

A SPECTRAL THEORY OF SCALAR VOLTERRA EQUATIONS

DAVID DARROW AND GEORGE STEPANIANTS

ABSTRACT. Volterra integral and integro-differential equations have been extensively studied in both pure mathematics and applied science. In one direction, developments in analysis have yielded far-ranging existence, uniqueness, and regularity results for Volterra equations. In the other, applications in science have inspired a substantial library of practical techniques to deal with such equations.

The present work connects these research areas by examining five large classes of linear Volterra equations: integral and integro-differential equations with *completely monotone* (CM) kernels, corresponding to linear viscoelastic models; those with *positive definite* (PD) kernels, corresponding to partially-observed quantum systems; difference equations with PD kernels; a class of generalized delay differential equations; and a class of generalized fractional differential equations. We develop a system of correspondences between these problems, showing that all five can be understood within the same, spectral theory. We leverage this theory to recover practical, closed-form solutions of all five classes, and we show that interconversion yields a natural, continuous involution within each class. Our work unifies (and rigorously grounds, when applicable) several results from science: the interconversion formula of Gross [36], recent results in viscoelasticity [53] and operator theory [5, 24] for integral equations of the second type, classical formulas for finite Prony series [75] and fractional differential equations [37, 35, 55], and the convergence of Prony series to CM kernels. Finally, our theory yields a novel, geometric construction of the regularized Hilbert transform on $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ [13], extends it to a wide class of infinite measures, and reveals a natural connection to delay and fractional differential equations.

We draw particular emphasis to practical applications of our work. On one hand, we show how it simplifies many Volterra equations to pen-and-paper calculations. On the other, connecting our theory with the AAA approximation scheme [60], we find a powerful, spectral method for working with scalar Volterra equations numerically, which we demonstrate with a number of practical examples.




FIGURE 1. Our system of correspondences between the five core classes of Volterra equations under consideration. Practical applications have inspired a broad library of practical techniques with which to handle several subclasses within this correspondence; we can identify many of these disparate results as special cases of the theory presented here. For detail on the interconversion maps (\mathcal{B} , $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and \mathcal{B}_{reg}) and embeddings (Ψ and Ψ_{reg}) that make up these correspondences, see Section 4. For detail on previous work in these directions, see Section 2.

CONTENTS

List of Numerical Experiments	3
1. Introduction	4
1.1. Note on infinite time horizons	9
1.2. Note on higher-order integro-differential equations	9
2. Prior Work	10
2.1. Materials Science	11
2.2. Electrical Networks	13
2.3. Operator Theory	14
2.4. Signal Processing	15
2.5. Numerical Analysis	17
3. Preliminaries	17
4. Main Results	22
4.1. Measures on the Circle, and Discrete-Time Volterra Equations	22
4.2. Measures on the Line, and Continuous-Time Volterra Equations	25
4.3. The Regularized Hilbert Transform, and Delay and Fractional Differential Equations	32
5. Volterra Equations in the Laplace Domain	38
6. Hardy Spaces on the Disc	42
7. Involutions on the Disc	47
8. Integral Transforms on the Real Line	49
9. Numerical Examples	59
9.1. Numerical Implementation of \mathcal{B} , $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and \mathcal{B}_{reg}	59
9.2. Practical Examples of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and Numerical Interconversion	61
9.3. Spectral Interconversion from Time-Sampled Kernels	63
9.4. Solving Volterra Equations through Interconversion	66
9.5. Discrete-Time Volterra Equations	68
9.6. Volterra Equations with Fractional Derivatives	70
10. Future Directions	71
Appendix A. Stability of Interconversion	73
Acknowledgments	75
References	75

LIST OF NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

Visualization of the σ -Cauchy Transform	21
Visualization of the Interconversion Map \mathcal{B}	23
Simple, Analytic Volterra Interconversion	26
Commutativity of Continuous- and Discrete-Time Interconversion	27
Approximation of Integral Kernels by Finite Sums of Exponentials	55
Examples of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ on the Real Line	62
Interconversion of Volterra Integral and Integro-Differential Equations	64
Interconversion from Time-Sampled Integral Kernels	67
Solving Volterra Integral Equations with Noise Corruption	69
Comparison of Solution Methods for Discrete Volterra Equations	71
Interconversion of Fractional Differential Equations	72

1. INTRODUCTION

In this work, we study five classes of convolution equations. The first is as follows:

$$\text{(gCM)} \quad y(t) = c_1 \dot{x}(t) - c_0 x(t) - \int_0^t K(t - \tau)x(\tau) d\tau, \quad x(0) = x_0 \quad (\text{if } c_1 \neq 0),$$

where c_0, c_1 are real¹² with $c_1 \geq 0$, the source term y is a locally integrable function on $\mathbb{R}_+ \doteq [0, \infty)$, and K is a *generalized-completely-monotone* (gCM) kernel:

Definition 1.1. A smooth, non-negative function $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is *completely monotone* (CM) if $(-1)^j F^{(j)}(t) \geq 0$ for all $j \geq 0$ and all $t > 0$. A function $K : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is *generalized CM* (gCM) if $K(t) = e^{\sigma t} F(t)$ for a CM kernel F and a value $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$.

CM kernels describe a variety of phenomena, ranging from material stress-strain relationships to current flow in electrical circuits; we highlight several applications in Section 2. More generally, Volterra equations with CM kernels arise in any setting where a quantity experiences exponential feedback according to its past values.

An illustrative example is provided by partially-observed *linear time-invariant* (LTI) systems. Suppose a vector quantity $\mathbf{q} = (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_N)$ evolves according to the system

$$(1.1) \quad \dot{\mathbf{q}}(t) = -\mathbf{M}\mathbf{q}(t) + \mathbf{f}(t),$$

where \mathbf{M} is a positive semi-definite matrix and $\mathbf{f}(t)$ is a time-dependent forcing term. In many applications, we are only able to observe the value of one element of \mathbf{q} , which we denote by q_0 . Formally solving (1.1) in terms of q_0 , we can rewrite

$$\dot{q}_0(t) = -\lambda q_0(t) + \int_0^t K(t - \tau)q_0(\tau) d\tau + g(t),$$

where $K(t)$ is an integral kernel dependent only on \mathbf{M} and g is a modified forcing term dependent on \mathbf{f} and on the initial values of \mathbf{q} . This program—an example of the more-general Mori-Zwanzig formalism [85, 29]—reduces our system to model the self-interaction of q_0 , as mediated by the other elements of \mathbf{q} . So long as \mathbf{M} is positive semi-definite (PSD)³, this equation is of the form (gCM). As we show later, the LTI example is highly general; *any* CM equation can be approximated to arbitrary precision by finite-dimensional LTI models of this form (Theorem 4.17).

LTI systems model several key physical phenomena; for instance, they are used to construct *reservoir models* for carbon transport [46], discussed in Fig. 2. In this example, q_0 would represent the carbon budget of the atmosphere, $q_{k \neq 0}$ would represent the carbon budget of other reservoirs (e.g., the ocean or biosphere), and \mathbf{f} would represent the rate of emission into the atmosphere.

¹In this and other classes of equations, we more generally handle the case that $\text{Im } c_0 \geq 0$; the subset with $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ turns out to be the most natural setting for our theory, however.

²The case $c_1 < 0$ of (gCM) will form a subset of the class (rPD) below.

³This hypothesis is not strictly necessary. One example relevant to carbon reservoir models (Fig. 2) is, if $M_{0k} = 0$ for $k \geq 2$, it turns out to be sufficient that the submatrix $[M_{ij}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq N}$ is a *product* of PSD matrices. A more general investigation of LTI systems is outside the present scope.




FIGURE 2. A five-box *reservoir model* for the global carbon cycle [46]. In such models, large environmental reservoirs of CO₂ are hypothesized to be well-mixed, such that the transport of CO₂ between them is given by the total quantity in each. Such models have been in use since the 1950s [20, 46], with subsequent developments introducing more reservoirs [47, 10], refined diffusion effects [62], and more. Such models have seen extensive use in understanding the global carbon cycle and anthropogenic effects; for instance, they have been used recently to estimate historical carbon budgets [44] and the impacts of radiative forcing [16] and of burning biomass [15] on global temperatures.

Our second class of equations is as follows:

$$(gPD) \quad y(t) = c_1 \dot{x}(t) - ic_0 x(t) + \int_0^t K(t - \tau)x(\tau) d\tau, \quad x(0) = x_0 \text{ (if } c_1 \neq 0),$$

noting the difference in sign with (gCM). Here, c_0, c_1 are real with $c_1 \geq 0$, the source term y is again locally integrable, and K is *positive (semi)definite*:

Definition 1.2. A function $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a *positive (semi)definite* (PD) kernel if, for all finite collections of points $\{t_1, \dots, t_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, the matrix A defined element-wise by $A_{jk} = F(t_j - t_k)$ is self-adjoint and non-negative definite. A complex measure K on \mathbb{R} is *generalized PD* (gPD) if $K(t) = (1 - \frac{d^2}{dt^2})^{1/2} F(t)$ for a PD kernel F , with fractional derivatives taken in a weak sense.

Remark 1.3. Although gPD kernels are defined using weak derivatives, we can see from Bochner’s theorem (Lemma 3.3) that they must be classical functions. Indeed, a kernel is only PD if it is the Fourier transform of a positive, finite measure; but it is a classical result from probability theory that Fourier transforms of finite measures are absolutely continuous, and so their weak derivatives (which include the class of *gPD* kernels) must be classical functions, well-defined almost everywhere in \mathbb{R} .

That the gPD class encompasses the PD class follows from Bochner’s theorem, discussed below (Lemma 3.3). Examples of PD kernels are widespread in science and engineering; for instance, this class includes Gaussian kernels $K(t) \propto e^{-t^2/2\sigma^2}$, exponential kernels $K(t) \propto e^{-\sigma|t|}$, and Paley–Wiener kernels $K(t) \propto \text{sinc}(\sigma t)$, each with $\sigma > 0$.

Importantly, the gPD class includes all CM kernels, allowing us to solve (gCM) when $c_1 < 0$. The sign of c_1 creates a substantial difference when solving these

two classes of equations, however. If $c_1 \geq 0$, our analysis of gCM equations will show that the equation necessarily admits an inverse equation of the form (gCM); if $c_1 < 0$, however, the natural analogue is the class (gPD), explaining why the program of Hannsgen and Wheeler [38] fails to find a completely monotone resolvent to such equations. In fact, we solve this problem completely in Section 4.3, and our closed-form interconversion formula reproduces the asymptotic results they derived.

Following a similar argument to the discussion of LTI systems above, we see that gPD equations apply to partially-observed *quantum* systems. Namely, fix a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , a (self-adjoint) Hamiltonian \hat{H} , and a state $|0\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, and decompose our wavefunction $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ as $\psi = \phi_0|0\rangle + \phi$. If we write $\hat{P} = 1 - |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and

$$H_0 = \langle 0|\hat{H}|0\rangle, \quad \hat{H}_1 = \hat{P}\hat{H}\hat{P},$$

then it is straightforward to show that ϕ_0 satisfies the Nakajima–Zwanzig equation [59, 84]

$$\dot{\phi}_0 + iH_0\phi_0 + \int \langle 0|\hat{H}e^{-i\hat{H}_1(t-\tau)}\hat{H}|0\rangle\phi_0(\tau) d\tau = -i\langle 0|\hat{H}e^{-i\hat{H}_1t}|\phi(t=0)\rangle.$$

Since \hat{H}_1 is self-adjoint, this equation falls into the class (gPD) with

$$c_1 = 1, \quad c_0 = -H_0, \quad K(t) = \langle 0|\hat{H}e^{-i\hat{H}_1t}\hat{H}|0\rangle,$$

and forcing determined by the initial conditions along the unobserved states.

By developing a natural duality between gCM and gPD equations, we will see that any statement proved for one applies to the other. In fact, there is a third class of equations we can bring into this correspondence, this time in *discrete time*:

$$(dPD) \quad y(n) = c_0x(n) + \sum_{j=0}^n K(n-j)x(j).$$

Here, $c_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfies $\text{Re } c_0 \geq -\frac{1}{2}K(0)$, and $K : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is *positive (semi)definite*:

Definition 1.4. A function $K : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a *positive (semi)definite* (PD) kernel if, for all finite collections of points $\{i_1, \dots, i_N\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, the matrix A defined element-wise by $A_{jk} = K(i_j - i_k)$ is self-adjoint and non-negative definite.

It is well known that discrete and continuous time convolution equations can be brought into correspondence [61], though we carry the program further for Volterra equations in the present work. In particular, we will see that this correspondence gives rise to a new, geometric formulation of the regularized Hilbert transform for functions in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, an object typically recovered from the general theory of Calderón–Zygmund theory [13].

In turn, we will see that this regularized transform brings two more classes of equations into our system of correspondences. In short, our fourth class of equations is the following modification of the (gPD) class:

$$(rPD) \quad y(t) = c_1\dot{x}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-t}^t K(\tau)x(|t-\tau|) d\tau, \quad x(0) = x_0 \quad (\text{if } c_1 \neq 0),$$

where $c_1 \geq 0$ and K is a real *rPD* kernel:

Definition 1.5. Suppose $K(t)$ is a distribution on \mathbb{R} . We say that K is a *regularized positive (semi)definite* (rPD) kernel if $K(t) = (1 - \frac{d^2}{dt^2})K'(t)$ weakly for a real PD kernel K' . Comparing with Remark 1.3, we see that K is a tempered distribution of order at most one.

As we discuss below, the restriction that K' (and thus K) is real can be lifted. Even still, however, this class covers a wide variety of delay differential equations. For instance, in Example 4.25, we solve the simple example

$$y(t) = c_1 \dot{x}(t) + x(t) + x(t-1)$$

in closed form. We note that delay differential equations have found broad applications in biology, such as in the study of gene networks and neuron models [67].

Giving the same treatment to the (gCM) class yields our fifth and final class of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(rCM)} \quad y(t) &= c_1 \dot{x}(t) - c_0 x(t) - \int_0^t K_1(t-\tau)x(\tau) d\tau + \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t K_2(t-\tau)x(\tau) d\tau, \\ x(0) &= x_0 \quad (\text{if } c_1 \neq 0), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_1 \geq 0$, $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, K_1 is a gCM kernel, and K_2 is a CM kernel. Despite the similarities between (gCM) and (rCM), the latter now encompasses a wide class of *fractional differential equations*. Given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ recall that the *Riemann–Liouville fractional derivative* is the operator [41]

$$(1.2) \quad D^\alpha : f \mapsto \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t \frac{f(\tau)}{(t-\tau)^\alpha} d\tau.$$

Fractional differential equations have been used to model anomalous diffusion processes [56], complex media [42], and ladder models in materials science [37, 35]. Through our analysis, we now see that (generalized) fractional differential equations provide a natural ‘dual’ to Volterra equations with completely monotone kernels, and that closed-form solutions to equations involving sums of fractional derivatives [37, 35, 55] can be seen as a special case of a broader, spectral theory.

Equations of the form (rCM) also connect closely to an open question in analysis [12]; given an arbitrary kernel K and a Volterra equation of the first kind $y = K * x$, when does the interconverted equation take the form

$$x(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t J(t-\tau)x(\tau) d\tau$$

for a kernel J depending on K ? Classical work of Abel demonstrates this principle for the kernel $K(t) = t^{-\alpha}$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and work of Gripenberg shows that J generally has to be measure-valued for such a relation to hold [32], but the question remains generally open [12]. Although we do not discuss the problem in depth in the present work, our work implies necessary and sufficient conditions for this relation to hold for gCM and gPD kernels K with appropriate regularity requirements, and it provides exactly the form that J takes in such cases.

In general, integral and integro-differential equations of these classes have been studied from several perspectives. We outline a more complete history in Section 2 below, but we note that much is already known about the solution of such equations. On the side of pure mathematics, linear Volterra equations are covered by a variety of existence and uniqueness results, both classical and recent [33]. CM equations have been studied in particular, as well. In the integral case (i.e., $c_1 = 0$ in (gCM)), it is well-known that the resolvent of the equation is another CM kernel, and in the integro-differential case (but with the sign $c_1 < 0$), it is known that the resolvent differs only from a CM kernel by an exponentially-decaying function [38].

Independently, applications in science have inspired powerful methods of solving these equations. Gross developed a (now classic) ‘interconversion’ formula to recover the resolvent of (gCM) in the special case of $c_1 = 0$, and his work was recently formalized by Loy & Anderssen [53]. In turn, Loy & Anderssen leveraged the theory of Aronszajn [5] and Donoghue [24], which relates the integral case (again with $c_1 = 0$) to the problem of rank-one perturbations of linear operators. Gross also studied fractional differential equations in the context of *ladder models* in materials science [37, 35], and classical, closed-form solutions exist to solve problems involving finite sums of fractional derivatives [55]. More recently, Bhattacharya et al. [8] derived a similar, closed-form equation for CM equations involving finite Prony series, extending standard techniques previously developed for such problems [75]. We discuss both the viscoelastic and operator-theoretic sides of the problem (and of the literature) in Section 2.

In this work, we aim to bridge the gap between theory and application, and to connect these disparate techniques within a unified framework. Namely, we develop a system of correspondences between the five classes of equations we consider, and we show how they can all be understood within the same, spectral theory. This allows us to rigorously prove closed-form solutions for all five classes, and to show that interconversion forms a natural involution within each class. In the context of (gCM), for instance, it reduces to the formula of Loy & Anderssen [53] for CM equations of the second type (i.e., with $c_1 = 0$ and $c_0 \neq 0$), and yields a duality between gCM equations of the first type ($c_1 = c_0 = 0$) and gCM integro-differential equations ($c_1 \neq 0$). In the context of (rCM), it greatly generalizes existing interconversion results relating fractional derivatives to *Mittag-Leffler* integral kernels, and showing that these results form a special case of a larger duality between generalized fractional differential operators and gCM kernels. Moreover, we show that the involution provided by interconversion is continuous in all five classes of equations, under topologies appropriate to each. This result justifies the approximation of CM kernels by Prony series [75, 70, 63, 36], for one, and offers an (exactly) equivalent approximation scheme for the other four classes of equations.

In Section 3 and Section 4, we introduce our system of correspondences and the basic structure of our spectral theory, and we present closed-form solutions and continuity results for each class of equations. We handle (dPD) in Section 4.1, (gCM) and (gPD) in Section 4.2, and (rPD) and (rCM) in Section 4.3. Involved in handling the latter two classes is a novel construction of the regularized Hilbert transform in Section 4.3, which generalizes it to a wider class of non-decaying measures on \mathbb{R} and reveals a natural connection to delay differential equations and fractional differential equations. We highlight analytical examples throughout Section 4, demonstrating how our work brings a wide variety of Volterra equations within the realm of pen-and-paper calculation.

We prove the correspondences between our five classes of equations in Section 5, and we develop our spectral theory in Section 6, Section 7, and Section 8. We present the numerical side of our work in Section 9. Namely, by connecting our theory with the AAA algorithm for rational function approximation [60], we recover a new, spectral method for working with scalar Volterra equations. We introduce our numerical algorithm more concretely in the sequel, focusing here on supporting and leveraging our analytical theory. To this end, we give numerical demonstrations of our theory applied to a number of practical problems: fast interconversion

of Volterra equations, interconversion from noisy time series data and/or sparsely-sampled integral kernels, approximation of generic integral kernels with Prony series, and others. Finally, in Appendix A, we show how to use our closed-form solutions of Volterra equations in order to estimate the condition number of interconversion in various limits.

Our codebase has been made available at the following GitHub link:

<https://github.com/sgstepaniants/time-deconvolution>

1.1. Note on infinite time horizons. In any of our integral or integro-differential equations, one might be interested in an *infinite time horizon*, where we specify homogeneous conditions as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. For instance, (gCM) would then take the form

$$y(t) = c_1 \dot{x}(t) - c_0 x(t) - \int_{-\infty}^t K(t - \tau) x(\tau) d\tau.$$

Our results adapt straightforwardly to this setting; in this case, all that is necessary is replacing the use of the Laplace transform in Section 5 with the *bilateral Laplace transform*

$$\mathcal{L}_b[y](s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y(t) e^{-ts} dt.$$

The same can be carried out in the case of (gPD) and (dPD).

1.2. Note on higher-order integro-differential equations. As we have pointed out, CM equations of the second type (i.e., with $c_1 = 0$ and $c_0 \neq 0$) have been treated by existing literature [53]. One might wonder, then, could we solve CM integral equations of the first type ($c_1 = c_0 = 0$) or CM integro-differential equations ($c_1 \neq 0$) by integrating or differentiating a second-type equation appropriately? The answer turns out to be, *sometimes, but not consistently*.

To see this, suppose we begin with a (gCM) Volterra equation of first type (i.e., $c_1 = c_0 = 0$), with a strictly CM kernel $K(t)$, and we differentiate (and negate) both sides:

$$-\dot{y}(t) = K(0)x(t) + \int_0^t \dot{K}(t - \tau)x(\tau) d\tau.$$

This equation is now of the second type, and it follows from Definition 1.1 that $-\dot{K}(t)$ is CM, and thus that the equation is of the form (gCM). Putting aside possible concerns over numerical differentiation, this procedure requires the additional hypothesis that $K(0) < \infty$, or equivalently, that \dot{K} is locally integrable near 0. In turn, this hypothesis is violated by important examples of CM kernels, such as those corresponding to fractional integrals [41].

It turns out that integro-differential CM equations are covered even less completely using this ‘integration by parts’ strategy. Here, we start with a CM equation of the second type, i.e., with $c_1 = 0$ and $c_0 \neq 0$ and a strictly CM kernel K , and we differentiate to find

$$\begin{aligned} -\dot{y}(t) &= -c_0 \dot{x}(t) + K(0)x(t) + \int_0^t \dot{K}(t - \tau)x(\tau) d\tau \\ &= \tilde{c}_1 \dot{x}(t) - \tilde{c}_0 x(t) - \int_0^t \tilde{K}(t - \tau)x(\tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Once again, it follows from Definition 1.1 that $\tilde{K}(t) \doteq -\dot{K}(t)$ is CM. However, from the hypothesis that $K(t)$ itself is CM, we require that

$$0 \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} K(t) = K(0) + \int_0^\infty \dot{K}(t) dt = -\tilde{c}_0 - \int_0^\infty \tilde{K}(t) dt,$$

which places substantial requirements on \tilde{c}_0 and \tilde{K} . Roughly, this requires that the contribution from the integral term is dominated by that of the \tilde{c}_0 term.

If the additional hypotheses on \tilde{c}_0 and \tilde{K} are met, however, this allows us to lift the requirement that $\tilde{c}_1 \geq 0$. In fact, taking further derivatives extends this program further; so long as each derivative is ‘dominated by’ the contribution from the next, in an appropriate sense, this allows us to handle CM integro-differential equations of arbitrary order.

2. PRIOR WORK

As discussed above, existence and uniqueness results for Volterra equations of the first type (i.e., $c_1 = c_0 = 0$ in (gCM)), Volterra equations of the second type ($c_1 = 0$, $c_0 \neq 0$), and Volterra integro-differential equations ($c_1 \neq 0$) have been derived in several classical textbooks [33]. For example, it is well-known that the resolvent of a Volterra equation of the second type with completely monotone (CM) kernel is given by another CM kernel [33]; we will see that the theory derived in this paper confirms this fact. In the integro-differential case (but with $c_1 < 0$, outside the present scope), it has also been shown that the resolvent differs only from a CM kernel by an exponentially-decaying function [38].

A particularly simple case of (gCM) arises when K is given by a finite sum of exponentials:

$$K(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N b_i e^{-a_i t},$$

where $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ with $b_i > 0$. In this case, the Laplace transform takes our integro-differential operator to a rational function, and interconversion reduces to calculating its reciprocal. This algorithm has been discovered repeatedly in the analysis of integral equations [79, 63] and in the theory of viscoelastic materials [36, 3, 54, 43, 8]. When K does not take this simple form, however, the ‘reciprocal’ operation in the Laplace domain must be formalized more carefully to arrive at the correct inversion formulas. In the case of Volterra equations of the second type, such a procedure can be reduced to the perturbative operator theory of Aronszajn [5] and Donoghue [24]; and indeed, this approach has been recently applied by Loy & Anderssen [53] to formalize previous results in viscoelastic theory [34, 26]. As discussed, materials science applications have also inspired closed-form solutions to other classes of Volterra equations, including CM equations involving finite Prony series [75, 8] and finite sums of fractional derivatives [55].

A core task of our paper is to recontextualize these results within a broader and more-accessible framework, thereby solving a far wider class of problems. Before doing so, however, it is valuable to review the foundational results—from both pure and applied sciences—that have contributed to our current understanding of Volterra equations.




FIGURE 3. The Kelvin–Voigt and Maxwell models of viscoelasticity, describe materials as (potentially-infinite) collections of springs and dampers, connected in series or in parallel, respectively. The spring-damper elements in each model can be indexed by a position variable x , giving rise to a position-dependent strain (displacement gradient) $\epsilon(x, t)$ and stress (force gradient) $\sigma(x, t)$. The map from average stress $\bar{\epsilon}(t)$ to average strain $\bar{\sigma}(t)$ in a Kelvin–Voigt material is a Volterra integral equation of either the first or second type, while for Maxwell materials, the map from average strain to average stress is either a Volterra integral equation of the second type or a Volterra integro-differential equation.

2.1. Materials Science. Materials are defined by their response to applied stresses. Elastic solids deform (e.g., strain or shear) under force, but return to their original configuration as soon as the force is removed; viscous fluids resist deformation, but also resist returning from a deformed state. Naturally, then, *viscoelastic* materials give rise to a rich family of stress-strain relations.

The simplest examples of viscoelastic materials are constructed from springs and dashpots. When a single spring-dashpot pair is connected in parallel, we recover the Kelvin–Voigt model:

$$\sigma(t) = E\epsilon(t) + \nu\dot{\epsilon}(t), \quad \frac{1}{E + s\nu} \mathcal{L}[\sigma](s) = \mathcal{L}[\epsilon](s),$$

written in both the time and Laplace domains. Here, σ is the applied stress, ϵ is the resulting strain, E is the material’s elastic modulus, and ν is its viscosity.

The Kelvin–Voigt model can be extended straightforwardly to encompass inhomogeneous media. If we connect Kelvin–Voigt spring-dashpot pairs in series over a continuous interval $x \in [0, 1]$, we find

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{L}[\sigma](x, s) = (E(x) + s\nu(x))\mathcal{L}[\epsilon](x, s).$$

Since our elements are connected in a one-dimensional chain, the applied stress must be constant throughout the material:

$$\sigma(x, t) = \bar{\sigma}(t) \doteq \int_0^1 \sigma(x, t) dx,$$

so (similarly writing $\bar{\epsilon}(t) = \int_0^1 \epsilon(x, t) dx$) we can integrate (2.1) to recover

$$(2.2) \quad \left(\int_0^1 \frac{dx}{E(x) + s\nu(x)} \right) \mathcal{L}[\bar{\sigma}](s) = \mathcal{L}[\bar{\epsilon}](s).$$

Note that if $\nu(x)$ is strictly positive, then back in the time domain, the Kelvin-Voigt model corresponds to a Volterra equation of the first type relating average stress to average strain:

$$\bar{\epsilon}(t) = \int_0^t J(t - \tau) \dot{\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) d\tau = (J * \dot{\bar{\sigma}})(t),$$

where the *creep compliance* function J is given by

$$J(t) = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{E(x)} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{E(x)}{\nu(x)}t} \right) dx.$$

Here, the derivative $\nu(x)$ should be computed weakly (i.e., in terms of distributions) if it does not exist classically. The Kelvin-Voigt model is illustrated on the left-hand side of Figure 3. Notably, if ν is allowed to vanish anywhere in the domain, the relationship between $\bar{\epsilon}$ and $\bar{\sigma}$ becomes a Volterra equation of the second type.

