

# Sampling discretization in Orlicz spaces

Egor Kosov and Sergey Tikhonov

**ABSTRACT.** We obtain new sampling discretization results in Orlicz norms on finite dimensional spaces. As applications, we study sampling recovery problems, where the error of the recovery process is calculated with respect to different Orlicz norms. In particular, we are interested in the recovery by linear methods in the norms close to  $L^2$ .

## 1. Introduction

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a compact set and  $\mu$  be a probability Borel measure on  $\Omega$ . Let

$$\|f\|_p := \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} := \left( \int_{\Omega} |f|^p d\mu \right)^{1/p}.$$

For a continuous function  $f \in C(\Omega)$ , let  $\|f\|_{\infty} := \max_{x \in \Omega} |f(x)|$ .

In this paper, we study the discretization problem for an integral norm on  $N$ -dimensional subspaces  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , which can be formulated as follows: *How can we substitute the initial measure  $\mu$  with a discrete measure  $\nu$  supported on some subset  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  in such a way that the initial integral norm and the corresponding discrete norm are close to each other for elements from  $X_N$ ?*

The classical Marcinkiewicz discretization in  $L^p$ -norms is a particular case of this problem. We say that, for a subspace  $X_N$ , a Marcinkiewicz-type discretization theorem holds with parameters  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $p \in [1, +\infty)$ , and  $C_2 \geq C_1 > 0$  if there is a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  such that

$$C_1 \|f\|_p^p \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(x_j)|^p \leq C_2 \|f\|_p^p \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

This problem goes back to the classical results of Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund for trigonometric polynomials [38], but its comprehensive study in the abstract framework has been started only very recently (see, e.g., [4], [6], [7], [18], the surveys [5] and [16], and the references therein). The Marcinkiewicz discretization problem in an abstract framework appeared to be related to the problem of tight embeddings of finite dimensional subspaces of  $L^p[0, 1]$  into discrete  $\ell_p^m$  (see, e.g., [2], [29], [30], [31], [32], the survey [15], and the references therein).

**Marcinkiewicz-type discretization for Orlicz norms.** The main goal of this paper is to study Marcinkiewicz-type sampling discretization for *integral Orlicz norms* generated by a general  $\Phi$ -function (see Definition 2.5 below). As it is well known, Orlicz spaces play a crucial role in various fields of analysis and PDEs. There is a vast literature on the general theory of

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 41A46, 46E30, Secondary 42A61 .

*Key words and phrases.* Sampling discretization, Orlicz norm, Entropy numbers.

Orlicz spaces; we refer the reader to the classical monographs [19], [28] and the recent book [13].

Our primary interest in the context of sampling discretization for Orlicz norms is related to the following observation. It is known that, for  $p \in [1, 2]$ ,  $O(N)$  points (up to some logarithmic factor in  $N$  for  $p \in [1, 2)$ ) are sufficient for an effective discretization of  $L^p$  norm on an  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N$ , satisfying the Nikolskii-type inequality assumption

$$(1.1) \quad \|f\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{BN} \|f\|_2 \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

However, if  $p > 2$  and  $X_N$  satisfies (1.1), one already needs at least  $O(N^{p/2})$  points (see D.20 in [16]).

Our first aim is to examine the transition from the case  $p = 2$  to the case  $p > 2$  in terms of the parameter  $m$ , being the number of points sufficient for discretization. One of our main results is that, for any  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N$  satisfying the assumption (1.1),  $O(\Phi(\sqrt{N}))$  (up to logarithmic in  $N$  factor) points are sufficient for an effective discretization of the Orlicz norm, generated by a  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi$  such that  $\Phi(t)t^{-2}$  is increasing. In more detail, our first main result can be formulated as follows (see Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 below).

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Phi$ -function such that the function  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-p}$  is increasing and assume that there is  $q \in [p, \infty)$  such that the function  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-q}$  is decreasing. There is a constant  $C_{\Phi, \varepsilon} > 0$  depending only on  $\Phi$  and  $\varepsilon$  such that for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N$ , satisfying condition (1.1), there exist*

$$m \leq C_{\Phi, \varepsilon} \Phi((BN)^{\frac{1}{\min\{p, 2\}}}) (\log 2BN)^3$$

and a subset  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m$  such that

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \|f\|_\Phi \leq \|f\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|f\|_\Phi \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

Here  $\|\cdot\|_\Phi$  is an integral Orlicz norm generated by the function  $\Phi$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}}$  is its corresponding discrete counterpart for a discrete uniform measure on the set  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Our approach is probabilistic in nature and relies on Theorem 1.2 from [12], which is a straightforward corollary of the Talagrand's generic chaining method. We will also use basic Dudley's entropy bound (see estimate (2.8) below) to estimate gamma functionals appearing from the application of the mentioned result from [12].

**One-sided discretization results.** The second part of the paper studies discretization for Orlicz norms on arbitrary subspaces  $X_N$ , not necessarily satisfying assumption (1.1). For an arbitrary  $X_N$ , under some technical assumptions on the function  $\Phi$ , which generates the Orlicz norm, we derive one-sided discretization results that bound the integral Orlicz norm by a suitable discrete norm. We consider two distinct cases: one where this discrete norm is generated by an Orlicz functional close to the original one, and another where this norm is simply a discrete  $L^2$  norm. In the latter case, we generalize the results from [20] as follows (see Corollary 5.10 below).

**THEOREM 1.2.** *Let  $\Phi$  be  $\Phi$ -functions such that  $\Phi(t)t^{-p}$  is increasing for some  $p \geq 2$ . There are positive numbers  $c_1$  and  $c_2 := c_2(\Phi, p)$  such that for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there is a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m \leq c_1 N$  for which*

$$\|f\|_\Phi \leq c_2 \left( \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} \right)^{1/p} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(x_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

This result and its more general version given in Theorem 5.6 allow for the study of one-sided discretization in spaces close to  $L^2$  and  $L^\infty$ . As model cases, we consider  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(t) = t^p \frac{(\ln(e+t))^\alpha}{(\ln(e+t^{-1}))^\beta}$ ,  $p \geq 1$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$  and  $\Phi_q(t) := e^{t^q} - 1$ . Then our results state that there exists a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality

$$m \leq c_1 N$$

such that

$$\|f\|_{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}} \leq c_2 N^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}} (\log 4N)^{\frac{\alpha}{p}} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(x_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \forall f \in X_N, \quad p \geq 2.$$

Similarly,

$$\|f\|_{\Phi_q} \leq c_2 \frac{N^{1/2}}{(\log(N+1))^{1/q}} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(x_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \forall f \in X_N, \quad q \geq 2.$$

See Examples 5.11 and 5.12.

**Sampling recovery by linear and non-linear methods.** It has been recently discovered that general one-sided discretization results as Theorem 1.2 above are linked with the problem of optimal sampling recovery (see [8], [20], [25], [34]). The problem of reconstruction of an unknown function  $f$  defined on a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  from its samples at a finite set of points  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  is an important problem of modern approximation theory. We refer the interested reader to the following textbooks for the exposition of known results in the field: [27], [35], [36].

Let us recall the sampling recovery setting. Let  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$  and let us fix a norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . The sampling numbers of a function class  $\mathbf{F}$  are given by

$$\varrho_m(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|) := \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \subset \Omega \\ \#\mathbf{x} \leq m}} \inf_{T_{\mathbf{x}} \text{-linear}} \sup_{f \in \mathbf{F}} \|f - T_{\mathbf{x}}(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m))\|,$$

that is, the sampling numbers correspond to the uniformly optimal recovery of a function from  $\mathbf{F}$  by its sample in  $m$  fixed points by linear methods of reconstruction. Similarly, we define the modified sampling numbers

$$\varrho_m^*(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|) := \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \subset \Omega \\ \#\mathbf{x} \leq m}} \inf_{X_N, N \leq m} \inf_{T_{\mathbf{x}}: \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow X_N} \sup_{f \in \mathbf{F}} \|f - T_{\mathbf{x}}(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m))\|.$$

In other words, considering  $\varrho_m^*(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|)$ , we also allow non-linear methods of reconstruction. The behavior of sampling numbers  $\{\varrho_m(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|)\}_{m=1}^\infty$  and  $\{\varrho_m^*(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|)\}_{m=1}^\infty$  are well studied in the  $L^2$ -case, that is, when  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mu)}$  (see [11], [14], [21], [22], [23], [26], [34], [37]). In particular, it was shown that sampling numbers admit sharp upper bounds in terms of the Kolmogorov widths. More than that, there are two positive constants  $B$  and  $b$  such that for any compact subset  $\mathbf{F}$  of  $C(\Omega)$  one always has

$$(1.2) \quad \rho_{bN}(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mu)}) \leq B d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty),$$

where  $\{d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)\}_{N=1}^\infty$  are the Kolmogorov widths with respect to the uniform norm (see [34]).

The problem of recovery in  $L^p$ -norm,  $p > 2$ , is far less studied. Some general bounds for the sampling numbers in the  $L^p$ -case, in terms of the classical Kolmogorov widths, have been obtained in the recent paper [20]. Apart from this result, we can only mention known results

for modified sampling numbers (see, e.g., **R.3** in [16]) and bounds involving some counterparts of the classical Kolmogorov widths (see Section 4 in [8]).

Our goal here is to investigate the problem of sampling recovery in intermediate cases, specifically, for the spaces that lie between  $L^2$  and  $L^p$ ,  $p > 2$ . In more detail, applying new discretization results we derive new bounds for the sampling numbers in Orlicz norms. These estimates generalize those from [20] and recover (1.2). Namely, we obtain the following result (see Theorem 6.4 below).

**THEOREM 1.3.** *Let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Phi$ -function such that  $\Phi(t)t^{-p}$  is increasing for some  $p \geq 2$ . There exist a positive numerical constant  $c \geq 1$  and a number  $C(\Phi, p) \geq 1$ , depending only on  $\Phi$  and  $p$ , such that, for any probability Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$  and for any function class  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$ , one has*

$$\varrho_{cN}(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^{\Phi}(\mu)}) \leq C(\Phi, p) \left( \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} \right)^{1/p} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty}).$$

As above, we consider two model examples of Orlicz functions  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(\cdot)$  and  $\Phi_q(\cdot)$ . For them, our general results imply the estimates

$$\varrho_{cN}(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}}(\mu)}) \leq cN^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}} (\log 4N)^{\alpha/p} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty}), \quad p \geq 2,$$

$$\varrho_{cN}(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^{\Phi_q}(\mu)}) \leq C \frac{N^{1/2}}{(\log(N+1))^{1/q}} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty}), \quad q \geq 2,$$

where  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$  is an arbitrary function class. See Examples 6.3 and 6.5 below.

**Structure of the paper and notation.** The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss the definitions and properties of  $\Phi$ -functions and Orlicz spaces. Moreover, we emphasize the importance of the Nikolskii condition and chaining technique in addressing the discretization problem. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Section 4 studies possible relaxations of the conditions on the  $\Phi$ -function in Theorem 1.1 under which suitable discretization results are still valid. Section 5 is devoted to the study of unconditional (in terms of subspace) discretization theorems. In their turn, these results are used in Section 6 to provide new bounds for the sampling numbers.

Throughout the paper symbols  $C, C_0, C_1, \dots$  and  $c, c_0, c_1, \dots$  denote universal numerical constant, the value of which may vary from line to line. Similarly, symbols  $C(\alpha), C_0(\alpha), C_1(\alpha), \dots$  and  $c(\alpha), c_0(\alpha), c_1(\alpha), \dots$  denote constants that may depend only on the set of parameters  $\alpha$  and the value of which may also vary from line to line. By  $\log x$  we always denote the logarithm to the base 2, i.e.,  $\log x := \log_2 x$ . Finally, we will intensively use the notation  $X_N^{\Phi}$  to denote the unit (open) ball in the subspace  $X_N$  with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\Phi}$ , defined as

$$X_N^{\Phi} := \{f \in X_N : \|f\|_{\Phi} < 1\}$$

and, in the case of the unit ball with respect to the  $L^p$ -norm,

$$X_N^p := \{f \in X_N : \|f\|_p < 1\}.$$

## 2. Preliminaries: Orlicz space and chaining bounds

**2.1.  $\Phi$ -functions.** We are partially following the notation from [13]. The following definition was introduced by Bernstein in [1]; see also [13, Def. 2.1.1].

**DEFINITION 2.1.** *Let  $t_* \in \mathbb{R}$ . A function  $\varphi: (t_*, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called almost increasing (respectively, decreasing) on  $(t_*, \infty)$  with the constant  $a \geq 1$  if  $\varphi(s) \leq a\varphi(t)$  ( $\varphi(t) \leq a\varphi(s)$ ) for all  $t_* < s < t$ . If  $a = 1$ , then  $\varphi$  is called increasing (decreasing) on  $(t_*, \infty)$ .*

REMARK 2.2. We note that  $\varphi: (t_*, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is almost increasing (respectively, decreasing) if and only if there is an increasing (decreasing) function  $\tilde{\varphi}$  and a constant  $a \geq 1$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(t) \leq \varphi(t) \leq a\tilde{\varphi}(t) \quad \forall t \in (t_*, \infty).$$

It is enough to take  $\tilde{\varphi}(t) := a^{-1} \sup_{t_* < s \leq t} \varphi(s)$  if  $\varphi$  is almost increasing and  $\tilde{\varphi}(t) := \inf_{t_* < s \leq t} \varphi(t)$  for almost decreasing  $\varphi$ . Moreover, for  $t_* < s < t$ , condition (2.1) implies  $\varphi(s) \leq a\varphi(t)$  if  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is increasing and  $\varphi(t) \leq a\varphi(s)$  if  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is decreasing.

