}|}{2l} \quad (2.5)$$

are called the upper and lower Banach densities of Λ , respectively. Moreover, if $\bar{d}(\Lambda) = \underline{d}(\Lambda)$, we say that Λ has a Banach density $d(\Lambda) := \bar{d}(\Lambda) = \underline{d}(\Lambda)$.

For example, if $\Lambda = m\mathbb{Z}$, then $d(\Lambda) = 1/m$, and if $|\Lambda| < \infty$, then $d(\Lambda) = 0$.

Definition 3 (Frame set). A frame $\{\phi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ in a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is a sequence of vectors satisfying the frame condition:

$$c\|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\langle f, \phi_n \rangle|^2 \leq C\|f\|^2, \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (2.6)$$

for some positive constants $c, C > 0$. The constants c and C are called the lower and upper frame bounds respectively, or the frame constants.

2.1. Preliminaries for operators. The complex vector space of all bounded linear operators on a generic separable complex Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, and the set of all bounded normal linear operators on \mathcal{H} is denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H})$, defined as:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H}) := \{B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) : BB^* = B^*B\}.$$

An example of such a bounded normal linear operator is $A : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ in (2.1), and its adjoint $A^* : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, which is another convolution operator with kernel $\bar{a} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$.

Definition 4. (Operator norm) Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|$. The operator norm for $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as

$$\|B\|_{op} := \sup_{0 < \|f\| \leq 1; f \in \mathcal{H}} \|B(f)\|.$$

If A satisfies (2.1), we also have [16]

$$\|A\|_{op} = \sup\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \text{spec}(A)\} = \|A^*\|_{op},$$

where $\text{spec}(A) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \lambda \cdot \text{id} - A \text{ is not invertible}\}$ denotes the spectrum of A with id being the identity operator. Similarly, if $B : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is a convolution operator with kernel $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, then we interpret $B^t : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$, $t \geq 0$, as

$$\mathcal{F}(B^t f) := (\mathcal{F}b)^t(\mathcal{F}f) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

To ensure that \hat{a}^t and $(\mathcal{F}b)^t$ are well-defined, we assume additionally that

$$\text{range}(\hat{a}), \text{range}(\mathcal{F}b) \subset \mathbb{C} - \{x + i \cdot 0 : x < 0\} =: R,$$

since if $\lambda \in R$ and $t \geq 0$, then $\lambda^t = \exp(t \cdot \text{Log}(\lambda))$ where $\text{Log} : R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the principal logarithm function [18].

Definition 5 (Norm of function on high dimensional tori). *Let $I \subset \mathbb{T} := [0, 1)$ be a set of positive measure. Let $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_m) \in (L^2(I))^m$, i.e., $z_j \in L^2(I)$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. The norm of \mathbf{z} is defined as*

$$\|\mathbf{z}\|^2 := \sum_{j=1}^m \|z_j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2. \quad (2.7)$$

We now present two existing results that will be useful in our analysis. The first is a proposition that imposes a restriction on the spectral topology of a normal operator.

Proposition 2.1 ([10]). *If $B \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$, $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ with $|\mathcal{G}| < \infty$, and the system $\{B^s g : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ satisfies the lower frame bound¹, then B is unitarily equivalent to an operator*

$$\sum_j \lambda_j P_j \quad \text{where} \quad |\lambda_j| < 1,$$

and P_j are orthogonal projections such that $\dim(P_j) \leq |\mathcal{G}|$.

The second result is a lemma on the operator norm on a high-dimensional torus (see Definition 5).

Lemma 2.2 ([21]). *Suppose $\mathcal{A} : (L^2(\mathbb{T}))^l \rightarrow (L^2(\mathbb{T}))^n$ is defined by $(\mathcal{A}x)(\omega) = M(\omega)x(\omega)$, where the map $\omega \mapsto M(\omega)$ from \mathbb{T} to the space of $n \times l$ matrices \mathcal{M}^{nl} is measurable. Then*

$$\|\mathcal{A}\|_{op} = \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \|M(\omega)\|_{op}.$$

3. CARDINALITY CHARACTERIZATION ON \mathcal{G} FOR FRAME CONDITIONS

In this section, our primary aim is to conduct a rigorous analysis of the cardinality of the set \mathcal{G} to verify the frame conditions stated in (1.3). Our specific objective is to establish that the set $\{A^s g : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ cannot be a frame system for $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ when the cardinality $|\mathcal{G}|$ is finite, irrespective of the properties of the convolution kernel a .

Theorem 3.1. *Let A be defined as in (2.1) and consider $\mathcal{G} \subset \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. If the set $\{A^s g : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ satisfies the lower frame bound (see (2.6)):*

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{N}_0} |\langle A^s g, f \rangle|^2 \geq c \|f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 \quad (3.1)$$

with a positive constant c , then the cardinality of \mathcal{G} must be infinite.

¹The proof of this proposition, [10, Corollary 1], only uses the the lower frame bound property.