In a different direction, we could start with a single spring-dashpot pair connected in series, recovering the Maxwell model:

$$\frac{\dot{\sigma}(t)}{E} + \frac{\sigma(t)}{\nu} = \dot{\epsilon}(t), \quad \left(\frac{s}{E} + \frac{1}{\nu} \right) \mathcal{L}[\sigma](s) = s\mathcal{L}[\epsilon](s).$$

The Maxwell model is illustrated on the right-hand side Figure 3. By connecting these pairs in parallel over a continuous interval $x \in [0, 1]$, now orthogonal to the direction of stress, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{s}{E(x)} + \frac{1}{\nu(x)} \right) \mathcal{L}[\sigma](x, s) = s\mathcal{L}[\epsilon](x, s).$$

Now it is the *strain* that must be constant throughout the material, so a similar analysis as above shows that

$$\mathcal{L}[\bar{\sigma}](s) = \left(\int_0^1 \frac{dx}{\frac{s}{E(x)} + \frac{1}{\nu(x)}} \right) s\mathcal{L}[\bar{\epsilon}](s).$$

Back in the time domain, this corresponds to a Volterra equation of the second type relating average strain and stress, so long as $E(x)$ is everywhere finite:

$$\bar{\sigma}(t) = \int_0^t G(t - \tau) \dot{\bar{\epsilon}}(\tau) d\tau = (G * \dot{\bar{\epsilon}})(t),$$

with the *relaxation modulus* G defined by

$$(2.3) \quad G(t) = \int_0^1 E(x) e^{-\frac{E(x)}{\nu(x)}t} dx.$$

Notably, if we allow $E(x) \rightarrow \infty$ anywhere in the domain, this is replaced by a Volterra integro-differential equation relating average strain and stress.

Although E and ν generally differ between the Kelvin–Voigt and Maxwell models, any linear viscoelastic material should have well-defined, physical values of $\bar{\sigma}$, $\bar{\epsilon}$, J , and G . Moreover, the kernels J and G always satisfy the resolvent (or *interconversion*) formula

$$(G * J)(t) = t,$$

which can be used to uniquely determine one from the other [26]. This program was first carried out by Gross, to derive analytical formulas relating J and G [34, 36]. Gross’ interconversion formulas became a cornerstone of viscoelastic theory [26, 55], though a formal proof (as well as a study of the *continuity* of interconversion) was given only recently by Loy & Anderssen [53].

In fact, the proof of Loy & Anderssen only covers a certain class of materials. As mentioned above, if $E(x) \rightarrow \infty$ for any x in the Maxwell model, the expression (2.3) must be replaced with an integro-differential equation relating $\bar{\epsilon}$ to $\bar{\sigma}$. The operator-theoretic techniques leveraged by Loy & Anderssen (which we return to shortly) do not apply in this case, putting this class of materials outside the scope they studied. Physically, these materials correspond to a Maxwell model where some spring-damper elements have no springs. Mapping to a Kelvin–Voigt model, this corresponds to a system where $\nu(x)$ vanishes for any x , or physically, where some spring-damper elements have no dampers.

Mathematically, the work of Loy & Anderssen allows one to solve Volterra integral equations of the second type (with CM kernels). Among other applications, the present work extends their results to cover Volterra integral equations of the second type and Volterra integro-differential equations, allowing us to study the classes of viscoelastic materials outside of their scope.

Materials science has also inspired a host of other solution methods for particular classes of Volterra (and related) equations. For one, classical results in the field allow for analytic interconversion of finite Prony series [75, 8] and finite sums of fractional derivatives [55], which are key to the ladder models employed by Gross [37, 35]. We will see that these results, along with the work of Loy & Anderssen discussed above, form special cases of a more general theory of Volterra interconversion. In the sequel, we also discuss how the spectral interconversion method developed here gives rise to an efficient scheme by which to approximate arbitrary kernels by finite Prony series.

2.2. Electrical Networks. Electrical networks are typically built from resistors (R), which resist the flow of electric current; inductors (L), which oppose changes in current by exchanging energy with a magnetic field; and capacitors (C), which manipulate the flow of current by exchanging energy with an electric field. Mathematically, these elements relate the current I to the voltage V in a network by the equations

$$(2.4) \quad V(t) = RI(t), \quad V(t) = L\dot{I}(t), \quad V(t) = \frac{1}{C} \int_0^t I(s) ds.$$

Arranging these elements in different network configurations allows us to achieve a broad array of transfer functions that map current I to voltage V and vice versa [21], and these networks are used in a wide array of applications including signal filtering, audio processing, and communication systems. Writing in the Laplace domain,

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{L}[V](s) = R\mathcal{L}[I](s), \quad \mathcal{L}[V](s) = sL\mathcal{L}[I](s), \quad \mathcal{L}[V](s) = \frac{1}{sC}\mathcal{L}[I](s),$$

we see that composing these elements in series or in parallel leads to transfer functions between I and V that are *biquadratic*, i.e., rational functions of degree at most two [58]. This is a fundamental difference from transfer functions in materials science applications, which are rational of degree at most one. Hence, electrical circuits are able to act on complex frequencies in I and V , leading to behaviors such as resonance and phase shifting.

In practical applications, the use of RLC circuits may be unnecessary if modulation of complex frequencies is not needed, and RC or RL networks built with two of the three components may still offer important lowpass or highpass signal filtering functionality. The transfer functions of RC and RL networks are once again rational polynomials of degree one, and are therefore identical to the viscoelastic transfer functions described earlier [58, Chapter 4]. In fact, even the Kelvin–Voigt and Maxwell models discussed in the previous section have natural analogues in *Foster synthesis* [7]. As such, the interconversion theory for integro-differential Volterra equations derived in this paper are applicable to general RC and RL circuits in much the same way as they are to viscoelastic materials.

2.3. Operator Theory. With particular choices of parameters—corresponding to the case studied by Loy & Anderssen [53]—our problem can be recast in the language of operator theory. Namely, fix a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , and suppose A is a self-adjoint operator with simple spectrum $\sigma(A) \subset \mathbb{R}$. The spectral theorem guarantees that, for a (non-unique) non-negative measure λ on $\sigma(A)$, the operator A is unitarily equivalent to the multiplication operator $f(s) \mapsto sf(s)$ on $L^2(\sigma(A), \lambda)$. If there exists a cyclic vector $v \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e., such that $\{v, Av, A^2v, \dots\} \subset \mathcal{H}$ span a dense subspace of \mathcal{H} , the measure λ can be uniquely chosen such that

$$\langle v | Av \rangle = \int s d\lambda(s).$$

We say that λ is the *spectral measure* of A corresponding to v . In this context, there is a unique *Borel functional calculus*; for any real-valued Borel function f on \mathbb{R} , there is a unique (generally unbounded) operator $f(A)$ on \mathcal{B} such that

$$\langle v | f(A)v \rangle = \int f(s) d\lambda(s).$$

In particular, we say that $v \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}(A)$ if

$$\langle v | (1 + A^2)^{-1/2}v \rangle = \int (1 + s^2)^{-1/2} d\lambda < \infty,$$

and in this case, we define the *Borel transform*

$$F : t \mapsto \langle v | (A - t)^{-1}v \rangle = \int \frac{d\lambda(s)}{s - t}.$$

The Borel transform provides a natural setting in which to study the spectral theory of A . In particular, consider the rank-one perturbation

$$A_\alpha \doteq A + \alpha v \langle v | \cdot \rangle$$

for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and let λ_α be the spectral measure of A_α corresponding to v . The Borel transform F_α of A_α is related to F using the Aronszajn–Krein formula:

$$F_\alpha = \frac{F}{1 + \alpha F},$$

from which key spectral properties of A_α can be derived. For instance, work of Aronszajn [5] and Donoghue [24] leverages this formula to recover explicit formulas for λ_α in terms of λ , corresponding to our Theorem 4.10 in the case $c_0 = -\alpha^{-1}$, $c_1 = 0$. As one consequence, for $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$, they deduce that the point spectra of A_{α_1} and A_{α_2} are disjoint.

The Aronszajn–Donoghue theory has since been extended in a number of directions. Simon and Wolff derived a necessary and sufficient criterion for the perturbations A_α to have pure point spectrum for almost all α [72], and they showed that the “almost all” qualifier cannot be dropped in general. Gordon [30, 31] and del Rio et al. [22, 23] (independently) took this analysis one step further, showing that for a wide class of operators A , there is an uncountable number of α for which A_α has pure singular continuous spectrum. All three groups applied their results to random Hamiltonians, where spectral results can be related to questions of Anderson localization; see the review by Simon [71] for more details.

Separately, Gesztesy and Simon explored the strong-coupling limit $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, showing that the (weighted) spectral measures of A_α converge weakly to a measure ρ_∞ on \mathbb{R} , and Albeverio and Koshmanenko [2] related this limit to the Friedrichs extension of A . More recently, Albeverio, Konstantinov, and Koshmanenko [1] have extended the Aronszajn–Krein relation to the case $v \in \mathcal{H}_{-2}(A)$, i.e., when it is only known that

$$\langle v | (1 + A^2)^{-1} v \rangle = \int (1 + s^2)^{-1} d\lambda < \infty,$$

Frymark and Liaw [28] have applied Aronszajn–Donoghue-type techniques to explore infinite iterations of rank-one perturbations.

As a result of our theory, we will see that several results of the Aronszajn–Donoghue theory can be obtained using substantially different techniques, by fitting the Aronszajn–Krein formula into a larger family of interconversion relations. In this sense, our work complements, extends, and recontextualizes this existing theory, though the most general case of our results is not directly applicable (as of yet) to operator theory.

2.4. Signal Processing. The field of signal processing focuses on the analysis, modification, and synthesis of time-dependent signals, which may be relayed as physical waves, electronic signals, or any other form of time series measurement [9]. A classical problem in the signal processing literature is that of signal deconvolution [66], which we present here in the discrete-time setting for convenience. Given a known filter $K(n)$ and output signal $y(n)$, we aim to determine the input signal $x(n)$ that satisfies the convolution equation

$$(2.6) \quad y(n) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^n K(n-i)x(i).$$

We can transform this problem into the spectral domain by taking a bilateral Z-transform,

$$\mathcal{Z}_b[x](z) \doteq \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} x(n)z^n$$

interpreted as a formal power series in z . We can likewise define $Y = \mathcal{Z}_b[y]$ and $H = \mathcal{Z}_b[K]$, defining $K(n) = 0$ for $n < 0$. The function H is called the *transfer*

function; with mild assumptions on K , it is a holomorphic function on the unit disc \mathbb{D} . Rewriting (2.6) in the spectral domain, we obtain

$$Y(z) = H(z)X(z)$$

where convolution transforms into pointwise multiplication. For continuous-time deconvolution, a similar transformation is accomplished by replacing the Z-transform with the Laplace transform.

Continuing in the discrete-time setting, the classical solution to the deconvolution problem is given by the *frequency domain deconvolution formula*,

$$(2.7) \quad X(z) = \frac{Y(z)}{H(z)} \doteq G(z)Y(z)$$

where $G(z) = 1/H(z)$ is defined wherever $H(z) \neq 0$. One objective of the present work in the discrete-time setting is to rigorously extend this formula in cases where H vanishes on the boundary of \mathbb{D} , which appear in a variety of problems of interest.

If H is analytic and nonzero in \mathbb{D} , then of course, its reciprocal G is analytic and nonzero as well. The inverse transform $J \doteq \mathcal{Z}_b^{-1}[G]$ is thus a causal kernel (i.e., with $J(n) = 0$ for $n < 0$), and we find

$$(2.8) \quad x(n) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^n J(n-i)y(i).$$

The deconvolution problem is one of the most classical examples of an ill-posed inverse problem [66, 11], as small errors in y are magnified to become large errors in x whenever $H(z)$ is small. As such, instead of studying the perfect deconvolution problem discussed above, the signal processing literature has proposed several regularized variants:

$$(2.9) \quad X(z) = \frac{Y(z)}{H(z) + \varepsilon}, \quad X(z) = \frac{\chi_{\{|H(z)| > \varepsilon\}}(z)}{H(z)} Y(z), \quad X(z) = \frac{\overline{H}(z)}{|H(z)|^2 + \varepsilon} Y(z)$$

where \overline{H} denotes the complex conjugate. These methods all give rise to different regularized filters $G_\varepsilon(z)$, each of which approximately solves the inverse problem as $X(z) \approx G_\varepsilon(z)Y(z)$. The first two filters listed in (2.9) are pseudoinverse filters and the third filter is a form of *Tikhonov regularization*, sometimes called the *Wiener deconvolution filter* [11] if ε is chosen to scale with the level of noise in y . Only the first of the filters $G_\varepsilon(z)$ in (2.9) is holomorphic in the unit disk, and hence it is the only filter for which $J_\varepsilon = \mathcal{Z}_b^{-1}[G_\varepsilon]$ is causal. The latter two filters are non-causal, and an alternative Shannon-Bode construction must be used to enforce causality exactly [81].

A fundamental problem with frequency domain deconvolution is that the regularization in G_ε biases the estimation of the true inverse filter $G(z)$, potentially leading to large errors in the reconstruction of x . Furthermore, the spectral reconstruction $X(z) = G_\varepsilon(z)Y(z)$ is typically evaluated at N equispaced points $z_k = e^{2\pi ik/N}$ on the unit circle and then inverted by the FFT to estimate $x(n)$. This approach is efficient and performs inversion in near-linear time, but assumes that x, y are N -periodic and hence enforces this assumption in the reconstruction of x . In this paper, we develop analytical formulas for the non-regularized inverse transfer function $G(z)$, thus mitigating the bias introduced by traditional frequency deconvolution approaches and removing a major source of error in this ill-posed problem.

An alternative approach to deconvolution is *time-domain deconvolution*, which directly solves (2.6) by forming the Toeplitz triangular system

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x(0) \\ \vdots \\ x(n) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} y(0) \\ \vdots \\ y(n) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ with $T_{ij} = \chi_{\{i \geq j\}} K(i-j)$, and where we have assumed that $x(n) = 0$ for all $n < 0$. Assuming $K(0) > 0$, this system can be solved by computing an inverse (or pseudoinverse) of \mathbf{T} , a method referred to as Finite Impulse Response (FIR) Wiener filtering. Performing deconvolution in the time domain alleviates the need to compute spectral properties of noisy signals y , as would be required by frequency deconvolution. However, inverting a triangular Toeplitz matrix is most easily done with forward substitution and Levinson recursion [82], each of which has computational complexity $O(n^2)$. Although there exist FFT-based algorithms for deconvolution in near-linear time, they are generally either complex in their implementation or make strong regularity assumptions on the spectrum of K [17, 14, 51]. We show in Section 9.5 that our general theory matches this runtime with an easy-to-implement, highly-general spectral method for deconvolution in the context of (dPD).

2.5. Numerical Analysis. Numerical solutions of Volterra equations have been developed for both linear and nonlinear equations. Linear equations can be solved in either the spectral or time domain. Methods for spectral inversion have been outlined in the section about on signal processing, so we focus here on inversion in the time domain.

For linear Volterra equations of the first and second type, discretization through Newton–Cotes quadrature leads to a triangular Toeplitz system, much like those discussed in the preceding section. Such systems can be inverted through forward substitution, Levinson recursion, or more involved *superfast* methods based on repeated applications of the fast Fourier transforms [14, 14, 51]. For linear integro-differential equations, the convolution kernel can be discretized with Newton–Cotes, Gaussian, or other quadrature schemes, and the resulting delay differential equation can be integrated numerically [4]. We investigate these methods for solving linear Volterra equations in Section 9.2, and we show that analytic interconversion using our general theory is able to match the accuracy of these approaches. In the sequel, we work to improve our algorithm to achieve high-order, *spectral* accuracy.

Although not explored in this work, there exist a variety of methods for obtaining numerical solutions of nonlinear Volterra equations. Important classes of algorithms consist of iterative methods based on Picard iteration, series solutions such as the Taylor or Adomian decompositions, analytic conversion into initial value or boundary value problems, direct numerical quadrature for integral equations and time stepping for integro-differential equations, or a combination of these approaches [52, 78].

3. PRELIMINARIES

We largely study our Volterra equations under the action of various integral transforms, where they can be related to questions of measure theory. To make progress, we introduce the following notation:

Definition 3.1 (Sets of Measures). Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{M}(S^1)$ be the spaces of Borel measures of locally bounded variation on \mathbb{R} and on S^1 , respectively. We define the following subsets of each:

- (1) Let $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ be the subspace of finite measures.
- (2) Let $\mathcal{M}_{+, \text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, $\mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$, and $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \subset \mathcal{M}(S^1)$ be the subsets of non-negative measures, excluding the zero measure.
- (3) Let $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R})$ be the subset of non-negative, compactly supported measures.
- (4) For any $n \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{M}^{(n)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ be the subspace of measures λ on \mathbb{R} such that $\int (1 + s^2)^{-n/2} d\lambda(s) < \infty$. In particular, $\mathcal{M}^{(0)}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$.
- (5) Let $\mathcal{M}_+^{(n)}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{M}_{+, \text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{M}^{(n)}(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, $\mathcal{M}_+^{(0)}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R})$.
- (6) Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(n)}(\mathbb{R})$ be the set of measures $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(n)}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\inf \text{supp } \lambda > -\infty$.

The notation $\mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(n)}(\mathbb{R})$ is inspired by the fact that, for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(n)}(\mathbb{R})$, the bilateral Laplace transform

$$\mathcal{L}_b[\lambda](t) \doteq \int e^{-\sigma t} d\lambda(\sigma)$$

is dominated by exponential growth or decay as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Also note that $\mathcal{M}_+^{(n)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(m)}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(n)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(m)}(\mathbb{R})$ for $n \leq m$. To make contact between the theory on the circle and the theory on the real line, we make use of the embedding $\psi : \mathcal{M}^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(S^1)$ given by

$$(3.1) \quad d\lambda(s) \doteq \pi(1 + s^2) \phi_* \psi[d\lambda](s),$$

where

$$(3.2) \quad \phi : z \mapsto i \frac{1 - z}{1 + z}, \quad \phi^{-1} : w \mapsto \frac{i - w}{i + w},$$

are the Cayley maps between the unit disc and the upper half-plane. For instance, if ds and $d\theta$ are the Lebesgue measures on \mathbb{R} and S^1 , respectively, then $\psi[ds] = (2\pi)^{-1} d\theta$. The utility of this embedding will largely be in relating integral transforms on the circle to integral transforms on the line, which we discuss shortly.

Such measures provide a helpful dual language for all three of (gCM), (gPD), and (dPD), albeit, in slightly different ways; we return to the more-involved classes (rPD) and (rCM) in Section 4.3.

Lemma 3.2 (Bernstein [80, 33]). *A kernel $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is generalized-completely-monotone if and only if*

$$K(t) = \int e^{-\sigma t} d\lambda(\sigma)$$

for a non-negative Borel measure λ with $\inf \text{supp } \lambda > -\infty$. We write $\lambda = \mathcal{L}_b^{-1}[K]$ and $\mathcal{L}_b[\lambda] = K$ for the (bilateral) Laplace transform in this context.

Lemma 3.3 (Bochner [65]). *A kernel $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is positive definite if and only if it is the Fourier transform of a measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R})$, and generalized-positive-definite if and only if it is the Fourier transform of a measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. We have $K(0) < \infty$ if and only if $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R})$, in which case, K takes the familiar form*

$$K(t) = \mathcal{F}[\lambda](t) \doteq \int e^{-i\omega t} d\lambda(\omega).$$

We write $\lambda = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[K]$ for the (inverse) Fourier transform.

Likewise, a kernel $K : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is positive definite if and only if it is the (discrete) Fourier transform of a measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$:

$$K(n) = \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} d\lambda(\theta).$$

We apply the same notation for the Fourier transform in this context.

As such, we can reduce all three classes of equations to the common language of non-negative measures. In turn, we largely study these measures by extending them to holomorphic functions:

Definition 3.4 (Integral Transforms on S^1). For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, we define the *Cauchy transform*

$$(3.3) \quad Q[\lambda](z) \doteq \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 + e^{-i\theta} z}{1 - e^{-i\theta} z} d\lambda(\theta),$$

viewed as a holomorphic map on the open unit disc $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$. The real part of $Q[\lambda](z)$ is known as the *Poisson integral*,

$$(3.4) \quad P[\lambda](re^{i\theta}) \doteq \operatorname{Re} Q[\lambda](re^{i\theta}) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 - r^2}{1 - 2r \cos(\theta - \theta') + r^2} d\lambda(\theta'),$$

and the imaginary part is the *conjugate Poisson integral*:

$$(3.5) \quad \operatorname{Im} Q[\lambda](re^{i\theta}) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{2r \sin(\theta - \theta')}{1 - 2r \cos(\theta - \theta') + r^2} d\lambda(\theta').$$

These integral transforms can be seen to be isometries of appropriate function spaces. To see this, following the notation of Axler et al. [6], we define the following *harmonic Hardy spaces* on the disc:

Definition 3.5. Suppose h is a real harmonic function on \mathbb{D} , and fix $0 < p \leq \infty$. We say that $h \in h^p(\mathbb{D})$ if, for all $r < 1$, the circular traces $e^{i\theta} \mapsto h(re^{i\theta})$ are uniformly bounded in $L^p(S^1)$. We define $\|h\|_{h^p} = \sup_r \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int |h(re^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \right)^{1/p}$.

In this language, we have the following classical results:

Proposition 3.6. *The following classical results are established, for instance⁴, in Axler et al. [6]:*

- (1) *The Poisson kernel $P : \lambda \rightarrow P[\lambda]$ is an isometry from $\mathcal{M}(S^1)$ (with variation norm) to $h^1(\mathbb{D})$ (Herglotz–Riesz).*
- (2) *If $1 < p \leq \infty$, the map $P : f \mapsto P[(2\pi)^{-1} f(e^{i\theta}) d\theta]$ is an isometry from $L^p(S^1)$ to $h^p(\mathbb{D})$.*
- (3) *If $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(S^1)$, the measures $\lambda_r \doteq (2\pi)^{-1} P[\lambda](re^{i\theta}) d\theta$ converge weakly to λ as $r \rightarrow 1$.*
- (4) *If $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(S^1)$, and $\lambda_c \in L^1(S^1)$ is the density of its continuous part with respect to the normalized Lebesgue measure $(2\pi)^{-1} d\theta$, as furnished by the Lebesgue decomposition [69], then $P[\lambda]$ has non-tangential limit λ_c almost everywhere in S^1 .*

In particular, we make use of the following corollary:

⁴Respectively, these correspond to Thm. 6.13a, Thm. 6.13b, Thm. 6.9, and Cor. 6.44.

Corollary 3.7. *For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a unique holomorphic function $Q_\sigma[\lambda](z)$ on \mathbb{D} with positive real part such that $\text{Im } Q_\sigma[\lambda](0) = \sigma$ and where the measures $\lambda_r \doteq (2\pi)^{-1} \text{Re } Q_\sigma[\lambda](re^{i\theta}) d\theta$ converge weakly to λ as $r \rightarrow 1$. This function is given by*

$$(3.6) \quad Q_\sigma[\lambda](z) = Q[\lambda](z) + i\sigma = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 + e^{-i\theta}z}{1 - e^{-i\theta}z} d\lambda(\theta) + i\sigma.$$

We say that $Q_\sigma[\lambda]$ is the σ -Cauchy transform of λ , and we define the σ -Hilbert transform to be its imaginary trace along S^1 :

$$(3.7) \quad H_\sigma[\lambda](e^{i\theta}) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \text{Im } Q[\lambda](re^{i\theta}),$$

well-defined almost everywhere in S^1 [6]. We set $H[\lambda] = H_0[\lambda]$.

Proof. One such function is provided by (3.6). Indeed, it is clear that $\text{Im } Q_\sigma[\lambda](0) = \sigma$; furthermore, standard arguments show that $Q_\sigma[\lambda](z)$ is holomorphic and of positive real part, and Proposition 3.6.3 shows that $\lambda_r \rightarrow \lambda$ weakly as $r \rightarrow 1$.

Suppose a distinct function h on \mathbb{D} satisfies all three properties. From the weak convergence of $(2\pi)^{-1} \text{Re } h(re^{i\theta}) d\theta$ to λ , we see in particular that $\|\lambda_r\|$ is uniformly bounded in r ; but then $\text{Re } h \in h^1(\mathbb{D})$, so Propositions 3.6.1 and 3.6.3 uniquely identify $\text{Re } h = P[\lambda]$. Of course, the harmonic conjugate $\text{Im } h$ of $\text{Re } h$ is unique up to a constant term [18], from which the lemma follows. \square

The utility of this one-parameter family of integral transforms is best seen by mapping our setting to the real line. The standard definition of the *Cauchy transform* on the real line is as follows; for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, we set

$$Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) \doteq \int \frac{i d\lambda(s)}{\pi(z - s)}.$$

This is a holomorphic function on the open half-plane $\mathbb{H} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Im } z > 0\}$, defined (up to the addition of an imaginary constant) by the property that

$$\text{Re } Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](t + i\varepsilon) dt \rightarrow d\lambda(t)$$

weakly as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The imaginary part of this limit is known as the *Hilbert transform* on the real line:

$$(3.8) \quad H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](t) \doteq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Im } Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](t + i\varepsilon) = \text{p. v.} \int \frac{d\lambda(s)}{\pi(t - s)},$$

defined almost everywhere in \mathbb{R} . Here, the (Cauchy) ‘principal value’ of the integral is taken [45]—in other words, the contour of integration is understood to travel above any singularities (i.e., in \mathbb{H}) of $Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda]$.

Then we note that, for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, with the latter inclusion provided by the map (3.1), we have

$$(3.9) \quad Q[\psi[\lambda]](\phi^{-1}(z)) = \int \frac{i d\lambda(s)}{\pi(z - s)} + \int \frac{is d\lambda(s)}{\pi(1 + s^2)} \doteq Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda),$$

where

$$\sigma_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \lambda \mapsto - \int \frac{s d\lambda(s)}{\pi(1 + s^2)}$$

measures the imaginary part of $Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda]$ at $z = +i$. Intuitively, the imaginary offset of $Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)$ is fixed by the requirement that $Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$, but the




FIGURE 4. Visualization of the Cauchy transform Q given by (3.3). By adding an imaginary component to the Cauchy transform, we recover the one-parameter family of σ -Cauchy transforms Q_σ , given by (3.6); these transforms allow us to capture the Cauchy transforms on the circle and real line (and in fact, any Jordan curve) using the same theory. By taking the imaginary trace of Q and Q_σ along the unit circle, we recover the Hilbert and σ -Hilbert transforms, respectively.

imaginary offset of $Q[\psi[\lambda]](\phi^{-1}(z))$ is fixed by the requirement that $\text{Im } Q[\psi[\lambda]](0) = 0$. Since $0 = \phi^{-1}(i)$, it is exactly the functional $\sigma_{\mathbb{R}}$ that quantifies this difference.

Critically, this insight implies that the Cauchy transform on the real line (and similarly for any Jordan curve) can be seen as a special case of the one-parameter family of transforms furnished by Corollary 3.7, with $\sigma = \sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda)$. Of course, a similar statement for the Hilbert transform follows:

$$(3.10) \quad H[\psi[\lambda]](\phi^{-1}(t)) = H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](t) - \sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda).$$

Before proceeding, we develop a quick result characterizing $H_\sigma[\lambda]$ outside the support of λ :

Lemma 3.8. *Fix $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, then $H_\sigma[\lambda]$ is smooth and strictly decreasing (in the counterclockwise direction) on each component of $S^1 \setminus \text{supp } f$. In particular, if $\psi^{-1}[\lambda] \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R})$ is compactly supported, then $t \mapsto H_{\mathbb{R}}[\psi^{-1}[\lambda]](-1/t)$ is smooth and strictly decreasing in an interval of $t = 0$.*

Proof. Fix a component $I \subset S^1 \setminus \text{supp } \lambda$, so that $\lambda \equiv 0$ uniformly on this interval. For any $\theta_0 \in I$, it follows from (3.5) that

$$H_\sigma[\lambda](\theta_0) = \sigma + \text{p. v.} \int_{S^1} \cot\left(\frac{\theta_0 - \theta}{2}\right) d\lambda(\theta) = \sigma + \int_{S^1 \setminus I} \cot\left(\frac{\theta_0 - \theta}{2}\right) d\lambda(\theta).$$

Since the integrand has a partial derivative (with respect to θ) defined almost everywhere, a strong version of the Leibniz rule [27] shows that

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} H_\sigma[\lambda](\theta_0) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{S^1 \setminus I} \csc^2\left(\frac{\theta_0 - \theta}{2}\right) d\lambda(\theta) \leq 0,$$

with equality if and only if $\lambda \equiv 0$. Since the cotangent is smooth with each derivative uniformly bounded in $S^1 \setminus I$, we can deduce similarly that $H_\sigma[\lambda]$ is smooth in I . The final claim follows from choosing $I \ni -1$ and applying the Cayley transform. \square

4. MAIN RESULTS

As discussed above, much of our analysis is carried out two steps removed from the topic of Volterra equations, in the setting of holomorphic functions on the disc. Section 4.1 is dedicated to understanding positive measures on the circle, which are related to holomorphic functions on the disc through Corollary 3.7. We introduce a natural involution \mathcal{B} on the set $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R}$, we show it to be weakly continuous, and we develop a practical closed-form expression for \mathcal{B} . We show how the map \mathcal{B} corresponds to the solution (or *interconversion*) of the discrete-time equation (dPD), giving a flavor of our subsequent results for continuous-time equations.