DEFINITION 2.3. Let  $\Phi: (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $p, q \geq 1$ . We write

- (i)  $\Phi \in (\text{Inc})_p(\infty)$  (respectively,  $\Phi \in (\text{Inc})_p$ ) if  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-p}$  is increasing on  $(t_*, \infty)$  for some  $t_* \geq 0$  (on  $(0, \infty)$ );
- (ii)  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p(\infty)$  (respectively,  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$ ) if  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-p}$  is almost increasing with some constant  $a_\Phi(p)$  on  $(t_*, \infty)$  for some  $t_* \geq 0$  (on  $(0, \infty)$ );
- (iii)  $\Phi \in (\text{Dec})_q(\infty)$  (respectively,  $\Phi \in (\text{Dec})_q$ ) if  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-q}$  is decreasing on  $(t_*, \infty)$  for some  $t_* \geq 0$  (on  $(0, \infty)$ );
- (iv)  $\Phi \in (\text{aDec})_q(\infty)$  (respectively,  $\Phi \in (\text{aDec})_q$ ) if  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-q}$  is almost decreasing with some constant  $b_\Phi(q)$  on  $(t_*, \infty)$  for some  $t_* \geq 0$  (on  $(0, \infty)$ ).

Set

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Dec}) &:= \bigcup_{q \geq 1} (\text{Dec})_q, & (\text{aDec}) &:= \bigcup_{q \geq 1} (\text{aDec})_q, \\ (\text{Dec})(\infty) &:= \bigcup_{q \geq 1} (\text{Dec})_q(\infty), & (\text{aDec})(\infty) &:= \bigcup_{q \geq 1} (\text{aDec})_q(\infty). \end{aligned}$$

The defined function classes are closely related to the concept of regular variation, see the monograph [3] for more detail.

REMARK 2.4. For a differentiable function  $\Phi: (0, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ , the condition  $\Phi \in (\text{Inc})_p$  (or  $(\text{Dec})_q$ ,  $(\text{Inc})_p(\infty)$ ,  $(\text{Dec})_q(\infty)$ ) can be simply verified by studying the function  $\varphi(t) := \frac{t\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)}$ . Indeed, since  $(\Phi(t)t^{-p})' = \Phi(t)t^{-p-1}(\varphi(t) - p)$  for  $p > 0$ , the condition  $\inf_{t > t_*} \varphi(t) \geq p$  yields that  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-p}$  is increasing on  $(t_*, \infty)$ . Similarly, if  $\sup_{t > t_*} \varphi(t) \leq q$  then  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-q}$  is decreasing on  $(t_*, \infty)$ .

DEFINITION 2.5 (see [13]). Let  $\Phi: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be an increasing function such that  $\Phi(0) = 0$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \Phi(t) = 0$ , and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi(t) = +\infty$ . Such  $\Phi$  is called a  $\Phi$ -prefunction.

A  $\Phi$ -prefunction  $\Phi$  is called

- (i)  $\Phi$ -function if  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_1$  (written as  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$ );
- (ii) convex  $\Phi$ -function if it is a convex function (written as  $\Phi \in \Phi_c$ ).

We point out that, for  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$  and  $\lambda \geq 1$ , we have

$$(2.2) \quad \Phi(a_\Phi(p)^{-1/p} \lambda^{-1/p} t) \leq \lambda^{-1} \Phi(t), \quad t \in [0, +\infty).$$

In particular,

$$(2.3) \quad \Phi(a_\Phi(1)^{-1} \lambda^{-1} t) \leq \lambda^{-1} \Phi(t), \quad t \in [0, +\infty)$$

for  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$  and  $\lambda \geq 1$ .

For a  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$ , set

$$(2.4) \quad R_\Phi(p) := \left(1 + \frac{a_\Phi(p)}{\Phi(1)}\right)^{1/p}.$$

We say that two functions  $\Phi, \Psi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  are equivalent (and write  $\Phi \simeq \Psi$ ) if there is a number  $L \geq 1$  such that

$$\Phi(t/L) \leq \Psi(t) \leq \Phi(Lt) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

It worth noting that the classes  $(\text{aInc})_p$  and  $(\text{aDec})_q$  are invariant under the equivalence of  $\Phi$ -functions (see [13, L. 2.1.9]). Another important observation regarding a weak  $\Phi$ -function is that it can always be upgraded to a convex  $\Phi$ -function (see [13, L. 2.2.1]).

LEMMA 2.6. *Let  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . If  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$  and  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$ , then there exists  $\Psi \in \Phi_c$  equivalent to  $\Phi$  such that  $\Psi^{1/p}$  is convex. In particular,  $\Psi \in (\text{Inc})_p$ .*

**2.2. Orlicz space.** Let  $\mu$  be a probability measure on some set  $\Omega$ . For  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$  we set

$$\rho_\Phi(f) := \int_\Omega \Phi(|f(x)|) \mu(dx).$$

Define

$$L^\Phi(\mu) := \{f: \exists \lambda > 0: \rho_\Phi(f/\lambda) < \infty\}.$$

and, for  $f \in L^\Phi(\mu)$ , let the Luxembourg functional be given by

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} = \|f\|_\Phi := \inf\{\lambda > 0: \rho_\Phi(f/\lambda) \leq 1\}.$$

It is known (see [13, Ch. 3]) that  $\|\cdot\|_\Phi$  is a norm if  $\Phi \in \Phi_c$  and  $\|\cdot\|_\Phi$  is a quasinorm if  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$ , that is,

$$(2.5) \quad \|f + g\|_\Phi \leq C_\Phi(\|f\|_\Phi + \|g\|_\Phi), \quad C_\Phi > 0,$$

for every  $f, g \in L^\Phi(\mu)$ . In particular,  $\|\cdot\|_\Phi$  always is a positively homogeneous functional. Moreover, for any  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$  one has

$$(2.6) \quad \|f\|_\Phi < 1 \Rightarrow \rho_\Phi(f) \leq 1 \Rightarrow \|f\|_\Phi \leq 1.$$

In the discrete setting, i.e., when  $\Omega := \mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  and  $\mu = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \delta_{x_j}$  for some set of weights  $\lambda := \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\}$ , we will use the notation

$$\|f\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}, \lambda} := \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \delta_{x_j})}.$$

In the case  $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_m$ , we simply write  $\|f\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}}$ . For  $L^p(\mu)$ -norms,  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , as usual, we define

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} = \|f\|_p := \left(\int_\Omega |f|^p d\mu\right)^{1/p}.$$

LEMMA 2.7. *Let  $q \in [1, +\infty)$  and let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Phi$ -function such that  $\Phi \in (\text{Dec})_q$ . Then*

$$|\Phi(u) - \Phi(v)| \leq q|u - v| \left(\frac{\Phi(u)}{u} + \frac{\Phi(v)}{v}\right) \quad \forall u, v \in [0, +\infty).$$

PROOF. Assume that  $u > v$ . Then

$$\frac{\Phi(u) - \Phi(v)}{u - v} = \Phi(u)u^{-q} \frac{u^q}{u - v} - \Phi(v)v^{-q} \frac{v^q}{u - v} \leq \Phi(u)u^{-q} \frac{u^q - v^q}{u - v} \leq q\Phi(u)u^{-1},$$

which implies the required estimate.  $\square$

LEMMA 2.8. *Let  $p \in [1, +\infty)$  and let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Phi$ -function such that  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$ . Then, for any function  $h \in C(\Omega)$ , one has*

$$\|h\|_{L^p(\mu)} \leq R_\Phi(p) \|h\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)},$$

where  $R_\Phi(p) := (1 + \frac{a_\Phi(p)}{\Phi(1)})^{1/p}$ , cf. (2.4).

PROOF. Let  $h \in C(\Omega)$  with  $\|h\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} < 1$ . We note that  $a_\Phi(p)\Phi(t) \geq \Phi(1)t^p$  for  $t \geq 1$ . Then there holds

$$\int_\Omega |h|^p d\mu \leq \mu(|h| \leq 1) + \frac{a_\Phi(p)}{\Phi(1)} \int_{|h| \geq 1} \Phi(|h|) d\mu \leq 1 + \frac{a_\Phi(p)}{\Phi(1)} = (R_\Phi(p))^p,$$

where we have used the first implication in (2.6).  $\square$

LEMMA 2.9. *Let  $\Phi \in \Phi_w \cap (\text{aDec})_q$ ,  $q \in [1, \infty)$ , and  $\varepsilon \in (0, (b_\Phi(q))^{-1})$ . Suppose that  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are two probability measures on  $\Omega$  and  $X$  is a subspace in  $C(\Omega)$ . Then the inequality*

$$\sup_{\substack{f \in X \\ \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} < 1}} \left| \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\nu - \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\mu \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

implies

$$(2.7) \quad a_\Phi(1)^{-1}((b_\Phi(q))^{-1} - \varepsilon) \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \leq a_\Phi(1)(1 + \varepsilon) \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \quad \forall f \in X.$$

PROOF. First, assume that  $\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} < 1$ . Then by (2.6),  $\rho_\Phi(f) \leq 1$ . Since  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_1$ , by (2.3), we have

$$\int_\Omega \Phi(a_\Phi(1)^{-1}(1 + \varepsilon)^{-1}|f|) d\nu \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\nu \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \left( \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\mu + \varepsilon \right) \leq 1,$$

which gives  $\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \leq a_\Phi(1)(1 + \varepsilon)$ . The latter yields

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \leq a_\Phi(1)(1 + \varepsilon) \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \quad \forall f \in X.$$

Second, we suppose that  $1 > \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} > \delta$  for some  $\delta \in ((b_\Phi(q)\varepsilon)^{1/q}, 1)$ . We note that  $\rho_\Phi(\delta^{-1}f) > 1$  due to (2.6). Thus, in light of (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \Phi(a_\Phi(1)(1 - b_\Phi(q)\delta^{-q}\varepsilon)^{-1}b_\Phi(q)\delta^{-q}|f|) d\nu &\geq (1 - b_\Phi(q)\delta^{-q}\varepsilon)^{-1}b_\Phi(q)\delta^{-q} \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\nu \\ &\geq (1 - b_\Phi(q)\delta^{-q}\varepsilon)^{-1}b_\Phi(q)\delta^{-q} \left( \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\mu - \varepsilon \right) \\ &\geq (1 - b_\Phi(q)\delta^{-q}\varepsilon)^{-1} \left( \int_\Omega \Phi(\delta^{-1}|f|) d\mu - b_\Phi(q)\delta^{-q}\varepsilon \right) > 1, \end{aligned}$$

that is,  $\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \geq a_\Phi(1)^{-1}((b_\Phi(q))^{-1}\delta^q - \varepsilon)$ . We apply this bound for  $\frac{1+\delta}{2} \frac{f}{\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)}}$  to get

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \geq a_\Phi(1)^{-1}((b_\Phi(q))^{-1}\delta^q - \varepsilon) \frac{2}{1+\delta} \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)}.$$

Taking the limit as  $\delta \rightarrow 1-$  completes the proof of the left-hand side estimate in (2.7).  $\square$

**2.3. Nikolskii's inequality.** A key assumption to study various problems of discretization is the Nikolskii inequality (see, e.g., [9], [10]). Let  $X_N$  be an  $N$ -dimensional subspace of  $C(\Omega)$ , where a compact set  $\Omega$  is endowed with a probability measure  $\mu$ . We say that the subspace  $X_N$  satisfies the Nikolskii inequality for the pair  $(p, q)$  with the constant  $H = H(X_N, p, q)$  if

$$\|f\|_q \leq H \|f\|_p \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

In this case we write  $X_N \in NI_{p,q}(H)$ . The case  $p = 2$  and  $q = \infty$  is particularly interesting due to the following observation.

REMARK 2.10. It is easy to see that for any orthonormal basis  $\{u_1, \dots, u_N\}$  of  $X_N$  in  $L^2(\mu)$ , one has  $\sum_{k=1}^N |u_k(x)|^2 = \sup_{\substack{f \in X_N \\ \|f\|_2 \leq 1}} |f(x)|^2$ . Thus,

$$X_N \in NI_{2,\infty}(H) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \sup_{x \in \Omega} \sum_{k=1}^N |u_k(x)|^2 \leq H^2.$$

We note that one always has  $H = H(X_N, 2, \infty) \geq \sqrt{N} \geq 1$ .

An important example of the space  $X_n$  satisfying Nikolskii's inequality is the set of trigonometric polynomials

$$\mathcal{T}(Q) := \left\{ f(x) = \sum_{k \in Q} c_k e^{i\langle k, x \rangle} : c_k \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$$

with  $Q \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $\Omega = [0, 2\pi)^d$ ,  $d\mu = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} I_\Omega d\lambda$ . One has  $\mathcal{T}(Q) \in NI_{2,\infty}(|Q|^{1/2})$ , see [9].

#### 2.4. Entropy numbers and chaining bound.

DEFINITION 2.11. Let  $(F, d)$  be a metric space. The entropy numbers  $\{e_n(F, d)\}_{n=0}^\infty$  are defined as follows:

$$e_n(F, d) := \inf \left\{ \varepsilon > 0 : \exists f_1, \dots, f_{N_n} \in F : F \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_n} B_\varepsilon(f_j) \right\},$$

where  $N_n = 2^{2^n}$  for  $n \geq 1$  and  $N_0 = 1$  and  $B_\varepsilon(f) := \{g : d(f, g) < \varepsilon\}$ .

If the metric  $d$  is induced by a norm  $\|\cdot\|$ , we will also use the notation  $e_n(F, \|\cdot\|)$  in place of  $e_n(F, d)$ .

DEFINITION 2.12. An admissible sequence of a set  $F$  is an increasing sequence  $(\mathcal{F}_n)$  of partitions of  $F$  such that  $|\mathcal{F}_n| \leq 2^{2^n}$  for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $|\mathcal{F}_0| = 1$ . For  $f \in F$ , let  $F_n(f)$  denote the unique element of  $\mathcal{F}_n$  that contains  $f$ .

DEFINITION 2.13. Let  $(F, d)$  be a metric space. Let

$$\gamma_2(F, d) := \inf_{f \in F} \sup_{n=0}^\infty 2^{n/2} \text{diam}(F_n(f)),$$

where  $\text{diam}(G) := \sup_{f, g \in G} d(f, g)$  and the infimum is taken over all admissible sequences of  $F$ .

The quantity  $\gamma_2(F, d)$  is called the chaining functional. If the metric  $d$  is induced by a norm  $\|\cdot\|$ , we will use the notation  $\gamma_2(F, \|\cdot\|)$  in place of  $\gamma_2(F, d)$ .