Proof. Since the Fourier transformation on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ is a unitary transformation from $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ to $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A(f)) = \hat{a}\hat{f} =: M_{\hat{a}}\hat{f}$, one has

$$\text{spec}(A) = \text{spec}(M_{\hat{a}}) = \text{range}(\hat{a}). \quad (3.2)$$

Suppose that $|\mathcal{G}| < \infty$. Since $A \in \mathcal{N}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}))$ and $\{A^s g : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ satisfies the lower frame bound, according to Proposition 2.1 by setting $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ and $B = A$, $\text{range}(\hat{a})$ must be a countable set, and

$$\hat{a}(\xi) = \sum_j \lambda_j \chi_{E_j}(\xi), \quad (3.3)$$

where $|\lambda_j| < 1$ and E_j 's are a.e. disjoint Borel subsets of \mathbb{T} . From (3.3), one can say that A is unitarily equivalent to a diagonal operator

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}} A \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-1} = M_{\hat{a}} = \sum_j \lambda_j P_j$$

through the Fourier transform with $P_j f := f \chi_{E_j}$ for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$. Again by Proposition 2.1, we also have $\dim(P_j) \leq |\mathcal{G}| < \infty$. Since the measure of \mathbb{T} equals 1, thus some of E_j has positive measure. Hence we have $\dim(L^2(E_j)) = \infty$ for some j , which contradict with that $\dim(P_j) = \dim(L^2(E_j)) < \infty$ for all j . Therefore, we have $|\mathcal{G}| = \infty$. \square

Remark 1. *The lower frame bound property remains unobtainable even when we take the iterative power in (3.1) continuously. Specifically, if*

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \int_0^T |\langle A^t g, f \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}|^2 dt \geq c \|f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 \text{ for all } f \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \text{ and } T < \infty$$

holds for some $c > 0$, then $\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g\|^2 = \infty$. Here², $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A^t f) := \hat{a}^t \hat{f}$ for A . in (2.1). A proof of this fact is a simple adaptation of that of [7, Lemma 5.2].

Given the results above, the following corollary can be readily derived.

Corollary 3.2. *Let A be defined as in (2.1) and consider $\mathcal{G} \subset \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. The set $\{A^s g : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ is a frame set in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, then the cardinality of \mathcal{G} must be infinite.*

4. STRUCTURAL SAMPLING: SUB-LATTICE SAMPLING

In Section 3, Theorem 3.1 establishes that the frame system $\{A^s g : g \in \mathcal{G}, s \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ is only possible in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ if $|\mathcal{G}| = \infty$. In this section, our focus is on sub-lattice sampling, where the sampling set Ω is of the following form:

$$\Omega = \{A^s e_k : k \in \Lambda \text{ and } s \in [N]\}, \quad (4.1)$$

with $\Lambda = \{mj + c : j \in \mathbb{Z}, c = 0, 1, \dots, L-1\}$, where m and L are some positive integers with $m \geq 2$, and the convolution operator A is defined by the kernel $a = (a(k))_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$. In the context of this sub-lattice sampling setting, we present the following key result that generalizes the finite dimensional result (see Theorem 2.12 in [34]).

Theorem 4.1. *Let A be defined as in (2.1) with $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$. If Ω in (4.1) is complete in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, then*

$$L \geq \mathfrak{N}(t, \omega) := \left| \left\{ j : \hat{a} \left(\frac{\omega + j}{m} \right) = t \right\} \right|, \quad (4.2)$$

for all $t \in \text{range}(\hat{a})$, a.e. $\omega \in [0, 1)$, and $NL \geq m$.

²For a more precise definition of a fractional power of an operator, please refer to [7].

Proof. First of all, let's introduce these notations: set $\Lambda := m\mathbb{Z} + \mathcal{E} := m\mathbb{Z} + \{0, \dots, L-1\}$, $e(t) := e^{-i2\pi t}$, and $\tau_c g(x) := g(x+c)$. The assumption that Ω in (4.1) is complete in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ implies that

$$\langle f, A^s e_\lambda \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} = (A^{*s} f)(\lambda) = 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Lambda, s \in [N] \text{ iff } f \equiv 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Applying the Fourier transform and the Poisson summation formula on (4.3) with each fixed pair of (c, s) , we get

$$\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega) \text{diag}(\mathbf{u}_c) \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\omega) = m \cdot e\left(-\frac{c\omega}{m}\right) \mathbf{y}_c(\omega), \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega) := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\hat{a}(\frac{\omega}{m})} & \frac{1}{\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+1}{m})} & \cdots & \frac{1}{\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+m-1}{m})} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{\hat{a}(\frac{\omega}{m})^{N-1}} & \frac{1}{\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+1}{m})^{N-1}} & \cdots & \frac{1}{\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+m-1}{m})^{N-1}} \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{u}_c := \begin{pmatrix} e(\frac{c}{m}) \\ \vdots \\ e(\frac{c(m-1)}{m}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_c(\omega) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}(S_m \tau_c f)(\omega) \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}(S_m \tau_c (A^*)^{N-1} f)(\omega) \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\omega) := \begin{pmatrix} \hat{f}(\frac{\omega}{m}) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{f}(\frac{\omega+m-1}{m}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, (4.3) is equivalent to

$$\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega) \text{diag}(\mathbf{u}_c) \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\omega) = 0 \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ a.e. } \omega \in \mathbb{T} \text{ iff } \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\omega) = 0 \text{ a.e. } \omega \in \mathbb{T}.$$