Section 4.2 deals with the latter problem by pulling our S^1 theory back to the real line. This motivates the definition of an involution $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ on a large subset of $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$, writing $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid t > 0\}$; this construction pulls back the more-natural involution \mathcal{B} under the embedding $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ provided by (3.1), except on certain subsets where it fails. Before exploring how widely $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ can be defined, we show how it corresponds to the interconversion of both (gCM) and (gPD). We then develop a practical closed-form expression for $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ over a wide class of measures (implying, for one, that it is well-defined for such measures), along with two more-specialized results in this direction. First, we see how $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ reduces to known interconversion formulas for Prony series [75, 8] when $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ is discrete; second, we see how it can be modified to handle (gPD) in the diffusive case, when $\text{Im } c_0 > 0$. Finally, we show that $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ is well-defined over several wider subsets of $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$, capturing all examples of (gCM) when either c_0 or c_1 is non-vanishing, and we show that $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ is continuous on these subset with respect to natural refinements of the weak topology.

Finally, Section 4.3 extends our theory on the real line by constructing a regularized Hilbert transform H_{reg} for measures in $\mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$; this represents a novel, geometric perspective on the regularized transform usually recovered from Calderón–Zygmund theory [13]. Corresponding to H_{reg} is a new involution \mathcal{B}_{reg} , now defined on all of $\mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}$. After proving similar closed-form expressions and continuity properties for \mathcal{B}_{reg} , we show how it yields interconversion formulas for both (rPD) and (rCM) in different limits—finally closing the loop on our Volterra theory.

We illustrate each of these results with simple analytical and numerical examples (see Fig. 6), showing how our work brings a variety of Volterra equations within the realm of pen-and-paper calculations. Our work also yields a powerful, spectral method to solve more complicated equations, as we discuss further in Section 9.

4.1. Measures on the Circle, and Discrete-Time Volterra Equations. On the circle, our primary object of study is the following involution:




FIGURE 5. Visualization of the interconversion map \mathcal{B} between (λ, c_0) and (μ, ζ_0) , related by (4.1). This map directly allows for the interconversion of discrete-time Volterra equations of the form (dPD), but can also be leveraged to solve integral, integro-differential, delay differential, and fractional differential equations.

Theorem 4.1 (Inversion in $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$). *For any $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, there are unique $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ such that*

$$Q_{c_0}[\lambda](z)Q_{\zeta_0}[\mu](z) \equiv 1.$$

In this context, we write

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{B}[\lambda, c_0] = (\mu, \zeta_0).$$

The map \mathcal{B} is an involution of $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R}$, continuous with respect to the product of the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and the standard topology on \mathbb{R} . By evaluating at the origin, we find

$$(\|\lambda\| + ic_0)(\|\mu\| + i\zeta_0) = 1,$$

with $\|\cdot\|$ the total variation norm on $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$.

Theorem 4.1 is proved in Section 7; in fact, we prove a significant generalization of the theorem, applying to a wide class of nonlinear functions applied to $Q[\lambda]$. We are interested in calculating \mathcal{B} explicitly, for which we introduce the following notation:

Definition 4.2. Suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$. Define the zero set of λ as

$$N_0(\lambda) = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \text{clos} \left\{ e^{i\theta} \in S^1 \mid \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(\exp i[\theta - \delta, \theta + \delta]) / 2\delta < \varepsilon \right\}.$$

If λ is a continuous measure with continuous density, for instance, the set $N_0(\lambda)$ corresponds exactly to the zeroes of this density. So long as $N_0(\lambda)$ is not too badly behaved, we can compute \mathcal{B} exactly:

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, and write $\text{supp } \lambda \subset S^1$ for its closed, essential support. Fix $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that*

$$Z' \doteq (N_0(\lambda) \cap \text{supp } \lambda) \cup \{z \notin \text{supp } \lambda \mid H[\lambda](z) + c_0 = 0\}$$

is discrete⁵, i.e., if $z \in Z'$, there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|z - z'| > \varepsilon$ for any $z' \neq z$ in Z' . Write $\lambda_c \in L^1(S^1)$ for the density of the continuous component of λ with respect to the normalized Lebesgue measure $(2\pi)^{-1} d\theta$, and write $\mathcal{B}[\lambda, c_0] = (\mu, \zeta_0)$. Then we find

$$(4.2) \quad d\mu(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1} \mu_c(e^{i\theta}) d\theta + \sum_{\alpha_i \in Z} \beta_i \delta(\theta - \theta_i) d\theta,$$

where the continuous part is given by

$$(4.3) \quad \mu_c(e^{i\theta}) = \frac{\lambda_c(e^{i\theta})}{\lambda_c(e^{i\theta})^2 + (H[\lambda](e^{i\theta}) + c_0)^2} \in L^1(S^1),$$

and the discrete part has weights

$$(4.4) \quad \beta_i = -\frac{1}{4} \left(\int \frac{e^{i(\theta+\theta_i)}}{(e^{i\theta} - e^{i\theta_i})^2} d\lambda(\theta) \right)^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

for all $e^{i\theta_i} \in Z$ in the discrete set

$$(4.5) \quad Z = N_0(\lambda) \cap \{z \in S^1 \mid H[\lambda](z) + c_0 = 0\}.$$

Finally, we have that

$$(4.6) \quad \zeta_0 = \text{Im} [(\|\lambda\| + ic_0)^{-1}].$$

We prove the (substantially harder) case of the real line below, as Theorem 4.10; our proof can be adapted straightforwardly to the case of S^1 . Although our ultimate aim is to pull \mathcal{B} back to the real line to understand continuous-time Volterra equations, it is also directly useful for solving discrete-time Volterra equations. We prove the following proposition in Section 5:

Proposition 4.4 (Solution of (dPD)). *In the setting of (dPD), assuming that $\text{Re } c_0 \geq -\frac{1}{2}K(0)$, write*

$$c'_0 = c_0 - 2 \text{Re } c_0 - K(0), \quad K'(n) = K(n) + \delta(n) (2 \text{Re } c_0 + K(0)),$$

where $\delta(n)$ is a discrete delta function. It is easy to verify that $K'(n)$ is positive definite, and that the pair (c'_0, K') give rise to the same discrete-time Volterra equation as (c_0, K) but now satisfying the equality $\text{Re } c'_0 = -\frac{1}{2}K'(0)$. Write $\lambda \doteq \mathcal{F}^{-1}[K'] \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, and define

$$(\mu, \zeta'_0) = \mathcal{B}[\lambda, 2 \text{Im } c'_0], \quad J = 4\mathcal{F}[\mu].$$

Setting $\zeta_0 = 2i\zeta'_0 - \frac{1}{2}J(0)$, the equation (dPD) is satisfied by

$$x(n) = \zeta_0 y(n) + \sum_{j=0}^n J(n-j)y(j).$$

We can illustrate this result with a simple, analytical example:

⁵This definition allows Z' to be infinite, so long as the limit points of Z' do not themselves belong to Z' .

Example 4.5. Fix $-1 < a < 1$, and consider the equation

$$y(n) = \sum_{j=0}^n (j+1)a^j x(n-j).$$

Following Proposition 4.7, we make the choice $c'_0 = -1$, $K'(n) = (|n|+1)a^{|n|} + \delta(|n|)$, which corresponds to the measure

$$d\lambda(\theta) = \operatorname{Re} \frac{2}{(1 - ae^{i\theta})^2} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad Q[\lambda](z) = \frac{2}{(1 - az)^2}.$$

By comparing against the statement of Theorem 4.1, we see that $\zeta'_0 = 0$ and $d\mu(\theta) = \operatorname{Re}[(1 - ae^{i\theta})^2] d\theta/4\pi$, and thus that

$$J = 2\delta(n) - 2a\delta(n-1) + a^2\delta(n-2), \quad \zeta_0 = -1.$$

Putting these ingredients together, we find

$$x(n) = y(n) - 2ay(n-1) + a^2y(n-2).$$

This inversion is shown in Fig. 6.

4.2. Measures on the Line, and Continuous-Time Volterra Equations.

In treating integral and integro-differential equations, we are primarily interested in the pullback of the involution \mathcal{B} to \mathbb{R} . Now, the embedding $\psi : \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ defined by (3.1) nearly covers its entire codomain, with the only element in the cokernel being the Dirac measure $\delta_{-1} \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ at $-1 = \phi^{-1}(\infty)$. To understand how the latter ‘should’ behave under our map, we calculate

$$Q[\delta_{-1}](\phi^{-1}(z)) = -iz.$$

We can combine this expression with that of (3.9) to develop a slight extension of our embedding ψ , to account for both constant contributions to λ as well as possible ‘poles at infinity’. In short, if $\psi \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $c_1 \geq 0$, we know that there is a value $c'_0 = \pi(\sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda) - c_0) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$Q[\psi[\lambda] + \pi c_1 \delta_{-1}](\phi^{-1}(z)) + ic'_0 = Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}(c_0 + c_1 z),$$

with π scalings chosen for later convenience. To codify this relationship, we write

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi : \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ &\rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \Psi[\lambda, c_0, c_1] &= (\psi[\lambda] + \pi^{-1}c_1 \delta_{-1}, \sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda) - \pi^{-1}c_0). \end{aligned}$$

The behavior of Ψ is shown in Fig. 7. In particular, we see that it allows us to pull the involution \mathcal{B} back to the line in a natural way. More rigorously, Theorem 4.1 implies that, for any measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ and parameters $c'_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1 \geq 0$, there is a unique measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ and parameters $\zeta'_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta_1 \geq 0$ such that

$$(Q[\psi[\lambda]](\phi^{-1}(z)) - i\pi^{-1}c'_0 - i\pi^{-1}c_1 z) (Q[\psi[\mu]](\phi^{-1}(z)) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta'_0 - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_1 z) \equiv 1.$$

As indicated above, we are primarily interested in the case that both λ and μ are known to live in $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$; this property corresponds to *local integrability* of the kernel $K(t)$ in Lemma 3.2, for instance, and we will discuss sufficient conditions for this to occur later (see Theorem 4.17). One can still interpret both of our integro-differential equations when $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, a topic we return to in Section 4.3.




FIGURE 6. Simple examples of three classes of Volterra equations studied in this paper: (gCM), (gPD), and (dPD). The first column shows the spectral distributions λ and μ , defined on \mathbb{R} for (gCM) and (gPD) and on S^1 for (dPD), showing the behavior of the involutions $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and \mathcal{B} . The second column depicts the Volterra kernels K and J corresponding to these spectral distributions. In the third column, we confirm that the predictions of our theory in Examples 4.11, 4.13, 4.15, and 4.5 correctly solve the corresponding Volterra equations. Namely, we show that given a Volterra equation with kernel K , input x , and output y , the inverse Volterra equation with kernel J successfully reconstructs the input $\hat{x} = x$ from y .




FIGURE 7. Commutative diagram showing how continuous-time Volterra equations, corresponding to triples (λ, c_0, c_1) , can be lifted to the circle by the map Ψ defined in (4.7). The interconversion maps \mathcal{B} (corresponding to discrete-time equations (dPD)) and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ (corresponding to integral and integro-differential equations, (gCM) and (gPD)) are directly related by the embedding Ψ .

If $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, then the values $\sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda), \sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\mu) \in \mathbb{R}$ are well-defined by (3.9), and we see that

$$(Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}c_0 - i\pi^{-1}c_1z)(Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\mu](z) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_0 - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_1z) \equiv 1,$$

where $c_0 = \sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda) - \pi^{-1}c'_0$ and $\zeta_0 = \sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\mu) - \pi^{-1}\zeta'_0$ are both real. In parallel with Theorem 4.1, we write

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1)$$

in this context, though we note that \mathcal{B} is not well-defined for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$; we discuss sufficient conditions for $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ to be well-defined in Theorem 4.10 and Theorem 4.17, below. The utility of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is highlighted by the following results:

Proposition 4.6 (Solution of (gCM)). *Suppose $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a gCM kernel for which $\lambda \doteq \mathcal{L}_b^{-1}[K] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. In the setting of (gCM), suppose $(\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1]$ is well-defined with $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, and write $J = \mathcal{L}_b[\mu]$. Then (gCM) is satisfied by*

$$-\pi^2 x(t) = \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) - \zeta_0 y(t) - \int_0^t J(t - \tau) y(\tau) d\tau - c_1 x_0 J(t).$$

Proposition 4.7 (Solution of (gPD)). *Suppose $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a gPD kernel for which $\lambda \doteq \mathcal{F}^{-1}[K] \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. In the setting of (gPD), suppose $(\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1]$ is well-defined, and write $J = \mathcal{F}[\mu]$. If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, then (gPD) is satisfied by*

$$\pi^2 x(t) = \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) - i\zeta_0 y(t) + \int_0^t J(t - \tau) y(\tau) ds + c_1 x_0 J(t).$$

Remark 4.8. As discussed in Section 1.1, both Proposition 4.6 and Proposition 4.7 can be adapted to homogeneous initial data with an infinite time horizon—i.e., $x \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. For this, we need only to change the lower bound of each integral above, from 0 to $-\infty$, and discard the term depending on x_0 .

Both results follow straightforwardly from analyzing our equations in the Laplace domain; we prove them both in Section 5. Much of our focus in this section, then, will be on characterizing $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. We start by developing a practical formula for $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, for which we need the following analogue of Definition 4.2:

Definition 4.9. Suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{+, \text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$. Then we define the zero set

$$N_0(\lambda) \doteq \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \text{clos} \left\{ s \in \mathbb{R} \mid \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lambda([s - \delta, s + \delta]) / 2\delta < \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Equivalently, we could define the zero set as the pullback of the zero set of Definition 4.2 to \mathbb{R} :

$$N_0(\lambda) = \phi(N_0(\psi[\lambda]) \setminus \{-1\}) \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

Next, given a non-negative function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, we say that $f \in L^*(\mathbb{R})$ if

$$(1 + s^2)^{1/2} f(s) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}), \quad \mathcal{F}[s \mapsto s^2 f(s)] \in L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

denoting by \mathcal{F} the Fourier transform on $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. For instance, $L^*(\mathbb{R})$ contains (along with much less well-behaved elements) the set of non-negative Schwartz functions on \mathbb{R} . The following theorem is proved in Section 8:

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\lambda \in L^*(\mathbb{R}) + \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(-1)}(\mathbb{R})$, in the sense that $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ for a non-negative function $\lambda_1 \in L^*(\mathbb{R})$ and measure $\lambda_2 \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$. Fix $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1 \geq 0$, and suppose that*

$$Z' \doteq (N_0(\lambda) \cap \text{supp } \lambda) \cup \{s \notin \text{supp } \lambda \mid H[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1 s + c_0) = 0\}$$

is discrete (i.e., it does not contain any of its limit points). Write λ_c for the density of the continuous component of λ . Then $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1)$ is well-defined, and we find

$$(4.9) \quad d\mu(s) = \mu_c(s) ds + \sum_{\alpha_i \in Z} \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i) ds,$$

where the continuous part is given by

$$(4.10) \quad \mu_c(s) = \frac{\lambda_c(s)}{\lambda_c(s)^2 + (H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1 s + c_0))^2} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

and the discrete part has weights

$$(4.11) \quad \beta_i = \pi^2 \left(c_1 + \int \frac{d\lambda(\tau)}{(\tau - \alpha_i)^2} \right)^{-1},$$

for all $\alpha_i \in Z$ in the discrete set

$$(4.12) \quad Z = N_0(\lambda) \cap \{s \in \mathbb{R} \mid H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1 s + c_0) = 0\}.$$

If $c_1 \neq 0$, then we have $\zeta_0 = \zeta_1 = 0$. If $c_1 = 0$ but $c_0 \neq 0$, then $\zeta_1 = 0$ and $\zeta_0 = -\pi^2/c_0$. Finally, if $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, then we have

$$(4.13) \quad \zeta_0 = -\frac{\pi^2}{\|\lambda\|^2} \int \tau d\lambda(\tau), \quad \zeta_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{\|\lambda\|},$$

writing $\|\lambda\| = \int d\lambda$ for the variation norm of λ .

Example 4.11. Consider the equation

$$y(t) = \dot{x}(t) + \int_0^t (1 - e^{-\tau}) x(t - \tau) \frac{d\tau}{\tau}, \quad x(0) = 0.$$

This is an integro-differential equation of the form (gCM), with $c_1 = 1$, $c_0 = 0$, and integral kernel

$$K(t) = \frac{1}{t}(1 - e^{-t}) = \mathcal{L}[\lambda](t),$$

where $d\lambda(s) = \chi_{[0,1]}(s) ds$ is the restriction of the Lebesgue measure to the unit interval. Since $c_1 \neq 0$, Theorem 4.10 yields $\zeta_1 = \zeta_0 = 0$. Next, we find

$$H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{t-s} = -\frac{1}{\pi} \log |1 - t^{-1}|.$$

The set Z has one element, $\alpha_1 = (1 - e^{-1})^{-1}$, with corresponding weight

$$\beta_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{e + e^{-1} - 2}.$$

In all, we find

$$\mu(s) = \beta_1 \delta(s - \alpha_1) ds + \frac{\chi_{[0,1]}(s) ds}{1 + (1 + \log |1 - s^{-1}|)^2 / \pi^2},$$

so we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\pi^2 x(t) &= \int_0^t \beta_1 e^{-\alpha_1(t-\tau)} y(\tau) d\tau + \int_0^t J_c(t-\tau) y(\tau) d\tau, \\ J_c(t) &\doteq \int_0^1 e^{-st} (1 + (1 + \log |1 - s^{-1}|)^2 / \pi^2)^{-1} ds. \end{aligned}$$

This example is depicted in Figure 6.

In numerical applications, a key case of interest is that of a *discrete* λ with a finite number of atoms. This case is already well-understood in the context of Prony series [36], but it is instructive to see how Theorem 4.10 reduces in this limit:

Corollary 4.12. *Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ be a discrete measure*

$$(4.14) \quad \lambda(s) = \sum_{i=1}^N b_i \delta(s - a_i)$$

where $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are distinct and $b_i > 0$. Fix values $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1 \geq 0$, and write $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1)$. Then we have that

$$(4.15) \quad \mu(s) = \sum_{i=1}^M \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i), \quad M = \begin{cases} N+1 & c_1 \neq 0 \\ N & c_0 \neq 0, c_1 = 0 \\ N-1 & c_0 = c_1 = 0 \end{cases}$$

where the positions of the atoms α_i are the M roots of $H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1 s + c_0) = 0$. These values interleave with the a_i such that exactly one α_i lies in each interval (a_i, a_{i+1}) . If $c_0 < 0$ or $c_1 > 0$, then one root will also lie in $(-\infty, a_1)$, and if $c_0 > 0$ or $c_1 > 0$, then one root will lie in (a_N, ∞) . As before, the weights are given by

$$(4.16) \quad \beta_i = \pi^2 \left(c_1 + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{b_j}{(a_j - \alpha_i)^2} \right)^{-1}$$

and the formulas for the constants ζ_0, ζ_1 are the same as in Theorem 4.10.

Example 4.13. Consider the equation

$$y(t) = \dot{x}(t) + 2 \int_0^t \cos(t - \tau) x(\tau) d\tau, \quad x(0) = 1.$$

This is an integro-differential equation of the type (gPD), with $c_1 = 1$, $c_0 = 0$, and integral kernel

$$K(t) = 2 \cos(t) = \mathcal{F}[\lambda](t),$$

where $d\lambda(t) = \delta(t - 1) dt + \delta(t + 1) dt$. From Corollary 4.12, we see that there are three atoms in the measure μ :

$$\alpha_1 = -\sqrt{3}, \quad \alpha_2 = 0, \quad \alpha_3 = \sqrt{3},$$

with corresponding weights $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \pi^2/3$. We thus deduce that $\mu(s) = \sum_i \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i)$ and obtain the following solution:

$$\pi^2 x(t) = \int_0^t J(t - \tau) y(\tau) d\tau, \quad J(t) = \mathcal{F}[\mu](t) = \frac{\pi^2}{3} \left(1 + 2 \cos(\sqrt{3}t) \right).$$

This example is depicted in Fig. 6.

For completeness' sake, we offer a similar result in the case where the measure is perturbed by a *positive, real* parameter, or equivalently, $\text{Im } c_0 > 0$ in (gPD):

Proposition 4.14. *Suppose $\lambda \in L^*(\mathbb{R}) + \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, as in Theorem 4.10. For any $c_0 \in \mathbb{H}$ (that is, with $\text{Im } c_0 > 0$), there is a unique signed measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$(4.17) \quad (Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}c_0) (Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\mu](z) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_0) \equiv 1.$$

where $\zeta_0 = -\pi^2/c_0 \in \mathbb{H}$. Moreover, μ is absolutely continuous, and its continuous density μ_c is given by

$$(4.18) \quad \mu_c(s) = \frac{\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \text{Im } c_0}{(\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \text{Im } c_0)^2 + (H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1} \text{Re } c_0)^2} - \pi \frac{\text{Im } c_0}{|c_0|^2}.$$

Similarly, for any $c_1 > 0$ and $c_0 \in \mathbb{H}$, there is a unique $\mu' \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$(4.19) \quad (Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}c_0 - i\pi^{-1}c_1z) Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\mu'](z) \equiv 1.$$

It is again absolutely continuous, with density

$$(4.20) \quad \mu'_c(s) = \frac{\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0}{(\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0)^2 + (H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Re} c_0 - \pi^{-1} c_1 s)^2}.$$

Notably, this result does *not* guarantee that μ or μ' lies in $\mathcal{M}_{\exp}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. Thus, while it can safely be employed in conjunction with Proposition 4.7 to solve equations of the form (gPD), it generically cannot be used with Proposition 4.6 to solve equations of the form (gCM).

Example 4.15. Consider the equation

$$y(t) = x(t) + \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-(t-\tau)^2} x(\tau) d\tau, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} x(t) = 0.$$

This is an integral equation of the form (gPD), with $c_0 = i$ and integral kernel

$$K(t) = e^{-t^2} = \mathcal{F}[\lambda](t),$$

where $\lambda = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-t^2/4} dt$. Now we use the fact that

$$(4.21) \quad H_{\mathbb{R}}[e^{-t^2/a}] = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} D(t/\sqrt{a})$$

where $D(x) = e^{-x^2} \int_0^x e^{t^2} dt$ is the Dawson function. Using this information, this problem is handled by the first statement of Proposition 4.14 where

$$\zeta_0 = \pi^2 i, \quad \mu_c(t) = \frac{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-t^2/4} + \pi^{-1}}{(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-t^2/4} + \pi^{-1})^2 + \frac{1}{\pi^2} D(t/2)^2} - \pi,$$

and hence we obtain

$$\pi^2 x(t) = -i\zeta_0 y(t) + \int_{-\infty}^t J(t-s)y(s) ds, \quad J = \mathcal{F}[\mu].$$

Note in this example that J is not a PD kernel, but $-J$ is; this is allowed by the stipulation in Proposition 4.14 that μ is signed. An example solution is shown in Figure 6.

Next, we prove important continuity properties of the map $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, mirroring our result on the circle (Theorem 4.1). We show, for one, that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is well-defined on a wider class of measures than allowed by Theorem 4.10, and that it is continuous in several refinements of the weak topology. For this, we define the following topologies:

Definition 4.16. We say that $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(n)}(\mathbb{R})$ converges to $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(n)}(\mathbb{R})$ in the W_{-n} -topology if

$$(1 + s^2)^{-n/2} d\lambda_j(s) \rightarrow (1 + s^2)^{-n/2} d\lambda(s)$$

weakly. Likewise, we say that $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ converges to $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ in the W_{∞} -topology if

$$\int f d\lambda_j \rightarrow \int f d\lambda$$

for all continuous (but not necessarily bounded) functions $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$. As we show in Proposition 8.3, $\mu_j \rightarrow \mu$ in W_∞ if and only if $\mu_j \rightarrow \mu$ weakly and the sets $\text{supp } \mu_j$ are uniformly bounded.

In this setting, our primary topological result is the following, which we prove in Section 8; we offer a more wide-reaching topological result in Theorem 4.19, as well.

Theorem 4.17 (Existence and Weak Continuity of $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$). *Write $U^0 = \{0\} \times \{0\}$, $U^1 = (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \times \{0\}$, and $U^2 = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$; these sets form a disjoint partition of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Respectively, the set U^0 corresponds to the choice $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, the set U^1 to the choice $c_1 = 0$ but $c_0 \neq 0$, and U^2 to the choice $c_1 > 0$. Then $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ is well-defined on the following spaces:*

$$\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R} : \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times U^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)} \times U^1, \quad \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R} : \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times U^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)} \times U^0,$$

applicable to gCM equations, and

$$\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R} : \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^{2-i}, \quad i \in \{0, 1, 2\},$$

applicable to both gCM and gPD equations. The restriction to $\mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times U^2$ is continuous from the W_{-2} topology on $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ and the standard topology on U^2 to the W_{-r} topology on $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, for any $r > 2$. The restriction to $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^i$ is continuous in product of the W_∞ -topology on $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ and the standard topology on each U^j .

Remark 4.18. Notably, this result does not make any claims about the application of $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times U^0$. In brief, the obstacle to such a result is that the resolvent equation can pick up a term corresponding to a fractional derivative. Such equations are handled neatly by our ‘regularized’ Hilbert transform theory in Section 4.3, and we see there how fractional derivatives naturally complete the definition of $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$.

Although written in an abstract form, Theorem 4.17 has practical applications in solving Volterra equations. In regards to its existence statement, it guarantees that they can be solved within the set of gCM equations whenever either (a) the measure λ is compactly supported or (b) the measure λ has support bounded below and either c_0 or c_1 is nonzero. Its statement of continuity justifies, for instance, the approximation of (gCM) using Prony series [75, 70, 63, 36]. We refer the reader to Figure 9 for a numerical illustration of the continuity of the map $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$.

4.3. The Regularized Hilbert Transform, and Delay and Fractional Differential Equations. Finally, we return to the question of what happens when λ does not satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 4.10. In such cases, we can apply Theorem 4.3 to recover an interconversion formula, though we can no longer guarantee that the result lies in $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. As such, we can no longer make use of the standard Hilbert transform (3.8) on the real line, so the application to Volterra equations requires more care.