The classical Dudley's entropy bound states that (see [33, Prop. 2.2.10] and the preceding discussion)

$$(2.8) \quad \gamma_2(F, d) \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{n/2} e_n(F, d).$$

We will use the following theorem from [12] (see Theorem 1.2 there), which is a combination of the chaining bound (see [33]) and the Giné–Zinn symmetrization argument.

**THEOREM 2.14.** *There is a numerical constant  $c > 0$  such that for any i.i.d. random vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  with the distribution  $\mu$  on the set  $\Omega$ , one has*

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{g \in G} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |g(x_j)|^2 - \int_{\Omega} |g|^2 d\mu \right| \right) \leq c \left( A + A^{1/2} \left( \sup_{g \in G} \int_{\Omega} |g|^2 d\mu \right)^{1/2} \right),$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}(\gamma_2^2(G, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))$$

$$\text{and } \|g\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |g(x_j)|.$$

We will also use the following useful property of the entropy numbers.

**LEMMA 2.15.** *Let  $a, b > 0$ . Let  $X_N$  be an  $N$ -dimensional space endowed with a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and let  $F \subset X_N$ . Then there is a number  $C(a, b) > 0$  such that*

$$\sum_{n > [\log N]} (2^{an} e_n(F, \|\cdot\|))^b \leq C(a, b) \sum_{n \leq [\log N]} (2^{an} e_n(F, \|\cdot\|))^b.$$

**PROOF.** Let  $n_0 = [\log N]$ . It is known (see (7.1.6) and Corollary 7.2.2 in [35]) that

$$e_n(F, \|\cdot\|) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{2^{n_0}/N} e_{n_0}(F, \|\cdot\|) 2^{-2^n/N} \quad \forall n > n_0.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{n > [\log N]} (2^{an} e_n(F, \|\cdot\|))^b \leq 6^b (e_{n_0}(F, \|\cdot\|))^b \sum_{n > [\log N]} (2^{an} 2^{-2^n/N})^b.$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \geq \log N} (2^{an} 2^{-2^n/N})^b &\leq 2 \max(2^{ab-1}, 1) \int_0^{\infty} x^{ab-1} 2^{-xb/N} dx \\ &= 2 \max(2^{ab-1}, 1) \left( \frac{N}{b \ln 2} \right)^{ab} \int_0^{\infty} y^{ab-1} e^{-y} dy = c(a, b) N^{ab}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n > [\log N]} (2^{an} e_n(F, \|\cdot\|))^b &\leq 6^b c(a, b) N^{ab} (e_{n_0}(F, \|\cdot\|))^b \leq 6^b c(a, b) 2^{ab} (2^{an_0} e_{n_0}(F, \|\cdot\|))^b \\ &\leq 6^b c(a, b) 2^{ab} \sum_{n \leq [\log N]} (2^{an} e_n(F, \|\cdot\|))^b. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete.  $\square$

### 3. Discretization with equal weights for $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$

**3.1. Main theorems and discussion.** This section is devoted to the proof of the following two theorems for  $\Phi$ -function satisfying the condition  $(\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$ .

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ . Let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Phi$ -function such that  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$ . There exists a constant  $C_{\Phi,p} > 0$ , depending only on  $p$  and  $\Phi$ , such that for every  $N \geq 1$ ,  $H \geq 1$ , for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \in NI_{2,\infty}(H)$ , for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ , and for every*

$$m \geq C_{\Phi,p} \varepsilon^{-2} (\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{\frac{\min\{p,2\}}{2}} \Phi(H^{\frac{2}{\min\{p,2\}}}) (\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2,$$

there is a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m$  such that

$$a_{\Phi}(1)^{-1} (1 - \varepsilon) \|f\|_{\Phi} \leq \|f\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}} \leq a_{\Phi}(1) (1 + \varepsilon) \|f\|_{\Phi} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

In the case  $p = 1$  we will prove the following counterpart of the above theorem.

**THEOREM 3.2.** *Let  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$  be such that  $\Phi \in (\text{Dec})$ . There exists a constant  $C_{\Phi} > 0$ , depending only on  $\Phi$  such that for every  $N \geq 1$ ,  $H \geq 1$ , for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \in NI_{2,\infty}(H)$ , and for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ , there are  $m$  points  $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \Omega$  with*

$$m \leq C_{\Phi} \varepsilon^{-2} (\log \varepsilon^{-1}) \Phi(H^2) (\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2$$

such that

$$a_{\Phi}(1)^{-2} (1 - \varepsilon) \|f\|_{\Phi} \leq \|f\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}} \leq a_{\Phi}(1)^2 (1 + \varepsilon) \|f\|_{\Phi} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

The proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 are divided into several steps and contained in subsections 3.2-3.5.

Let us illustrate the use of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 for the specific  $\Phi$ -function. Set

$$(3.1) \quad \Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(t) := t^p \frac{(\ln(e+t))^{\alpha}}{(\ln(e+t^{-1}))^{\beta}}, \quad p \geq 1, \alpha, \beta \geq 0.$$

It is easy to see that for  $t > 0$ , one has

$$\frac{t\Phi'_{p,\alpha,\beta}(t)}{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(t)} = p + \frac{\alpha t}{e+t} \cdot \frac{1}{\ln(e+t)} + \frac{\beta t^{-1}}{e+t^{-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{\ln(e+t^{-1})}.$$

Thus,

$$p \leq \frac{t\Phi'_{p,\alpha,\beta}(t)}{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(t)} \leq p + \alpha + \beta \quad \text{for } t > 0.$$

In light of Theorem 3.1, in order to obtain the discretization estimates between  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}$  and  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta, \mathbf{x}}$ , it is sufficient to choose

$$m \geq C_{p,\alpha,\beta} \varepsilon^{-2} (\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{\frac{\min\{p,2\}}{2}} \Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(H^{\frac{2}{\min\{p,2\}}}) (\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2.$$

Noting that

$$\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(H^{\frac{2}{\min\{p,2\}}}) \leq H^{\frac{2p}{\min\{p,2\}}} (\ln(e + H^{\frac{2}{\min\{p,2\}}}))^{\alpha} \leq c(p, \alpha) H^{\frac{2p}{\min\{p,2\}}} (\log 2H^2)^{\alpha},$$

we arrive at the following result.

**EXAMPLE 3.3.** Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ ,  $N \geq 1$ ,  $B \geq 1$ . Let  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta} := t^p \frac{(\ln(e+t))^{\alpha}}{(\ln(e+t^{-1}))^{\beta}}$ . There exists a constant  $C_{p,\alpha,\beta} > 0$ , depending only on  $p$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $\beta$ , such that for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \in NI_{2,\infty}(\sqrt{BN})$ , for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ , and for every

$$m \geq C_{p,\alpha,\beta} \varepsilon^{-2} (\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{\frac{\min\{p,2\}}{2}} (BN)^{\frac{p}{\min\{p,2\}}} (\log 2BN)^{\alpha+1} (\log 2N)^2,$$

there is a subset  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m$  such that

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\|f\|_{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}} \leq \|f\|_{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta,\mathbf{x}}} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|f\|_{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

Similarly, Theorem 3.2 implies the discretization for spaces close to  $L_1$ .

**EXAMPLE 3.4.** Let  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ ,  $N \geq 1$ ,  $B \geq 1$ , and let  $\Phi_{1,\alpha,\beta} := t \frac{(\ln(e+t))^\alpha}{(\ln(e+t^{-1}))^\beta}$ . There exists a constant  $C_{\alpha,\beta} > 0$ , depending only on the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , such that, for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \in NI_{2,\infty}(\sqrt{BN})$  and for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ , there are

$$m \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \varepsilon^{-2} (\log \varepsilon^{-1}) BN (\log 2BN)^{\alpha+1} (\log 2N)^2.$$

and a subset  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m$  such that

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\|f\|_{\Phi_{1,\alpha,\beta}} \leq \|f\|_{\Phi_{1,\alpha,\beta,\mathbf{x}}} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|f\|_{\Phi_{1,\alpha,\beta}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

**REMARK 3.5.** The proof of Theorem 3.1 is probabilistic in its nature and it actually implies that, under the assumptions of the theorem, for  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ , and

$$m \geq C_{\Phi,p} (\varepsilon \delta)^{-2} (\log(\varepsilon \delta))^{-1} \frac{\min\{p,2\}}{2} \Phi\left(H \frac{2}{\min\{p,2\}}\right) (\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2,$$

we have

$$P\left(a_\Phi(1)^{-1} (1 - \varepsilon)\|f\|_\Phi \leq \|f\|_{\Phi,\mathbf{x}} \leq a_\Phi(1) (1 + \varepsilon)\|f\|_\Phi \quad \forall f \in X_N\right) \geq 1 - \delta/2,$$

where the points  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$  are choosing independently distributed according to the measure  $\mu$ .

**3.2. Proof of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2: the key step.** To prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we apply Theorem 2.14 with the set

$$G := \{g := (\Phi(|f|))^{1/2} : f \in X_N^\Phi\}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{f \in X_N^\Phi} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(|f(x_j)|) - \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\mu \right|\right) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{g \in G} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |g(x_j)|^2 - \int_\Omega |g|^2 d\mu \right|\right) \\ &\leq c \left( A + A^{1/2} \left( \sup_{g \in G} \int_\Omega |g|^2 d\mu \right)^{1/2} \right) \leq c \left( A + A^{1/2} \left( \sup_{f \in X_N^\Phi} \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\mu \right)^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}(\gamma_{2,1}^2(G, \|\cdot\|_{\infty,\mathbf{x}}))$$

and  $\|g\|_{\infty,\mathbf{x}} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |g(x_j)|$ . Further, to estimate  $\gamma_{2,1}(G, \|\cdot\|_{\infty,\mathbf{x}})$ , we use Dudley's entropy bound (2.8) to get

$$\gamma_{2,1}(G, \|\cdot\|_{\infty,\mathbf{x}}) \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{n/2} e_n(G, \|\cdot\|_{\infty,\mathbf{x}}).$$

Let  $p_* := \min\{p, 2\}$ . We note that  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_{p_*}$  under the assumptions of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. For  $f, g \in X_N^\Phi$ , by Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\Phi(|f|))^{1/2} - (\Phi(|g|))^{1/2} \right\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \left| ((\Phi(|f(x_j)|))^{1/p_*})^{p_*/2} - ((\Phi(|g(x_j)|))^{1/p_*})^{p_*/2} \right| \\ & \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \left| (\Phi(|f(x_j)|))^{1/p_*} - (\Phi(|g(x_j)|))^{1/p_*} \right|^{p_*/2} \\ & \leq (qp_*^{-1})^{p_*/2} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \left( |f(x_j) - g(x_j)| \cdot \left| \frac{(\Phi(|f(x_j)|))^{1/p_*}}{|f(x_j)|} + \frac{(\Phi(|g(x_j)|))^{1/p_*}}{|g(x_j)|} \right| \right)^{p_*/2} \\ & \leq 2q \sup_{h \in X_N^\Phi} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \left( \frac{\Phi(|h(x_j)|)}{|h(x_j)|^{p_*}} \right)^{1/2} \|f - g\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}^{p_*/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$e_n(G, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) \leq 2q \sup_{h \in X_N^\Phi} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \left( \frac{\Phi(|h(x_j)|)}{|h(x_j)|^{p_*}} \right)^{1/2} (e_n(X_N^\Phi, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{p_*/2}.$$

In light of Lemma 2.8, we have  $X_N^\Phi \subset R_\Phi(p_*)X_N^{p_*} = \{f \in X_N : \|f\|_{p_*} < R_\Phi(p_*)\}$ . Hence, from the assumption  $X_N \in NI_{2, \infty}(H)$ , we derive

$$\|h\|_\infty = \left( \frac{\|h\|_\infty^2}{\|h\|_\infty^{2-p_*}} \right)^{1/p_*} \leq \left( \frac{H^2 \|h\|_2^2}{\|h\|_\infty^{2-p_*}} \right)^{1/p_*} \leq H^{2/p_*} \|h\|_{p_*} \leq R_\Phi(p_*) H^{2/p_*} \|h\|_\Phi \quad \forall h \in X_N^\Phi.$$

Since the function  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-p_*}$  is almost increasing and  $|h(x_j)| \leq R_\Phi(p_*)H^{2/p_*}$  for  $h \in X_N^\Phi$ , we have

$$\sup_{h \in X_N^\Phi} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \frac{\Phi(|h(x_j)|)}{|h(x_j)|^{p_*}} \leq a_\Phi(p_*) \frac{\Phi(R_\Phi(p_*)H^{2/p_*})}{(R_\Phi(p_*))^{p_*} H^2}.$$

From the inclusion  $X_N^\Phi \subset R_\Phi(p_*)X_N^{p_*}$  we get

$$e_n(X_N^\Phi, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) \leq R_\Phi(p_*) \cdot e_n(X_N^{p_*}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{n/2} e_n(G, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) & \leq 2q(a_\Phi(p_*))^{1/2} \left( \frac{\Phi(R_\Phi(p_*)H^{2/p_*})}{(R_\Phi(p_*))^{p_*} H^2} \right)^{1/2} \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^\Phi, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{p_*/2} \\ & \leq 2q(a_\Phi(p_*))^{1/2} \left( \frac{\Phi(R_\Phi(p_*)H^{2/p_*})}{H^2} \right)^{1/2} \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^{p_*}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{p_*/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.15, we have

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^{p_*}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{p_*/2} \leq C_1 \sum_{n \leq \lfloor \log N \rfloor} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^{p_*}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{p_*/2}$$

with some numerical constant  $C_1 > 0$ . Thus, we arrive at the following statement.

**PROPOSITION 3.6.** *Let  $p \in [1, +\infty)$ ,  $q \in [p, +\infty)$ ,  $p_* := \min\{p, 2\}$ ,  $N \geq 1$ , and  $H \geq 1$ . There is a numerical constant  $c > 0$  such that, for every  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})_q$  and for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \in NI_{2, \infty}(H)$ , one has*

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{f \in X_N^\Phi} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(|f(x_j)|) - \int_{\Omega} \Phi(|f|) d\mu \right| \right) \leq c(A + A^{1/2}),$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{m} q^2 a_{\Phi}(p_*) \frac{\Phi(R_{\Phi}(p_*) H^{2/p_*})}{H^2} \mathbb{E} \left( \left( \sum_{n \leq \lfloor \log N \rfloor} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^{p_*}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{p_*/2} \right)^2 \right),$$

$\|f\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |f(x_j)|$ , and points  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  are choosing randomly, independently, and distributed according to the measure  $\mu$ .