This implies that $\bigcap_{c \in \mathcal{E}} \ker(\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega) \text{diag}(\mathbf{u}_c)) = \{0\}$, which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}} (\ker(\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega) \text{diag}(\mathbf{u}_c)))^\perp = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}} \text{diag}^*(\mathbf{u}_c) \ker(\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega))^\perp = \mathbb{C}^m \quad (4.6)$$

for a.e. $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$. In order to prove (4.6), set

$$S_{t,\omega} = \left\{ j+1 : \hat{a}\left(\frac{\omega+j}{m}\right) = t \text{ and } j \in [m] \right\}.$$

For fixed t, ω with $S_{t,\omega} \neq \emptyset$, $1_{S_{t,\omega}} \in \ker(\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega))^\perp$, where $1_{S_{t,\omega}}(i) = \begin{cases} 0, & i \notin S_{t,\omega} \\ 1, & i \in S_{t,\omega} \end{cases}$.

Notice that for each fixed ω , only a finite number of t will result in $S_{t,\omega} \neq \emptyset$. Let us enumerate them as $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{l_\omega}$ and denote the corresponding vectors in $\ker(\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega))^\perp$ as $1_{S_{t_0,\omega}}, 1_{S_{t_1,\omega}}, \dots, 1_{S_{t_{l_\omega},\omega}}$.

One can see that $1_{S_{t_0,\omega}}, 1_{S_{t_1,\omega}}, \dots, 1_{S_{t_{l_\omega},\omega}}$ form an orthonormal basis for $(\ker(\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega)))^\perp$. Thus, (4.6) is equivalent to

$$\text{span} \left\{ \bar{\mathbf{u}}_c \odot 1_{S_{t_l,\omega}} : c \in \mathcal{E}, l = 0, \dots, l_\omega \right\} = \mathbb{C}^m,$$

which is further equivalent to $\bigoplus_{l=0}^{l_\omega} R_{t_l} = \mathbb{C}^m$ with $R_{t_l} = \text{span}\{\bar{\mathbf{u}}_c \odot 1_{S_{t_l,\omega}} : c \in \mathcal{E}\}$, where \oplus and \odot denote the direct summation and the Hadamard product, respectively. It is observed that R_{t_l} can also be represented as $R_{t_l} := \text{span}\{e_j : j \in S_{t_l,\omega}\}$, which are orthogonal spaces that compose \mathbb{C}^m . This means, in particular,

$$|\mathcal{E}| = L \geq \left| \left\{ j : \hat{a}\left(\frac{\omega+j}{m}\right) = t \right\} \right| = \mathfrak{N}(t, \omega), \quad (4.7)$$

from which (4.2) follows. To make sure that $\begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{A}_m(\omega) \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{u}_0) \\ \vdots \\ \mathfrak{A}_m(\omega) \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{u}_{L-1}) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{NL \times m}$ is left invertible, then $NL \geq m$ holds. \square

Remark 2.

- Notice that if $\mathfrak{N}(t, \omega) > 1$ for some $t \in \operatorname{range}(\hat{a})$ and every ω on a subset of \mathbb{T} with positive measure, then the completeness of Ω requires $L > 1$.
- In the context of sub-lattice sampling, we impose a restriction on the sampling time set, limiting it to a finite set with $N = m$. This restriction is based on the observation that the left invertibility of $\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega)$ relies solely on the distinctness of $\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+j}{m})$ for $j = 0, \dots, m-1$.
- In [17], Davis provided a sufficient condition for sub-lattice sampling, emphasizing the importance of the number of $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ that make $\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega)$ (defined in (4.4)) singular. In contrast, our result imposes no restrictions on the number of singular points $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$. Instead, we focus on the condition that, for each fixed $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, we examine how many j s can make $\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+j}{m})$ equal, though our characterization is only a necessary condition.

Based on Theorem 4.1, one can easily get the following corollary for the case of

$$\Omega_0 = \{A^s e_{mj} : j \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } s \in [N]\}. \quad (4.8)$$

Corollary 4.2. *Let A be a convolution operator given by the kernel $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$. Suppose that $N \geq m$. Then Ω_0 is complete in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ only if $\mathfrak{N}(t, \omega) = 1$ for all $t \in \operatorname{range}(\hat{a})$, a.e. $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$.*

Additional insights can be derived from Corollary 4.2, providing further understanding. Specifically, Theorem 4.4 will demonstrate that if $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ and $N = m$, the completeness of Ω_0 in (4.8) within $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ is equivalent to it being a frame system in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. To establish this proposition, we will first require the following lemma, which asserts the stability of the inversion process in (4.4) with $c = 0$, given the existence of the inverse matrix $\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}(\omega)$ for every $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that $N = m$ and $c = 0$ in (4.4). Let $\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1} : (L^2(\mathbb{T}))^m \rightarrow (L^2(\mathbb{T}))^m$ be a function such that*

$$(\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1} \mathbf{y})(\omega) := \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\omega)/m. \quad (4.9)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{y}$ are defined in (4.4). Then \mathfrak{A}_m^{-1} in (4.9) is bounded iff $\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega)$ in (4.5) is invertible for every $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$.