As a first step, we note a critical application of our circle theory: the relation (3.10) provides an alternative, geometric perspective on how the Hilbert transform can be regularized to apply to functions $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, a result typically recovered from the general theory of Calderón and Zygmund [13]. Namely, for any bounded $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, the image of $\lambda = f(s) ds$ under ψ is simply

$$\psi[\lambda] = (2\pi)^{-1} f(\phi(e^{i\theta})) d\theta.$$

This is a continuous measure with bounded density, so it must lie in $\mathcal{M}(S^1)$. Pulling back the Hilbert transform $H[\psi[\lambda]]$ yields (in fact, for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$)

$$(4.22) \quad H_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](t) \doteq H[\psi[\lambda]](\phi^{-1}(t)) = \text{p. v.} \int \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{1}{t-s} + \frac{s}{1+s^2} \right) d\lambda(s),$$

refraining now from splitting the integral because we generically have $\lambda \notin \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. The analysis of Section 3 shows that this notion agrees (up to an additive constant) with the standard Hilbert transform where the latter is defined, and that it extends to a regularized Cauchy transform

$$(4.23) \quad Q_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](z) \doteq Q[\psi[\lambda]](\phi^{-1}(z)) = \int \frac{i}{\pi} \left(\frac{1}{z-s} + \frac{s}{1+s^2} \right) d\lambda(s)$$

on the upper half-plane. By Corollary 3.7, $Q_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](z)$ is uniquely defined within the family $Q_\sigma[\psi[\lambda]](\phi^{-1}(z))$, $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, by the property that $\text{Im} Q_S[\lambda](i) = 0$.

More than just geometric insight, however, this result allows us to take the theory in a few interesting, practical directions. For one, it extends the domain of the regularized Hilbert transform from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to the much larger space $\mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, and suggests the latter as the most natural setting on which to study it. It also allows us to recover an understanding of the regularized transform H_{reg} by appealing to the better-understood action of H on $L^\infty(S^1)$.

At present, we aim to understand how the regularized Hilbert transform can extend the class of Volterra equations covered by our theory. There are two directions we can take this investigation, which correspond to (generalized classes of) delay differential equations and fractional differential equations, respectively.

First, we develop an analogue of Theorem 4.3 for the regularized transform on the real line. The following result can be deduced straightforwardly from Theorem 4.3; we discussed such a result in the previous section, but it is instructive to formalize it in terms of Q_{reg} :

Theorem 4.19. *Suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, and fix $c_1 \geq 0$ and $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. There is a unique measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ and unique values $\zeta_1 \geq 0$ and $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(H_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}(c_0 + c_1 z))(H_{\text{reg}}[\mu](z) - i\pi^{-1}(\zeta_0 + \zeta_1 z)) \equiv 1$$

for $z \in \mathbb{H}$. In this context, we write $\mathcal{B}_{\text{reg}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1)$. The map \mathcal{B}_{reg} is continuous in the pullback of the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ under Ψ .

If λ is even and $c_0 = 0$, then μ is even and $\zeta_0 = 0$.

Remark 4.20. The topological statement of this theorem is distinct from the W_{-2} topology of Definition 4.16 in the following way. Consider a sequence $\theta_j \in [0, \pi)$ converging to π , and consider the atoms $\delta_{e^{i\theta_j}} \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ converging weakly to δ_{-1} . These atoms pull back under Ψ to the measures

$$\pi \sec^2(\theta_j/2) \delta(s - \tan(\theta_j/2)) ds \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}),$$

which do not converge in W_{-2} . In the pullback of the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, however, these measures converge to the pair $\lambda = 0$, $c_1 = \pi$.

We could alternatively state the theorem in terms of convergence in the W_{-r} topology for $r > 2$, as we did in Theorem 4.17, but this choice no longer illustrates the asymptotic behavior of \mathcal{B}_{reg} .

Likewise, we can recover a closed-form formula for \mathcal{B}_{reg} over a wide class of measures λ . To state this result, we make use of the following, regularized form of (4.7):

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi_{\text{reg}} &: \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \Psi_{\text{reg}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] &= (\psi[\lambda] + \pi^{-1}c_1\delta_{-1}, -\pi^{-1}c_0). \end{aligned}$$

Pulling back the proof of Theorem 4.3 under Ψ_{reg} , we find the following result:

Theorem 4.21. *Suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, fix $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1 \geq 0$, and write*

$$\Psi_{\text{reg}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{c}_0), \quad \mathcal{B}_{\text{reg}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1).$$

Suppose that

$$Z' \doteq \left(N_0(\tilde{\lambda}) \cap \text{supp } \tilde{\lambda} \right) \cup \{z \notin \text{supp } \lambda \mid H[\tilde{\lambda}](z) + i\tilde{c}_0 = 0\}$$

is discrete (i.e., it does not contain any of its limit points), and write λ_c for the continuous density of λ . Then we find

$$d\mu(s) = \mu_c(s) ds + \sum_{\alpha_i \in Z} \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i) ds,$$

with the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_c(s) &= \frac{\lambda_c(s)}{\lambda_c(s)^2 + (H_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1s + c_0))^2}, \\ \beta_i &= \pi^2 \left(c_1 + \int \frac{d\lambda(\tau)}{(\tau - \alpha_i)^2} \right)^{-1}, \\ Z &= N_0(\lambda) \cap \{s \in \mathbb{R} \mid H_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1s + c_0) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\zeta_0 = -\pi^2 \text{Im} \left(\int \frac{d\lambda(s)}{1 + s^2} + c_1 - ic_0 \right)^{-1}.$$

Finally, if $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, then we have

$$\zeta_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{\|\lambda\|},$$

taking $\zeta_1 = 0$ if $\lambda \notin \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R})$. If either of c_0 or c_1 is nonzero, then $\zeta_1 = 0$.

We split now into two cases. First, we study the setting (**rPD**), which generalizes (**gCM**) to account for delay terms. Indeed, it is easy to see that the rPD setting corresponds to spectra in $\mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$:

Remark 4.22. From Bochner's theorem (Lemma 3.3), a kernel K is *rPD* in the sense of Definition 1.5 if and only if $K = \mathcal{F}[\lambda]$ for some $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$.

For clarity, we have phrased (**rPD**) only in the case that λ is even, corresponding to a real rPD kernel $K = \mathcal{F}[\lambda]$. We note that the class (**dPD**) can be extended more broadly—for instance, our analysis works equally well when $\lambda = \lambda_e + \lambda_o$ for an even $\lambda_e \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ and an odd $\lambda_o \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. One could consider an even broader class of measures, where $\sigma_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda)$ diverges, but this is outside the present scope.

With only mild regularity requirements on K , the map \mathcal{B}_{reg} allows us to solve (**rPD**) in much the same way as our other classes of integro-differential equations.

The following result requires distinct techniques from the circle case, so we prove it in Section 5:

Proposition 4.23 (Solution of (rPD)). *Suppose $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a rPD kernel for which $\lambda \doteq \mathcal{F}^{-1}[K]$ is even, and fix $c_1 \geq 0$. Write $\mathcal{B}_{\text{reg}}[\lambda, 0, c_1] = (\mu, 0, \zeta_1)$ and $J = \mathcal{F}[\mu]$. If K and J both restrict to measures in a neighborhood of the origin, then (rPD) is satisfied by*

$$\pi^2 x(t) = \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-t}^t J(\tau) y(|t - \tau|) d\tau + c_1 x_0 J(t).$$

Remark 4.24. We note that the extension to $\text{Im } c_0 > 0$ offered by Proposition 4.14 is no longer necessary in the (rPD) setting. Namely, an imaginary component of c_0 can be replaced by adding a constant density to λ . Although this would imply $\lambda \notin \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, putting it out of scope of our gPD analysis in Section 4.2, it would still obey $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, and we could treat the equation as (rPD).

For one, the class (rPD) contains a wide variety of delay differential equations:

Example 4.25. Consider the equation

$$y(t) = c_1 \dot{x}(t) + x(t) + x(t - 1)$$

with $c_1 > 0$. This falls into the class (rPD) with

$$K(t) = 2\delta(t) + \delta(t - 1), \quad d\lambda(s) = \pi^{-1}(1 + \cos s) ds \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}).$$

We can calculate $H_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](s) = \pi^{-1} \sin s$, and thus

$$d\mu(s) = \frac{\pi(1 + \cos s) ds}{(1 + \cos s)^2 + (\sin s - c_1 s)^2}.$$

This expression is L^1 -integrable, so we can define the Fourier transform as $J(t) = \int e^{-ist} d\mu(s)$. This example is shown in Figure 6 [Add figure or remove].

It also allows us to solve *negative* CM equations—i.e., equations of the form

$$y(t) = c_1 \dot{x}(t) + \int_0^t K(t - \tau)x(\tau) d\tau,$$

where $c_1 \geq 0$ and K is CM (but not gCM). To see how, consider how the Fourier transform acts on a Cauchy distribution:

$$\mathcal{F} \left[t \mapsto \frac{a}{a^2 + t^2} \right] (s) = \pi e^{-a|s|},$$

where $a > 0$. If we have a measure $\lambda_{\text{CM}} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ supported on \mathbb{R}_+ , then, we can show that

$$\mathcal{F} \left[t \mapsto \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{a d\lambda_{\text{CM}}(a)}{a^2 + t^2} \right] (s) = \int e^{-a|s|} d\lambda_{\text{CM}}(a) = \mathcal{L}_b[\lambda_{\text{CM}}](s)$$

for $s > 0$. More simply, we can write

$$\mathcal{F}[t \mapsto \text{Im } Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_{\text{CM}}](it)] = \mathcal{L}_b[\lambda_{\text{CM}}],$$

allowing us to represent generic CM kernels as Fourier transforms of non-negative functions (i.e., PD kernels).

Although ‘negative’ CM equations represent only a sign flip from the (gCM) class, we see now that they are best understood within the much larger class of PD

kernels. In particular, we see from Proposition 4.23 that their resolvent equations are themselves in the rPD class, but do *not* necessarily feature CM kernels themselves. This explains why the program of Hannsgen and Wheeler [38] fails to find a CM resolvent to such equations.

Example 4.26. Consider the equation

$$y(t) = - \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \int_0^t e^{-a_i(t-\tau)} x(\tau) d\tau,$$

where $a_i, b_i > 0$. This equation can easily be recast in the form (gCM), but we treat it now as an equation of the form (gPD) in order to understand how rPD kernels can arise in the resolvent equation.

From the argument above, a finite sum of exponentials in the time domain corresponds to a weighted sum of Cauchy distributions in the spectral domain:

$$(4.25) \quad d\lambda(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{b_i a_i}{s^2 + a_i^2} ds, \quad H_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](s) = H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{b_i a_i s}{s^2 + a_i^2}.$$

Now, it is important to note that this kernel does *not* satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 4.10, as it decays too slowly to lie in $L^*(\mathbb{R})$. As such, we need to use the more general theory of rPD kernels to handle it. From Theorem 4.21, we find

$$\zeta_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i}, \quad \zeta_0 = 0, \quad d\mu(s) = \frac{\pi}{1+s^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i a_i}{s^2 + a_i^2} \right)^{-1} ds.$$

In particular, we have

$$d\mu(s) = \frac{\pi}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i} ds - \tilde{\mu}_c(s) ds,$$

where $\mu_c(s) = O(s^{-2})$. Applying Proposition 4.23 to map these expressions back to the time domain, we find

$$-\pi^2 x(t) = \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) + \tilde{\zeta}_0 y(t) - \int_0^t \tilde{J}(t-\tau) y(\tau) d\tau,$$

where $\tilde{\zeta}_0 = \pi^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i \right)^{-1}$ and $\tilde{J} = \mathcal{F}[\tilde{\mu}_c]$. Already, we can see that the expressions for ζ_1 and $\tilde{\zeta}_0$ agree with the statement of Proposition 4.6. The same is true of \tilde{J} , of course, though we do not investigate further at present.

In another direction, we can extend the class of CM equations to incorporate a generalized class of *fractional differential equations*. For this, we define the following subset of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$:

Definition 4.27. Given $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, we say that $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{frac}}(\mathbb{R})$ if $\text{supp } \lambda \subset [0, \infty)$ and if $t^{-1} d\lambda(t) \in \mathcal{M}_{+, \text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, i.e., if the restriction of $t^{-1} d\lambda(t)$ to a neighborhood of $t = 0$ is a finite measure. If $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{frac}}(\mathbb{R})$, we define

$$\xi_{\text{frac}}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{d\lambda(s)}{s(1+s^2)} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then Proposition 4.6 generalizes as follows; we prove the following result in Section 5:

Proposition 4.28 (Solution of (rCM)). *Suppose $K_1 = \mathcal{L}_b[\lambda_1]$ is a gCM kernel with $\lambda_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, and*

$$K_2(t) = \mathcal{L}_b[s^{-1} d\lambda(s)](t) = \int e^{-ts} s^{-1} d\lambda_2(s)$$

for some $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{frac}}(\mathbb{R})$. Fix $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1 \geq 0$, and write

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{reg}}[\lambda_1 + \lambda_2, c_0 - \pi \xi_{\text{frac}}(\lambda_2), c_1] = (\mu, \zeta'_0, \zeta_1).$$

The measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ can be decomposed as $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$, where $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{frac}}(\mathbb{R})$. Given any such decomposition, let $J_1 = \mathcal{L}_b[\mu_1]$ and $J_2(t) = \mathcal{L}_b[s^{-1} d\mu_2(s)](t)$, and write $\zeta_0 = \zeta'_0 + \pi \xi_{\text{frac}}(\mu_2)$. Then (rCM) is satisfied by

$$\begin{aligned} -\pi^2 x(t) &= \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) - \zeta_0 y(t) - \int_0^t J_1(t-\tau) y(\tau) d\tau + \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t J_2(t-\tau) y(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad - c_1 x_0 (J_1(t) - \dot{J}_2(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Example 4.29. Consider the fractional differential equation

$$y(t) = \dot{x}(t) + D^{1/2}x(t) = \dot{x}(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t \frac{x(\tau)}{\sqrt{t-\tau}} d\tau,$$

defining the Riemann–Liouville fractional derivative as in (1.2). This is of the form (rCM) with $\lambda_1 = 0$ and

$$d\lambda_2(s) = \pi^{-1} \chi_{[0,\infty)}(s) \sqrt{s} ds,$$

and we can verify from (4.23) that

$$Q_{\text{reg}}[\lambda_2](z) = \pi^{-1} \sqrt{z} - \pi^{-1} 2^{-1/2} i,$$

with \sqrt{z} denoting the principal value of the square root. Similarly, we find $\xi_{\text{frac}}(\lambda_2) = \pi^{-1} 2^{-1/2}$, so Theorem 4.21 yields

$$\zeta_1 = \zeta_0 = 0, \quad d\mu(s) = \frac{\pi}{s^{1/2} + s^{3/2}} \chi_{[0,\infty)}(s) ds.$$

The Laplace transform of μ is the Mittag–Leffler kernel [39]

$$(4.26) \quad \mathcal{L}[\mu](s) = \pi^2 E_{1/2}(-t^{1/2}), \quad E_\alpha(z) \doteq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{\Gamma(\alpha k + 1)},$$

which gives the classical result [39, Section 7]

$$x(t) = \int_0^t E_{1/2}(-(t-\tau)^{1/2}) y(\tau) d\tau.$$

It has been previously noted that the Mittag–Leffler kernel is completely monotone [57], but the example presented here provides an alternate proof. We solve this example numerically in Section 9.6.

5. VOLTERRA EQUATIONS IN THE LAPLACE DOMAIN

Propositions 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.23, and 4.28 provide the connecting link between our harmonic analysis in later sections and the Volterra equations of interest. We prove all five in the present section.

The first of these five results relates measures on the circle to discrete-time Volterra equations, using power series expansions. This equivalence is otherwise known as the *Z-transform* in signal processing [9]; if $x = \{x_0, x_1, \dots\} \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a discrete signal, the Z-transform $X(z)$ of x can be defined as

$$X(z) = \mathcal{Z}[x](z) \doteq \sum_{j \geq 0} x_j z^j,$$

as a formal power series. That X converges for any non-zero z is not guaranteed, of course; since we are interested only in Volterra equations, however, we can safely restrict to cases where $X(z)$ is a polynomial in z . We recall the statement of Proposition 4.4:

Proposition 4.4 (Solution of (dPD)). *In the setting of (dPD), assuming that $\operatorname{Re} c_0 \geq -\frac{1}{2}K(0)$, write*

$$c'_0 = c_0 - 2 \operatorname{Re} c_0 - K(0), \quad K'(n) = K(n) + \delta(n) (2 \operatorname{Re} c_0 + K(0)),$$

where $\delta(n)$ is a discrete delta function. It is easy to verify that $K'(n)$ is positive definite, and that the pair (c'_0, K') give rise to the same discrete-time Volterra equation as (c_0, K) but now satisfying the equality $\operatorname{Re} c'_0 = -\frac{1}{2}K'(0)$. Write $\lambda \doteq \mathcal{F}^{-1}[K'] \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, and define

$$(\mu, \zeta'_0) = \mathcal{B}[\lambda, 2 \operatorname{Im} c'_0], \quad J = 4\mathcal{F}[\mu].$$

Setting $\zeta_0 = 2i\zeta'_0 - \frac{1}{2}J(0)$, the equation (dPD) is satisfied by

$$x(n) = \zeta_0 y(n) + \sum_{j=0}^n J(n-j)y(j).$$

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that the prescribed change of parameters $c_0 \mapsto c'_0$, $K(n) \mapsto K'(n)$ has already been performed, so that $\operatorname{Re} c_0 = -\frac{1}{2}K(0)$. We assume also that $y(j)$ has only finitely many nonzero values; since $x(n)$ depends only on $y(j)$ for $j \leq n$, the general formula follows directly.

Let $Y(z)$ and $X(z)$ be the Z-transforms of $y(n)$ and $x(n)$, respectively. Then we find

$$(5.1) \quad Y(z) = (c_0 + \mathcal{Z}[K](z)) X(z)$$

formally. In turn, since $K = \mathcal{F}[\lambda]$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, we note that

$$|K(n)| = \left| \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} d\lambda(\theta) \right| \leq \|\lambda\|,$$

so that, in particular, $\mathcal{Z}[K](z)$ converges absolutely on the open unit disc \mathbb{D} . We thus find

$$\mathcal{Z}[K](z) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-ij\theta} z^j d\lambda(\theta) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{1 - ze^{-i\theta}} d\lambda(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}Q[\lambda](z) + \frac{1}{2}\|\lambda\|,$$

employing partial fractions in the last step. Since $\operatorname{Re} c_0 = -\frac{1}{2}K(0) = -\frac{1}{2}\|\lambda\|$, this reduces (5.1) to

$$Y(z) = \frac{1}{2} (Q[\lambda](z) + i\tilde{c}_0) X(z),$$

where $\tilde{c}_0 = 2 \operatorname{Im} c_0 = -2ic_0 - iK(0)$. If $\mathcal{B}[\lambda, \tilde{c}_0] = (\mu, \tilde{\zeta}_0)$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$(Q[\mu](z) + i\tilde{\zeta}_0) 2Y(z) = X(z),$$

implying as well that $X(z)$ converges in \mathbb{D} . Working the same logic backwards proves the formula. \square

The continuous-time results follow a similar line of reasoning, but using the (bilateral) Laplace transform in place of the Z-transform.

Proposition 4.6 (Solution of (gCM)). *Suppose $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a gCM kernel for which $\lambda \doteq \mathcal{L}_b^{-1}[K] \in \mathcal{M}_{\exp}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. In the setting of (gCM), suppose $(\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1]$ is well-defined with $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\exp}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, and write $J = \mathcal{L}_b[\mu]$. Then (gCM) is satisfied by*

$$-\pi^2 x(t) = \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) - \zeta_0 y(t) - \int_0^t J(t-\tau) y(\tau) d\tau - c_1 x_0 J(t).$$

Proof. Let $Y(s)$ and $X(s)$ be the Laplace transforms of $y(t)$ and $x(t)$, respectively; we suppose that $y(t)$ is growing at most exponentially in t . Applying a Laplace transform to (gCM) yields

$$Y(s) = (c_1 s - c_0 - \mathcal{L}[K](s)) X(s),$$

and, applying Fubini's theorem, we calculate

$$\mathcal{L}[K](s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-ts} \int e^{-\sigma t} d\lambda(\sigma) dt = \int \int_0^\infty e^{-(\sigma+s)t} dt d\lambda(\sigma) = \int \frac{d\lambda(\sigma)}{s+\sigma}$$

for $s \notin \operatorname{supp} \lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$; the latter integral converges by our hypothesis that $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. Noting that

$$c_1 s - c_0 - \mathcal{L}[K](s) = -i\pi (Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](-s) - i\pi^{-1}c_0 + i\pi^{-1}c_1 s),$$

the result follows. \square

The proof of Proposition 4.7 is complicated only by the fact that the Fourier transform might not exist classically when λ is not a finite measure. By interpreting the transform weakly, we push the result through similarly.

Proposition 4.7 (Solution of (gPD)). *Suppose $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a gPD kernel for which $\lambda \doteq \mathcal{F}^{-1}[K] \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. In the setting of (gPD), suppose $(\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1]$ is well-defined, and write $J = \mathcal{F}[\mu]$. If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, then (gPD) is satisfied by*

$$\pi^2 x(t) = \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) - i\zeta_0 y(t) + \int_0^t J(t-\tau) y(\tau) ds + c_1 x_0 J(t).$$

Proof. As before, we find

$$Y(s) = (c_1 s - ic_0 + \mathcal{L}[K](s)) X(s),$$

but now,

$$\mathcal{L}[K](s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-ts} \mathcal{F}[\lambda](t) dt = \int_{-\infty}^\infty u(t) e^{-ts} \mathcal{F}[\lambda](t) dt,$$

where $u(t)$ is Heaviside's step function. If we knew that λ was finite (i.e., $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R})$), we could complete the proof in much the same way as that of Proposition 4.7, using an integral form of $\mathcal{F}[\lambda]$; as it stands, however, we need to interpret λ as a tempered distribution and employ the Plancherel theorem. Consider the family of Schwartz functions

$$\eta_{\varepsilon,s}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\varepsilon}} \int_0^\infty e^{-t's - (t-t')^2/2\varepsilon^2} dt'$$

converging to $u(t)e^{-ts}$ pointwise; for any s with $\operatorname{Re} s > 0$, we find that

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \eta_{\varepsilon,s}(t) \mathcal{F}[\lambda](t) dt = \int \mathcal{F}[\eta_{\varepsilon,s}](-t) d\lambda(t) = \int \frac{e^{-\varepsilon t^2/2}}{s + it} d\lambda(t),$$

and thus, by dominated convergence, that

$$\mathcal{L}[K](s) = \int \frac{d\lambda(t)}{s + it}.$$

The remainder of the proof follows as before. \square

We turn now to our two results on the *regularized* Hilbert transform, discussed in Section 4.3. The first of these employs the distributional Fourier transform, so it requires the same convergence argument as the proof of Proposition 4.7:

Proposition 4.23 (Solution of (rPD)). *Suppose $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a rPD kernel for which $\lambda \doteq \mathcal{F}^{-1}[K]$ is even, and fix $c_1 \geq 0$. Write $\mathcal{B}_{\text{reg}}[\lambda, 0, c_1] = (\mu, 0, \zeta_1)$ and $J = \mathcal{F}[\mu]$. If K and J both restrict to measures in a neighborhood of the origin, then (rPD) is satisfied by*

$$\pi^2 x(t) = \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-t}^t J(\tau) y(|t - \tau|) d\tau + c_1 x_0 J(t).$$

Proof. Since K restricts to a measure in the neighborhood of $t = 0$, we can define $\alpha = K(\{0\})$ as the measure of K at 0. Then we can rewrite (rPD) as

$$y(t) = c_1 \dot{x}(t) - \frac{\alpha}{2} x(t) + \int_0^t K(\tau) x(t - \tau) d\tau,$$

with the integral taken over the closed interval $[0, t]$. In the Laplace domain, we thus find

$$Y(s) = (c_1 s - \alpha/2 + \mathcal{L}[K](s)) X(s),$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}[K](s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} K(t) dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-s|t|} K(t) dt + \frac{\alpha}{2},$$

using the fact that K is even. Now define the family of Schwartz functions

$$\eta_{\varepsilon,s}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\varepsilon}} \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-|t'|s - (t-t')^2/2\varepsilon^2} dt',$$

converging to $e^{-|t|s}$ pointwise. As before, for any s with $\operatorname{Re} s > 0$, we find that

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \eta_{\varepsilon,s}(t) K(t) dt = \int \mathcal{F}[\eta_{\varepsilon,s}](-t) d\lambda(t) = \int \frac{2s e^{-\varepsilon t^2/2}}{s^2 + t^2} d\lambda(t),$$

and again by dominated convergence that

$$\mathcal{L}[K](s) = \int \frac{s d\lambda(t)}{s^2 + t^2} + \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Since λ is even, however, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{s d\lambda(t)}{s^2 + t^2} &= \frac{i}{2} \int \left(\frac{1}{is - t} + \frac{1}{is + t} \right) d\lambda(t) \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \int \left(\frac{1}{is - t} - \frac{t}{1 + t^2} + \frac{1}{is + t} + \frac{t}{1 + t^2} \right) d\lambda(t) \\ &= iQ_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](is), \end{aligned}$$

and the proof follows as before. \square

Finally, we prove Proposition 4.28, which involves two, distinct integral kernels. This proof makes non-trivial use of the spectral theory developed in later sections—this does not cause a conflict, however, as the following result is not used to develop any of the theory that follows.

Proposition 4.28 (Solution of (rCM)). *Suppose $K_1 = \mathcal{L}_b[\lambda_1]$ is a gCM kernel with $\lambda_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, and*

$$K_2(t) = \mathcal{L}_b[s^{-1} d\lambda(s)](t) = \int e^{-ts} s^{-1} d\lambda_2(s)$$

for some $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{frac}}(\mathbb{R})$. Fix $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1 \geq 0$, and write

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{reg}}[\lambda_1 + \lambda_2, c_0 - \pi\xi_{\text{frac}}(\lambda_2), c_1] = (\mu, \zeta'_0, \zeta_1).$$

The measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ can be decomposed as $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$, where $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{frac}}(\mathbb{R})$. Given any such decomposition, let $J_1 = \mathcal{L}_b[\mu_1]$ and $J_2(t) = \mathcal{L}_b[s^{-1} d\mu_2(s)](t)$, and write $\zeta_0 = \zeta'_0 + \pi\xi_{\text{frac}}(\mu_2)$. Then (rCM) is satisfied by

$$\begin{aligned} -\pi^2 x(t) &= \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) - \zeta_0 y(t) - \int_0^t J_1(t - \tau) y(\tau) d\tau + \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t J_2(t - \tau) y(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad - c_1 x_0 (J_1(t) - \dot{J}_2(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Taking the Laplace transform of (rCM), we find

$$Y(s) = (c_1 s - c_0 - \mathcal{L}[K_1](s) + s\mathcal{L}[K_2](s)) X(s).$$

The expression $\mathcal{L}[K_1]$ has been calculated in the proof of Proposition 4.6, and we likewise find

$$s\mathcal{L}[K_2](s) = \int \frac{s\sigma^{-1}}{s + \sigma} d\lambda(\sigma) = \int \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{s + \sigma} \right) d\lambda(\sigma) = \pi\xi_{\text{reg}}(\lambda) - i\pi Q_{\text{reg}}[\lambda](-s).$$

The remainder of the proof goes through as before. The only statement to verify is that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, which will follow from our spectral theory (which does not depend upon the present result); indeed, Theorem 4.21 implies that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, and Proposition 6.9 implies that $\text{supp } \mu$ is bounded below if $\text{supp } \lambda$ is. \square

6. HARDY SPACES ON THE DISC

Although we are ultimately interested in understanding the involution \mathcal{B} , we proceed by studying how the Cauchy transform $Q[\lambda]$ behaves under a wide class of nonlinear maps. Interconversion will then follow as a special case.

Let $H_+ = -i\mathbb{H}$ be the open right half-plane, and \overline{H}_+ be its closure. Below, we say that a map $S : \overline{H}_+ \rightarrow \overline{H}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ is *admissible* if $S|_{H_+}$ is holomorphic, if $\text{clos } S^{-1}(\infty) \subset \partial H_+$ is countable (if non-empty), and if S is continuous on the complement $\overline{H}_+ \setminus \text{clos } S^{-1}(\infty)$. Archetypal examples of these maps include affine transformations and circular inversions:

$$z \mapsto az + z_0, \quad z \mapsto \frac{a}{z - i\zeta},$$

where $a > 0$, $z_0 \in \overline{H}_+$, and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$. Interconversion corresponds to $S : z \mapsto 1/z$.