To complete the proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we will consider three separate cases in the following subsections:  $p \geq 2$ ,  $p \in (1, 2)$ , and  $p = 1$ .

**3.3. Proof of Theorem 3.1: the case  $p \geq 2$ .** We note that in this case  $p_* = 2$ .

LEMMA 3.7. *Let  $p \geq 2$ ,  $q \in [p, +\infty)$ ,  $N \geq 1$ ,  $H \geq 1$ . There is a numerical constant  $c > 0$  such that, for every  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})_q$  and for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \in NI_{2, \infty}(H)$ , one has*

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{f \in X_N^{\Phi}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(|f(x_j)|) - \int_{\Omega} \Phi(|f|) d\mu \right| \right) \leq c(A + A^{1/2}),$$

where

$$(3.3) \quad A = \frac{q^2 a_{\Phi}(2) \Phi(R_{\Phi}(2)H) \log m (\log 2N)^2}{m}.$$

PROOF. By Proposition 3.6, it is enough to estimate

$$\sum_{n \leq \lfloor \log N \rfloor} 2^{n/2} e_n(X_N^2, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}})$$

for a fixed set of points  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$ . Let  $\|h\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |h(x_j)|$ . Taking into account the dual Sudakov bound for the entropy numbers of the Euclidean ball (see [33, L. 8.3.6]), we have

$$e_n(X_N^2, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) \leq c 2^{-n/2} \mathbb{E}_g \left\| \sum_{k=1}^N g_k u_k \right\|_{\infty, X},$$

where  $c$  is a numerical constant,  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_N)$  is a standard Gaussian random vector, and  $\{u_1, \dots, u_N\}$  is any orthonormal basis in  $X_N$ . Using now the estimate for the expectation of the maximum of Gaussian random variables (see [33, Prop. 2.4.16]) and the Nikolskii inequality, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_g \left\| \sum_{k=1}^N g_k u_k \right\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}} &= \mathbb{E}_g \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \left| \sum_{k=1}^N g_k u_k(x_j) \right| \\ &\leq c_1 \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \left( \sum_{k=1}^N |u_k(x_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} (\log m)^{1/2} \leq c_1 H (\log m)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(3.4) \quad e_n(X_N^2, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) \leq c_2 H 2^{-n/2} (\log m)^{1/2}.$$

and we have

$$\sum_{n \leq \lfloor \log N \rfloor} 2^{n/2} e_n(X_N^2, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) \leq c_2 H (\log m)^{1/2} \log 2N.$$

The lemma is proved.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1 FOR  $p \geq 2$ . By Lemma 2.9, Lemma 3.7, and Chebyshev's inequality, it is sufficient to choose  $m$  such that

$$c(A + A^{1/2}) \leq \varepsilon/2,$$

where  $A$  is given by (3.3). Since  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ , it is enough to see that

$$A\varepsilon^{-2} \leq (4c)^{-2}.$$

Let now

$$m \geq C_\Phi \varepsilon^{-2} (\log \varepsilon^{-1}) \Phi(H) (\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2$$

with sufficiently large constant  $C_\Phi \geq 2$ , which will be specified later.

We note that  $\Phi \in (\text{Dec})_q$  with some  $q := q(\Phi) \in [1, +\infty)$ . Then, since  $R_\Phi(2) \geq 1$  (see (2.4)), we have

$$\Phi(R_\Phi(2)H) \leq (R_\Phi(2))^q \Phi(H).$$

Thus, using that  $t \mapsto \frac{\log t}{t}$  is decreasing for  $t \geq 3$ , we have

$$A\varepsilon^{-2} = \varepsilon^{-2} \frac{\log m}{m} q^2 a_\Phi(2) \Phi(R_\Phi(2)H) (\log 2N)^2 \leq \frac{q^2 a_\Phi(2) (R_\Phi(2))^q}{C_\Phi} J,$$

where

$$J := \frac{\log C_\Phi + 2 \log \varepsilon^{-1} + \log \log \varepsilon^{-1} + \log \Phi(H) + 2 \log \log 2N + \log \log 2H^2}{(\log \varepsilon^{-1}) \log 2H^2}.$$

Noting that  $H^2 \geq N$  and  $\log \log t \leq \log t$  for  $t > 2$ , we estimate

$$J \leq \log C_\Phi + \frac{\log \Phi(H)}{\log 2H^2} + C$$

with some numerical constant  $C > 0$ .

Finally, in view of the inequality  $\Phi(H) \leq \Phi(1)H^q$  (note that  $H \geq 1$ ), we have

$$\log \Phi(H) \leq \log(\Phi(1)) + q/2 \log H^2.$$

Therefore,

$$A\varepsilon^{-2} \leq \frac{q^2 a_\Phi(2) (R_\Phi(2))^q}{C_\Phi} (\log C_\Phi + \log(\Phi(1)) + q/2 + C).$$

By choosing the constant  $C_\Phi$  sufficiently large, we can make the right-hand side of the last inequality smaller than  $(4c)^{-2}$ . This implies that  $A\varepsilon^{-2} \leq (4c)^{-2}$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

**3.4. Proof of Theorem 3.1: the case  $p \in (1, 2)$ .** In this case we need the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.8. *Let  $p \in (1, 2)$ ,  $q \in [p, +\infty)$ ,  $N \geq 1$ ,  $H \geq 1$ . There is a constant  $c(p) > 0$ , depending only on  $p$ , such that, for every  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})_q$  and for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \in NI_{2,\infty}(H)$ , one has*

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{f \in X_N^\Phi} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(|f(x_j)|) - \int_{\Omega} \Phi(|f|) d\mu \right| \right) \leq c(p)(A + A^{1/2}),$$

where

$$(3.5) \quad A = \frac{q^2 a_\Phi(p) \Phi(R_\Phi(p)H^{2/p}) (\log 2H^2)^{1-p/2} (\log m)^{p/2} (\log 2N)^2}{m}.$$

PROOF. In light of Proposition 3.6, our goal is to estimate

$$\sum_{n \leq \lfloor \log N \rfloor} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^p, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{p/2}.$$

It is known (see, e.g., [18, L. 4.10]) that

$$e_n(X_N^p, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) \leq C(p) H^{2/p} 2^{-n/p} (\log 2H^2)^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}} (\log m)^{1/2}$$

with a constant  $C(p) > 0$  depending only on  $p$ . This yields

$$\sum_{n \leq \lfloor \log N \rfloor} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^p, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{p/2} \leq C_1(p) H (\log 2H^2)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{p}{4}} (\log m)^{\frac{p}{4}} \log 2N.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1 FOR  $p \in (1, 2)$ . The argument is similar to the one in the proof in the case  $p \geq 2$ . Taking into account Lemma 3.8, it suffices to take  $m$  such that  $c(p)(A + A^{1/2}) \leq \varepsilon/2$  and

$$(3.6) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} A \leq (4c(p))^{-2}.$$

Let now

$$m \geq C_{\Phi, p} \varepsilon^{-2} (\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{p/2} \Phi(H^{2/p}) (\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2$$

with sufficiently large constant  $C_{\Phi, p} \geq 2$ , which will be specified later. Since the function  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-q}$  is decreasing on  $(0, +\infty)$  with some  $q := q(\Phi) \in [1, +\infty)$  and  $R_{\Phi}(p) \geq 1$ , we have

$$\Phi(R_{\Phi}(p)H^{2/p}) \leq (R_{\Phi}(p))^q \Phi(H^{2/p}),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-2} A &= \varepsilon^{-2} \frac{(\log m)^{p/2}}{m} q^2 a_{\Phi}(p) \Phi(R_{\Phi}(p)H^{2/p}) (\log H^2)^{1-p/2} (\log 2N)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{q^2 a_{\Phi}(p) (R_{\Phi}(p))^q}{C_{\Phi, p}} J, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$J = \frac{(\log C_{\Phi, p} + 2 \log \varepsilon^{-1} + \frac{p}{2} \log \log \varepsilon^{-1} + \log \Phi(H^{2/p}) + 2 \log \log 2N + \log \log 2H^2)^{p/2}}{(\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{p/2} (\log 2H^2)^{p/2}}.$$

It is easy to see that, for some positive  $C$ ,

$$J^{2/p} \leq \log C_{\Phi, p} + \frac{\log \Phi(H^{2/p})}{\log 2H^2} + C.$$

Further, taking into account that  $\Phi(H^{2/p}) \leq \Phi(1)H^{2q/p}$ , we have

$$\log \Phi(H^{2/p}) \leq \log(\Phi(1)) + q/p \log H^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\varepsilon^{-2} A \leq \frac{q^2 a_{\Phi}(p) (R_{\Phi}(p))^q}{C_{\Phi, p}} (\log C_{\Phi, p} + \log(\Phi(1)) + q/p + C)^{p/2}.$$

Taking  $C_{\Phi, p}$  large enough, we arrive at (3.6).  $\square$

**3.5. Proof of Theorem 3.2.** Let  $q := q(\Phi) \in [1, +\infty)$  be such that  $\Phi \in (\text{Dec})_q$ . Since

$$\|f\|_2^2 \leq \|f\|_\infty \|f\|_1 \leq H \|f\|_2 \|f\|_1 \quad \forall f \in X_N$$

we have  $X_N^1 \subset HX_N^2$ . Thus,

$$e_n(X_N^1, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) \leq H e_n(X_N^2, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}) \leq cH^2 2^{-n/2} (\log m_0)^{1/2}.$$

for every fixed set of points  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_{m_0}\}$ , where we have used estimate (3.4). Using Proposition 3.6, we derive

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{f \in X_N^\Phi} \left| \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \Phi(|f(x_j)|) - \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\mu \right| \right) \leq c_1(A + A^{1/2}),$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{m_0} q^2 a_\Phi(1) \Phi(R_\Phi(1)H^2) N^{1/2} (\log m_0)^{1/2}.$$

Using the fact that the function  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-q}$  is decreasing and  $R_\Phi(1)H^2 \geq 1$ , we note that

$$(3.7) \quad \Phi(R_\Phi(1)H^2) \leq (R_\Phi(1))^q H^{2q} \Phi(1).$$

Therefore, since  $\log m_0 \leq m_0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{f \in X_N^\Phi} \left| \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \Phi(|f(x_j)|) - \int_\Omega \Phi(|f|) d\mu \right| \right) \leq c_2(\Phi)(A_1 + A_1^{1/2}),$$

where

$$A_1 = \frac{H^{2q} N^{1/2}}{\sqrt{m_0}}.$$

On the other hand, Corollary 3.7 implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{f \in X_N^2} \left| \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} |f(x_j)|^2 - \int_\Omega |f|^2 d\mu \right| \right) \leq c_3(A_2 + A_2^{1/2}),$$

where

$$A_2 = \frac{H \log m_0 (\log 2N)^2}{m_0} \leq 16 \frac{HN}{\sqrt{m_0}}.$$

Thus, for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ , there exist a number  $m_0 \leq c_4(\Phi) \alpha^{-4} H^{4q} N^2$  and a set of points  $\mathbf{x}_0 := \{x_1^0, \dots, x_{m_0}^0\} \subset \Omega$  such that

$$(3.8) \quad a_\Phi(1)^{-1} (1 - \alpha) \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \leq a_\Phi(1) (1 + \alpha) \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \quad \forall f \in X_N$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\nu)} \leq \frac{3}{2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \quad \forall f \in X_N,$$

where  $\nu = \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \delta_{x_j^0}$ . Then

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(\nu)} = \sup_{x \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{m_0}\}} |f(x)| \leq \|f\|_\infty \leq H \|f\|_2 \leq 2H \|f\|_{L^2(\nu)}.$$

Let  $X_N^\Phi(\nu)$ ,  $X_N^2(\nu)$ , and  $X_N^1(\nu)$  be the (open) unit balls in  $X_N$  with respect to the norms of spaces  $L^\Phi(\nu)$ ,  $L^2(\nu)$ , and  $L^1(\nu)$ , respectively. In light of estimate (3.4),

$$e_n(X_N^2(\nu), \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}) \leq cH^2 2^{-n/2} (\log m_0)^{1/2}.$$



We now note that Lemma 3.3 from [7] implies that

$$e_n(X_N^1(\nu), \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}) \leq CR2^{-n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

if

$$e_n(X_N^2(\nu), \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}) \leq (R2^{-n})^{1/2} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence,

$$e_n(X_N^1(\nu), \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}) \leq c_5(\Phi)H^2(\log \alpha^{-1})(\log 2H^2)2^{-n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where we have used the estimate  $H \geq \sqrt{N}$ . We now apply Proposition 3.6 with the set  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and with the measure  $\nu$ . We note that for any  $\mathbf{x} \subset \mathbf{x}_0$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq \lfloor \log N \rfloor} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^1(\nu), \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}}))^{1/2} &\leq \sum_{n \leq \lfloor \log N \rfloor} 2^{n/2} (e_n(X_N^1(\nu), \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{x}_0}))^{1/2} \\ &\leq c_6(\Phi)H(\log \alpha^{-1})^{1/2}(\log 2H^2)^{1/2}(\log 2N). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{f \in X_N^\Phi(\nu)} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(|f(x_j)|) - \int_{\mathbf{x}_0} \Phi(|f|) d\nu \right| \right) \leq c_7(\Phi)(A + A^{1/2}),$$

where

$$A = \frac{(\log \alpha^{-1})\Phi(H^2)(\log 2H^2)(\log 2N)^2}{m}.$$

Therefore, for any  $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$ , there exists  $m \leq c_8(\Phi)\beta^{-2}(\log \alpha^{-1})\Phi(H^2)(\log 2H^2)(\log 2N)^2$  such that  $c_7(\Phi)(A + A^{1/2}) \leq \beta/2$ . For this  $m$ , there is a set of points  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \mathbf{x}_0$  such that

$$a_\Phi(1)^{-1}(1 - \beta)\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \leq \|f\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}} \leq a_\Phi(1)(1 + \beta)\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

Finally, taking  $\alpha = \beta = \varepsilon/3$  and combining this bound with (3.8), we obtain the required statement.  $\square$

#### 4. Descritization under relaxed assumptions on $\Phi$ -functions

In this section, we show that the conditions on the  $\Phi$ -function in Theorem 3.1 can be relaxed while still achieving an effective discretization result. Specifically, we demonstrate that the assumption  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$  can be replaced with the less restrictive condition  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p(\infty) \cap (\text{aDec})(\infty)$ , yielding the same discretization result up to constant factors.