Proof. The only if direction is obvious; hence we focus on the if direction. Suppose $\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}(\omega)$ exists for every $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$. To see if this leads to \mathfrak{A}_m^{-1} in (4.9) being a bounded operator, we apply Lemma 2.2 to our context and obtain

$$\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op} = \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}(\omega)\|_{op}, \quad (4.10)$$

since $\hat{a} \in C(\mathbb{T})$. Furthermore, for every $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, the following holds [19],

$$\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}(\omega)\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{m} \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \prod_{j \neq i, j=0}^{m-1} \frac{1 + |\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+j}{m})|}{|\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+j}{m}) - \hat{a}(\frac{\omega+i}{m})|}. \quad (4.11)$$

Combining (4.10) and (4.11), it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op} &\leq \sqrt{m} \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \prod_{j \neq i, j=0}^{m-1} \frac{1 + |\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+j}{m})|}{|\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+j}{m}) - \hat{a}(\frac{\omega+i}{m})|} \\ &\leq \sqrt{m} (1 + \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} |\hat{a}(\omega)|)^{m-1} \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \prod_{j \neq i, j=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{|\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+j}{m}) - \hat{a}(\frac{\omega+i}{m})|}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Due to the continuity of \hat{a} and the invertibility of $\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega)$, we have that for $i \neq j$,

$$\inf_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \left| \hat{a}\left(\frac{\omega+j}{m}\right) - \hat{a}\left(\frac{\omega+i}{m}\right) \right| = \min_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \left| \hat{a}\left(\frac{\omega+j}{m}\right) - \hat{a}\left(\frac{\omega+i}{m}\right) \right| =: \mathbf{c}_{ij} > 0. \quad (4.13)$$

Since there are only a finite number of pairs (i, j) with $i \neq j$, we can take $\min_{i \neq j} \mathbf{c}_{ij} =: \mathbf{c} > 0$. Substituting this back to (4.12), we obtain that

$$\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{m} (\mathbf{c}^{-1} (1 + \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} |\hat{a}(\omega)|))^{m-1} < \infty.$$

Therefore, \mathfrak{A}_m^{-1} is bounded. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$. Then*

$$\Omega_0 \text{ is a frame system in } \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \text{ iff } \Omega_0 \text{ is complete in } \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}). \quad (4.14)$$

Proof. It is obvious that when Ω_0 is a frame system in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, then Ω_0 is complete in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. Next, we only need to show that Ω_0 being complete in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ can imply that Ω_0 is a frame system in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

It is worth noting that it suffices to establish the conclusion for the case where $N = m$, given the properties of the Vandermonde matrix. Therefore, our focus will be on proving the case that $N = m$ for Ω_0 . It follows from Theorem 4.1 that Ω_0 is complete in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ only if the system (4.4) is left invertible for every $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$; moreover, (4.2) becomes

$$L \geq \sup_{t \in \text{range}(\hat{a})} \mathfrak{N}(t, \omega). \quad (4.15)$$

If $\mathfrak{A}_m(\omega)$ in (4.5) is not invertible for some $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, then $\mathfrak{N}(t, \omega) > 1$ for some $t \in \text{range}(\hat{a})$, which in turn implies that $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\omega)$ is not unique for some ω .

Let $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ be as in (4.5). Recall from (2.7) (with $I = [0, 1/m)$) that

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{f}}\|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_{j/m}^{(1+j)/m} |\hat{f}(\omega)|^2 d\omega = \|\hat{f}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 = \|f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2.$$

\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1} being a bounded operator implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 &= \|\hat{\mathbf{f}}\|^2 = \|m\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\mathbf{y}_0\|^2 \leq m^2\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op}^2\|\mathbf{y}_0\|^2 \\
 &= m^2\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op}^2 \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} \|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}(S_m A^{*s} f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \\
 &= m^2\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op}^2 \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} \|S_m A^{*s} f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 \\
 &= m^2\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op}^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} |(A^{*s} f)(mj)|^2 \\
 &= m^2\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op}^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} |\langle A^s e_{mj}, f \rangle|^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} |\langle A^s e_{mj}, f \rangle|^2 \geq \frac{1}{m^2\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op}^2} \|f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2. \quad (4.16)$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} |\langle A^s e_{mj}, f \rangle|^2 &= \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} \|S_m A^{*s} f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 \\
 &= \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} \|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}(S_m A^{*s} f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 = \|\mathbf{y}_0\|^2 = \frac{1}{m^2} \|\mathfrak{A}_m \hat{\mathbf{f}}\|^2 \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{m^2} \|\mathfrak{A}_m\|_{op}^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{f}}\|^2 = \frac{1}{m^2} \|\mathfrak{A}_m\|_{op}^2 \|f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2.
 \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Therefore, Ω_0 is a frame system in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. \square

5. CHARACTERIZATION OF SENSOR DENSITY, MAXIMUM SPATIAL GAPS, AND FRAME BOUNDS

In the previous section, we discussed that a stable sampling set not only satisfies the cardinality requirement (Section 3) but also depends on the convolution kernel. In this section, we introduce additional factors that characterize a stable sampling set. Let's start by examining an illustrative example.