Consider the nonlinearly-transformed data $S \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda]$, for $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. By construction, this data forms a holomorphic function in \mathbb{D} with positive real part, so Proposition 3.6.1 guarantees that

$$S \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda] = Q_{\sigma'}[\mu]$$

for some $\sigma' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$. Our first goal is to understand what form σ' and μ take, and in particular, to show how S can be seen to “commute” with the Cauchy and Hilbert transforms. As a first step, we show how admissible maps preserve integrability, in an appropriate sense:

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, and write $\lambda_c \in L^1(S^1)$ for the density of its continuous part, furnished by the Lebesgue decomposition [69]. Fix an admissible map S , and let $S^{\text{Re}} = \text{Re } S$. Then $S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda]) \in L^1(S^1)$, and moreover,*

$$(6.1) \quad \|S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])\|_{S^1} \leq S^{\text{Re}}(\|\lambda\|_{S^1} + i\sigma)$$

for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. By construction, $\text{Im } Q_\sigma[\lambda](0) = \sigma$; but we know that $\text{Re } Q_\sigma[\lambda](0) = \|\lambda\|_{S^1}$ from the mean value property (or alternatively, from the circular symmetry of the Poisson kernel), so we have

$$Q_\sigma[\lambda](0) = \|\lambda\|_{S^1} + i\sigma.$$

We can deduce from the maximum principle that $\text{Re } Q_\sigma[\lambda] > 0$ everywhere in \mathbb{D} . Since S is holomorphic on H_+ , however, we know that $S(H_+) \subset H_+$, and thus that $S^{\text{Re}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda] > 0$ everywhere in \mathbb{D} .

Let $\Sigma = \text{clos } S^{-1}(\infty)$ be the set of singularities of S ; by hypothesis, we know that Σ is a countable subset of ∂H_+ . Fix $y \in \Sigma$, and consider the function $q_y \doteq \exp(y - Q_\sigma[\lambda]) - 1$. This is a bounded holomorphic function on \mathbb{D} , so it follows from a theorem of F. and M. Riesz [49, 25] that its zero set $\{q_y^{-1}(0)\} \supset \{Q_\sigma[\lambda] = y\}$ forms a set of measure zero in S^1 ; taking the union over $y \in \Sigma$, we see that $S \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda]$ is finite almost everywhere on S^1 .

Thus, since S is continuous away from its singularities and $Q_\sigma[\lambda] \rightarrow \lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda]$ almost everywhere in S^1 (along non-tangential paths), we know that

$$S^{\text{Re}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda] \rightarrow S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])$$

(along non-tangential paths) almost everywhere in S^1 . From Fatou's lemma, then, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])\|_{S^1} &\leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} (S^{\text{Re}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda])(re^{i\theta}) d\theta \\ &= (S^{\text{Re}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda])(0) \\ &= S^{\text{Re}}(\|\lambda\|_{S^1} + i\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the result. \square

We can derive a stronger result by leveraging Proposition 3.6.4; in short, if a positive harmonic function in \mathbb{D} has a known non-tangential limit almost everywhere in S^1 , the remaining (measure zero) set *must* carve out a unique, singular measure:

Theorem 6.2. *Let λ and S be as in Lemma 6.1, and fix $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. There is a unique singular measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ such that*

$$(6.2) \quad S \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda] = Q[\nu] + Q[S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])] + iS^{\text{Im}}(\|\lambda\|_{S^1} + i\sigma),$$

and equivalently,

$$(6.3) \quad S^{\text{Im}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda]) = H[\nu] + H[S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])] + S^{\text{Im}}(\|\lambda\|_{S^1} + i\sigma).$$

Proof. Recall from the proof of Lemma 6.1 that

$$S^{\text{Re}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda] \rightarrow S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])$$

almost everywhere (along non-tangential directions) in S^1 . Suppose that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ is the unique finite (positive) Borel measure such that

$$(6.4) \quad S^{\text{Re}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda] = P[\mu] = \text{Re } Q[\mu],$$

furnished by Proposition 3.6, and let μ_c be the density of its continuous component. From Proposition 3.6.4, then, we know that

$$\text{Re } Q[\mu] \rightarrow \mu_c$$

pointwise along non-tangential directions, almost everywhere in S^1 ; we can thus identify

$$S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda]) = \mu_c,$$

and define ν to be the (leftover) singular component of μ .

Now, recall from Corollary 3.7 that the conjugate harmonic function of $P[\mu]$ in \mathbb{D} is uniquely defined up to addition of imaginary constants; in particular, (6.4) shows that $S^{\text{Im}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda]$ and $\text{Im } Q[\mu]$ differ by a real constant. Identifying this constant by evaluating each at the origin, we deduce (6.2), and taking the non-tangential limit at $r = 1$, we deduce (6.3). \square

Our next goal is to understand the singular measure ν more concretely; if one could calculate ν from the base measure λ , then Theorem 6.2 would yield an explicit formula for the Cauchy and Hilbert transforms of the nonlinearly-transformed data $S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda]) \in L^1(S^1)$. In this direction, we now investigate the *support* of ν ; if we know the support to be countable, we can deduce that ν is discrete.

If S is an admissible map, we further say that S is *highly admissible* if, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the real part $\text{Re } S(z)$ is uniformly bounded over the set

$$H_\varepsilon \doteq \{z \in H_+ \mid \varepsilon < \text{Re } z < 1/\varepsilon\},$$

that is, $\sup_{z \in H_\varepsilon} \operatorname{Re} S(z) < C_\varepsilon$ for a fixed $C_\varepsilon > 0$. For instance, the maps $z \mapsto z$ and $z \mapsto 1/z$ are both highly admissible, but

$$S_0 : z \mapsto \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{n}{z - in^3}$$

is not; indeed, at the point $z = \varepsilon + in_0^3$, we have

$$\operatorname{Re} S_0(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{n\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 + (n^3 - n_0^3)^2} \geq n_0/\varepsilon.$$

Choosing sequentially larger n_0 shows that $\operatorname{Re} S_0$ is not uniformly bounded on H_ε .

We generalize the definition of Definition 4.2 as follows:

Definition 6.3. Suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$. Define the critical set of λ as follows:

$$N_\infty(\lambda) = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \operatorname{clos} \left\{ e^{i\theta} \in S^1 \mid \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(\exp i[\theta - \delta, \theta + \delta])/2\delta > 1/\varepsilon \right\},$$

and similarly, the zero set of λ as

$$N_0(\lambda) = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \operatorname{clos} \left\{ e^{i\theta} \in S^1 \mid \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(\exp i[\theta - \delta, \theta + \delta])/2\delta < \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Define the *problematic* set of λ to be

$$N(\lambda) \doteq N_0(\lambda) \cup N_\infty(\lambda) \subset S^1,$$

with $\operatorname{supp} \lambda \subset S^1$ the closed, essential support of λ .

The sets $N_\infty(\lambda)$ and $N(\lambda)$ allow us to treat general highly admissible maps, rather than simply $S : z \mapsto 1/z$; we will see shortly that only $N_0(\lambda)$ plays a role for the latter.

Lemma 6.4. *In the setting of Lemma 6.1, suppose now that S is highly admissible. Then the singular measure ν furnished by Theorem 6.2 satisfies*

$$\operatorname{supp} \nu \subset N_0(\lambda) \cup N_\infty(\lambda),$$

with $N_0(\lambda)$ and $N_\infty(\lambda)$ as defined in Definition 6.3.

Proof. Write

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{aligned} N_\varepsilon(\lambda) = & \operatorname{clos} \left\{ e^{i\theta} \in S^1 \mid \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(\exp i[\theta - \delta, \theta + \delta])/2\delta > 1/\varepsilon \right\} \\ & \cup \operatorname{clos} \left\{ e^{i\theta} \in S^1 \mid \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(\exp i[\theta - \delta, \theta + \delta])/2\delta < \varepsilon \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that $N_0(\lambda) \cup N_\infty(\lambda) = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} N_\varepsilon(\lambda)$. Suppose that $z \notin N_0(\lambda) \cup N_\infty(\lambda)$, so that, in particular, there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $z \notin N_\varepsilon(\lambda)$; since $N_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ is closed, we can fix a closed interval $I \ni z$ in S^1 such that

$$I \cap N_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \emptyset.$$

In particular, the restriction $\lambda|_I$ is absolutely continuous, with density $\varepsilon < \lambda_c < 1/\varepsilon$. As in the proof of Theorem 6.2, let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ be the unique measure such that

$$P[\mu] = S^{\operatorname{Re}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda]$$

in \mathbb{D} . Now, we decompose λ as

$$\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2,$$

where $\operatorname{supp} \lambda_1 \subset I$ and $\operatorname{supp} \lambda_2 \subset S^1 \setminus I$.

Since λ_1 is absolutely continuous with density $\lambda_c \chi_I$ (where χ_I is the characteristic function of I), our choice of I guarantees that

$$\varepsilon \chi_I < \lambda_c \chi_I < (1/\varepsilon) \chi_I$$

almost everywhere. The maximum principle thus shows that

$$\varepsilon P[\chi_I] < P[\lambda_1] < (1/\varepsilon) P[\chi_I]$$

everywhere in \mathbb{D} . Fix a small interval $I' \subset I$ containing z and a small $\delta > 0$, such that $P[\chi_I]$ is uniformly continuous in the neighborhood

$$B_\delta \doteq \{z \in \mathbb{D} \mid \|z - I'\| < \delta\}.$$

For sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, then, we can guarantee that $2\varepsilon/3 < P[\lambda_1] < 1/\varepsilon$ in B_δ . Next, inspecting the Poisson kernel, we can see that—potentially shrinking I' and δ —the harmonic function $P[\lambda_2]$ is uniformly bounded in the neighborhood

$$B_\delta \doteq \{z \in \mathbb{D} \mid \|z - I'\| < \delta\}$$

by $C\delta$, where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of δ . Fixing δ such that $C\delta < \varepsilon/3$ and combining with our control on $P[\lambda_1]$, we find that

$$\varepsilon/3 < P[\lambda](z) = \operatorname{Re} Q_\sigma[\lambda](z) < 3/\varepsilon$$

for $z \in B_\delta$. Since S is highly admissible, then, we find that

$$(S^{\operatorname{Re}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda])(z) < C_{\varepsilon/3}$$

for $z \in B_\delta$; since it is uniformly bounded, there cannot be a singular component of μ in I' . But $z \notin N(\lambda)$ was general, so the claim follows. \square

The above lemma can be refined slightly, in fact, if one knows more information about the singularities of S . The following lemma follows from a similar argument as above:

Lemma 6.5. *If $\operatorname{Re} S(z)$ is uniformly bounded over the set $\operatorname{Re} z > \varepsilon$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$, we say it is lower highly admissible (LHA), and a similar argument shows that*

$$\operatorname{supp} \nu \subset N_0(\lambda).$$

Likewise, if $\operatorname{Re} S(z)$ is uniformly bounded over the set $\operatorname{Re} z < 1/\varepsilon$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$, we say it is upper highly admissible (UHA), and we find

$$\operatorname{supp} \nu \subset N_\infty(\lambda).$$

Under appropriate conditions on λ , these lemmas allows us to deduce further structure on the measure ν :

Corollary 6.6. *Suppose S is highly admissible. If $N(\lambda) \cap \operatorname{supp} \lambda$ is countable, then the measure ν furnished by Theorem 6.2 is discrete, and its support has countable closure. Alternatively, if $N(\lambda)$ is finite, $\operatorname{supp} \lambda$ has finitely many components, and $S^{-1}(\infty)$ is finite, then ν is discrete, and its support has finite closure. In either case, define the set*

$$(6.6) \quad Z(\lambda) = N(\lambda) \cup \{z \notin \operatorname{supp} \lambda \mid iH_\sigma[\lambda](z) \in \Sigma\}.$$

For any choice of $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$S \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda](z) = Q[S^{\operatorname{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])](z) + \sum_{\alpha_j \in Z(\lambda)} \beta_j Q[\delta_{\alpha_j}](z) + i\zeta$$

for unique values $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta_j > 0$, where $\delta_{\alpha_j}(z) = \delta(z - \alpha_j)$ is an atomic measure at $\alpha_j \in S^1$. Equivalently,

$$S^{\text{Im}} \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda](z) = H[S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])](z) + \sum_{\alpha_j \in Z(\lambda)} \beta_j H[\delta_{\alpha_j}](z) + \zeta.$$

Proof. From Lemma 6.4, we deduce that $\text{supp } \nu \cap \text{supp } \lambda$ is countable [resp., finite] and contained in $N(\lambda) \cap \text{supp } \lambda$. That $\text{supp } \nu \setminus \text{supp } \lambda$ is countable [resp., finite] follows from Lemma 3.8; since $H_\sigma[\lambda]$ is smooth and strictly decreasing outside of $\text{supp } \lambda$, it can only intersect the singular region $S^{-1}(\infty)$ countably [resp., finitely] many times. \square

Once again, the LHA condition of Lemma 6.5 allows for a refinement of this statement, with much the same argument:

Corollary 6.7. *If S is LHA and $N_0(\lambda) \cap \text{supp } \lambda$ is countable, then Corollary 6.6 holds with $Z(\lambda)$ replaced by*

$$Z_0(\lambda) = (N_0(\lambda) \cap \text{supp } \lambda) \cup \{z \notin \text{supp } \lambda \mid iH_\sigma[\lambda](z) \in \Sigma\}.$$

We now study the support of $S \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda]$. Although the following two results are not used in the proof of Theorem 4.1, they will be necessary to understand the pullback of the theorem to \mathbb{R} in later sections. For any function g on S^1 defined only up to sets of measure zero, we write

$$\text{supp } g \doteq S^1 \setminus \bigcup \{I \subset S^1 \text{ open} \mid g(z) = 0 \text{ for almost all } z \in I\}$$

for its closed, essential support.

Lemma 6.8. *Suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$, and write $\lambda_c \in L^1(S^1)$ for the density of its continuous part with respect to the normalized Lebesgue measure $(2\pi)^{-1} d\theta$. Fix an admissible map S , and let $S^{\text{Re}} = \text{Re}(S)$; note that S need not be highly admissible. Then we find*

$$\text{supp } [S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])] \supset \text{supp } \lambda_c$$

for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Suppose $z \in S^1$ satisfies $\lambda_c(z) > 0$. Since $S^{\text{Re}}(H_+) \subset H_+$, we know that $S^{\text{Re}}(\lambda_c(z) + iH_\sigma[\lambda](z)) > 0$ wherever $iH_\sigma[\lambda](z)$ is finite; of course, this holds for almost all $z \in S^1$. Thus, if $S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda]) \equiv 0$ almost everywhere on an open set $I \subset S^1$, the same must be true of λ_c ; the claim follows. \square

The converse of Lemma 6.8 requires a stronger hypothesis on S , i.e., that it restricts to a map $S : \partial H_+ \rightarrow \partial H_+ \cup \{\infty\}$. This hypothesis is independent of the highly admissible hypothesis used in Corollary 6.6. Archetypal maps of this form include

$$z \mapsto az, \quad z \mapsto \frac{a}{z - i\zeta},$$

where $a > 0$ and $\zeta \in \partial H_+$.

Proposition 6.9. *In the setting of Lemma 6.8, suppose that S restricts to a function $S : \partial H_+ \rightarrow \partial H_+ \cup \{\infty\}$. Then*

$$\text{supp } [S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])] = \text{supp } \lambda_c.$$

Proof. One direction of the proof is furnished by Lemma 6.8. Conversely, suppose that $\lambda_c \equiv 0$ almost everywhere on an open $I \subset S^1$. Recall from the proof of Proposition 6.1 that $S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda])$ is finite almost everywhere in S^1 ; fix a $z \in I$ for which this is true (and for which $\lambda_c(z) = 0$), so that our hypothesis on S ensures that

$$S(\lambda_c(z) + iH_\sigma[f](z)) = S(iH_\sigma[f](z)) \in \partial H_+,$$

and thus $S^{\text{Re}}(\lambda_c(z) + iH_\sigma[f](z)) = 0$. Since z was generic, the claim follows. \square

7. INVOLUTIONS ON THE DISC

Finally, before turning to measures on the real line, we prove a generalization of Theorem 4.1. Much of the result follows from theory discussed in the preceding section; for instance, Proposition 3.6.1 and Corollary 3.7 together imply that the map \mathcal{B} is a well-defined involution of $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R}$, and Theorem 6.2 gives an explicit representation of ζ_0 and of the continuous component of μ . What remains to be shown is the *topological* claim of the theorem—i.e., that \mathcal{B} is weakly continuous—which we show here in generalized form.

Given an admissible $S : \overline{H}_+ \rightarrow \overline{H}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, define the map $\mathcal{B}_S : \mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(7.1) \quad \mathcal{B}_S[\lambda, \sigma] = (\mu, \xi), \quad S \circ Q_\sigma[\lambda] = Q_\xi[\mu].$$

By Theorem 6.2, we can express the map more explicitly as

$$\mu = S^{\text{Re}} \circ (\lambda_c + iH_\sigma[\lambda]) + \nu_{S,\sigma}[\lambda], \quad \xi = S^{\text{Im}}(\|\lambda\|_{S^1} + i\sigma),$$

where $\nu_{S,\sigma}[\lambda]$ is the singular measure furnished by the theorem. For convenience, we write $\mathcal{B}_{S,\sigma}[\lambda] = \mu$ and $\xi_{S,\sigma}[\lambda] = \xi$. Theorem 4.1 follows straightforwardly from the following proposition:

Proposition 7.1. *If S is admissible, then $\mathcal{B}_S : \mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_+(S^1) \times \mathbb{R}$ is continuous with respect to the product of the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and the standard topology on \mathbb{R} .*

Proof. Fix a nonzero $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, and suppose $\lambda_n \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ converges weakly to λ and σ_n converges to σ . For any $r < 1$, define the following complex functions on S^1 :

$$f_{r,n}(e^{i\theta}) = Q_{\sigma_n}[\lambda_n](re^{i\theta}) = Q[\lambda_n](re^{i\theta}) + i\sigma_n.$$

Notably, $f_{r,n}$ is smooth, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{r,n}(e^{i\theta}) = f_r(e^{i\theta}) \doteq Q_\sigma[\lambda](re^{i\theta})$$

pointwise in S^1 ; this follows from the weak convergence of λ_n , as the Cauchy kernel is smooth and uniformly bounded along each fixed r . Suppose $\|\lambda\|_{S^1} = M > 0$, and fix $N \geq 1$ such that $\|\lambda_n\|_{S^1} \leq 2M$ for all $n \geq N$. We then know that $\partial_\theta f_{r,n}$ is uniformly bounded in n , since

$$|\partial_\theta f_{r,n}(e^{i\theta})| = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left| \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 + ire^{i(\theta-\theta')}}{1 - ire^{i(\theta-\theta')}} d\lambda_n(\theta') \right| \leq \frac{2M}{2\pi} \frac{1+r}{1-r},$$

and so a standard argument shows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{r,n} = f_r$$

uniformly, for fixed r . Fix a neighborhood $U \supset f_r(S^1)$ in H_+ ; by increasing N , we can guarantee that

$$f_{r,n}(S^1) \subset U$$

for $n \geq N$. However, S is smooth on \bar{U} , so in particular, it is uniformly Lipschitz on U ; as such,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S \circ f_{r,n} = S \circ f_r$$

uniformly, for fixed r .

Let $(\mu, \xi) = \mathcal{B}_S[\lambda, \sigma]$ and $(\mu_n, \xi_n) = \mathcal{B}_{S,\sigma}[\lambda_n, \sigma_n]$. By applying the uniform convergence of $S \circ f_{r,n}$ to the case $r = 0$, we see that $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Next, define the following measures in $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$:

$$\mu_{r,n} = (2\pi)^{-1} (S^{\text{Re}} \circ f_{r,n})(e^{i\theta}) d\theta, \quad \mu_r = (2\pi)^{-1} (S^{\text{Re}} \circ f_r)(e^{i\theta}) d\theta.$$

Since $S \circ f_{r,n} \rightarrow S \circ f_r$ uniformly in n , we deduce that $\mu_{r,n}$ converges weakly to μ_r . Moreover, if $\|\mu\|_{S^1} = M'$, increase N such that $\|\mu_n\|_{S^1} \leq 2M'$ for $n \geq N$; this is necessarily possible, because

$$\|\mu_n\|_{S^1} = \text{Re } Q[\mu_n](0) = S^{\text{Re}} \circ Q[\lambda_n](0) \rightarrow S^{\text{Re}} \circ Q[\lambda](0) = \|\mu\|_{S^1}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Fix a bounded, continuous function $g : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Since $P[g]$ is continuous on the compact set \mathbb{D} , it is necessarily uniformly continuous. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, then, we can fix $r_\varepsilon < 1$ such that

$$\sup_\theta |g(e^{i\theta}) - P[g](re^{i\theta})| < \varepsilon$$

for $r \geq r_\varepsilon$. Define $\tilde{g}(e^{i\theta}) = g(e^{-i\theta})$. Then we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int g d\mu_{r,n} &= (2\pi)^{-1} \int_0^{2\pi} g(\theta) P[\mu_n](re^{i\theta}) d\theta \\ &= (2\pi)^{-1} \int_0^{2\pi} g(\theta) \int_0^{2\pi} \text{Re} \left(\frac{1 + re^{i(\theta-\theta')}}{1 - re^{i(\theta-\theta')}} \right) d\mu_n(\theta') d\theta \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} P[\tilde{g}](re^{-i\theta'}) d\mu_n(\theta') \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} P[g](re^{i\theta'}) d\mu_n(\theta'), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for μ_r and μ ; this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int g d(\mu_n - \mu) \right| &\leq \left| \int g d(\mu_{n,r_\varepsilon} - \mu_n) \right| + \left| \int g d(\mu_{n,r_\varepsilon} - \mu_{r_\varepsilon}) \right| + \left| \int g d(\mu_{r_\varepsilon} - \mu) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_0^{2\pi} (g(e^{i\theta}) - P[g](r_\varepsilon e^{i\theta})) d\mu_n(\theta) \right| + \left| \int g d(\mu_{n,r_\varepsilon} - \mu_{r_\varepsilon}) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_0^{2\pi} (g(e^{i\theta}) - P[g](r_\varepsilon e^{i\theta})) d\mu(\theta) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int g d(\mu_{n,r_\varepsilon} - \mu_{r_\varepsilon}) \right| + 2\varepsilon M'. \end{aligned}$$

Since ε was arbitrary and $\mu_{n,r_\varepsilon} \rightarrow \mu_{r_\varepsilon}$ weakly, we deduce that

$$\int g d\mu_n \rightarrow \int g d\mu$$

for any bounded, continuous function g . The proposition follows. \square

8. INTEGRAL TRANSFORMS ON THE REAL LINE

Now, we derive the explicit interconversion formula given by Theorem 4.10. One *could* follow a similar logic as the preceding sections to derive a formula for general admissible (nonlinear) maps of data on the real line; for simplicity, however, we focus on the map $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, which provides a solution to the convolution equations (gCM) and (gPD). We make use of the following asymptotic notation:

Definition 8.1. For some $\delta_0 > 0$, suppose we have functions $f : (0, \delta_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $g : (0, \delta_0) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. We say that $f = O(g)$ if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $|f(\delta)| < Cg(\delta)$ for all δ sufficiently small, and $f = o(g)$ if this holds for all $C > 0$. Similarly, we say that $f = \Omega(g)$ if there exists $C > 0$ such that $|f(\delta)| > Cg(\delta)$ for all δ sufficiently small, and $f = \omega(g)$ if this holds for all $C > 0$.

We define these relations similarly for functions $f : (R_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $g : (R_0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ of large, positive arguments. Finally, if the argument δ of g is ambiguous, we may write $f = O_{\delta}(g)$, and similarly for the other relations.

We first establish the following lemma:

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\lambda \in L^*(\mathbb{R}) + \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, in the sense that $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ for (possibly non-unique) $\lambda_1 \in L^*(\mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda_2 \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$. Then the Hilbert transform of λ has the following asymptotic behavior:*

$$(8.1) \quad H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) = \frac{1}{\pi s} \int d\lambda + \frac{1}{\pi s^2} \int s' d\lambda(s') + o(s^{-2}).$$

Moreover, if $\lambda_c \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is the continuous density of λ , then for any $c_1 \geq 0$ and $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we find

$$(8.2) \quad \frac{(1 + s^2)^{-1/2} \lambda_c(s)}{\lambda_c(s)^2 + (H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda] - \pi^{-1}c_0 - \pi^{-1}c_1 s)^2} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

Proof. We prove these statements in turn. First, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} s\pi H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) &= \text{p. v.} \int \frac{s}{s-t} d\lambda(t) \\ &= \text{p. v.} \int \frac{t}{s-t} d\lambda(t) + \int d\lambda \\ &= \pi H_{\mathbb{R}}[t \mapsto t d\lambda(t)](s) + \int d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and likewise

$$s\pi H_{\mathbb{R}}[t \mapsto t d\lambda(t)](s) = \pi H_{\mathbb{R}}[t \mapsto t^2 d\lambda(t)](s) + \int t d\lambda(t).$$

Now, $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ for some (possibly non-unique) $\lambda_1 \in L^*(\mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda_2 \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$. But since $\mathcal{F}[t \mapsto t^2 \lambda_1(t)] \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ by hypothesis, it follows that $\mathcal{F}[H_{\mathbb{R}}[t \mapsto t^2 \lambda_1(t)]] \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, and the Riemann–Lebesgue lemma [68] shows that

$$H_{\mathbb{R}}[t \mapsto t^2 \lambda_1(t)](s) \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R})$$

is a continuous function decaying to zero at infinity; since λ_2 is compactly supported, Lemma 3.8 likewise shows that

$$H_{\mathbb{R}}[t \mapsto t^2 \lambda_2(t)](s) = O(s^{-1})$$

for large s . The asymptotic formula (8.1) follows.

By pulling Lemma 6.1 back under ψ , we see that the expression in (8.2) is *locally* in L^1 ; it remains to check its behavior at infinity. But this follows from our asymptotic formula (8.1); if $H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) = O(s^{-1})$, then the full expression is of order $O(s\lambda_c(s))$; since $\lambda_1 \in L^*(\mathbb{R})$ and λ_2 is compactly supported, this expression must be globally L^1 . \square

We are now in a place to prove our closed-form expression for $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Recall the statement of Theorem 4.10:

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\lambda \in L^*(\mathbb{R}) + \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(-1)}(\mathbb{R})$, in the sense that $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ for a non-negative function $\lambda_1 \in L^*(\mathbb{R})$ and measure $\lambda_2 \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$. Fix $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1 \geq 0$, and suppose that*

$$Z' \doteq (N_0(\lambda) \cap \text{supp } \lambda) \cup \{s \notin \text{supp } \lambda \mid H[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1 s + c_0) = 0\}$$

is discrete (i.e., it does not contain any of its limit points). Write λ_c for the density of the continuous component of λ . Then $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1)$ is well-defined, and we find

$$(4.9) \quad d\mu(s) = \mu_c(s) ds + \sum_{\alpha_i \in Z} \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i) ds,$$

where the continuous part is given by

$$(4.10) \quad \mu_c(s) = \frac{\lambda_c(s)}{\lambda_c(s)^2 + (H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1 s + c_0))^2} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

and the discrete part has weights

$$(4.11) \quad \beta_i = \pi^2 \left(c_1 + \int \frac{d\lambda(\tau)}{(\tau - \alpha_i)^2} \right)^{-1},$$

for all $\alpha_i \in Z$ in the discrete set

$$(4.12) \quad Z = N_0(\lambda) \cap \{s \in \mathbb{R} \mid H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1 s + c_0) = 0\}.$$

If $c_1 \neq 0$, then we have $\zeta_0 = \zeta_1 = 0$. If $c_1 = 0$ but $c_0 \neq 0$, then $\zeta_1 = 0$ and $\zeta_0 = -\pi^2/c_0$. Finally, if $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, then we have

$$(4.13) \quad \zeta_0 = -\frac{\pi^2}{\|\lambda\|^2} \int \tau d\lambda(\tau), \quad \zeta_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{\|\lambda\|},$$

writing $\|\lambda\| = \int d\lambda$ for the variation norm of λ .