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $N \geq 1$ ,  $H \geq 1$ . For every  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi$ , satisfying the condition  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p(\infty) \cap (\text{aDec})(\infty)$ , there exist positive constants  $c := c(\Phi, p)$ ,  $C := C(\Phi, p)$ ,  $C_1 := C_1(\Phi, p)$ , and  $C_2 := C_2(\Phi, p)$ , depending only on  $\Phi$  and  $p$ , such that for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \in NI_{2, \infty}(H)$  and for every*

$$m \geq C\Phi\left(cH^{\frac{2}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right)(\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2,$$

there is a subset  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m$  such that

$$C_1\|f\|_\Phi \leq \|f\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}} \leq C_2\|f\|_\Phi \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

PROOF. Since  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p(\infty) \cap (\text{aDec})(\infty)$ , there are  $t_* := t_*(\Phi) \in (0, +\infty)$  and  $q := q(\Phi) > p$  such that the mapping  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-p}$  is almost increasing with a constant  $a := a_\Phi(p)$  on  $(t_*, \infty)$  and  $t \mapsto \Phi(t)t^{-q}$  is almost decreasing with a constant  $b := b_\Phi(q)$  on  $(t_*, \infty)$ . Let  $t_0 = 2t_*$ . We consider a new  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi_1$  such that

$$\Phi_1(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi(t_0)}{t_0^p} t^p, & t \in (0, t_0] \\ \Phi(t), & t \geq t_0 \end{cases}.$$

Now we claim that  $\Phi_1 \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{aDec})$ . Indeed, let  $0 < s < t$  and  $\varphi(\tau) := \Phi_1(\tau)\tau^{-p}$ . If  $t \leq t_0$ , then  $\varphi(s) = \varphi(t) \leq a\varphi(t)$ . If  $s \geq t_0$ , then  $\varphi(s) = \Phi(s)s^{-p} \leq a\Phi(t)t^{-p} = a\varphi(t)$ . If  $s < t_0 < t$ , then  $\varphi(s) = \varphi(t_0) \leq a\varphi(t)$ . Let now  $\psi(\tau) := \Phi_1(\tau)\tau^{-q}$ . If  $t \leq t_0$ , then  $\psi(t) = ct^{p-q} \leq cs^{p-q} = \psi(s) \leq b\psi(s)$  where  $c := \frac{\Phi(t_0)}{t_0^p}$ . If  $s \geq t_0$ , then  $\psi(t) = \Phi(t)t^{-q} \leq b\Phi(s)s^{-q} = b\psi(s)$ . If  $s < t_0 < t$ , then  $\psi(t) \leq b\psi(t_0) \leq b\psi(s)$ , completing the proof of the claim.

Using Lemma 2.6, we can find a convex  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi_2 \in \Phi_c$ , which is equivalent to  $\Phi_1$ . By [13, L. 2.1.9], we have  $\Phi_2 \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{aDec})$ . Moreover, for a convex  $\Phi$ -function, the conditions  $\Phi_2 \in (\text{aDec})$  and  $\Phi_2 \in (\text{Dec})$  are equivalent (see [13, L. 2.2.6]). Thus,  $\Phi_2 \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$ , and by Theorem 3.1, for every

$$m \geq C_{\Phi_2, p} \Phi_2\left(H^{\frac{2}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right) (\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2,$$

there is a subset  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m$  such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{\Phi_2} \leq \|f\|_{\Phi_2, \mathbf{x}} \leq \frac{3}{2} \|f\|_{\Phi_2} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

Let  $c = c(\Phi, p) := \max\{L, t_0\}$ , where  $L$  is the constant from the equivalence  $\Phi_1(L^{-1}x) \leq \Phi_2(x) \leq \Phi_1(Lx)$ . Then

$$\Phi_2\left(H^{\frac{2}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right) \leq \Phi_1\left(LH^{\frac{2}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right) \leq \Phi_1\left(cH^{\frac{2}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right) = \Phi\left(cH^{\frac{2}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right).$$

Finally, we note that for any probability measure  $\nu$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \Phi_2\left(\frac{|f|}{2L(\Phi(t_0) + 1)\|f\|_{L^{\Phi}(\nu)}}\right) d\nu &\leq \frac{1}{\Phi(t_0) + 1} \int_{\Omega} \Phi_2\left(\frac{|f|}{2L\|f\|_{L^{\Phi}(\nu)}}\right) d\nu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\Phi(t_0) + 1} \int_{\Omega} \Phi_1\left(\frac{|f|}{2\|f\|_{L^{\Phi}(\nu)}}\right) d\nu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\Phi(t_0) + 1} \left( \Phi_1(t_0)\nu(|f|(2\|f\|_{L^{\Phi}(\nu)})^{-1} \leq t_0) + \int_{\Omega} \Phi\left(\frac{|f|}{2\|f\|_{L^{\Phi}(\nu)}}\right) d\nu \right) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we have used the convexity of  $\Phi_2$ , in the second one the equivalence between  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$ , and in the last one the first implication in (2.6). Therefore, we arrive at  $\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(\nu)} \leq 2L(\Phi(t_0) + 1)\|f\|_{L^{\Phi}(\nu)}$ .

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \Phi\left(\frac{|f|}{2La_{\Phi}(1)(\Phi(t_0) + 1)\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(\nu)}}\right) d\nu &\leq \frac{1}{\Phi(t_0) + 1} \int_{\Omega} \Phi\left(\frac{|f|}{2L\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(\nu)}}\right) d\nu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\Phi(t_0) + 1} \left( \Phi(t_0)\nu(|f|(2L\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(\nu)})^{-1} \leq t_0) + \int_{\Omega} \Phi_1\left(\frac{|f|}{2L\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(\nu)}}\right) d\nu \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\Phi(t_0) + 1} \left( \Phi(t_0) + \int_{\Omega} \Phi_2\left(\frac{|f|}{2\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(\nu)}}\right) d\nu \right) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we have used (2.3). Thus,  $\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} \leq 2a_\Phi(1)L(\Phi(t_0) + 1)\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(\nu)}$ . Therefore, for every

$$m \geq C(\Phi, p)\Phi\left(cH^{\frac{2}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right)(\log 2N)^2 \log 2H^2 \quad \text{with} \quad C(\Phi, p) = C_{\Phi_2, p},$$

there is a subset  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m$  such that, for every  $f \in X_N$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{8a_\Phi(1)L^2(\Phi(t_0) + 1)^2}\|f\|_\Phi &\leq \frac{1}{4L(\Phi(t_0) + 1)}\|f\|_{\Phi_2} \leq \frac{1}{2L(\Phi(t_0) + 1)}\|f\|_{\Phi_2, \mathbf{x}} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\Phi, \mathbf{x}} \leq 2a_\Phi(1)L(\Phi(t_0) + 1)\|f\|_{\Phi_2, \mathbf{x}} \\ &\leq 3a_\Phi(1)L(\Phi(t_0) + 1)\|f\|_{\Phi_2} \leq 6a_\Phi(1)L^2(\Phi(t_0) + 1)^2\|f\|_\Phi. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete.  $\square$

## 5. One-sided weighted discretization for an arbitrary subspace

The aim of this section is to obtain one-sided discretization inequalities without additional conditions on the subspace  $X_N$ , that is, we do not assume that Nikolskii's inequality (1.1) holds.

**5.1. Bounds of integral Orlicz norms by discrete Orlicz norms.** We start with the following analogue of Lewis's change of density lemma (see [24] and [30]).

LEMMA 5.1. *Let  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ ,  $\nu := \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \delta_{x_j}$  be a discrete positive measure on  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $X_N$  be an  $N$ -dimensional subspace of functions on  $\mathbf{x}$ . Assume that  $\Phi$  is an  $\Phi$ -prefunction with continuous derivative  $\varphi$ . There exist a constant  $c > 0$  and a basis  $v_1, \dots, v_N$  in  $X_N$  such that*

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}'} \varphi\left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^N |v_k(x)|^2\right)^{1/2}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^N |v_k(x)|^2\right)^{-1/2} v_r(x)v_{r'}(x) \nu(dx) = c\delta_{r, r'}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi\left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^N |v_k(x)|^2\right)^{1/2}\right) \nu(dx) = 1,$$

where  $\mathbf{x}' := \{x \in \mathbf{x} : \sum_{k=1}^N |v_k(x)|^2 \neq 0\}$ .

PROOF. The proof repeats the argument by Schechtman and Zvavitch in [30, Th. 2.1]. Without loss of generality, we assume that for each point  $x_j$  there is a function  $f \in X_N$  such that  $f(x_j) \neq 0$ . Let  $\{u_1, \dots, u_N\}$  be a basis in  $X_N$ . For an  $N \times N$  matrix  $B := (b_{k,l})$ , we define

$$G(B) := \int_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi\left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left|\sum_{l=1}^N b_{k,l}u_l(x)\right|^2\right)^{1/2}\right) \nu(dx) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \Phi\left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left|\sum_{l=1}^N b_{k,l}u_l(x_j)\right|^2\right)^{1/2}\right).$$

Clearly,  $G$  is a continuous function. Since the set  $\{B : G(B) = 1\}$  is compact, there exists a matrix  $A := (a_{k,l})$  such that the maximum value of  $\det B$  under the condition  $G(B) = 1$  is attained on  $A$ . For  $t \geq 0$ , one has

$$G(tI) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \Phi\left(t\left(\sum_{k=1}^N |u_k(x_j)|^2\right)^{1/2}\right).$$

Moreover,  $t \mapsto G(tI)$  is a continuous function on  $[0, +\infty)$ ,  $G(0) = 0$ , and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} G(tI) = +\infty$ . Thus, there is  $t_0 \in (0, +\infty)$  such that  $G(t_0I) = 1$ , which implies that  $\det A \geq t_0^N > 0$ . Therefore, the functions  $v_k := \sum_{l=1}^N a_{k,l} u_l$  form a basis in  $X_N$ . In particular,

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \left| \sum_{l=1}^N a_{k,l} u_l(x_j) \right|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^N |v_k(x_j)|^2 > 0$$

for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and therefore, the function  $G$  is continuously differentiable on some neighborhood of the point  $A$ . We note that, for fixed  $k_0$  and  $l_0$ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial b_{k_0 l_0}} G(B) = \int_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi \left( \left( \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \sum_{l=1}^N b_{k,l} u_l \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \left( \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \sum_{l=1}^N b_{k,l} u_l \right|^2 \right)^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{s=1}^N b_{k_0,s} u_s \right) u_{l_0} d\nu.$$

Using the method of Lagrange multipliers, the matrix  $C := \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{k_0 l_0}} G(B) \right)_{k_0, l_0} \Big|_{B=A}$  coincides, up to a constant, with the matrix  $\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{k_0 l_0}} \det(B) \right)_{k_0, l_0} \Big|_{B=A}$ . The latter matrix is equal to  $(\det A) \cdot (A^T)^{-1}$ . Thus,  $CA^T$  coincides, up to a constant factor, with the unit matrix. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi \left( \left( \sum_{k=1}^N |v_k(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \left( \sum_{k=1}^N |v_k(x)| \right)^{-1/2} v_r(x) v_{r'}(x) \nu(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi \left( \left( \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \sum_{l=1}^N a_{k,l} u_l \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \left( \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \sum_{l=1}^N a_{k,l} u_l \right|^2 \right)^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{s=1}^N a_{r,s} u_s \right) \left( \sum_{s=1}^N a_{r',s} u_s \right) d\nu = c \delta_{r,r'} \end{aligned}$$

with some constant  $c > 0$ . □

**THEOREM 5.2.** *Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ . Let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Phi$ -function such that  $\Phi \in (\text{Inc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$  and*

$$\sup_{t>0} (\Phi(t)\Phi(t^{-1})) < \infty.$$

*Assume that  $\varphi := \Phi'$  is continuous on  $(0, +\infty)$  and there is a  $\Phi$ -function  $\Psi \in (\text{aInc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$  such that*

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{\Phi(ts)}{\Phi(t)} \leq K_{\Phi, \Psi} \Psi(s) \quad \forall t, s > 0$$

*with  $K_{\Phi, \Psi} \geq 1$ . Then there are positive constants  $C := C(\Phi, \Psi, p)$  and  $c := c(\Phi, \Psi, p)$ , depending only on  $\Phi$ ,  $\Psi$ , and  $p$ , such that for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ ,  $1 \in X_N$ , there exist a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality*

$$m \leq c \Psi \left( N^{\frac{1}{\min\{p, 2\}}} \right) (\log 2N)^3$$

*and positive weights  $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\}$ ,  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_m = 1$ , providing the following one-sided discretization inequality*

$$(5.2) \quad \|f\|_{\Phi} \leq C (M_{\Phi, \Psi}(m))^{1/p} \|f\|_{\Psi, \mathbf{x}, \lambda} \quad \forall f \in X_N,$$

*where*

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\Phi, \Psi}(m) &:= \max \left\{ 1, \max \left\{ \frac{\Psi(t)}{\Phi(t)} : t \in [\Phi^{-1}(1), \Phi^{-1}(m)] \right\} \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ 1, \max \left\{ \frac{\Psi \circ \Phi^{-1}(t)}{t} : t \in [1, m] \right\} \right\} \quad \forall m \in (0, +\infty). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Since  $X_N$  is a finite-dimensional space of continuous functions, there is a constant  $H > 0$  such that  $X_N \in NI_{2,\infty}(H)$ . In light of Theorem 3.1, one has a number  $m_0$ , a set of points  $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_{m_0}\} \subset \Omega$ , and a uniform probability measure  $\nu_0 := \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \delta_{y_j}$  on this set such that