Example 5.1. *Let $\hat{a} \in C^1(\mathbb{T})$ be one-to-one. Then the set $\{(A^s f)(mj) : j \in \mathbb{Z}, s \in [m]\}$ is always stable. Indeed, the lower frame bound can be $\frac{1}{m^2} \|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op}^{-2}$ with*

$$\|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}\|_{op}^{-1} = \inf_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \|\mathfrak{A}_m^{-1}(\omega)\|_{op}^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \min_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \inf_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \prod_{l \neq i, l=0}^{m-1} \frac{|\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+l}{m}) - \hat{a}(\frac{\omega+i}{m})|}{1 + |\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+l}{m})|}.$$

The factor $|\hat{a}(\frac{\omega+l}{m}) - \hat{a}(\frac{\omega+i}{m})|$ is bounded below by $\frac{\kappa}{m}$, where κ satisfies

$$\inf_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{d}{d\omega} \hat{a}(\omega) \right| \geq \kappa > 0.$$

Since the Banach density (see Definition 2) of $m\mathbb{Z}$ is $1/m$, one might be tempted to consider the naive strategy of increasing m , in order to achieve a high placement cost effectiveness.

However, one might as well decrease the sampling's noise tolerance in doing so. More precisely, when f is corrupted by a Gaussian additive noise $N(0, \sigma^2)$ - and observed as \tilde{f} - then the reconstruction error, $\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}$, can be as large as $\Omega(\sigma m^{-5/2} \|\mathfrak{A}^{-1}\|_{op})$ [4]. Hence, if κ is small and m grows large, the lower bound in (5.1) is significantly reduced. This lessens the chance of stable reconstruction in the presence of noise.

The above example highlights the influence of sampling density on stability and emphasizes the importance of kernel adaptivity for efficient sampling. In this section, we explore how sampling density varies with respect to the kernel profile a when a stable sampling is provided (or the frame lower and upper bounds are given). We set up our experiment as follows: we consider $\mathbb{T} := [-1/2, 1/2)$ and assume that $\hat{a} \in C^1(\mathbb{T})$ satisfies the conditions

$$\mu \geq \hat{a}(\omega) \geq \nu > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{d\hat{a}}{d\omega}(\omega) \right| \leq \mathcal{K} < \infty, \quad \text{for } \omega \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (5.1)$$

Theorem 5.1. *Let the convolution operator A defined by the kernel a satisfy the properties in (5.1). Suppose that there are two positive constants c_{max} and c_{min} such that for any $f \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, the samples*

$$\{A^s f(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}, s \in [N]\}, \quad (5.2)$$

satisfy the frame inequality

$$c_{min} \|f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 \leq \sum_{s=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |A^s f(\lambda)|^2 \leq c_{max} \|f\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2. \quad (5.3)$$

Then there exist two constants c_a, C_a , only depending on the kernel a , such that

$$\underline{d}(\Lambda) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{c_a c_{min}}{2c_{max} C_a}, \frac{c_{min}}{3C_a} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{d}(\Lambda) \leq \min \left\{ \frac{c_{max}}{c_a}, \frac{3}{2} \right\}. \quad (5.4)$$

Before presenting the proof for Theorem 5.1, we will first introduce and establish a supporting lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Let A be a convolution operator in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ defined by the kernel a and assume that a satisfies (5.1). Then there exist $C_a > c_a > 0$ such that for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sum_{s=0}^{N-1} |A^s(g)(\lambda)|^2 \leq \frac{C_a}{1 + \lambda^2}, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (5.5)$$

$$\text{and } \sum_{s=0}^{N-1} |A^s(g)(\lambda)|^2 \geq c_a, \quad \text{for } \lambda = 0, \pm 1, \quad (5.6)$$

where $g \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ is defined by $g(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & n = 0 \\ \frac{2 \sin(n\pi/2)}{n\pi}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Proof. Note that when $s = 0$, we have that

$$|g(\lambda)|^2 = \begin{cases} 1, & \lambda = 0 \\ \frac{4 \sin^2(\lambda\pi/2)}{\lambda^2 \pi^2}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \leq 1/(1 + \lambda^2). \quad (5.7)$$

When $s \geq 1$, note that the Fourier transformation of g is

$$\hat{g}(\omega) = \begin{cases} 0, & \omega \in [-1/2, -1/4) \cup (1/4, 1/2] \\ 1/2, & \omega = \pm 1/4 \\ 1, & \omega \in (-1/4, 1/4) \end{cases}.$$