Proof. We prove the theorem in the case $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, which is the most involved; the argument carries forward straightforwardly to cases where one or both parameters are nonzero.

By pulling Corollary 6.7 back under ψ , we see that

$$\frac{1}{Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)} = Q_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_c^2 + H_{\sigma}[\lambda]^2} \right] (z) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta'_0 - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_1 z + \sum_{\alpha_j \in Z'} \beta_j Q[\psi[\delta_{\alpha_j}]](\phi^{-1}(z))$$

for unique $\zeta_1, \beta_j \geq 0$ and $\zeta'_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. The term $i\pi^{-1}\zeta_1 z$ in the above equation arises from a pole at $-1 = \phi^{-1}(\infty)$ in the unit circle, as discussed in Section 4. Now, although each atom δ_{α_j} lies in $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, it is not necessarily clear that their sum does as well. To see that it does, note from (8.1) that the zero set of $H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s)$ must be bounded, and so $\sum_{\alpha_j} \delta_{\alpha_j}$ is compactly supported. Since we know it to lie in $\mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ (from pulling back the case of S^1 under ψ), we see that it is locally of

bounded variation, and thus that $\sum_{\alpha_j} \delta_{\alpha_j} \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$. For a potentially different value of ζ_0 , then, we find

$$(8.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)} &= Q_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_c^2 + H_{\sigma}[\lambda]^2} \right] (z) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_0 - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_1 z + \sum_{\alpha_j \in Z'} \beta_j Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\delta_{\alpha_j}](z) \\ &= Q_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_c^2 + H_{\sigma}[\lambda]^2} \right] (z) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_0 - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_1 z + \frac{i}{\pi} \sum_{\alpha_j \in Z'} \frac{\beta_j}{z - \alpha_j}. \end{aligned}$$

The values ζ_0 and ζ_1 can be identified by studying the large- s limit of $H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s)$. Indeed, since the \mathbb{R} -Hilbert transform must vanish at ∞ , from Lemma 8.2, we know that ζ_0, ζ_1 must be chosen to exactly cancel the asymptotic behavior of the imaginary component of $1/Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)$. Inverting the leading terms on the right-hand side of (8.3), we find

$$\frac{\pi}{\zeta_1 s + \zeta_0} = \frac{\pi}{s} \left(\frac{1}{\zeta_1} - \frac{\zeta_0}{\zeta_1^2 s} \right) + o(s^{-2}).$$

By comparing against the asymptotic formula (8.1), we thus identify

$$\frac{1}{\zeta_1} = \pi^{-2} \|\lambda\|, \quad \frac{\zeta_0}{\zeta_1^2} = -\pi^{-2} \int \tau d\lambda(\tau),$$

or more succinctly,

$$\zeta_0 + \zeta_1 s = \frac{\pi^2 s}{\|\lambda\|} - \frac{\pi^2}{\|\lambda\|^2} \int \tau d\lambda(\tau) = \frac{\pi^2}{\|\lambda\|^2} \int (s - \tau) d\lambda(\tau).$$

We deal now with the singular contribution. Fix a value $\alpha_j \in Z'$ for which a nonzero atom exists. For $z \in \overline{\mathbb{H}}$ in a sufficiently small neighborhood of α_j , we have

$$\frac{1}{Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)} = \frac{i\beta_j/\pi}{z - \alpha_j} + o(\|z - \alpha_j\|^{-1}),$$

and so

$$Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) = \frac{\pi}{i\beta_j} (z - \alpha_j) + o(\|z - \alpha_j\|).$$

In particular, we see that

$$H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j) \doteq \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j + iy) = 0,$$

so any nonzero poles of $Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda]$ along its boundary are contained in

$$Z = N_0(\lambda) \cap \{s \in \mathbb{R} \mid H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) = 0\} \subset Z'.$$

In any case, the residue theorem provides

$$0 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)}{(z - \alpha_j)^2} dz,$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$ is a union of (a) the horizontal line segment(s) $\{i\varepsilon + s \mid \delta < |s - \alpha_j| < R\}$, (b) the intersection of $\{z \in \mathbb{H} \mid \text{Im}(z) > \varepsilon\}$ with a semicircle of radius δ above α_j , and (c) a semicircle of radius R connecting the two end-points of Γ_1 . The full contour is shown in Figure 8.




FIGURE 8. The contour $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$ applied in the proof of Theorem 4.10.

As $R \rightarrow \infty$, the integral about Γ_3 tends to zero, as $Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)$ is uniformly bounded as $z \rightarrow \infty$; as such, we discard Γ_3 and suppose that $R = \infty$. Next, taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ with a fixed δ , the weak convergence of $\operatorname{Re} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) ds$ to λ shows that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Gamma_1} \frac{\operatorname{Re} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)}{(z - \alpha_j)^2} dz = \int_{|s - \alpha_j| > \delta} \frac{d\lambda(s)}{(s - \alpha_j)^2}.$$

Finally, looking at the integral about Γ_2 (which must be taken in the *clockwise* direction), we see

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_2} \frac{Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z)}{(z - \alpha_j)^2} dz = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^\pi \frac{(\pi/i\beta_j)\delta e^{i\theta} + o(\delta)}{\delta^2 e^{2i\theta}} i\delta e^{i\theta} d\theta = -\frac{\pi}{2i\beta_j} + o_\delta(1).$$

Taking the $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit of the (imaginary part of the) residue theorem, we find

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{|s - \alpha_j| > \delta} \frac{d\lambda(s)}{(s - \alpha_j)^2} = \frac{\pi}{2\beta_j} + o_\delta(1),$$

and thus

$$\pi^{-2} \int \frac{d\lambda(s)}{(s - \alpha_j)^2} = \frac{1}{\beta_j}.$$

Conversely, suppose that, for some $\alpha_j \in Z$, there is *no* singular contribution at α_j . Then we find $1/Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) = o(\|z - \alpha_j\|^{-1})$ in a sufficiently small neighborhood of α_j , and so

$$(8.4) \quad Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) = \omega(\|z - \alpha_j\|).$$

Suppose also that $\int (s - \alpha_j)^{-2} d\lambda(s) < \infty$; otherwise, we can self-consistently define $\beta_j = 0$. On one hand, we find for $y > 0$ that

$$(8.5) \quad \operatorname{Re} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j + iy) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{y d\lambda(s)}{(s - \alpha_j)^2 + y^2} \leq y \int \frac{d\lambda(s)}{(s - \alpha_j)^2} = O(y).$$

On the other, consider the derivative

$$(8.6) \quad \partial_y \operatorname{Im} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j + iy) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int \frac{y(s - \alpha_j) d\lambda(s)}{((s - \alpha_j)^2 + y^2)^2}.$$

Define $\lambda_{\text{odd}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ by $d\lambda_{\text{odd}}(s) = \frac{1}{2} (d\lambda(s) - d\lambda(2\alpha_j - s))$, and define the sets

$$\Lambda_+ \doteq \left\{ s > \alpha_j \mid \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lambda_{\text{odd}}([s - \delta, s + \delta]) / 2\delta > 0 \right\}, \quad \Lambda = \Lambda_+ \cup \{2\alpha_j - \Lambda_+\},$$

and the two measures

$$\lambda'_1 \doteq \lambda_{\text{odd}}|_{\Lambda}, \quad \lambda'_2 \doteq -\lambda_{\text{odd}}|_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \Lambda}.$$

By construction, $\lambda_{\text{odd}} = \lambda'_1 - \lambda'_2$, and each of λ'_i is non-negative over the set $[\alpha_j, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, we know that

$$\int \frac{|d\lambda'_i(s)|}{(s - \alpha_j)^2} < \infty$$

is absolutely convergent, by our assumption of the same on λ , so that the measures $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ defined by $d\tilde{\lambda}_i(s) \doteq d\lambda'_i(s)/(s - \alpha_j)^2$ are each in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$. Then (8.6) can be reduced as follows:

$$\partial_y \operatorname{Im} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j + iy) = \frac{4}{\pi} \int_{\alpha_j}^{\infty} \frac{y(s - \alpha_j) d\lambda'_1(s)}{((s - \alpha_j)^2 + y^2)^2} - \frac{4}{\pi} \int_{\alpha_j}^{\infty} \frac{y(s - \alpha_j) d\lambda'_2(s)}{((s - \alpha_j)^2 + y^2)^2},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_y \operatorname{Im} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j + iy)| &\leq \frac{4}{\pi} \int_{\alpha_j}^{\infty} \frac{y(s - \alpha_j) d\lambda'_1(s)}{((s - \alpha_j)^2 + y^2)^2} + \frac{4}{\pi} \int_{\alpha_j}^{\infty} \frac{y(s - \alpha_j) d\lambda'_2(s)}{((s - \alpha_j)^2 + y^2)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{4y}{\pi} \int_{\alpha_j}^{\infty} \frac{(s - \alpha_j) d\tilde{\lambda}_1(s)}{(s - \alpha_j)^2 + y^2} + \frac{4y}{\pi} \int_{\alpha_j}^{\infty} \frac{(s - \alpha_j) d\tilde{\lambda}_2(s)}{(s - \alpha_j)^2 + y^2} \\ &= 2y \operatorname{Im} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\tilde{\lambda}_1](\alpha_j + iy) - 2y \operatorname{Im} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\tilde{\lambda}_2](\alpha_j + iy). \end{aligned}$$

But $Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\tilde{\lambda}_i](\alpha_j + iy)$ can approach the real line no faster than $O(1/y)$, so we see that the derivative of $\operatorname{Im} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j + iy)$ is uniformly bounded for small y . But $H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j) = 0$, by hypothesis, so we find that

$$\operatorname{Im} Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j + iy) = O(y).$$

Together with (8.5), this violates the bound (8.4), and we come to a contradiction. It follows that, if there is no singular component at α_j , the integral defining β_j^{-1} necessarily diverges. \square

Proposition 4.14 follows using similar methods, but more straightforwardly:

Proposition 4.14. *Suppose $\lambda \in L^*(\mathbb{R}) + \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, as in Theorem 4.10. For any $c_0 \in \mathbb{H}$ (that is, with $\operatorname{Im} c_0 > 0$), there is a unique signed measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$(4.17) \quad (Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}c_0) (Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\mu](z) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_0) \equiv 1.$$

where $\zeta_0 = -\pi^2/c_0 \in \mathbb{H}$. Moreover, μ is absolutely continuous, and its continuous density μ_c is given by

$$(4.18) \quad \mu_c(s) = \frac{\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0}{(\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0)^2 + (H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Re} c_0)^2} - \pi \frac{\operatorname{Im} c_0}{|c_0|^2}.$$

Similarly, for any $c_1 > 0$ and $c_0 \in \mathbb{H}$, there is a unique $\mu' \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$(4.19) \quad (Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}c_0 - i\pi^{-1}c_1z) Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\mu'](z) \equiv 1.$$

It is again absolutely continuous, with density

$$(4.20) \quad \mu'_c(s) = \frac{\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0}{(\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0)^2 + (H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Re} c_0 - \pi^{-1} c_1 s)^2}.$$

Proof. Pulling Theorem 4.1 back under ψ , we see that there is a unique $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ (along with ζ'_0 and ζ_1) satisfying

$$(Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}c_0 - i\pi^{-1}c_1z) (Q[\psi[\tilde{\mu}]](\phi^{-1}(z)) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta'_0 - i\pi^{-1}\zeta_1z) \equiv 1$$

for any $c_1 \geq 0$. Moreover, because

$$|Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](z) - i\pi^{-1}c_0 - i\pi^{-1}c_1z| \geq \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0 > 0$$

everywhere in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$, it is clear that $\tilde{\mu}$ is absolutely continuous and that $\zeta_1 = 0$, and it must have density

$$\tilde{\mu}_c(s) = \frac{\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0}{(\lambda_c(s) + \pi^{-1} \operatorname{Im} c_0)^2 + (H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) - \pi^{-1}(c_1s + \operatorname{Re} c_0))^2}.$$

Next, write $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ for some $\lambda_1 \in L^*(\mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda_2 \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$; since $\mathcal{F}[t \mapsto t^2\lambda_1(t)] \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, the Riemann–Lebesgue lemma [68] shows that $\lambda_1(s) = o(s^{-2})$ as $s \rightarrow \pm\infty$; combining with Lemma 8.2, we find that

$$Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s) = O(s^{-1})$$

as $s \rightarrow \pm\infty$ along the real line. Suppose first that $c_1 = 0$. Writing $\omega = -i\pi^{-1}c_0$, we expand

$$(\omega + Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s))^{-1} = \omega^{-1} (1 - \omega^{-1}Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s)) + O(s^{-2}),$$

Taking real parts, we see that $\mu \doteq \operatorname{Re} \omega^{-1} - \tilde{\mu}_c = O(s^{-1})$, and thus, as we know already that $\tilde{\mu}_c$ is bounded, that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. The $c_1 > 0$ case follows similarly. \square

We now prove Theorem 4.17, which establishes the existence and continuity of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ in several sets of real measures. In Fig. 9, we show how this continuity can be applied to random samplings of the distribution λ . In this example, $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ is a standard normal distribution, cropped to the set $\{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid d\lambda(t)/dt \geq 10^{-15}\}$, and $\lambda^{(n)}$ are empirical distributions corresponding to n i.i.d. samples from λ . As n increases, we see that

$$\mu^{(n)} \doteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda^{(n)}, 0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, 0, 1] \doteq \mu.$$

We focus first on proving the continuity of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ on the space $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ of compactly-supported, non-negative measures on the real line. In this setting, we make use of the W_{∞} topology introduced in Definition 4.16; this topology is best characterized by the following proposition:

Proposition 8.3. *Let $\mu_n, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$. Then $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in W_{∞} if and only if $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ weakly and the sets $\operatorname{supp} \mu_n$ are uniformly bounded.*

Proof. In one direction, suppose that $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ weakly and $\operatorname{supp} \mu_n, \operatorname{supp} \mu \subset I$ for a fixed interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. For any continuous $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$, define a bounded continuous function $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\tilde{f}|_I \equiv f|_I$; for instance, we can extend f by its values on the endpoints of I . Then we know that

$$\int f d\mu_n = \int \tilde{f} d\mu_n \rightarrow \int \tilde{f} d\mu = \int f d\mu,$$




FIGURE 9. Continuity of the map $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, where λ is the standard normal distribution (cropped such that $d\lambda(t)/dt > 10^{-15}$) and $\mu = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, 0, 1]$. Here, $\lambda^{(n)}$ is an empirical distribution of n i.i.d. samples from λ , and we define $\mu^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda^{(n)}, 0, 1]$. We see that $\mu^{(n)}$ converges to μ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, as predicted from Theorem 4.17.

so that $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in W_{∞} .

Conversely, suppose that $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in W_{∞} , but that the sets $\text{supp } \mu_n$ are *not* uniformly bounded. For each integer $N \geq 1$, choose $n_N \geq 1$ such that $\text{supp } \mu_{n_N} \not\subset [-N, N]$, and let

$$\varepsilon'_N \doteq \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-N, N]} d\mu_{n_N} > 0.$$

Inductively, we define

$$\varepsilon_N = \min(\varepsilon'_N, \varepsilon_{m < N}),$$

so that ε_N is non-increasing with N . Then, define the function f as follows; set $f(\pm N) = N/\varepsilon_N$ for any positive integer N , set $f(0) = 0$, and let $f(s)$ linearly interpolate between its values at adjacent integers. Then we find

$$\int f d\mu_{n_N} \geq \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-N, N]} f d\mu_{n_N} \geq \frac{N}{\varepsilon_N} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-N, N]} d\mu_{n_N} = N\varepsilon'_N/\varepsilon_N \geq N.$$

This contradicts the W_{∞} -convergence of μ_n , and the proposition follows. \square

The second half of Theorem 4.17 (relating to compactly-supported measures) can be proved as follows:

Lemma 8.4. *Write U^0, U^1, U^2 as in Theorem 4.17. For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, the map $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^{2-i}$ is well-defined and continuous in the product of the W_{∞} -topology on \mathcal{M}_c and the standard topology on U^i, U^{2-i} .*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$, and let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite interval containing $\text{supp } \lambda$. Write

$$\tilde{\lambda} \doteq \psi[\lambda] + 2c_1\delta_{-1} \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1),$$

with δ_{-1} a Dirac measure at $-1 = \phi^{-1}(\infty)$. Then from Theorem 4.1, there is a unique pair $(\tilde{\mu}, \zeta'_1)$ such that

$$(8.7) \quad (Q[\tilde{\lambda}](z) - i\pi^{-1}c'_0)(Q[\tilde{\mu}](z) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta'_0) \equiv 1$$

on \mathbb{D} , with $c'_0 = c_0 - \pi\sigma(\lambda)$. From Proposition 6.9, we know that the support of the absolutely continuous component $\tilde{\mu}_c$ of $\tilde{\mu}$ is bounded away from -1 . But the singular component of $\tilde{\mu}_c$ is supported exactly where $Q[\tilde{\lambda}](z) = i\pi^{-1}c'_0$ on the unit circle. If $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, this occurs only at -1 , and we find

$$\tilde{\mu} = \psi[\mu] + 2\zeta_1\delta_{-1}$$

for a compactly-supported $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and a finite $\zeta_1 > 0$; this argument shows that \mathcal{B} maps $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^0$ to $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^2$.

If either c_1 or c_0 is nonzero, then from Lemma 3.8, the singular component of $\tilde{\mu}_c$ is supported on at most one point in each component of $S^1 \setminus (\{-1\} \cup \text{supp } \phi^{-1}(I))$. Thus, \mathcal{B} maps $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times (U^1 \cup U^2)$ to $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times (U^0 \cup U^1)$. Suppose $c_1 \neq 0$; then $Q[\tilde{\lambda}](z) - i\pi^{-1}c'_0 \rightarrow \infty$ as $z \rightarrow -1$ along non-tangential directions, but (8.7) thus implies that $Q[\tilde{\mu}](z) - i\pi^{-1}\zeta'_0 \rightarrow 0$ along the same. This is only possible if $\zeta_0 = 0$, so we find that \mathcal{B} maps $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^2$ to $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^0$. That \mathcal{B} maps $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^1$ to itself follows similarly.

We turn now to the claim of continuity. Fix a nonzero $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ and $(c_0, c_1) \in U^i$, and suppose $\lambda_n \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ converges in W_∞ to λ , and $(c_{0,n}, c_{1,n}) \in U^i$ converges to (c_0, c_1) . For $\delta > 0$, define the following complex functions on \mathbb{R} :

$$f_{\delta,n}(s) = Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n](s + i\delta) - i\pi^{-1}(c_{0,n} + c_{1,n}(s + i\delta)).$$

Following the same argument as in Proposition 7.1, we can deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{\delta,n} = Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](s + i\delta) - i\pi^{-1}(c_0 + c_1(s + i\delta)) \doteq f_\delta$$

locally uniformly. Next, for any $R > 0$, fix a neighborhood $U_R \supset f_r([-R, R])$, and choose $N_R \geq 1$ such that

$$f_{\delta,n}([-R, R]) \subset U_R$$

for all $n > N_R$. Since $S : z \mapsto 1/z$ is smooth on \bar{U}_R , we deduce (similar to Proposition 7.1) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 1/f_{\delta,n} = 1/f_\delta$$

uniformly on $[-R, R]$, and thus locally uniformly.

Now, fix $(\mu_n, \zeta_{0,n}, \zeta_{1,n}) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n, c_{0,n}, c_{1,n}]$ and $(\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1]$. Notably, explicit formulas for ζ_0 and ζ_1 can be recovered as in the proof of Theorem 4.10 below, so the convergence of $\zeta_{0,n} \rightarrow \zeta_0$ and $\zeta_{1,n} \rightarrow \zeta_1$ is clear; the only non-trivial case occurs for $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, for which convergence follows from the W_∞ convergence of λ_n to λ .

It remains only to be seen that μ_n converge in W_∞ to μ . Fix $N \geq 1$ and an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{supp } \lambda_n \subset I$ for all $n \geq N$; that such a choice is possible follows from Definition 4.16. Defining $M = \|\lambda\|_{L^1}$ and increasing N if necessary, we can also suppose that $M/2 \leq \|\lambda_n\|_{L^1} \leq 2M$ for all $n \geq N$.

Let $s_- = \inf I$ and $s_+ = \sup I$. Then for $s \geq s_+$, we find

$$H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n](s) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{d\lambda_n(s')}{s - s'} \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{d\lambda_n(s')}{s - s_+} \leq \frac{2M/\pi}{s - s_+}.$$

With a similar procedure, we find the string of inequalities

$$(8.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{M/2\pi}{s-s_-} \leq H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n](s) \leq \frac{2M/\pi}{s-s_+} < 0, & \quad s \geq s_+, \\ 0 < \frac{2M/\pi}{s-s_-} \leq H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n](s) \leq \frac{M/2\pi}{s-s_+}, & \quad s \leq s_-, \end{aligned}$$

and likewise for $H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda]$. Of course, since $H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n]$ is smooth (and thus everywhere well-defined) outside of I , any poles of

$$Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\mu_n](z) - i\pi^{-1}(\zeta_{n,0} + \zeta_{n,1}z) = (Q_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n](z) - i\pi^{-1}(c_{n,0} + c_{n,1}z))^{-1}$$

in $\mathbb{R} \setminus I$ must correspond to zeroes of

$$H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n](s) - i\pi^{-1}(c_{n,0} + c_{n,1}s).$$

Combining this argument with Proposition 6.9, we find that

$$\text{supp } \mu_n, \text{supp } \mu \subset I \cup \{s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I \mid H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_n](s) - i\pi^{-1}(c_{n,0} + c_{n,1}s) = 0\}.$$

First, in the case $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, this argument shows that $\text{supp } \mu_n, \text{supp } \mu \subset I$. In the case that $c_0 \neq 0$ (regardless of the value of c_1), increase N such that $|c_0 - c_{n,0}| < |c_0|/2$ for all $n \geq N$. Then the inequalities (8.8) show that

$$\text{supp } \mu_n, \text{supp } \mu \subset [-R_1, R_1], \quad R_1 = \frac{4M}{|c_0|} + |s_+| + |s_-|.$$

In the case that $c_1 > 0$ but $c_0 = 0$, increase N once again such that $|c_1 - c_{n,1}| < |c_1|/2$ for all $n \geq N$; the same inequalities then show that

$$\text{supp } \mu_n, \text{supp } \mu \subset [-R_2, R_2], \quad R_2 = \sqrt{|s_+|^2 + |s_-|^2 + 4M/|c_1|} + |s_+| + |s_-|.$$

By expanding I appropriately, then, we can suppose that

$$\text{supp } \mu_n, \text{supp } \mu \subset I$$

for $n \geq N$; note that the inequalities (8.8) hold with the new definition of I . Fix a neighborhood $I' \supset I$, and define the measures

$$\mu_{n,\delta} = P[\mu_n](s + i\varepsilon)\chi_{I'}(s) ds \in \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}),$$

where $\chi_{I'}$ is the characteristic function of I' . These measures converge weakly to μ_n as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, by Proposition 3.6.3. Fix a bounded, continuous function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, fix $\delta_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{s \in I'} |g(s) + P[g](s + i\delta_\varepsilon)| < \varepsilon,$$

using the locally uniform continuity of $P[g]$ in a neighborhood of I' . Decreasing δ_ε if necessary, we can ensure also that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus I'} P[\mu_n](s + i\delta) ds \leq \frac{2M}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus I'} \frac{\delta}{s^2 + \delta^2} (\delta(s - s_-) + \delta(s - s_+)) ds < \varepsilon$$

for all n . With this choice, we can apply the same argument as we did in Proposition 7.1 to deduce that $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ weakly. But we also know that μ_n are uniformly compactly supported, so we recover convergence in W_∞ . \square

We can now prove Theorem 4.17 in full:

Theorem 4.17 (Existence and Weak Continuity of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$). *Write $U^0 = \{0\} \times \{0\}$, $U^1 = (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \times \{0\}$, and $U^2 = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$; these sets form a disjoint partition of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Respectively, the set U^0 corresponds to the choice $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, the set U^1 to the choice $c_1 = 0$ but $c_0 \neq 0$, and U^2 to the choice $c_1 > 0$. Then $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is well-defined on the following spaces:*

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times U^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)} \times U^1, \quad \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times U^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)} \times U^0,$$

applicable to gCM equations, and

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^{2-i}, \quad i \in \{0, 1, 2\},$$

applicable to both gCM and gPD equations. The restriction to $\mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \times U^2$ is continuous from the W_{-2} topology on $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ and the standard topology on U^2 to the W_{-r} topology on $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, for any $r > 2$. The restriction to $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R}) \times U^i$ is continuous in product of the W_{∞} -topology on $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ and the standard topology on each U^j .

Proof. The claim about $\mathcal{M}_c(\mathbb{R})$ is proven in Lemma 8.4, so we prove only the statement about $\mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$ here. In general, it is clear that the restriction of the embedding Ψ (defined by (3.1)) to $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)} \times U^i$ is continuous from the W_{-2} topology on $\mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ and the standard topology on U^i to the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and the standard topology on \mathbb{R} . Write $\Psi[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\tilde{\lambda}, c'_0)$. From Theorem 4.1, we thus see that there is a unique pair $(\tilde{\mu}, \zeta'_0)$ such that

$$(8.9) \quad (Q[\tilde{\lambda}](z) + ic'_0)(Q[\tilde{\mu}](z) + i\zeta'_0) \equiv 1,$$

and that the map $(\lambda, c_0, c_1) \mapsto (\tilde{\mu}, \zeta'_0)$ is continuous in the same topologies. Moreover, so long as either c_0 or c_1 is nonzero, we can follow the same logic as Lemma 8.4 to deduce that $\tilde{\mu}$ has no atom at -1 , and thus that $\tilde{\mu} = \psi[\mu]$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$.

Since $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, we further deduce that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, as it can have at most one atom to the left of $\inf \text{supp } \lambda$. Next, suppose that $\mu \notin \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, and calculate

$$Q[\psi[\mu]](\phi^{-1}(z)) = \frac{i}{\pi} \int \left(\frac{1}{z-s} + \frac{s}{1+s^2} \right) d\mu(s).$$

Fix $R > 0$ sufficiently large and $z_0 < \inf \text{supp } \mu$ sufficiently small that $(z-s)^{-1} > -s(1+s^2)^{-1}$ for all $s > R$ and $z < z_0$. Then we find

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow -\infty} Q[\psi[\mu]](\phi^{-1}(z)) = \frac{i}{\pi} \int_{-R}^R \frac{s d\mu(s)}{1+s^2} + \lim_{z \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{i}{\pi} \int_R^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{z-s} + \frac{s}{1+s^2} \right) d\mu(s),$$

but then, a standard application of Fatou's lemma shows that the latter term diverges. Since at least one of c_0 and c_1 is nonzero, by hypothesis, this contradicts the (pushforward of the) relation (8.9). Thus, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$.

Finally, let $r > 2$, and consider a sequence $\tilde{\mu}_n \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ converging weakly to $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$. Let μ_n, μ be such that $\psi[\mu_n] + \pi^{-1}\tilde{c}_{1,n}\delta_{-1} = \tilde{\mu}_n$ and $\psi[\mu] + \pi^{-1}\tilde{c}_1\delta_{-1} = \tilde{\mu}$, for some values \tilde{c}_n and \tilde{c} . For any bounded, continuous $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$, the function

$$\tilde{f}(z) \doteq (1 + \phi(z)^2)^{1-r/2} (f \circ \phi)(z)$$

is bounded and continuous on S^1 , and so

$$\int (1+s^2)^{-r/2} f(s) d\mu_n(s) = \pi \int \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mu}_n \rightarrow \pi \int \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mu} = \int (1+s^2)^{-r/2} f(s) d\mu(s)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that the projection ψ^{-1} is continuous from the weak topology on S^1 to the W_{-r} topology on $\mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, so the map $(\lambda, c_0, c_1) \mapsto \mu$ is continuous. The theorem follows. \square

9. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we show how the theory developed so far can be implemented numerically, giving rise to a straightforward-but-powerful spectral approach for working with scalar Volterra equations of all types.