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu_0)} \leq \frac{3}{2} \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 5.1, there is a basis  $v_1, \dots, v_N$  in  $X_N$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbf{y}'} \varphi(F(y)) F(y)^{-1} v_r(y) v_{r'}(y) \nu_0(dy) = c \delta_{r,r'}, \quad c > 0,$$

where  $F(y) := \left( \sum_{k=1}^N |v_k(y)|^2 \right)^{1/2}$  and  $\mathbf{y}' = \{y \in \mathbf{y} : F(y) > 0\}$ . In particular,

$$\int_{\mathbf{y}'} \varphi(F(y)) F(y) \nu_0(dy) = \sum_{r=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{y}'} \varphi(F(y)) F(y)^{-1} |v_r(y)|^2 \nu_0(dy) = cN.$$

Further, the condition  $\Phi \in (\text{Inc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$  (cf. Remark 2.4) implies

$$(5.4) \quad p\Phi(F(y)) \leq \varphi(F(y)) F(y) \leq q\Phi(F(y))$$

with some  $q := q(\Phi) \geq 1$  such that  $\Phi \in (\text{Dec})_q$ . Moreover, Lemma 5.1 yields

$$\int_{\mathbf{y}} \Phi(F(y)) \nu_0(dy) = 1.$$

Thus, we arrive at the condition

$$(5.5) \quad 1 \leq p \leq cN \leq q.$$

We set  $\tilde{\nu}_0 := \frac{\varphi(F)F}{cN} \nu_0 = \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \frac{\varphi(F(y_j))F(y_j)}{cN} \delta_{y_j}$ ,  $\tilde{v}_r := \frac{\sqrt{N}}{F} v_r$ , and

$$\tilde{X}_N := \{\tilde{f} = F^{-1}f : f \in X_N\}.$$

Then we note that

$$\int_{\mathbf{y}'} \tilde{v}_r \tilde{v}_{r'} d\tilde{\nu}_0 = c^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{y}'} \varphi(F) F^{-1} v_r v_{r'} d\nu_0 = \delta_{r,r'}$$

and

$$\sum_{r=1}^N |\tilde{v}_r|^2 \leq N,$$

i.e.,  $\tilde{X}_N \in NI_{2,\infty}(\sqrt{N})$ , where the  $L^2$  norm is taken with respect to the measure  $\tilde{\nu}_0$ .

By (5.1) with  $t = 1$ ,  $\Phi(s) \leq K_{\Phi,\Psi} \Psi(s)$  and therefore,

$$\Phi(N^{\frac{1}{\min\{p,2\}}}) \leq K_{\Phi,\Psi} \Psi(N^{\frac{1}{\min\{p,2\}}}).$$

In light of Remark 3.5 (with  $\delta = 1/2$ ), we simultaneously discretize  $L^\Phi(\tilde{\nu}_0)$  and  $L^\Psi(\tilde{\nu}_0)$  norms on the subspace  $\tilde{X}_N$  as follows: there is a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \mathbf{y}' \subset \Omega$  of cardinality

$$m \leq c(\Phi, \Psi, p) \Psi(N^{\frac{1}{\min\{p,2\}}}) (\log 2N)^3$$

such that for a uniform measure  $\nu' = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_{x_j}$  on  $\mathbf{x}$  one has

$$(5.6) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Phi(\tilde{\nu}_0)} \leq \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Phi(\nu')} \leq \frac{3}{2} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Phi(\tilde{\nu}_0)} \quad \forall \tilde{f} \in \tilde{X}_N$$

and

$$(5.7) \quad a_\Psi(1)^{-1} \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Psi(\tilde{\nu}_0)} \leq \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Psi(\nu')} \leq a_\Psi(1) \frac{3}{2} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Psi(\tilde{\nu}_0)} \quad \forall \tilde{f} \in \tilde{X}_N.$$

Setting

$$(5.8) \quad M_0 := q \max\{1, \max\{\Phi(F(y_j))\Phi(\frac{1}{F(y_j)}): y_j \in \mathbf{y}'\}\},$$

we note that  $1 \leq M_0 < \infty$  due to the assumptions on the function  $\Phi$ . Then, by (2.3), (5.4), (5.5), and the definition of  $\tilde{\nu}_0$ , one has

$$\int_{\mathbf{y}'} \Phi(M_0^{-1}\tilde{1}) d\tilde{\nu}_0 = (cN)^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{y}'} \Phi(M_0^{-1}\tilde{1})\varphi(F)F d\nu_0 \leq qM_0^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{y}'} \Phi(\frac{1}{F})\Phi(F) d\nu_0 \leq 1,$$

where  $\tilde{1} := 1/F$ . This and  $\|\tilde{1}\|_{L^\Phi(\nu')} \leq \frac{3}{2}\|\tilde{1}\|_{L^\Phi(\tilde{\nu}_0)} < 2M_0$ , cf. (5.6), imply that

$$(5.9) \quad \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(\frac{1}{2M_0F(x_j)}) \leq 1.$$

Now we set

$$(5.10) \quad \lambda_j := \frac{\Phi(\max\{\frac{1}{2M_0F(x_j)}, 1\})}{\sum_{k=1}^m \Phi(\max\{\frac{1}{2M_0F(x_k)}, 1\})}$$

and  $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \delta_{x_j}$ .

Fix  $f \in X_N$  with  $\|f\|_{L^\Psi(\nu)} < 1$ . Let us prove that

$$(5.11) \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Psi(\nu')} \leq C_1(\Phi, \Psi, p)(1 + \Psi \circ \Phi^{-1}(1) + M_{\Phi, \Psi}(m))^{1/p}.$$

First, by (2.3), (5.1), and (5.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi(\frac{1}{K_{\Phi, \Psi}(1 + \Phi(1))}) (2M_0)^{-1} |\tilde{f}| d\nu' &\leq \frac{1}{K_{\Phi, \Psi}(1 + \Phi(1))} \int_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi((2M_0)^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) d\nu' \\ &= \frac{1}{K_{\Phi, \Psi}(1 + \Phi(1))} \cdot \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi((2M_0)^{-1} |\tilde{f}(x_j)|) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 + \Phi(1)} \cdot \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Psi(|f(x_j)|) \Phi(\max\{\frac{1}{2M_0F(x_j)}, 1\}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 + \Phi(1)} \cdot \frac{1}{m} \left( \sum_{k=1}^m \Phi(\max\{\frac{1}{2M_0F(x_k)}, 1\}) \right) \int_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi(|f|) d\nu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 + \Phi(1)} \cdot \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \Phi(\max\{\frac{1}{2M_0F(x_k)}, 1\}) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $M_0$  is defined by (5.8). Therefore,  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Phi(\nu')} \leq 2M_0K_{\Phi,\Psi}(1+\Phi(1)) < 3M_0K_{\Phi,\Psi}(1+\Phi(1))$ , which implies the estimate

$$\Phi\left(\frac{\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\tilde{f}(x_j)|}{3M_0K_{\Phi,\Psi}(1+\Phi(1))}\right) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \Phi\left(\frac{|\tilde{f}(x_j)|}{3M_0K_{\Phi,\Psi}(1+\Phi(1))}\right) \leq m.$$

Second, letting  $M_1 = 3M_0K_{\Phi,\Psi}(1+\Phi(1))$  and  $M_2 := 1 + \Psi \circ \Phi^{-1}(1) + M_{\Phi,\Psi}(m)$ , from (2.2) we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi(a_\Psi(p)^{-1/p} M_2^{-1/p} M_1^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) d\nu' &\leq M_2^{-1} \int_{\{M_1^{-1}|\tilde{f}| \leq \Phi^{-1}(1)\}} \Psi(M_1^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) d\nu' \\ &\quad + M_2^{-1} \int_{\{M_1^{-1}|\tilde{f}| \geq \Phi^{-1}(1)\}} \Psi(M_1^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) d\nu' \\ &\leq M_2^{-1} \left( \Psi \circ \Phi^{-1}(1) + M_{\Phi,\Psi}(m) \int_{\{M_1^{-1}|\tilde{f}| \geq \Phi^{-1}(1)\}} \Phi(M_1^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) d\nu' \right) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

which yields  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Psi(\nu')} \leq a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} M_1 M_2^{1/p}$ , i.e., inequality (5.11) holds.

Then, using the left-hand side bound in (5.7), we get

$$(5.12) \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Psi(\tilde{\nu}_0)} \leq 2a_\Psi(1) \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\Psi(\nu')} \leq 2a_\Psi(1) a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} M_1 M_2^{1/p}.$$

By (2.3), (5.4), the definition of  $\tilde{\nu}_0$ , relation (5.5) and property (5.1), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{y}} \Phi((qK_{\Phi,\Psi})^{-1} (3a_\Psi(1) a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} M_1 M_2^{1/p})^{-1} |f|) d\nu_0 \\ &\leq (qK_{\Phi,\Psi})^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{y}} \Phi((3a_\Psi(1) a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} M_1 M_2^{1/p})^{-1} |f|) d\nu_0 \\ &\leq q^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{y}'} \Psi((3a_\Psi(1) a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} M_1 M_2^{1/p})^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) \Phi(F) d\nu_0 \\ &\leq q^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{y}'} \Psi((3a_\Psi(1) a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} M_1 M_2^{1/p})^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) \varphi(F) F d\nu_0 \\ &= q^{-1} cN \int_{\mathbf{y}'} \Psi((3a_\Psi(1) a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} M_1 M_2^{1/p})^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) d\tilde{\nu}_0 \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbf{y}'} \Psi((3a_\Psi(1) a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} M_1 M_2^{1/p})^{-1} |\tilde{f}|) d\tilde{\nu}_0 \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (5.12). This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu_0)} &\leq C_2(\Phi, \Psi, p) (1 + \Psi \circ \Phi^{-1}(1) + M_{\Phi,\Psi}(m))^{1/p} \\ &\leq 3^{1/p} C_2(\Phi, \Psi, p) (M_{\Phi,\Psi}(m))^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_2(\Phi, \Psi, p) := 9qK_{\Phi,\Psi}^2 a_\Psi(1) a_\Psi(p)^{1/p} (1 + \Phi(1)) M_0.$$

Finally, (5.3) yields

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \leq 2\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu_0)} \leq C_3(\Phi, \Psi, p) (M_{\Phi,\Psi}(m))^{1/p}$$

with  $C_3(\Phi, \Psi, p) := 2 \cdot 3^{1/p} C_2(\Phi, \Psi, p)$ . The proof of the theorem is now complete.  $\square$

We note that in Theorem 5.2 one can actually choose weights  $\lambda_j$  to be equal.

REMARK 5.3. Under the same assumptions on the functions  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  as in Theorem 5.2, we obtain the following statement: There are positive constants  $C := C(\Phi, \Psi, p)$  and  $c := c(\Phi, \Psi, p)$  such that for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$  there is a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality

$$m \leq c\Psi\left(N^{\frac{1}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right)(\log 2N)^3$$

for which

$$\|f\|_\Phi \leq C(M_{\Phi, \Psi}(m))^{1/p} \|f\|_{\Psi, \mathbf{x}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

Indeed, if  $1 \notin X_N$ , we consider the space  $X'_N := \text{span}\{X_N, 1\}$  of dimension  $N + 1 \leq 2N$ . We now argue as in the proof of Proposition 3.1 from [25]. Let  $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$  and  $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k\}$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j = 1$ , be the points and weights from Theorem 5.2 with

$$k \leq c\Psi\left((2N)^{\frac{1}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right)(\log 4N)^3$$

and

$$\|f\|_\Phi \leq C(M_{\Phi, \Psi}(k))^{1/p} \|f\|_{\Psi, \mathbf{y}, \lambda} \quad \forall f \in X'_N.$$

There holds

$$m := \sum_{j=1}^k ([\lambda_j k] + 1) \leq 2k \leq 16c2^{\frac{q}{\min\{p, 2\}}} \Psi\left(N^{\frac{1}{\min\{p, 2\}}}\right)(\log 2N)^3,$$

where  $q := q(\Psi)$  is a number such that  $\Psi \in (\text{Dec})_q$ . Take points  $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  such that  $([\lambda_j k] + 1)$  of them coincide with  $y_j$  for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Let now  $f \in X'_N$  be such that  $\|f\|_{\Psi, \mathbf{x}} < 1$ . Then, by (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \Psi(a_\Psi(1)^{-1} 2^{-1} |f(y_j)|) &\leq 2^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \Psi(|f(y_j)|) \leq \frac{1}{2k} \sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j k) \Psi(|f(y_j)|) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^k ([\lambda_j k] + 1) \Psi(|f(y_j)|) \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \Psi(|f(x_i)|) \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $k \leq m$ , we have

$$\|f\|_\Phi \leq C(M_{\Phi, \Psi}(k))^{1/p} \|f\|_{\Psi, \mathbf{y}, \lambda} \leq 2a_\Psi(1)C(M_{\Phi, \Psi}(m))^{1/p}$$

completing the proof.

REMARK 5.4. We point out that one can always take

$$\Psi_\Phi(s) := \sup_{t>0} \frac{\Phi(ts)}{\Phi(t)}$$

so that condition (5.1) holds with  $K_{\Phi, \Psi_\Phi} = 1$ . Indeed, for a function  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$  (respectively,  $\Phi \in (\text{aDec})_q$ ) one always has  $\Psi_\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$  ( $\Psi_\Phi \in (\text{aDec})_q$ ) with  $a_{\Psi_\Phi}(p) = a_\Phi(p)$  ( $b_{\Psi_\Phi}(q) = b_\Phi(q)$ ).

We now apply Theorem 5.2 and Remark 5.3 to the function  $\Phi_{p, \alpha, \beta} := t^p \frac{(\ln(e+t))^\alpha}{(\ln(e+t-1))^\beta}$ , cf. (3.1).