Using integration by parts, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & (A^s g)(n) \\ &= (a^{(s)} * g)(n) = \int_{-1/4}^{1/4} \hat{a}^s(\omega) e^{i2\pi n\omega} d\omega \\ &= \frac{\hat{a}(1/4)^s e^{i\pi n/2} - \hat{a}(-1/4)^s e^{-i\pi n/2}}{i2\pi n} - \frac{s}{i2\pi n} \int_{-1/4}^{1/4} e^{i2\pi n\omega} \hat{a}^{s-1}(\omega) \frac{d\hat{a}}{d\omega}(\omega) d\omega. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the triangle inequality,

$$|n \cdot (a^{(s)} * g)(n)| \leq \frac{\mu^s}{\pi} + \frac{s\mu^{s-1}\mathcal{K}}{2\pi},$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 \sum_{s=1}^{N-1} |(a^{(s)} * g)(n)|^2 &\leq \sum_{s=1}^{N-1} \left(\frac{\mu^s}{\pi} + \frac{s\mu^{s-1}\mathcal{K}}{2\pi} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\mu^{2(N-1)} - 1}{\mu^2 - 1} \cdot \left(\frac{2\mu^2}{\pi^2} + \frac{(N-1)^2\mathcal{K}^2}{2\pi^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

In addition,

$$|(a^{(s)} * g)(n)| = \left| \int_{-1/4}^{1/4} \hat{a}^s(\omega) e^{i2\pi n\omega} d\omega \right| \leq \int_{-1/4}^{1/4} |\hat{a}^s(\omega) e^{i2\pi n\omega}| d\omega \leq \mu^s/2. \quad (5.9)$$

Combining (5.7), (5.8), and (5.9), we can derive (5.5).

For (5.6), note that for $|n| \leq 1$,

$$|(a^{(s)} * g)(n)| = \left| 2 \int_{-1/4}^{1/4} \hat{a}^s(\omega) e^{i2\pi n\omega} d\omega \right| \geq \left| 2 \int_{-1/4}^{1/4} \hat{a}^s(\omega) \cos(2\pi n\omega) d\omega \right|.$$

Additionally, note that when $|n| \leq 1$, we have that $\cos(2\pi n\omega) \geq 0$ for all $\omega \in [-1/4, 1/4]$. Therefore,

$$|(a^{(s)} * g)(n)| \geq \left| 2\nu^s \int_{-1/4}^{1/4} \cos(2\pi n\omega) d\omega \right| = \left| 2\nu^s \frac{\sin(n\pi/2)}{n\pi} \right| \geq \frac{2}{\pi} \nu^s.$$

Therefore, we have $\sum_{s=0}^{N-1} |(a^{(s)} * g)(n)|^2 \geq \frac{4}{\pi^2} \cdot \frac{\nu^{2(N-1)} - 1}{\nu^2 - 1}$. \square

We are now ready to provide the proof of Theorem 5.1. The main idea is to effectively utilize the frame inequality in (5.3) for the specific g described in Lemma 5.2.

The proof of Theorem 5.1. According to Lemma 5.2, the following two inequality holds with constants c_a, C_a :

$$\sum_{s=0}^{N-1} |A^s(g)(\lambda)|^2 \leq \frac{C_a}{1 + \lambda^2}, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (5.10)$$

$$\sum_{s=0}^{N-1} |A^s(g)(\lambda)|^2 \geq c_a \quad \text{for } \lambda = 0, \pm 1, \quad (5.11)$$

$$\text{where } g(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & n = 0 \\ \frac{2\sin(n\pi/2)}{n\pi}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Let $N(\Lambda) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \#(\Lambda \cap [x-1, x+1])$. From (5.11) and (5.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \#(\Lambda \cap [x-1, x+1]) &\leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda \cap [x-1, x+1]} \frac{1}{c_a} \sum_{s=0}^{N-1} |A^s(g)(\lambda-x)|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_a} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{s=0}^{N-1} |A^s(g)(\lambda-x)|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{c_{\max}}{c_a} \|g(\cdot-x)\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 = \frac{c_{\max}}{c_a} \|g\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 = \frac{2c_{\max}}{c_a} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\bar{d}(\Lambda) \leq \frac{N(\Lambda)}{2} \leq \frac{c_{\max}}{c_a}. \quad (5.12)$$

In addition, $\bar{d}(\Lambda) \leq 3/2$. Thus, $\bar{d}(\Lambda) \leq \min\{c_{\max}/c_a, 3/2\}$.