Central to our approach is the AAA (‘triple-A’) algorithm for rational approximation [60], which we use for two reasons. For one, the measures we make use of—as well as their integral transforms—are generally non-smooth, so traditional (e.g., polynomial) approximation schemes are ill-suited to our problem. Equally important is, in handling time series, we are interested in equispaced samples on the real line. We require high-order methods in order to accurately approximate integral transforms of such data accurately, but polynomial methods give rise to large, non-physical oscillations (the *Runge phenomenon*) when applied to equispaced sample points [74]. Although somewhat less foolproof than polynomial interpolation, the rational approximation offered by AAA is able to cleanly resolve discontinuities and (certain kinds of) singularities, and it does not depend nearly as strongly as polynomial methods on the distribution of sample points.

The numerical methods presented here are used primarily to support our analytical results, so we do not delve too deeply into the numerical theory (or accuracy/runtime analysis) needed to justify our numerical approach fully. We introduce our ‘AAA-Hilbert’ (hereafter, *AAAH*) algorithm more completely in the sequel, and we show there how it can be used to solve a variety of problems orthogonal to those of present interest; for instance, it gives an efficient scheme for the approximation of (even non-CM) functions by Prony series.

Our codebase, complete with all examples presented here, has been made available at the following GitHub link:

<https://github.com/sgstepaniants/time-deconvolution>

9.1. Numerical Implementation of \mathcal{B} , $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and \mathcal{B}_{reg} . Basic to our spectral theory is the triple of involutions \mathcal{B} , $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and \mathcal{B}_{reg} , introduced in Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, respectively. In turn, these maps allow us to solve difference equations (see Proposition 4.4), integral and integro-differential equations (see Propositions 4.6 and Proposition 4.7), and delay and fractional differential equations (see Propositions 4.23 and 4.28).

The map \mathcal{B} takes a measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and an offset $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and returns the ‘interconverted’ pair $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S^1)$ and $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, according to Theorem 4.1. For our present purposes, we assume that λ has only finitely many atoms and no singular continuous part, so that

$$d\lambda(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1} \lambda_c(e^{i\theta}) d\theta + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \delta(\theta - \theta_i) d\theta$$

for a known, non-negative density $\lambda_c \in L^1(S^1)$, atom locations $\theta_i \in [0, 2\pi)$, and weights $b_i > 0$. Such a measure is within the scope of Theorem 4.3, so we can compute $\mathcal{B}[\lambda, c_0] = (\mu, \zeta_0)$ as derived there.

In turn, this procedure requires computing the Hilbert transform $H[\lambda]$. That of the discrete part of λ is straightforward, as the Hilbert transform of a delta function is given explicitly by $H[\delta_{e^{i\theta_0}}](e^{i\theta}) = \cot(\frac{\theta-\theta_0}{2})$; this expression is exactly (the restriction of) a pole in the complex plane, so it can be represented exactly using AAA. To compute the Hilbert transform of λ_c , we first solve a Laplace problem to find $Q[\lambda_c]$, using the AAA-LS method of Costa and Trefethen [19]. The AAA-LS method proceeds as follows:

- (1) Apply AAA to λ_c to recover a rational approximation $r(z)|_{S^1} \approx \lambda_c(z)$.
- (2) Recover the set of poles z_1, \dots, z_n of $r(z)$ with $|z_i| > 1$.
- (3) Fix a small $m \geq 1$. Writing

$$\tilde{Q}_c(z) = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j z^j + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{c_j}{z - z_j},$$

perform a least-squares optimization on $\{a_j, c_j\}$ to minimize the error $\|\operatorname{Re} \tilde{Q}_c(z) - \operatorname{Re} \lambda_c(z)\|_{L^\infty(S^1)}$, subject to $\operatorname{Im} \tilde{Q}_c(0) = 0$.

The resulting function $\tilde{Q}_c(z)$ is necessarily holomorphic in the unit disc \mathbb{D} , and its real part converges approximately to λ_c on S^1 ; as such, Corollary 3.7 indicates⁶ that it should approximate $Q[\lambda_c]$ on \mathbb{D} . Adding the discrete part of λ , discussed above, yields an approximation of $Q[\lambda]$ itself. We can then find $H[\lambda]$ by restricting $\operatorname{Im} Q[\lambda]$ to S^1 .

Following along with Theorem 4.3, this information is sufficient to compute the continuous density μ_c of the distribution μ . The discrete part of μ is supported on the zeroes of $H[\lambda] + c_0$ on the circle, which can be found either using traditional rootfinding schemes or using AAA itself; rootfinding is particularly easy in this context, as we know that each of the (finite number of) components of $S^1 \setminus \operatorname{supp} \lambda$ has at most one root. The weight of each atom of μ , as well as the value of ζ_0 , can be found by taking appropriate integrals of λ .

The map $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is computed similarly, but on the real line instead of the circle. Recall that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ takes a measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, a constant offset $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and a linear offset $c_1 \geq 0$, and returns the interconverted triple $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\zeta_1 \geq 0$. We treat only λ satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 4.10, so we know with certainty that \mathcal{B} is well-defined. The only modification to the AAA-LS procedure described above is, instead of restricting to poles outside the unit disc, we restrict to poles in the lower half-plane $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{H}}$ before performing our least-squares optimization.

The map \mathcal{B}_{reg} takes a measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, a constant offset $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and a linear offset $c_1 \geq 0$, and it returns the interconverted triple $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$, $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\zeta_1 \geq 0$. We implement \mathcal{B}_{reg} by using our existing implementation of \mathcal{B} , i.e., using the formula $\mathcal{B}_{\text{reg}} = \Psi_{\text{reg}}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{B} \circ \Psi_{\text{reg}}$, where Ψ_{reg} is defined by (4.24).

At present, we calculate Laplace and Fourier transforms of our measures using low-order (i.e., trapezoidal) quadrature methods; we return to the inverse Laplace transform in Section 9.3. As such, this step represents a primary bottleneck in accuracy, in an algorithm otherwise carried out with spectral accuracy. We investigate this question further in the sequel. Based on early numerical tests, we anticipate high-order accuracy to be preserved across the full, revised algorithm.

⁶We do not pursue a formal proof of this statement at present.

9.2. Practical Examples of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and Numerical Interconversion. We now develop an intuition for the behavior of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, by investigating how it transforms four different triples (λ, c_0, c_1) . These are as follows: a purely discrete measure,

$$\lambda_1(s) = \sum_{i=1}^6 \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i), \quad \begin{array}{l} \alpha = (5.0, 7.0, 8.1, 10.3, 12.2, 15.0) \\ \beta = (1.0, 2.3, 0.5, 0.7, 2.0, 0.4) \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{l} c_0 = -10 \\ c_1 = 5 \end{array},$$

a sum of two parabolic kernels,

$$\lambda_2(s) = \chi_{[4,6]}(s)(1 - (s - 5)^2) + \chi_{[14,16]}(s)(1 - (s - 15)^2), \quad \begin{array}{l} c_0 = 1 \\ c_1 = 0 \end{array},$$

a fully-supported measure with both continuous and discrete parts,

$$\lambda_3(s) = e^{-|s-6|} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i), \quad \begin{array}{l} \alpha = (3.0, 5.0, 7.0) \\ \beta = (0.3, 0.4, 0.2) \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{l} c_0 = 0 \\ c_1 = 0 \end{array},$$

and a sum of two triangular kernels and several atoms,

$$\lambda_4(s) = \chi_{[-6,-4]}(s)(1 - |s + 5|) + \chi_{[4,6]}(s)(1 - |s - 5|) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i),$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \alpha = (-2, 0, 2) \\ \beta = (1.2, 0.2, 1.3) \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{l} c_0 = 1 + i \\ c_1 = 1 \end{array}.$$

In Fig. 10, we show how each of the measures λ_i is mapped to μ_i under $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, with the parameters c_0 and c_1 as indicated. As evidenced by the example of λ_1 , discrete measures are always mapped to discrete measures for real c_0 , and the atoms of λ and μ must interlace (see Corollary 4.12). Likewise, as the example of λ_2 demonstrates, continuous measures with compact support are taken to other measures with the same support, along with a countable number of atoms added on (see Proposition 6.9). The example of λ_3 shows that any measure with density everywhere locally bounded away from zero is mapped to a continuous measure with full support; this is implied by Theorem 4.10, as $N_0(\lambda)$ is empty. Finally, the example of λ_4 shows that the same is true for *any* measure when c_0 has positive imaginary part (see Proposition 4.14). We can understand this latter example as a special case of the case of a measure of full support, connecting with our broader theory of rPD kernels (see Remark 4.24).

We now apply our spectral method to solve the interconversion problem. Namely, given a triple (K, c_0, c_1) in either (gCM) or (gPD), how accurately can we compute the triple (J, ζ_0, ζ_1) that defines the inverse equation (see Propositions 4.6 and 4.7)?

We first consider the context of Proposition 4.6; i.e., where $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ satisfy the pair of equations

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= c_1 \dot{x}(t) - c_0 x(t) - \int_0^t K(t-s)x(s)ds, \\ -\pi^2 x(t) &= \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) - \zeta_0 y(t) - \int_0^t J(t-s)y(s)ds, \end{aligned}$$

with $K = \mathcal{L}_b[\lambda]$ and $J = \mathcal{L}_b[\mu]$ are gCM integral kernels, with $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, and where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda, c_0, c_1] = (\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1)$. By combining these two equations, we can see that




FIGURE 10. We display the diverse set of behaviors exhibited by the map $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. The four examples shown above—discussed in Section 9.2—show a discrete measure, a continuous measure of compact support, a ‘mixed’ measure with full support, and a mixed measure with compact support. Notably, the choice of c_0 and c_1 significantly affect the behavior of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

the kernels K and J satisfy the following *resolvent equations*:

$$(9.1a) \quad \zeta_1 \dot{K} - \zeta_0 K - K * J = 0, \quad K(0) = \pi^2 / \zeta_1, \quad \text{if } c_1 = c_0 = 0,$$

$$(9.1b) \quad c_0 J + \zeta_0 K + K * J = 0, \quad \text{if } c_1 = 0, c_0 \neq 0,$$

$$(9.1c) \quad c_1 \dot{J} - c_0 J - K * J = 0, \quad J(0) = \pi^2 / c_1, \quad \text{if } c_1 > 0.$$

In order to evaluate the accuracy to which an estimated kernel J satisfies the resolvent equations above, we can compute the relative L^2 error

$$(9.2) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{gCM}}(J) = \begin{cases} \frac{\|\zeta_1 \dot{K} - \zeta_0 K - K * J\|_{L^2}}{\|\zeta_1 \dot{K} - \zeta_0 K\|_{L^2}}, & c_1 = c_0 = 0 \\ \frac{\|\zeta_0 K + c_0 J + K * J\|_{L^2}}{\|\zeta_0 K\|_{L^2}}, & c_1 = 0, c_0 \neq 0. \\ \frac{\|c_1 \dot{J} - c_0 J - K * J\|_{L^2}}{\|c_1 \dot{J}\|_{L^2}}, & c_1 > 0 \end{cases}.$$

The error in the first two cases is chosen to weigh against the total contribution of terms in the resolvent equation that do not involve J ; since no such terms appear

in the final case, the error is chosen to weigh against the ‘most irregular’ expression in the resolvent equation, $c_1 \dot{J}$.

We can carry out a similar program in the setting of Proposition 4.7, where $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ satisfy the pair of equations

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= c_1 \dot{x}(t) - ic_0 x(t) + \int_0^t K(t-s)x(s)ds, \\ \pi^2 x(t) &= \zeta_1 \dot{y}(t) - i\zeta_0 y(t) + \int_0^t J(t-s)y(s)ds, \end{aligned}$$

now with $K = \mathcal{F}[\lambda]$ and $J = \mathcal{F}[\mu]$ gPD integral kernels. The resolvent equations in this context are as follows:

$$(9.3a) \quad \zeta_1 \dot{K} - i\zeta_0 K + K * J = 0, \quad K(0) = \pi^2 / \zeta_1, \quad \text{if } c_1 = c_0 = 0$$

$$(9.3b) \quad i\zeta_0 K = -ic_0 J + K * J, \quad \text{if } c_1 = 0, c_0 \neq 0$$

$$(9.3c) \quad c_1 \dot{J} - ic_0 J + K * J, \quad J(0) = \pi^2 / c_1 \quad \text{if } c_1 > 0.$$

with the resulting relative L^2 error expression

$$(9.4) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{gPD}}(J) = \begin{cases} \frac{\|i\zeta_0 K - \zeta_1 \dot{K} - K * J\|_{L^2}}{\|i\zeta_0 K - \zeta_1 \dot{K}\|_{L^2}}, & c_1 = c_0 = 0 \\ \frac{\|i\zeta_0 K + ic_0 J - K * J\|_{L^2}}{\|i\zeta_0 K\|_{L^2}}, & c_1 = 0, c_0 \neq 0. \\ \frac{\|c_1 \dot{J} - ic_0 J + K * J\|_{L^2}}{\|c_1 J\|_{L^2}}, & c_1 > 0 \end{cases}.$$

Using these error expressions, we can study how the spectral interconversion of CM and PD Volterra equations through $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ compares against classical numerical approaches to solving the resolvent equations (9.1) and (9.3). We consider Volterra equations corresponding to the four measures λ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, introduced in Section 9.2. First, we study (gCM) with kernels given by $K(t) = \mathcal{L}_b[\lambda_i](t)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$; since $c_0 \notin \mathbb{R}$ in the fourth case, it cannot be applied in the gCM context. Second, we study (gPD) with kernels given by $K(t) = \mathcal{F}[\lambda_i](t)$, now with all four kernels.

In Fig. 11, we show how our new spectral approach—introduced in Section 9.1—compares against traditional quadrature methods to solve these interconversion equations. Traditional methods differ somewhat between integral and integro-differential equations. Namely, for solving integral equations of the first and second types, we discretize the integrals according to the trapezoid rule, with 10^4 time-points between 0 and 1; for example, see [73, Chapter 18.2]. We solve integro-differential Volterra equations by approximating integral terms with Gauss quadrature (with 20 nodes), as discussed in [4]. In all cases, we find that our spectral interconversion approach offers the same or higher accuracy as compared to traditional methods. Once again, we note that in our current implementation, we use trapezoidal quadrature to compute Laplace and Fourier transforms, to recover the kernels K ; in the sequel, we show how to improve this step to achieve spectral accuracy across the full algorithm.

9.3. Spectral Interconversion from Time-Sampled Kernels. In practice, one may not know the spectrum of our integral kernel K *a priori*, but only the values of K at discrete time points t_1, \dots, t_n . To solve this problem with our spectral theory, we must first estimate the measure λ (either $\mathcal{L}_b^{-1}[K]$ or $\mathcal{F}^{-1}[K]$, depending on context).




FIGURE 11. Interconversion of the equations (gCM) and (gPD) for various integral kernels K (shown in blue). The spectral approach introduced in Section 9.1, using our analytic formulas for $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, gives interconverted kernels J_{spec} (red) that agree closely with the kernels J_{num} (pink) provided by traditional quadrature schemes. In all cases, our spectral approach offers similar or higher accuracy as compared with traditional methods. As noted above, low-order quadrature methods currently represent a bottleneck in accuracy in our algorithm, which we attempt to correct in the sequel.

Consider again the case of (gCM), where $K = \mathcal{L}_b[\lambda]$ for some $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{exp}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$. We would like to approximate K by a sum of exponential kernels, which would correspond to a discrete approximation of λ . The problem of fitting sums of exponentials is well-explored and known to be very ill-posed [76, 77, 40, 83], and can be reframed as the challenging task of computing an inverse Laplace transform of a function from sample data. Here we explore the use of the AAA algorithm [60] to solve this ill-posed problem. The approach we describe below is closely related to the method of Padé–Laplace approximation [83], which uses a one-point rational approximant (analogous to a Taylor series) to compute integral transforms.

Taking a (one-sided) Laplace transform of K , we find

$$(9.5) \quad \mathcal{L}[K](s) = \mathcal{L}[\mathcal{L}_b[\lambda]](s) = \int_0^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-st} e^{-tu} d\lambda(u) dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{d\lambda(u)}{s+u},$$

suggesting that we can construct a discrete approximation of λ by first approximating $\mathcal{L}[K]$ with an appropriate rational function. Instead of computing $\mathcal{L}[K]$ with direct quadrature, as we do elsewhere, we now use AAA to fit a rational approximation to the sample data $\{(t_i, K(t_i))\}_{i=1}^n$ to obtain⁷

$$K(t) \approx \widehat{K}(t) \doteq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{t - z_i}, \quad \mathcal{L}[\widehat{K}](s) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i e^{-z_i s} E_1(-z_i s),$$

with $w_i, z_i \in \mathbb{C}$, and where $E_1(x) = \int_x^\infty \frac{e^{-u}}{u} du$ denotes the exponential integral. We now apply AAA a *second* time, to approximate $\mathcal{L}[\widehat{K}]$ on a set of chosen (logarithmically spaced) quadrature points $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^m$. This procedure yields

$$\mathcal{L}[\widehat{K}](s) \approx \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\rho_i}{s - \zeta_i},$$

with $\rho_i, \zeta_i \in \mathbb{C}$. Our aim is to approximate λ from (9.5) using the pairs (ρ_i, ζ_i) discovered by AAA. Although ρ_i and ζ_i are generally complex-valued, in approximating completely monotone integral kernels (which have no oscillatory properties), AAA typically concentrates its pole placement along the negative real axis. We find that rounding these values to the real axis and constructing the discrete distribution

$$(9.6) \quad \widehat{\lambda}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \delta(s - \alpha_i), \quad \alpha_i = -\operatorname{Re}[\zeta_i], \quad \lambda_i = \operatorname{Re}[\rho_i]$$

robustly approximates the distribution λ . In fact, the procedure we described above can be used even when K exhibits exponential growth. If K grows at a rate $\tau > 0$, then for AAA to accurately compute its Laplace transform, K must be pre-multiplied by an exponential decay $e^{-\tau t}$, and its transform must be subsequently shifted as $\mathcal{L}[\widehat{K}](s) \mapsto \mathcal{L}[\widehat{K}](s - \tau)$.

Even if K is a valid gCM kernel—i.e., a bilateral Laplace transform of a positive measure—the discrete measure $\widehat{\lambda}(s)$ computed above may have negative masses. A natural correction in this case is as follows. We use the spectral weights λ_i above as a warm start, set to zero those weights which are negative, and optimize the remaining pairs (α_i, λ_i) through a projected gradient descent, minimizing the mean squared error between $K(t_i)$ and $\mathcal{L}_b[\widehat{\lambda}](t_i)$ while constraining all weights λ_i to be positive. This correction procedure robustly recovers the (positive) spectrum of our gCM kernel. At the top of Fig. 12, we show how this procedure works on the kernel

$$(9.7) \quad K(t) = \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} + e^{-t}, \quad \lambda(s) = \mathcal{L}^{-1}[K](s) = \chi_{[0,\infty)}(s) s e^{-s} + \delta(s-1).$$

We sample this kernel at $n = 5$ and $n = 10$ logarithmically spaced points in time, use AAA as outlined above to achieve a candidate spectrum, and then apply 1000 steps of Adam gradient optimization [48] to construct a non-negative spectrum $\widehat{\lambda} \approx \mathcal{L}_b^{-1}[K]$. In turn, we can use the methods outlined in the preceding sections to

⁷Generically, AAA may give polynomial terms along with single poles. We discuss how to correct this behavior in the sequel.

obtain $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\widehat{\lambda}, c_0 = 0, c_1 = 0] = (\widehat{\mu}, \zeta_0, \zeta_1)$, and thus the interconverted gCM kernel $J = \mathcal{L}_b[\widehat{\mu}]$. We find that we are able to accurately reconstruct the true inverse kernel J with $n = 10$ samples; $n = 5$ samples are sufficient to closely approximate K itself, but too few to accurately recover J .

Now we turn to the case of (gPD), where $K = \mathcal{F}[\lambda]$ for a non-negative measure λ . The AAA-based approximation could be used equally well in this setting, but we demonstrate an alternate approximation scheme using the discrete cosine transform (DCT). We write $t_i = (i - 1)\Delta t$ for a given resolution Δt , and perform an inverse DCT on the sample vector $\{K(t_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ to obtain

$$\widehat{\lambda}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i}{2} \left[\delta(s - \omega_i) + \delta(s + \omega_i) \right],$$

with weights and frequencies

$$\lambda_i = \frac{2}{n} \left(\frac{1}{2} K(t_1) + \sum_{j=2}^n K(t_j) \cos(\omega_j t_j) \right), \quad \omega_i = \frac{\pi(2i - 1)}{2n\Delta t}.$$

More concretely, this yields the following representation of K :

$$K(t) \approx \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \cos(\omega_j t),$$

which interpolates K at the sample points t_i . Once again, this procedure does not enforce that λ_i are positive, but gradient descent can be used to correct this behavior. We show the full procedure at the bottom of Fig. 12, applied to the kernel

(9.8)

$$K(t) = e^{-t^2} + \frac{1}{4} \cos(2t) + \frac{1}{4} \cos(5t),$$

$$\lambda(s) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\lambda](s) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{s^2}{4}} + \frac{1}{8} \left[\delta(s - 5) + \delta(s - 1) + \delta(s + 1) + \delta(s + 5) \right].$$

This gPD kernel is sampled at $n = 10$ and $n = 20$ equispaced points in time, and we use the DCT along with 1000 steps of Adam gradient optimization to construct its approximate spectral distribution $\widehat{\lambda}$. We use the methods of the preceding section to compute $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}[\widehat{\lambda}, c_0 = 1, c_1 = 1] = (\widehat{\mu}, \zeta_0, \zeta_1)$ and recover $J = \mathcal{F}[\widehat{\mu}]$. We see that the reconstruction of the J is highly accurate when $n = 20$ samples of K are given, but still remains reasonably accurate even with $n = 10$ samples. This highlights a possible difference with the gCM case studied earlier, that inversion of gPD kernels may be less sensitive to mis-estimation of the spectral distribution λ .

9.4. Solving Volterra Equations through Interconversion. Now that we have established that our method can effectively interconvert either (gCM) or (gPD), we test its ability to recover the solution $x(t)$ from a given input $y(t)$. In particular, we are interested in seeing how this inversion behaves under increasing levels of noise corruption in $y(t)$.

We construct a random curve $x(t)$ by first generating a random walk that takes 10 steps, at intervals $\Delta t = 1$ and of step size $1/\sqrt{10}$; this ensures that the random walk has unit variance at time $t = 10$. We then interpolate its values at $t = 1, \dots, 10$ using a 5th-order spline to obtain a differentiable trajectory $x(t)$.




FIGURE 12. The first two rows above study the interconversion of a Volterra equation with $c_0 = c_1 = 0$ and the gCM Volterra kernel $K = \mathcal{L}_b[\lambda]$ given by (9.7). This interconversion is performed by first computing the approximate inverse Laplace transform of K through AAA to obtain a discrete spectrum $\hat{\lambda}$, which is then mapped to a discrete spectrum $\hat{\mu}$ using the map $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Although $\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\mu}$ in the middle two columns are exactly discrete, we plot them with kernel density estimation for clearer visualization. We see that the inversion accurately approximates the inverse kernel J with only a moderate number of sample points. The second two rows study the interconversion of a Volterra equation with $c_0 = c_1 = 1$ and the gPD Volterra kernel $K = \mathcal{F}[\lambda]$ given in (9.8). In this case, $\hat{\lambda}$ is obtained by taking the inverse Fourier transform of K computed through the DCT. Once again, the reconstruction of J is accurate with only a moderate number of sample points.

We then study the following gCM Volterra equation

$$(9.9) \quad y(t) = 2x(t) - \int_0^t K(t-s)x(s)ds, \quad K(t) = e^{-t} + e^{-2t}$$

and the following gPD Volterra equation

$$(9.10) \quad y(t) = \int_0^t K(t-s)x(s)ds, \quad K(t) = \cos(t) + \cos(2t).$$

For each equations, we numerically compute the convolution $K * x$ at 1000 time points to obtain a baseline value of $y(t)$. We then proceed to corrupt the resulting values with $p\%$ Gaussian white noise, as $\tilde{y}(t) = y(t) + \xi(t)$, where the standard deviation of ξ is $\frac{p}{100} \|y\|_{L^2}$.

In Figure 13 we show a comparison of two approaches for recovering $x(t)$ from noisy measurements $\tilde{y}(t)$. For this example, we assume that the spectral distribution λ of the gCM or gPD kernel K in the examples above is known exactly. Our spectral approach once uses Propositions 4.6 and 4.7 to recover an approximate value $\hat{x}_{\text{spec}}(t)$ (dark blue line). This approach works remarkably well, even at high noise levels. Notably, our approach achieves near-identical results in this test as compared to solving the resolvent equation for $J(t)$ directly (using numerical quadrature), and then using J to recover x .

The second approach we investigate is to numerically invert (9.9) and (9.10) directly, i.e., by discretizing these systems through a trapezoid rule at 1000 equispaced timepoints and solving. This reconstruction, labeled $\hat{x}_{\text{data}}(t)$ (light purple line), shows poor high sensitivity to noise in both the gCM and gPD cases. This behavior is as expected; numerical solution of Volterra equations is generally ill-posed, and the linear system formed by discretizing (9.9) and (9.10) in the time domain is poorly-conditioned. This confirms that interconversion is crucial for solving the deconvolution problem from noise-corrupted and filtered observations, and once again highlights the strength of our spectral approach.

9.5. Discrete-Time Volterra Equations. In this section, we show how our interconversion formulas allow us to analytically solve discrete-time Volterra equations of the class (dPD), reducing the computational complexity required by traditional methods. We demonstrate our approach on the equation

$$(9.11) \quad y(n) = c_0 x(n) + \sum_{j=0}^n K(n-j)x(j), \quad K(n) = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k \cos(n\theta_k)$$

where $\theta_k \in [0, \pi]$, and fixing $c_0 = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N a_k$. Note that the inverse Fourier transform of this kernel is

$$d\lambda(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{a_k}{2} \left(\delta(\theta - \theta_k) + \delta(\theta + \theta_k) \right) d\theta,$$

and by Proposition 4.7, we obtain $\mu \simeq (\mu, 0) = \mathcal{B}[\lambda, 0]$. Because \mathcal{B} always takes discrete measures to discrete measures, we know that μ will take the form

$$d\mu(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{2} \left(\delta(\theta - \gamma_k) + \delta(\theta + \gamma_k) \right) d\theta$$




FIGURE 13. Reconstruction of the trajectory $x(t)$ given only a noisy forcing term $\tilde{y}(t) = y(t) + \xi(t)$, in both gCM (9.9) and gPD (9.10) Volterra equations. In our approach, we reconstructing $x(t)$ by first determining the interconverted Volterra kernel J from K through our spectral interconversion formulas, using J to reconstruct $x(t)$ analytically. This reconstruction is shown in $\hat{x}_{\text{spec}}(t)$ (dark blue line), and we see that it is robust to even significant noise corruption. An alternative approach for reconstructing $x(t)$ is to numerically solve the Volterra equations (9.9) and (9.10) through a trapezoid rule discretization. The resulting numerical problem is highly ill-conditioned, and as such, the reconstructed values $\hat{x}_{\text{data}}(t)$ (light purple line) are highly sensitive to noise.

where $\gamma_k \in [0, \pi]$ interleave between the angles θ_k on the unit circle. Hence, defining

$$J(t) = 4\mathcal{F}[\mu](t) = 4 \sum_{k=1}^N b_k \cos(\gamma_k t), \quad \zeta_1 = -\frac{1}{2}J(0) = -2 \sum_{k=1}^N b_k,$$

we find that the solution to (9.11) is given by

$$(9.12) \quad x(n) = \zeta_1 + \sum_{j=0}^n J(n-j)y(j).$$

We compare this spectral approach to a naïve numerical solution of (9.11). For the latter, we form the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ with $T_{ij} = \mathbb{1}_{\{i \geq j\}}K(i-j)$ and solve

$$(9.13) \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x(0) \\ \vdots \\ x(n) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} y(0) \\ \vdots \\ y(n) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The classical algorithm for this inversion uses forward substitution and requires $O(n^2)$ operations. However, the matrix \mathbf{T} is *Toeplitz* as well as triangular, so this scheme can be improved upon. Generic (i.e., non-triangular) Toeplitz matrices can be inverted in $O(n^2)$ operations using Levinson recursion [82], although relatively-involved *superfast* methods exist that use the FFT to invert such matrices in $O(n \log n + np^2)$ operations, where p depends on the entries of the Toeplitz matrix [14]. Triangular Toeplitz matrices can likewise be inverted in $O(n \log n)$ time with ~ 10 applications of the FFT [17]. Approximate algorithms based on polynomial interpolation can drop this time complexity to the cost of two FFTs and one DCT [51].