EXAMPLE 5.5. Let  $p \geq 2$  and  $\alpha \geq 0$ . There are positive constants  $c := c(p, \alpha)$  and  $C := C(p, \alpha)$  such that, for every  $N$ -dimensional space  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there exists a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality

$$m \leq CN^{\frac{p}{\min\{p, 2\}}} (\log 2N)^{3+2\alpha}$$



for which

$$\|f\|_{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}} \leq c(\log 2N)^{\alpha/p} \|f\|_{\Phi_{p,2\alpha,0,\mathbf{x}}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}(ts) \leq 4^\alpha \Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}(t) \Phi_{p,2\alpha,0}(s), \quad t, s > 0,$$

i.e., condition (5.1) holds with  $\Psi = \Phi_{p,2\alpha,0}$ . Moreover,

$$\sup_{t>0} (\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}(t) \Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}(t^{-1})) = 1$$

and, for every  $m \geq 1$ ,

$$M_{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}, \Phi_{p,2\alpha,0}}(m) := \max \left\{ 1, \max \left\{ \frac{\Phi_{p,2\alpha,0}(t)}{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}(t)} : t \in [\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}^{-1}(1), \Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}^{-1}(m)] \right\} \right\} \leq 2^\alpha (\ln(e+m))^\alpha.$$

To see the last estimate, we note that  $\frac{\Phi_{p,2\alpha,0}(t)}{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}(t)} = (\ln(e+t) \ln(e+t^{-1}))^\alpha \leq 2^\alpha (\ln(e+t))^\alpha$  and  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha} \in (\text{Inc})_1$ . Finally, we apply (5.2) and Remark 5.3 to complete the proof.

**5.2. Bounds of integral Orlicz norms by discrete  $L^2$ -norms.** In this subsection we are going to prove the following general one-sided discretization result.

**THEOREM 5.6.** *Let  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$ . Assume that, for every  $N \geq 1$ , there is a number  $K := K(N, \Phi) > 0$  such that*

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq \sqrt{N}} \frac{\Phi(K^{-1}t)}{t^2} < 1.$$

*Then there are positive numbers  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  such that, for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there is a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m \leq c_1 N$  for which*

$$\|f\|_\Phi \leq c_2 K \|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

The proof of this theorem follows the ideas from [20], cf. Theorem 13 there. In particular, we will use the following two lemmas.

**LEMMA 5.7** (see Lemma 11 in [20] or Proposition 3.2 in [25]). *There exist two numerical universal constants  $c_1, c_2 \geq 1$  such that for any  $N \geq 1$  and for any  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there is a number  $m := m(N) \in [N, c_1 N]$  and points  $y_1, \dots, y_m \in \Omega$  such that*

$$\|f\|_2 \leq c_2 \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(y_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

**LEMMA 5.8** (see Theorem 12 in [20]). *There are two numerical universal constants  $c_1, c_2 \geq 1$  such that for any  $N \geq 1$  and for any  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there is a number  $m := m(N) \in [N, c_1 N]$  and points  $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \Omega$  such that*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq c_2 \sqrt{N} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(z_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

We point out that Lemma 5.8 follows from Lemma 5.7 taking into account the following useful result by Kiefer and Wolfowitz (see also the discussion in [20]).

**THEOREM 5.9** ([17]). *Let  $N \geq 1$ . For any  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there exists a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$  such that*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{N} \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega, \mu)} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 5.6.

**Proof of Theorem 5.6.** For  $N \geq 1$ , let  $m := m(N)$  be the number of points sufficient for the successful discretization provided by Lemmas 5.7 and 5.8 and  $\mathbf{x} := \{y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_m\}$  be the union of the sets of points from these lemmas. We note that, for every  $f \in X_N$  with  $\|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \leq 1$ , one has

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq c_2 \sqrt{N} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(z_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c_2 \sqrt{N} \sqrt{2} \left( \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{j=1}^{2m} |f(x_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \sqrt{N}$$

and

$$\|f\|_2 \leq c_2 \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f(y_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c_2 \sqrt{2} \left( \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{j=1}^{2m} |f(x_j)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C.$$

For any  $f \in X_N$  with  $\|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \leq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \Phi(K^{-1}C^{-1}|f(x)|) \mu(dx) &= \int_\Omega \frac{\Phi(K^{-1}C^{-1}|f(x)|)}{C^{-2}|f(x)|^2} |f(x)|^2 C^{-2} \mu(dx) \\ &\leq \sup_{0 < t \leq \sqrt{N}} \frac{\Phi(K^{-1}t)}{t^2} C^{-2} \int_\Omega |f(x)|^2 \mu(dx) \leq \sup_{0 < t \leq \sqrt{N}} \frac{\Phi(K^{-1}t)}{t^2} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|f\|_\Phi \leq CK \|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

The proof is now complete.  $\square$

For  $\Phi$ -functions  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$ ,  $p \geq 2$ , we obtain the following more explicit version of Theorem 5.6.

**COROLLARY 5.10.** *Let  $p \in [2, \infty)$ ,  $N \geq 1$ . Let  $\Phi$  be  $\Phi$ -functions such that  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$ . There are positive numbers  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , where  $c_2 = c_2(\Phi, p)$  depends only on  $\Phi$  and  $p$ , such that for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there is a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m \leq c_1 N$  for which*

$$\|f\|_\Phi \leq c_2 \left( \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} \right)^{1/p} \|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

Moreover, one can take  $c_2(\Phi, p)$  to be of the form

$$c_2(\Phi, p) = C a_\Phi(p)^{2/p} (1 + (\Phi(1))^{-1})^{1/p}$$

where  $C \geq 1$  is a numerical constant.

**PROOF.** Let  $M = a_\Phi(p) \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} \cdot \frac{1 + \Phi(1)}{\Phi(1)} \geq 1$ . Then, by (2.2), for any  $t \in (0, \sqrt{N}]$ , one has

$$\frac{\Phi(a_\Phi(p)^{-1/p} M^{-1/p} t)}{t^2} \leq M^{-1} \frac{\Phi(t)}{t^2} = M^{-1} \frac{\Phi(t)}{t^p} t^{p-2} \leq M^{-1} a_\Phi(p) \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} < 1.$$

Taking into account Theorem 5.6 with  $K = a_\Phi(p)^{1/p} M^{1/p}$ , we obtain

$$\|f\|_\Phi \leq C a_\Phi(p)^{1/p} M^{1/p} \|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \leq C a_\Phi(p)^{2/p} (1 + (\Phi(1))^{-1})^{1/p} \left( \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} \right)^{1/p} \|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

The proof is now complete.  $\square$

Recall that  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(t) = t^p \frac{(\ln(e+t))^\alpha}{(\ln(e+t^{-1}))^\beta}$ ,  $p \geq 1$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ , cf. (3.1). Note that  $\Phi \in (\text{Inc})_p$ ,  $a_\Phi(p) = 1$ , and  $\Phi(1) = 1$ . In addition,

$$\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(\sqrt{N}) \leq N^{p/2} (\log 4N)^\alpha.$$

Thus, Corollary 5.10 yields the following result.

**EXAMPLE 5.11.** Let  $p \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ , and  $N \geq 1$ . There exist numerical constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  satisfying the following condition: for every  $N$ -dimensional space  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there exist a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m \leq c_1 N$  such that

$$\|f\|_{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}} \leq c_2 N^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} (\log 4N)^{\frac{\alpha}{p}} \|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

In the case  $\alpha = \beta = 0$  we recover the result of Theorem 13 in [20].

By applying Theorem 5.6 directly, we obtain the following one-sided discretization result for exponential Orlicz functions.

**EXAMPLE 5.12.** Let  $q \geq 2$ ,  $\Phi_q(t) := e^{t^q} - 1$ . There are positive numbers  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  such that, for every  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , there is a set  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  of cardinality  $m \leq c_1 N$  for which

$$\|f\|_{\Phi_q} \leq c_2 \frac{N^{1/2}}{(\log(N+1))^{1/q}} \|f\|_{2,\mathbf{x}} \quad \forall f \in X_N.$$

**PROOF.** Note that the function  $t \mapsto \frac{\Phi_q(t)}{t^2}$  is increasing on  $[0, +\infty)$  and

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq \sqrt{N}} \frac{\Phi_q(K^{-1}t)}{t^2} = \frac{\Phi_q(K^{-1}\sqrt{N})}{N} = \frac{e^{K^{-q}N^{q/2}} - 1}{N}.$$

Letting  $K = \frac{2N^{1/2}}{(\log(N+1))^{1/q}}$  implies  $\frac{e^{K^{-q}N^{q/2}} - 1}{N} = \frac{(N+1)^{2^{-q} \log e - 1}}{N} < 1$ . Theorem 5.6 now yields the announced discretization inequality.  $\square$

## 6. Applications to sampling recovery

In this section, we obtain new estimates of the sampling numbers in the Orlicz norm in terms of the corresponding Kolmogorov widths in the uniform norm. Let  $\mathbf{F}$  be subset of some function Banach space  $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ . We further always assume that  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$  for some compact set  $\Omega$ . The sampling numbers of a function class  $\mathbf{F}$  are defined by

$$\varrho_m(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|) := \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \subset \Omega \\ \#\mathbf{x} \leq m}} \inf_{T_{\mathbf{x}} \text{-linear}} \sup_{f \in \mathbf{F}} \|f - T_{\mathbf{x}}(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m))\|.$$

Similarly, we introduce the modified sampling numbers of a function class  $\mathbf{F}$  as

$$\varrho_m^*(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|) := \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \subset \Omega \\ \#\mathbf{x} \leq m}} \inf_{X_N, N \leq m} \inf_{T_{\mathbf{x}}: \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow X_N} \sup_{f \in \mathbf{F}} \|f - T_{\mathbf{x}}(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m))\|.$$

Let

$$d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|) = \inf_{X_N} \sup_{f \in \mathbf{F}} \inf_{u \in X_N} \|f - u\|$$

be the  $N$ -th Kolmogorov width of  $\mathbf{F}$ . For a fixed  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N$  in  $C(\Omega)$  we consider the following error of approximation of a function by elements of  $X_N$  in the uniform norm:

$$d(f, X_N)_\infty := \inf_{u \in X_N} \|f - u\|_\infty.$$

For a fixed number  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , a set of points  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$ , and a probability measure  $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \delta_{x_j}$  on  $\mathbf{x}$ , we consider the following recovery algorithm

$$\ell_{L^\Phi(\nu), X_N}(f) := \arg \min_{u \in X_N} \|f - u\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)}.$$

based on functional values  $(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m))$ .

We need the following extension of Theorem 2.1 in [34] to the Orlicz setting.

LEMMA 6.1. *Let  $p \geq 1$ ,  $D \geq 1$ , and let  $\Phi, \Psi \in (\text{aInc})_p$  be a pair of  $\Phi$ -functions. Then for any probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$ , any discrete probability measure  $\nu$  on a finite subset of  $\Omega$ , and for any  $N$ -dimensional subspace  $X_N \subset C(\Omega)$ , satisfying*

$$\|u\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \leq D \|u\|_{L^\Psi(\nu)} \quad \forall u \in X_N,$$

there holds

$$\|f - \ell_{L^\Psi(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \leq C(\Phi, \Psi, p, D) d(f, X_N)_\infty,$$

where

$$(6.1) \quad C(\Phi, \Psi, p, D) = C_\Phi(2a_\Phi(p)^{1/p}(\Phi(1) + 1)^{1/p} + 4DC_\Psi a_\Psi(p)^{1/p}(\Psi(1) + 1)^{1/p})$$

and  $C_\Psi$  and  $C_\Phi$  are the constants from inequality (2.5).

PROOF. We follow the argument from [34]. Let  $P_{X_N}(f) \in X_N$  be such that

$$\|f - P_{X_N}(f)\|_\infty \leq 2d(f, X_N)_\infty.$$

Then, by (2.2), there holds

$$\|f - P_{X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \leq a_\Phi(p)^{1/p}(\Phi(1) + 1)^{1/p} \|f - P_{X_N}(f)\|_\infty \leq 2a_\Phi(p)^{1/p}(\Phi(1) + 1)^{1/p} d(f, X_N)_\infty$$

and, similarly,

$$\|f - P_{X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Psi(\nu)} \leq 2a_\Psi(p)^{1/p}(\Psi(1) + 1)^{1/p} d(f, X_N)_\infty.$$

Then it is clear that

$$\|f - \ell_{L^\Psi(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Psi(\nu)} \leq \|f - P_{X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Psi(\nu)} \leq 2a_\Psi(p)^{1/p}(\Psi(1) + 1)^{1/p} d(f, X_N)_\infty.$$

Taking this into account, we get

$$\|P_{X_N}(f) - \ell_{L^\Psi(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Psi(\nu)} \leq 4C_\Psi a_\Psi(p)^{1/p}(\Psi(1) + 1)^{1/p} d(f, X_N)_\infty$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{X_N}(f) - \ell_{L^\Psi(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} &\leq D \|P_{X_N}(f) - \ell_{L^\Psi(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Psi(\nu)} \\ &\leq 4DC_\Psi a_\Psi(p)^{1/p}(\Psi(1) + 1)^{1/p} d(f, X_N)_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \ell_{L^\Psi(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} &\leq C_\Phi (\|f - P_{X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} + \|P_{X_N}(f) - \ell_{L^\Psi(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)}) \\ &\leq C(\Phi, \Psi, p, D) d(f, X_N)_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C(\Phi, \Psi, p, D)$  is given by (6.1). □

We now prove the Orlicz counterparts of the recent result in [20] (see Theorem 20 there).

**THEOREM 6.2.** *Let  $\Phi \in \Phi_w$ . Assume that, for every  $N \geq 1$ , there is a number  $K := K(N, \Phi) > 0$  such that*

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq \sqrt{N}} \frac{\Phi(K^{-1}t)}{t^2} < 1.$$

*Then there is a positive number  $c \geq 1$  such that, for any probability Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$  and for any function class  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$ , one has*

$$\varrho_{cN}(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)}) \leq C(N, \Phi) d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty),$$

where

$$C(N, \Phi) = C_\Phi(2a_\Phi(1)(\Phi(1) + 1) + CK(N, \Phi)),$$

$C > 0$  is a numerical constant and  $C_\Phi$  is the constant from inequality (2.5).