Suppose that there exists some $u \in \mathbb{Z}$ and let R be the largest positive integer such that $\Lambda \cap [u-R, u+R] = \emptyset$ and

$$\Lambda \cap [u-R-1, u+R+1] \neq \emptyset. \quad (5.13)$$

By translation invariance, we may assume $u = 0$. Substitute $g \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ to (5.3). From (5.10), (5.12)

$$\begin{aligned} 2c_{\min} &= c_{\min} \|g\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 \leq \sum_{s=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |g * a^{(s)}(\lambda)|^2 \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \frac{C_a}{1 + \lambda^2} \\ &= \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda \cap [R+2k, R+2k+2]} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda \cap [-R-2k-2, -R-2k]} \right) \frac{C_a}{1 + \lambda^2} \\ &\leq 2N(\Lambda)C_a \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + (R+2k)^2} \\ &\leq 2C_a \min \left\{ \frac{c_{\max}}{c_a}, 3/2 \right\} \int_R^{\infty} \frac{1}{2x^2} dx = \min \left\{ \frac{C_a c_{\max}}{Rc_a}, \frac{3C_a}{2R} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to (5.13), we have

$$R \leq \min \left\{ \frac{C_a c_{\max}}{2c_a c_{\min}}, \frac{3C_a}{4c_{\min}} \right\} \Rightarrow \underline{d}(\Lambda) \geq \frac{1}{2(R+1)} \geq \frac{1}{4R} \geq \max \left\{ \frac{c_a c_{\min}}{2c_{\max} C_a}, \frac{c_{\min}}{3C_a} \right\}.$$

which is the first part of (5.4). \square

Remark 3.

- From the proof of the lower Banach density in Theorem 5.1, it becomes evident that if the frame (lower and upper) bounds are given, the maximal gap between the spatial samples cannot be arbitrarily large.
- Note that the conclusion of Theorem 5.1 is parallel to [5, Theorem 4.4], which provides the density requirements for the spatial sampling set $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ for the Parley-Wiener space. Their result is established under the conditions that the sampling time set is an interval and the convolution kernel satisfies similar conditions to ours.

6. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we have investigated the dynamical sampling problem on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ driven by a convolution operator. Our study highlights the critical roles that sampling density and kernel profile play in determining reconstruction stability. Specifically, we found that a finite spatial sampling set often results in insufficient reconstruction capabilities. However, under certain conditions, we demonstrated that stable reconstruction, as measured by frame lower and upper bounds, effectively controls the maximal gap between spatial samples. We also delved into the stability of dynamical sampling on sub-lattices of the form $\Lambda = \{mj + c : j \in \mathbb{Z}, c = 0, 1, \dots, L - 1\}$. Our findings elucidate the relationship between L , m , and the properties of the convolution kernel when the initial signal is guaranteed to be reconstructed from the given samples. Particularly, for the specific case where $L = 1$ and the convolution kernel is regular, the stability of the sampling set hinges primarily on its ability to differentiate between signals. We thus established that the dual system generated by dynamical sub-lattice sampling forms a frame for $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ if and only if it is complete.

There are two lines for future work. Firstly, we would like to generalize our characterizations of dynamical sampling in higher-dimensional settings. Secondly, we will consider various characterizations of the sampling set to ensure the reconstruction of both the initial signal and the convolution operator from the given samples. These investigations will further enhance our understanding and application of dynamical sampling in more complex scenarios.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

S. Tang was partially supported by Regents Junior Faculty fellowship, Faculty Early Career Development Awards sponsored by University of California Santa Barbara, Hellman Family Faculty Fellowship, NSF DMS #2111303 and DMS Career #2340631. Y. Xie was supported in part by the NIH grants U01DE029255, U01DE033330, R01HL166508, R01DE026728 and RO3DE027399 and NSF grants IOS2107215/IIS 2123260. Finally, L. Huang and S. Tang are greatly indebted to Akram Aldroubi for his mentorship and introduction to dynamical sampling problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] Roza Aceska, Armenak Petrosyan, and Sui Tang. Multidimensional signal recovery in discrete evolution systems via spatiotemporal trade off. *Sampling Theory in Signal and Image Processing*, 14(2):153–169, 2015.
- [2] Akram Aldroubi, Carlos Cabrelli, Ursula Molter, and Sui Tang. Dynamical sampling. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 42(3):378–401, 2017.
- [3] Akram Aldroubi, Jacqueline Davis, and Ilya Krishtal. Dynamical sampling: Time–space trade-off. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 34(3):495–503, 2013.
- [4] Akram Aldroubi, Jacqueline Davis, and Ilya Krishtal. Exact reconstruction of signals in evolutionary systems via spatiotemporal trade-off. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 21(1):11–31, 2015.
- [5] Akram Aldroubi, Karlheinz Gröchenig, Longxiu Huang, Philippe Jaming, Ilya Krishtal, and José Luis Romero. Sampling the flow of a bandlimited function. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis*, pages 1–35, 2021.
- [6] Akram Aldroubi, Longxiu Huang, Ilya Krishtal, Akos Ledeczki, Roy R Lederman, and Peter Volgyesi. Dynamical sampling with additive random noise. *Sampling Theory in Signal and Image Processing*, 17:153–182, 2018.
- [7] Akram Aldroubi, Longxiu Huang, and Armenak Petrosyan. Frames induced by the action of continuous powers of an operator. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 478(2):1059–1084, 2019.
- [8] Akram Aldroubi and Ilya Krishtal. Krylov subspace methods in dynamical sampling. *Sampling Theory in Signal and Image Processing*, 15:9–20, 2016.