By contrast, using the analytical formulas in Proposition 4.7 and computing the convolution $J * y$ in Fourier space, we carry out a spectrally-accurate inversion with a highly efficient, easy-to-implement algorithm. One point of uncertainty in our time complexity lies in the computation of Hilbert transforms, which are in turn carried out by the asymptotically-potentially-expensive AAA algorithm. Since AAA is highly accurate even with small rational approximants, we find our algorithm to be highly efficient in practice. In Fig. 14, we show that our method is more efficient (on the example (9.11)) than the classical $O(n^2)$ options, i.e., forward substitution algorithm for triangular matrices and Levinson recursion for Toeplitz matrices. We find that our inversion formula reconstructs x in $O(n \log n)$ time, as expected if it were dominated by the FFT.

9.6. Volterra Equations with Fractional Derivatives. We finish our numerical studies by showing how spectral interconversion allow us to solve Volterra equations with fractional derivatives. Namely, we study the equation

$$(9.14) \quad y(t) = \dot{x}(t) + D^{1/2}x(t) = \dot{x}(t) + \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t K(t-\tau)x(\tau) d\tau,$$

discussed in Example 4.29, where $D^{1/2}$ is the Riemann–Liouville half-derivative (1.2). Here, we have $K(t) = 1/\sqrt{\pi t}$, which can be represented (comparing with Proposition 4.28) as

$$(9.15) \quad K(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-ts}}{s} \lambda(s) ds, \quad d\lambda(s) = \chi_{[0, \infty)}(s) \pi^{-1} \sqrt{s} ds.$$

We note that $\lambda \notin \mathcal{M}_+^{(1)}(\mathbb{R})$, so our theory of gCM equations cannot be used to solve this example. Even still, our extension to rCM kernels allows it to be solved

Comparison of Solution Methods for Discrete Volterra Equations




FIGURE 14. Comparison of three different methods for solving the discrete Volterra equation (9.11). The spectral method developed in this paper for inversion of discrete Volterra equations (light blue line) scales nearly linearly in n , suggesting that it is dominated by the two FFTs it performs. By contrast, Levinson recursion [82] (pink line) and forward substitution (purple line) for solving Toeplitz and triangular systems, respectively, both scale quadratically with n . All methods have comparable relative root squared error in their reconstruction of x .

in closed-form; recall from Example 4.29 that the solution takes the form

$$x(t) = \int_0^\infty E_{1/2}(-(t - \tau)^{1/2})y(\tau) d\tau,$$

where $E_{1/2}$ is the Mittag-Leffler kernel [39]. In our notation, this corresponds to a kernel

$$J(t) = \mathcal{L}[\mu](t) = \pi^2 E_{\frac{1}{2}}(-t^{\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \mu(s) = \chi_{[0,\infty)}(s) \frac{\pi}{s^{\frac{1}{2}} + s^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

In Figure 15, we compute the same result numerically, using the implementation of \mathcal{B}_{reg} discussed in Section 9.1. We compare the result of our spectral interconversion against a direct implementation of the Mittag-Leffler kernel, using the GenML library in Python [64]; we see that our spectral approach accurately captures both the kernel J and its spectrum μ accurately, and that it is able to recover x from a random input y , generated using the same technique discussed in Section 9.4.

10. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Although our work covers a broad range of Volterra equations, there remain several interesting directions for future research. For one, it would be interesting to further investigate the practical applications of the present work. As one example, our work gives practical, closed-form expressions of the *reciprocal Cauchy transform* of positive measures on the line and on the circle, so it can be used to calculate boolean, monotone, and orthogonal convolutions of probability measures [50]. In




FIGURE 15. Interconversion of the fractional differential equation (9.14) leads to a CM Volterra equation with a Mittag–Leffler kernel J , as predicted by Proposition 4.28. We see that our spectral approach accurately captures both J and its spectrum $\mu = \mathcal{L}^{-1}[J]$, and that it accurately recovers x from a random input y ; the latter is generated using the technique discussed in Section 9.4.

another direction, the *AAA-Hilbert* (AAAH) algorithm presented in Section 9 can be applied in several directions orthogonal to the applications presented here, such as efficient approximation of functions by Prony series. We investigate these questions further in the sequel.

One important application is as follows. Suppose that in the context of (gCM) (with $c_1 \neq 0$), we have complete knowledge of the input y and partial knowledge (or a sparse sampling) of the output x , and we are interested in inferring the values of c_0 , c_1 , and K . Since we only have partial knowledge of x , it would be prohibitively difficult to calculate the numerical derivatives needed to evaluate the expression $c_1 \dot{x} - c_0 x - K * x$ for a candidate set of parameters. Alternatively, leveraging Theorem 4.10, we could efficiently recover the resolvent kernel J from a given set of parameters, and compare $J * y$ against x in turn; combining this with a nonlinear optimization scheme would allow us to estimate the true equation parameters without calculating numerical derivatives. This problem is particularly important in the context of reservoir models for climate modeling (see Fig. 2), where emissions data is well-known, atmospheric carbon budget data is known more sparsely, and equation parameters must be inferred.

There is also substantial room to improve our analytical results. Most straightforwardly, we believe that the statement of Theorem 4.17 can be greatly improved—comparing against our numerical results, the map $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is likely to be well-defined on far broader sets than those given in the theorem, and is likely to be continuous on far more stringent topologies. We would also like to develop a better understanding of how interconversion applies to measures with nonzero singular continuous components, which are outside the scope of Theorem 4.10, Theorem 4.3, and Theorem 4.21, but have been understood to some degree in the Aronszajn–Donoghue theory [5, 24].

Of course, the most restrictive of our hypotheses is that the spectra of our integral kernels are non-negative. Broadly, there are two reasons we need positive measures: to bound the variation norm of the interconverted measure in Lemma 6.1,

and to ensure that no poles exist when we take contour integrals in the proof of Theorem 4.10. If we had *a priori* knowledge of either of these facts, we might be able to soften this hypothesis.

Another interesting direction is, the construction of the regularized Hilbert transform presented here (see Section 4.3) appears substantially novel, and greatly extends the domain on which the transform can be defined. We have already seen one important application of this extension, in understanding the spectral theory of fractional and delay differential equations, but we would like to investigate these questions further.

APPENDIX A. STABILITY OF INTERCONVERSION

Here, we highlight a final benefit of our analytic interconversion formulas: one can directly estimate the (linearized) condition number of the interconversion itself. As a starting point, we show the following simple lemma:

Lemma A.1. *Fix parameters $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1 \geq 0$ and a measure $\lambda(s) = \sum_{i=1}^N b_i \delta(s - a_i)$, and let $(\mu, \zeta_0, \zeta_1) = \mathcal{B}[\lambda, c_0, c_1]$; further write $\mu(s) = \sum_{i=1}^M \beta_i \delta(s - \alpha_i)$. For any smooth, bounded, positive $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, write*

$$E_f[\lambda] = \int f(s) d\lambda(s).$$

Then the following bounds hold:

$$(A.1) \quad |\partial_{a_i} E_f[\mu]| \leq \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\beta_j^2}{\pi^2} \frac{b_i f(\alpha_j)}{|\alpha_j - a_i|^2} \left(\left| \frac{f'(\alpha_j)}{f(\alpha_j)} \right| + \frac{2}{|\alpha_j - a_i|} + \frac{2\beta_j}{\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{|\alpha_j - a_k|^3} \right),$$

$$|\partial_{b_i} E_f[\mu]| \leq \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\beta_j^2}{\pi^2} \frac{f(\alpha_j)}{|\alpha_j - a_i|} \left(\left| \frac{f'(\alpha_j)}{f(\alpha_j)} \right| + \frac{1}{|\alpha_j - a_i|} + \frac{2\beta_j}{\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{|\alpha_j - a_k|^3} \right),$$

$$|\partial_{c_1} E_f[\mu]| \leq \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\alpha_j \beta_j^2}{\pi^2} f(\alpha_j) \left(\left| \frac{f'(\alpha_j)}{f(\alpha_j)} \right| + \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|} + \frac{2\beta_j}{\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{|\alpha_j - a_k|^3} \right),$$

$$|\partial_{c_0} E_f[\mu]| \leq \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\beta_j^2}{\pi^2} f(\alpha_j) \left(\left| \frac{f'(\alpha_j)}{f(\alpha_j)} \right| + \frac{2\beta_j}{\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{|\alpha_j - a_k|^3} \right).$$

Proof. For any variable z , we find

$$(A.2) \quad |\partial_z E_f[\mu]| \leq \sum_{j=1}^M \left| \beta_j f'(\alpha_j) \partial_z \alpha_j + f(\alpha_j) \partial_z \beta_j \right|,$$

so our problem reduces to computing derivatives of α_j and β_j . We calculate $\partial_{a_i} \alpha_j$ using implicit differentiation:

$$\partial_{a_i} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{\alpha_j - a_k} - c_1 \partial_{a_i} \alpha_j = \frac{b_i}{(\alpha_j - a_i)^2} - \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{(\alpha_j - a_k)^2} + c_1 \right) \partial_{a_i} \alpha_j = 0,$$

so

$$\partial_{a_i} \alpha_j = \frac{b_i \beta_j}{\pi^2 (\alpha_j - a_i)^2},$$

and likewise,

$$\partial_{b_i} \alpha_j = \frac{\beta_j}{\pi^2(\alpha_j - a_i)}, \quad \partial_{c_1} \alpha_j = -\alpha_j \beta_j / \pi^2, \quad \partial_{c_0} \alpha_j = -\beta_j / \pi^2.$$

Next, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{a_i} \beta_j &= -\pi^2 \left(c_1 + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{(\alpha_j - a_k)^2} \right)^{-2} \left(\frac{2b_i}{(\alpha_j - a_i)^3} - \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{2b_k}{(\alpha_j - a_k)^3} \partial_{a_i} \alpha_j \right) \\ &= \frac{\beta_j^2}{\pi^2} \frac{b_i}{(\alpha_j - a_i)^2} \left(\frac{2}{\alpha_j - a_i} - \frac{2\beta_j}{\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{(\alpha_j - a_k)^3} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (A.1). The remaining formulas follow similarly. \square

Though the formulas provided by Lemma A.1 are unwieldy in their full generality, we can use them to estimate the stability of our interconversion formulas in various asymptotic limits.

As an example, suppose we fix $c_0 = c_1 = 0$, we choose a smooth, bounded, positive function $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, and we take λ_N to discretely approximate the measure $g(s) ds$ in the unit interval:

$$\lambda_N(s) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N g(j/N) \delta(s - j/N).$$

In this setting, we wish to see how error propagates through the map \mathcal{B} if we perturb

$$g(s) \mapsto g(s) + \delta g(s)$$

and let $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Supposing that the zeros α_j of $H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda_N]$ lie approximately halfway between each set of adjacent poles, we estimate

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{|\alpha_j - a_k|^n} \sim N^{n-1}$$

for any $n > 1$. In turn, this implies $\beta_j \sim N$, and, for any f with $\|f\|_{\infty}, \|\nabla f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{a_j} E_f[\mu]| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\beta_j^2}{\pi^2} \frac{b_i}{|\alpha_j - a_i|^2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{|\alpha_j - a_i|} + \frac{2\beta_j}{\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{|\alpha_j - a_k|^3} \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{b_i}{|\alpha_j - a_i|^2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{|\alpha_j - a_i|} + N \right) \sim 1. \end{aligned}$$

The total error in $E_f[\mu]$ can be computed as

$$\delta E_f[\mu] \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta g(j/N) \partial_{a_j} E_f[\mu] \lesssim \int_0^1 |\delta g(s)| ds,$$

so we see that, in the high-resolution limit, the L^1 error in μ should be on the same order as the L^1 error in λ .

For another example, suppose we fix N and write $\lambda(s) = \sum_{j=1}^N b_j \delta(s - a_j)$, set $c_1 = 0$, and consider the limit $c_0 \rightarrow \infty$. In this case, how do errors in $\lambda(s)$ propagate to affect the Laplace transform $\mathcal{L}_b[\mu]$?

To balance the equation

$$H_{\mathbb{R}}[\lambda](\alpha_j) - \pi^{-1}c_0 \propto \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{\alpha_j - a_k} - c_0 = 0,$$

each root α_j must be “close to” a neighboring pole a_j . More specifically, for any α_j , there is a pole $a_j \in \{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$ such that

$$\alpha_j - a_j \sim b_j/c_0.$$

In this setting, we estimate

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{|\alpha_j - a_k|^n} \sim b_j(c_0/b_j)^n$$

for any $n \geq 1$, and thus $\beta_j \sim \pi^2 b_j/c_0^2$.

In applying Lemma A.1 to the Laplace transform, we fix $f(t) = e^{-st}$ for a fixed $s \geq 0$. Then we find

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{a_i} E_f[\mu]| &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\beta_j^2}{\pi^2} \frac{b_j e^{-s\alpha_j}}{|\alpha_j - a_i|^2} \left(s + \frac{2}{|\alpha_j - a_i|} + \frac{2\beta_j}{\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{|\alpha_j - a_k|^3} \right), \\ &\sim \frac{\beta_i^2}{\pi^2} \frac{b_i e^{-s\alpha_i}}{|\alpha_i - a_i|^2} \left(s + \frac{2}{|\alpha_i - a_i|} + \frac{2\beta_i}{\pi^2} \frac{b_i}{|\alpha_i - a_i|^3} \right), \\ &\sim 4\pi^2 e^{-s\alpha_i}/c_0, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$|\partial_{b_i} E_f[\mu]| \lesssim 3\pi^2 e^{-s\alpha_i}/(b_i c_0).$$

This asymptotic behavior is perhaps as expected—that error propagation decays as $O(1/c_0)$ —but our analytic formulas further suggest the leading order coefficient for this decay.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DD would like to thank John Bush and Glenn Flierl (MIT) for allowing him to spend so much time on work with such tenuous connections to his doctoral research. He would also like to thank Glenn Flierl and Paolo Giani (MIT) for helpful discussions regarding the geophysical applications of scalar Volterra equations. Finally, DD would like to acknowledge the support of an NDSEG Graduate Fellowship.

GS would like to thank Andrew Stuart and Kaushik Bhattacharya (Caltech) for helpful discussions on dynamics with memory in the contexts of the Mori-Zwanzig formalism and in applications to materials science, as well as to Lianghao Cao and Margaret Trautner (Caltech) for insightful discussions. He is particularly grateful to Andrew Stuart for encouraging mathematical exploration in this direction considering the well-established history of Volterra integral equations and viscoelastic material models. GS is supported by an NSF Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowship (MSPRF) under award number 2402074.

REFERENCES

1. S. Albeverio, A. Konstantinov, and V. Koshmanenko, *The Aronszajn–Donoghue theory for rank one perturbations of the H_{-2} -class*, *Integral Equations and Operator Theory* **50** (2004), no. 1, 1–8.

2. S. Albeverio and V. Koshmanenko, *Singular rank one perturbations of self-adjoint operators and Krein theory of self-adjoint extensions*, Potential Analysis **11** (1999), no. 3, 279–287.
3. R. Anderssen, A. R. Davies, and F. R. de Hoog, *On the interconversion integral equation for relaxation and creep*, ANZIAM Journal **48** (2006), C346–C363.
4. G. Ansmann, *Efficiently and easily integrating differential equations with JiTCODE, JiTCDDE, and JiTCSDE*, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science **28** (2018), no. 4.
5. N. Aronszajn, *On a problem of Weyl in the theory of singular Sturm-Liouville equations*, American Journal of Mathematics **79** (1957), no. 3, 597–610.
6. S. Axler, P. Bourdon, and R. Wade, *Harmonic function theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer New York, 2013.
7. U. A. Bakshi and L. A. V. Bakshi, *Electrical circuit analysis*, Amazon Digital Services LLC - KDP Print US, 2020.
8. K. Bhattacharya, B. Liu, A. Stuart, and M. Trautner, *Learning Markovian homogenized models in viscoelasticity*, Multiscale Modeling & Simulation **21** (2023), no. 2, 641–679.
9. S. Bhattacharyya, E. F. Deprettere, R. Leupers, and J. Takala, *Handbook of signal processing systems*, Springer, 2018.
10. A. Björkström, *One-dimensional and two-dimensional ocean models for predicting the distribution of CO₂ between the ocean and the atmosphere*, pp. 258–278, Springer New York, New York, NY, 1986.
11. R. G. Brown and P. Y. C. Hwang, *Introduction to random signals and applied Kalman filtering: with MATLAB exercises, fourth ed.*, Wiley & Sons., 2012.
12. H. Brunner, *1896–1996: One hundred years of Volterra integral equations of the first kind*, Applied Numerical Mathematics **24** (1997), no. 2, 83–93, Second International Conference on the Numerical Solution of Volterra and Delay Equations.
13. A. P. Calderon and A. Zygmund, *On the existence of certain singular integrals*, Acta Mathematica **88** (1952), 85–139.
14. S. Chandrasekaran, M. Gu, X. Sun, J. Xia, and J. Zhu, *A superfast algorithm for Toeplitz systems of linear equations*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications **29** (2008), no. 4, 1247–1266.
15. S. H. Choi and V. I. Manousiouthakis, *On the carbon cycle impact of combustion of harvested plant biomass vs. fossil carbon resources*, Computers & Chemical Engineering **140** (2020), 106942.
16. ———, *Modeling the carbon cycle dynamics and the greenhouse effect*, IFAC-PapersOnLine **55** (2022), no. 7, 424–428, 13th IFAC Symposium on Dynamics and Control of Process Systems, including Biosystems DYCOPS 2022.
17. D. Commenges and M. Monsion, *Fast inversion of triangular Toeplitz matrices*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control **29** (1984), no. 3, 250–251.
18. J. B. Conway, *Functions of one complex variable I*, Springer, 1978.
19. S. Costa and L. N. Trefethen, *AAA-least squares rational approximation and solution of Laplace problems*, Proceedings 8ECM, to appear (2023).
20. H. Craig, *The natural distribution of radiocarbon and the exchange time of carbon dioxide between atmosphere and sea*, Tellus **9** (1957), no. 1, 1–17.
21. S. Darlington, *A history of network synthesis and filter theory for circuits composed of resistors, inductors, and capacitors*, IEEE transactions on circuits and systems **31** (1984), no. 1, 3–13.
22. R. del Rio, S. Jitomirskaya, N. Makarov, and B. Simon, *Singular continuous spectrum is generic*, 1994.
23. R. del Rio, N. Makarov, and B. Simon, *Operators with singular continuous spectrum. II. Rank one operators*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **165** (1997).
24. W. F. Donoghue Jr., *On the perturbation of spectra*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **18** (1965), no. 4, 559–579.
25. R. Doss, *Elementary proof of the Rudin–Carleson and the F. and M. Riesz theorems*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **82** (1981), no. 4, 599–602.
26. J. D. Ferry, *Viscoelastic properties of polymers*, vol. 264, Wiley, 1980.
27. G. B. Folland, *Real analysis: Modern techniques and their applications*, Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Wiley Series of Texts, Monographs and Tracts, Wiley, 2013.

28. D. Frymark and C. Liaw, *Spectral analysis of iterated rank-one perturbations*, arXiv: Spectral Theory (2019).
29. D. Givon, R. Kupferman, and A. Stuart, *Extracting macroscopic dynamics: model problems and algorithms*, *Nonlinearity* **17** (2004), no. 6, R55.
30. A. Y. Gordon, *On exceptional values of the boundary phase for the Schrödinger equation on a half-line*, *Russian Mathematical Surveys* **47** (1992), no. 1, 260.
31. ———, *Pure point spectrum under 1-parameter perturbations and instability of Anderson localization*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **164** (1994), no. 3, 489–505.
32. G. Gripenberg, *On Volterra equations of the first kind*, *Integral Equations and Operator Theory* **3** (1980), no. 4, 473–488.
33. G. Gripenberg, S. O. Londen, and O. Staffans, *Completely monotone kernels*, *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, p. 140–167, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
34. B. Gross, *On the inversion of the Volterra integral equation*, *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics* **10** (1952), no. 1, 74–76.
35. ———, *Ladder structures for representation of viscoelastic systems. II.*, *Journal of Polymer Science* **20** (1956), no. 94, 123–131.
36. ———, *Mathematical structure of the theories of viscoelasticity*, (No Title) (1968).
37. B. Gross and R. M. Fuoss, *Ladder structures for representation of viscoelastic systems*, *Journal of Polymer Science* **19** (1956), no. 91, 39–50.
38. K. B. Hamnsgen and R. L. Wheeler, *Complete monotonicity and resolvents of Volterra integrodifferential equations*, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **13** (1982), no. 6, 962–969.
39. H. J. Haubold, A. M. Mathai, and R. K. Saxena, *Mittag–Leffler functions and their applications*, *Journal of applied mathematics* **2011** (2011), no. 1, 298628.
40. J. F. Hauer, C. J. Demeure, and L. L. Scharf, *Initial results in Prony analysis of power system response signals*, *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* **5** (1990), no. 1, 80–89.
41. R. Herrmann, *Fractional Calculus: an Introduction for Physicists (2nd Edition)*, 2014.
42. S. Holm and S. P. Näsholm, *A causal and fractional all-frequency wave equation for lossy media*, *Acoustical Society of America Journal* **130** (2011), no. 4, 2195.
43. J. Y. Hristov, *Linear viscoelastic responses: The Prony decomposition naturally leads into the Caputo–Fabrizio fractional operator*, *Frontiers in Physics* **6** (2018), 135.
44. K. Kamiuto, *A simple global carbon-cycle model*, *Energy* **19** (1994), no. 8, 825–829.
45. R. P. Kanwal, *Linear integral equations*, Birkhäuser Boston, 1996.
46. C. D. Keeling, *The carbon dioxide cycle: Reservoir models to depict the exchange of atmospheric carbon dioxide with the oceans and land plants*, pp. 251–329, Springer US, Boston, MA, 1973.
47. C. D. Keeling and B. Bolin, *The simultaneous use of chemical tracers in oceanic studies I. general theory of reservoir models*, *Tellus* **19** (1967), no. 4, 566–581.
48. Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba, *Adam: A method for stochastic optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980 (2014).
49. G. Lars, M. Riesz, and L. Hörmander, *Collected papers*, Springer collected works in mathematics, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1988.
50. R. Lenczewski, *Decompositions of the free additive convolution*, 2006.
51. F. Lin, W. Ching, and M. K. Ng, *Fast inversion of triangular Toeplitz matrices*, *Theoretical Computer Science* **315** (2004), no. 2, 511–523, Algebraic and Numerical Algorithms.
52. P. Linz, *Analytical and numerical methods for Volterra equations*, SIAM, 1985.
53. R. Loy and R. Anderssen, *Interconversion relationships for completely monotone functions*, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **46** (2014), no. 3, 2008–2032.
54. R. Loy, F. R. De Hoog, and R. Anderssen, *Interconversion of Prony series for relaxation and creep*, *Journal of Rheology* **59** (2015), no. 5, 1261–1270.
55. F. Mainardi, *Fractional calculus and waves in linear viscoelasticity: an introduction to mathematical models*, World Scientific, 2022.
56. R. Metzler and J. Klafter, *The random walk’s guide to anomalous diffusion: a fractional dynamics approach*, *Physical Reports* **339** (2000), no. 1, 1–77.
57. K. S. Miller, *A note on the complete monotonicity of the generalized Mittag–Leffler function*, (1999).
58. A. Morelli and M. C. Smith, *Passive network synthesis: an approach to classification*, SIAM, 2019.

59. S. Nakajima, *On quantum theory of transport phenomena: Steady diffusion*, Progress of Theoretical Physics **20** (1958), no. 6, 948–959.
60. Y. Nakatsukasa, O. Sète, and L. N. Trefethen, *The AAA algorithm for rational approximation*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing **40** (2018), no. 3, A1494–A1522.
61. N. Nikolski, *Toeplitz matrices and operators*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2020.
62. H. Oeschger, U. Siegenthaler, U. Schotterer, and A. Gugelmann, *A box diffusion model to study the carbon dioxide exchange in nature*, Tellus **27** (1975), no. 2, 168–192.
63. A. D. Polyanin and A. V. Manzhirov, *Integral equations*, 2017.
64. X. Qu, H. Zhao, W. Cai, G. Wang, and Z. Huang, *GenML: A Python library to generate the Mittag-Leffler correlated noise*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04273 (2024).
65. M. Reed and B. Simon, *II: Fourier analysis, self-adjointness*, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, no. 2, Elsevier Science, 1975.
66. S. M. Riad, *The deconvolution problem: An overview*, Proceedings of the IEEE **74** (1986), no. 1, 82–85.
67. F. A. Rihan et al., *Delay differential equations and applications to biology*, (2021).
68. H. L. Royden and P. Fitzpatrick, *Real analysis*, Prentice Hall, 2010.
69. W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, Higher Mathematics Series, McGraw-Hill, 1974.
70. A. Serra-Aguila, J. M. Puigoriol-Forcada, G. Reyes, and J. Menacho, *Viscoelastic models revisited: characteristics and interconversion formulas for generalized Kelvin–Voigt and Maxwell models*, Acta Mechanica Sinica **35** (2019), 1191–1209.
71. B. Simon, *Spectral analysis of rank one perturbations and applications*, CRM Proceedings and Lecture Notes **8** (1997).
72. B. Simon and T. H. Wolff, *Singular continuous spectrum under rank one perturbations and localization for random Hamiltonians*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **39** (1986), 75–90.
73. S. A. Teukolsky, B. P. Flannery, W. H. Press, and W. Vetterling, *Numerical recipes in C*, SMR **693** (1992), no. 1, 59–70.
74. L. N. Trefethen, *Approximation theory and approximation practice, extended edition*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2019.
75. N. W. Tschoegl, *The phenomenological theory of linear viscoelastic behavior: an introduction*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
76. A. van den Bos and J. H. Swarte, *Resolvability of the parameters of multiexponentials and other sum models*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing **41** (1993), no. 1, 313.
77. J. J. Waterfall, F. P. Casey, R. N. Gutenkunst, K. S. Brown, C. R. Myers, P. W. Brouwer, V. Elser, and J. P. Sethna, *Sloppy-model universality class and the Vandermonde matrix*, Physical Review Letters **97** (2006), no. 15, 150601.
78. Abdul-Majid Wazwaz, *Linear and nonlinear integral equations*, vol. 639, Springer, 2011.
79. E. T. Whittaker, *On the numerical solution of integral-equations*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character **94** (1918), no. 662, 367–383.
80. D. V. Widder, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for the representation of a function as a Laplace integral*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **33** (1931), 851–892.
81. B. Widrow and E. Walach, *Wiener filters*, pp. 40–58, 2008.
82. N. Wiener, *The Wiener RMS (root mean square) error criterion in filter design and prediction*, (1964).
83. E. Yeramian and P. Claverie, *Analysis of multiexponential functions without a hypothesis as to the number of components*, Nature **326** (1987), no. 6109, 169–174.
84. R. Zwanzig, *Ensemble method in the theory of irreversibility*, The Journal of Chemical Physics **33** (1960), no. 5, 1338–1341.
85. ———, *Nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*, Oxford University Press, 2001.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE,
MA

Email address: `ddarrow@mit.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTING AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECH-
NOLOGY, PASADENA, CA

Email address: `gstepan@caltech.edu`