**PROOF.** Let  $X_N$  be such that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathbf{F}} d(f, X_N)_\infty \leq 2d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty).$$

Take  $c_1, c_2$ , and  $\mathbf{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \Omega$  provided by Theorem 5.6 (in particular,  $m \leq c_1 N$ ). By Lemma 6.1, for every  $f \in \mathbf{F}$ , we have

$$\|f - \ell_{L^2(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} \leq C_\Phi(2a_\Phi(1)(\Phi(1) + 1) + 8c_2 K(N, \Phi)) d(f, X_N)_\infty.$$

It remains to notice that  $\ell_{L^2(\nu), X_N}(f)$  is linear in  $(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m))$  since it is an orthogonal projection on  $X_N$  in  $L^2(\nu)$ .  $\square$

**EXAMPLE 6.3.** Let  $q \geq 2$ ,  $\Phi_q(t) := e^{t^q} - 1$ . There are numerical constants  $c, C \geq 1$  such that, for any probability Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$  and for any function class  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$ , one has

$$\varrho_{cN}(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^{\Phi_q}(\mu)}) \leq \frac{CN^{1/2}}{(\log(N+1))^{1/q}} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty).$$

We now present a more explicit version of Theorem 6.2 for  $\Phi$ -functions  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$ ,  $p \geq 2$ .

**THEOREM 6.4.** *Let  $p \in [2, \infty)$ ,  $N \geq 1$ . Let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Phi$ -function such that  $\Phi \in (\text{aInc})_p$ . There exist a positive numerical constant  $c \geq 1$  and a number  $C(\Phi, p) \geq 1$ , depending only on  $\Phi$  and  $p$ , such that, for any probability Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$  and for any function class  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$ , one has*

$$\varrho_{cN}(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)}) \leq C(\Phi, p) \left( \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} \right)^{1/p} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty).$$

Moreover, one can take  $C(\Phi, p)$  to be of the form

$$C(\Phi, p) = C \cdot C_\Phi a_\Phi(p)^{2/p} (1 + (\Phi(1))^{-1})^{1/p},$$

where  $C \geq 1$  is a numerical constant and  $C_\Phi$  is the constant from inequality (2.5).

**PROOF.** We argue as in the proof of Theorem 6.2. Let  $X_N$  be such that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathbf{F}} d(f, X_N)_\infty \leq 2d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty).$$

Let  $c_1, c_2 := c_2(\Phi, p) > 0$ ,  $m \leq c_1 N$ , and  $\mathbf{x} \subset \Omega$  be provided by Corollary 5.10. Recall that one can take

$$c_2(\Phi, p) = c_0 a_\Phi(p)^{2/p} (1 + (\Phi(1))^{-1})^{1/p},$$

where  $c_0 \geq 1$  is a numerical constant. Using Lemma 6.1, for every  $f \in \mathbf{F}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \ell_{L^2(\nu), X_N}(f)\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)} &\leq C_\Phi \left( 2a_\Phi(p)^{1/p} (\Phi(1) + 1)^{1/p} + 8c_2 \left( \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} \right)^{1/p} \right) d(f, X_N)_\infty \\ &\leq 2C_\Phi \left( 2(a_\Phi(p))^{2/p} (1 + (\Phi(1))^{-1})^{1/p} + 8c_2 \right) \left( \frac{\Phi(\sqrt{N})}{N} \right)^{1/p} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we again notice that  $\ell_{L^2(\nu), X_N}(f)$  is linear in  $(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m))$  since it is an orthogonal projection on  $X_N$  in  $L^2(\nu)$ .  $\square$

**EXAMPLE 6.5.** Let  $p \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ , and  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}(t) := t^p \frac{(\ln(e+t))^\alpha}{(\ln(e+t^{-1}))^\beta}$ . There exist positive numerical constants  $c, C \geq 1$  such that, for any probability Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$  and for any function class  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$ , one has

$$\varrho_{cN}(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}}(\mu)}) \leq CN^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} (\log 4N)^{\alpha/p} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty).$$

In the case  $\alpha = \beta = 0$  we recover the result of Theorem 20 in [20].

Let us emphasise that for the Orlicz norm generated by  $\Phi_{2,\alpha,\beta}$  this estimate involves only the logarithmic factor  $(\log 4N)^{\alpha/2}$  unlike in the case of the norms generated by  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\beta}$  with  $p > 2$ , where an additional polynomial factor appears. We can avoid such factor for *modified* sampling numbers allowing certain polynomial oversampling (see Example 6.7 below). In more detail, first, combining Lemma 6.1, Theorem 5.2, and Remarks 5.3 and 5.4, we obtain the following result.

**THEOREM 6.6.** *Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ . Let also  $\Phi$  be a  $\Phi$ -function, continuously differentiable on  $(0, +\infty)$ , such that  $\Phi \in (\text{Inc})_p \cap (\text{Dec})$  and*

$$\sup_{t>0} (\Phi(t)\Phi(t^{-1})) < \infty.$$

*There exist positive numbers  $c := c(\Phi, p) \geq 1$  and  $C := C(\Phi, p) \geq 1$ , depending only on  $\Phi$  and  $p$ , such that, for any probability Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$ , for any function class  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$ , and for any*

$$m \geq c\Psi_\Phi(N^{\frac{1}{\min\{p, 2\}}}) (\log 2N)^3,$$

*we have*

$$\varrho_m^*(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(\mu)}) \leq C(M_{\Phi, \Psi_\Phi}(m))^{1/p} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty),$$

*where*

$$\Psi_\Phi(s) := \sup_{t>0} \frac{\Phi(ts)}{\Phi(t)}$$

*and*

$$M_{\Phi, \Psi_\Phi}(m) := \max \left\{ 1, \max \left\{ \frac{\Psi_\Phi(t)}{\Phi(t)} : t \in [\Phi^{-1}(1), \Phi^{-1}(m)] \right\} \right\} \quad \forall m \in (0, +\infty).$$

Second, we apply this theorem to the  $\Phi$ -function  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}$  (see Example 5.5).

**EXAMPLE 6.7.** Let  $p \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha \geq 0$ , and  $\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}(t) := t^p \frac{(\ln(e+t))^\alpha}{(\ln(e+t^{-1}))^\alpha}$ . There exist positive constants  $c := c(p, \alpha), C := C(p, \alpha) \geq 1$ , depending only on  $p$  and  $\alpha$ , such that, for any probability Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$  and for any function class  $\mathbf{F} \subset C(\Omega)$ , we have

$$\varrho_{cN^{p/2}(\log 2N)^{3+2\alpha}}^*(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^{\Phi_{p,\alpha,\alpha}}(\mu)}) \leq C(\log 2N)^{\alpha/p} d_N(\mathbf{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty).$$

For similar recovery results in  $L^p$  (the case  $\alpha = 0$ ), see Section **R.3** in [16].

### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Mario Ullrich for sharing the ideas that helped us to improve the original results in Theorem 5.6.

The first named author was supported by the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant 101109701. The second named author was supported by PID2023-150984NB-I00, 2021 SGR 00087, AP 23488596. The research was also supported by the Spanish State Research Agency, through the Severo Ochoa and María de Maeztu Program for Centers and Units of Excellence in R&D (CEX2020-001084-M). The authors thanks CERCA Programme (Generalitat de Catalunya) for institutional support. The authors also would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the programme Discretization and recovery in high-dimensional spaces, where work on this paper was partially undertaken. This work was supported by EPSRC grant EP/R014604/1.

### References

- [1] S.N. Bernstein, *On majorants of finite or quasi-finite growth*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **65** (1949), 117–120.
- [2] J. Bourgain, J. Lindenstrauss, and V. Milman, *Approximation of zonoids by zonotopes*, Acta Math. **162** (1989), 73–141.
- [3] N.H. Bingham, C.M. Goldie, and J.L. Teugels, *Regular Variation*, Cambridge University Press, 1987/1989.
- [4] F. Dai, E. Kosov, and V. Temlyakov, *Some improved bounds in sampling discretization of integral norms*, J. Funct. Anal. **285** (2023), no. 4, 109951.
- [5] F. Dai, A. Prymak, V. Temlyakov, and S. Tikhonov, *Integral norm discretization and related problems*, Russian Math. Surveys **74** (2019), no. 4, 579–630.
- [6] F. Dai, A. Prymak, A. Shadrin, V. Temlyakov, and S. Tikhonov, *Sampling discretization of integral norms*, Constr. Approx. **54** (2021), 455–471.
- [7] F. Dai, A. Prymak, A. Shadrin, V. Temlyakov, and S. Tikhonov, *Entropy numbers and Marcinkiewicz-type discretization theorem*, J. Funct. Anal. **281** (2021), no. 6, 109090.
- [8] F. Dai and V. Temlyakov, *Sampling discretization of integral norms and its application*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **319** (2022), no. 1, 97–109.
- [9] R. DeVore and G. Lorentz, *Constructive Approximation*, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [10] Z. Ditzian and S. Tikhonov, *Ul’yanov and Nikol’skii-type inequalities*, J. Approx. Theory **133** (2005), no. 1, 100–133.
- [11] M. Dolbeault, D. Krieg, and M. Ullrich, *A sharp upper bound for sampling numbers in  $L_2$* , Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **63** (2023), 113–134.
- [12] O. Guédon, S. Mendelson, A. Pajor, and N. Tomczak-Jaegermann, *Subspaces and orthogonal decompositions generated by bounded orthogonal systems*, Positivity **11** (2007), 269–283.
- [13] P. Harjulehto and P. Hästö, *Generalized Orlicz Spaces*, Springer, 2019.
- [14] T. Jahn, T. Ullrich, and F. Voigtlaender, *Sampling numbers of smoothness classes via  $\ell^1$ -minimization*, J. Complexity **79** (2023), 101786.
- [15] W.B. Johnson and G. Schechtman, *Finite dimensional subspaces of  $L_p$* , Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. 1 (2001), 837–870, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [16] B.S. Kashin, E.D. Kosov, I.V. Limonova, and V.N. Temlyakov, *Sampling discretization and related problems*, J. Complexity **71** (2022), 101653.
- [17] J. Kiefer and J. Wolfowitz, *The equivalence of two extremum problems*, Canadian J. Math. **12** (1960), 363–366.

- [18] E.D. Kosov, *Marcinkiewicz-type discretization of  $L^p$ -norms under the Nikolskii-type inequality assumption*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **504** (2021), no. 1, 125358.
- [19] M.A. Krasnosel'skii and Ya.B. Rutickii, *Convex Functions and Orlicz Spaces*, Groningen-The Netherlands: P. Noordhoff Ltd., 1961.
- [20] D. Krieg, K. Pozharska, M. Ullrich, and T. Ullrich, *Sampling projections in the uniform norm*, arXiv:2401.02220 (2024).
- [21] D. Krieg, P. Siedlecki, M. Ullrich, and H. Wozniakowski, *Exponential tractability of  $L_2$ -approximation with function values*, Adv. Comput. Math. **49** (2023), no. 2, 18.
- [22] D. Krieg and M. Ullrich, *Function values are enough for  $L_2$ -approximation*, Found. Comput. Math. **21** (2021), 1141–1151.
- [23] D. Krieg and M. Ullrich, *Function values are enough for  $L_2$ -approximation: Part II*, J. Complexity **66** (2021), 101569.
- [24] D. Lewis, *Finite dimensional subspaces of  $L_p$* , Studia Math. **63** (1978), no. 2, 207–212.
- [25] I.V. Limonova, Yu.V. Malykhin, and V.N. Temlyakov, *One-sided discretization inequalities and sampling recovery*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk. **79** (2024), no. 3(477), 149–180.
- [26] N. Nagel, M. Schäfer, and T. Ullrich, *A new upper bound for sampling numbers*, Found. Comput. Math. **22** (2022), no. 2, 445–468.
- [27] E. Novak, *Deterministic and Stochastic Error Bounds in Numerical Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
- [28] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, *Applications of Orlicz Spaces*, Vol. 250, CRC Press, 2002.
- [29] G. Schechtman, *More on embedding subspaces of  $L_p$  in  $\ell_r^n$* , Compositio Math. **61** (1987), no. 2, 159–169.
- [30] G. Schechtman and A. Zvavitch, *Embedding subspaces of  $L_p$  into  $\ell_p^N$ ,  $0 < p < 1$* , Math. Nachr. **227** (2001), no. 1, 133–142.
- [31] M. Talagrand, *Embedding subspaces of  $L_1$  into  $\ell_1^N$* , Proc. AMS **108** (1990), no. 2, 363–369.
- [32] M. Talagrand, *Embedding subspaces of  $L_p$  in  $\ell_p^N$* , Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis: Israel Seminar (GAFA), 1992-94. Basel: Birkhäuser. Oper. Theory, Adv. Appl. 77, 289–293 (1995).
- [33] M. Talagrand, *Upper and Lower Bounds for Stochastic Processes: Modern Methods and Classical Problems*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014.
- [34] V.N. Temlyakov, *On optimal recovery in  $L_2$* , J. Complexity **65** (2021), 101545.
- [35] V.N. Temlyakov, *Multivariate Approximation*, Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [36] J.F. Traub, G.W. Wasilkowski, and H. Wozniakowski, *Information Based Complexity*, Academic Press, Inc., 1988.
- [37] G.W. Wasilkowski and H. Wozniakowski, *On the power of standard information for weighted approximation*, Found. Comput. Math. **1** (2001), 417–434.
- [38] A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric Series*, Volumes I and II combined, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

E. KOISOV, CENTRE DE RECERCA MATEMÀTICA, CAMPUS DE BELLATERRA, EDIFICI C 08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA), SPAIN.

*Email address:* kosoved09@gmail.com

S. TIKHONOV, ICREA, PG. LLUÍS COMPANYS 23, 08010 BARCELONA, SPAIN, CENTRE DE RECERCA MATEMÀTICA CAMPUS DE BELLATERRA, EDIFICI C, 08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA), SPAIN, AND UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA, FACULTAT DE CIÈNCIES, 08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA), SPAIN.

*Email address:* stikhonov@crm.cat