- [9] Akram Aldroubi, Ilya Krishtal, and Sui Tang. Phaseless reconstruction from space–time samples. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 48(1):395–414, 2020.
- [10] Akram Aldroubi and Armenak Petrosyan. Dynamical sampling and systems from iterative actions of operators. In *Frames and Other Bases in Abstract and Function Spaces*, pages 15–26. Springer, 2017.
- [11] Robert Beinert and Marzieh Hasannasab. Phase retrieval and system identification in dynamical sampling via prony’s method. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 49(4):56, 2023.
- [12] Carlos Cabrelli, Ursula Molter, Victoria Paternostro, and Friedrich Philipp. Dynamical sampling on finite index sets. *Journal d’analyse mathématique*, 140(2):637–667, 2020.
- [13] Emmanuel J Candes, Justin K Romberg, and Terence Tao. Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences*, 59(8):1207–1223, 2006.
- [14] Jiahui Cheng and Sui Tang. Estimate the spectrum of affine dynamical systems from partial observations of a single trajectory data. *Inverse Problems*, 38(1):015004, 2021.
- [15] Ole Christensen and Marzieh Hasannasab. A survey on frame representations via dynamical sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00038*, 2021.
- [16] Kenneth R Davidson. *C*-algebras by example*, volume 6. American Mathematical Soc., 1996.
- [17] Jacqueline Davis. Dynamical sampling in infinite dimensions with and without a forcing term. *AMS Contemporary Mathematics (CONM) BS*, pages 167–174, 2014.
- [18] Theodore Gamelin. *Complex analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [19] Walter Gautschi. On inverses of vandermonde and confluent vandermonde matrices. *Numerische Mathematik*, (4):117–123, 1962.
- [20] Karlheinz Gröchenig, José Luis Romero, Jayakrishnan Unnikrishnan, and Martin Vetterli. On minimal trajectories for mobile sampling of bandlimited fields. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 39(3):487–510, 2015.
- [21] Paul R Halmos. *Introduction to Hilbert space and the theory of spectral multiplicity*. Courier Dover Publications, 2017.
- [22] Ali Hormati, Olivier Roy, Yue M Lu, and Martin Vetterli. Distributed sampling of signals linked by sparse filtering: Theory and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 58(3):1095–1109, 2009.
- [23] Longxiu Huang, Deanna Needell, and Sui Tang. Robust recovery of bandlimited graph signals via randomized dynamical sampling. *Information and Inference*, 2024.
- [24] Benjamin Jaye and Mishko Mitkovski. A sufficient condition for mobile sampling in terms of surface density. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 61:57–74, 2022.
- [25] Christian Kümmerle, Mauro Maggioni, and Sui Tang. Learning transition operators from sparse space-time samples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.00746*, 2022.
- [26] Yue M Lu, Pier Luigi Dragotti, and Martin Vetterli. Localization of diffusive sources using spatiotemporal measurements. In *2011 49th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 1072–1076. IEEE, 2011.
- [27] Yue M Lu and Martin Vetterli. Spatial super-resolution of a diffusion field by temporal oversampling in sensor networks. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 2249–2252. IEEE, 2009.
- [28] M Zuhair Nashed and Qiyu Sun. Sampling and reconstruction of signals in a reproducing kernel subspace of l_p (rd). *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 258(7):2422–2452, 2010.
- [29] Juri Ranieri, Amina Chebira, Yue M Lu, and Martin Vetterli. Sampling and reconstructing diffusion fields with localized sources. In *2011 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 4016–4019. IEEE, 2011.
- [30] Günter Reise and Gerald Matz. Reconstruction of time-varying fields in wireless sensor networks using shift-invariant spaces: Iterative algorithms and impact of sensor localization errors. In *2010 IEEE 11th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2010.
- [31] Günter Reise, Gerald Matz, and Karlheinz Grochenig. Distributed field reconstruction in wireless sensor networks based on hybrid shift-invariant spaces. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 60(10):5426–5439, 2012.
- [32] Qiyu Sun. Nonuniform average sampling and reconstruction of signals with finite rate of innovation. *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis*, 38(5):1389–1422, 2007.
- [33] Sui Tang. System identification in dynamical sampling. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 43:555–580, 2017.

- [34] Sui Tang. Universal spatiotemporal sampling sets for discrete spatially invariant evolution processes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(9):5518–5528, 2017.
- [35] Alexander Ulanovskii and Ilya Zlotnikov. Reconstruction of bandlimited functions from space–time samples. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 280(9):108962, 2021.
- [36] Jayakrishnan Unnikrishnan and Martin Vetterli. Sampling high-dimensional bandlimited fields on low-dimensional manifolds. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 59(4):2103–2127, 2012.
- [37] Qing Yao, Longxiu Huang, and Sui Tang. Space-time variable density samplings for sparse bandlimited graph signals driven by diffusion operators. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [38] Ilya Zlotnikov. On planar sampling with gaussian kernel in spaces of bandlimited functions. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 28(3):55, 2022.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, USA
Email address: `huang13@msu.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, USA
Email address: `neumana6@msu.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA, USA
Email address: `suitang@math.ucsb.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING AND DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS AND PROBABILITY, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, USA
Email address: `xyy@msu.edu`