

SOME REMARKS ON A PROOF OF GEOMETRICAL PALEY–WIENER THEOREMS FOR THE DUNKL TRANSFORM

MARCEL DE JEU

ABSTRACT. We argue that a proof of the geometrical form of the Paley–Wiener theorems for the Dunkl transform in the literature is not correct.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [3] a proof of the geometrical form of the Paley–Wiener theorems for the Dunkl transform is presented. In our opinion, however, this proof is not correct. We have informed the author of the details underlying this opinion from November 2003 onward, but at the time of writing he has not refuted our remarks, or agreed with them, or given an alternative correct proof, or expressed the intention to publish an Erratum.

The material which was communicated to the author is presented below. It is our opinion that at this moment the geometrical forms of the Paley–Wiener theorems for the Dunkl transform are still unproven.

2. ARGUMENTS

In [3] the geometric form of the Paley-Wiener theorem for the Dunkl transform is stated for functions and for distributions, as Theorems 6.2 and 6.3, respectively. The crucial ingredient in the proof of these results is Proposition 6.3. Our arguments concern the proof of this proposition. In formulating them, we will use the notation and definitions of [3].

In the proof of Proposition 6.3, a W -invariant compact convex subset E of \mathbb{R}^d is considered. For $x \in E$ fixed, the function f_x on \mathbb{R}^d is defined as

$$(2.1) \quad f_x(y) = \frac{e^{-i(x,y)}}{(1 + \|y\|^2)^p} \quad (y \in \mathbb{R}^d),$$

where p is an integer such that $p \geq \gamma + d/2 + 1$. Since the constant γ is assumed to be strictly positive in line 3 on page 29, we see that $p \geq 2$.

The function F_x is defined on \mathbb{R}^d in equation (69) as essentially the inverse Dunkl transform of f_x , namely

$$F_x(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_x(y) K(iy, t) \omega_k(y) dy \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Following this definition, it is observed that F_x is continuous.

After a computation involving Riemann sums and contour integration, it is then concluded on line -3 on page 31 that F_x has support in the set E . Since E is

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 33C52; Secondary 33C67.
Key words and phrases. Dunkl transform, Paley–Wiener theorem.

compact, one sees—if the line of reasoning in [3] is correct—that F_x is a compactly supported continuous function.

But this never holds. Indeed, if F_x were compactly supported, then f_x could be reconstructed from F_x as is stated in the last line on page 31 (an application of the inversion theorem for the Dunkl transform):

$$(2.2) \quad f_x(y) = \frac{C_k^2}{2^{2\gamma+d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F_x(t) K(-iy, t) \omega_k(t) dt \quad (y \in \mathbb{R}^d).$$

However, as with the ordinary Fourier transform, the fact that F_x is a continuous function with compact support implies [1, Part 3 of Lemma 4.4] that its Dunkl transform has an entire extension to \mathbb{C}^d , i.e., that f_x has an entire extension to \mathbb{C}^d . But it follows from (2.1), written as

$$f_x(y) = \frac{e^{-i(x,y)}}{(1+(y,y))^p},$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) is the holomorphic standard bilinear form on \mathbb{C}^d , that f_x has no such extension from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{C}^d , since this extension would have a pole along the divisor $\{y \in \mathbb{C}^d \mid (y, y) = -1\}$, as a consequence of the fact that $p \geq 2$. This is a contradiction, so F_x can never have compact support.

The above argument shows that F_x can never be a continuous function with compact support, but apart from that it is also easy to give an elementary counterexample to the claim in [3] that F_x always has these properties, as follows. Consider the W -invariant compact convex set $E = \{0\}$ and choose $x = 0 \in E$. Then the fact that the continuous function F_0 has support in E implies that $F_0 = 0$. But in that case (2.2) implies that $f_0 = 0$, contradicting (2.1).

The fact that F_x has support in E is the cornerstone of the proof of Proposition 6.3 and therefore also of the proof of the geometrical Paley–Wiener theorems in [3]. Since this statement is in fact false, as shown above, we consider the proof of the geometrical Paley–Wiener theorems in [3] to be incorrect.

Remark 2.1. The crucial mistake in the line of reasoning which leads to the statement that F_x has support in E appears to be the following.

In line -9 on page 31 it is stated that, after shifting the domain of integration over $i\eta$ for $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, one has

$$(2.3) \quad F_x(t) = \frac{1}{(i\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i(x, u+i\eta)} K(i(u+i\eta), t) m_k(u+i\eta) du \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Following this it is claimed that an application of equation (20) in [3], i.e., an application of the estimate

$$(2.4) \quad |K(x, z)| \leq \exp(\|x\| \|\operatorname{Re} z\|) \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^d, z \in \mathbb{C}^d)$$

implies—here one also uses the symmetry of the Dunkl kernel—that

$$(2.5) \quad |F_x(t)| \leq \frac{e^{(I_E(\eta) - (t, \eta))}}{\pi^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |m_k(u+i\eta)| du \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}^d),$$

where $I_E(\eta) = \sup_{x \in E} (x, \eta)$. Next it is argued that (2.5) implies the crucial fact that $F_x(t) = 0$ if $t \notin E$, by shifting the domain to infinity in a direction depending on t .

However, the estimate in (2.5) does not follow from (2.3) and (2.4). One can only conclude that

$$(2.6) \quad |F_x(t)| \leq \frac{e^{(I_E(\eta) + \|t\|\|\eta\|)}}{\pi^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |m_k(u + i\eta)| \, du \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}^d).$$

But then shifting the domain of integration no longer works. If one chooses, e.g., for E a ball with radius R centered at the origin, then a factor $e^{(R + \|t\|)\|\eta\|}$ appears before the integral in (2.6), and this factor has exponential growth in any direction for η , rather than exponential decay.

Remark 2.2. If the multiplicity is strictly positive, then in the one-dimensional case the kernel $K(iy, x)$ has exponential growth if $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{R}$ is fixed and y tends to infinity in the imaginary direction through the upper or lower half plane. The choice of the half plane is immaterial, quite in contrast to the ordinary exponential function. The available estimates for the Dunkl kernel suggest that the same behaviour may occur in any dimension. As a consequence, shifting the domain of integration is in our opinion not likely to work as long as the integrand contains the Dunkl kernel as a factor. This technical difficulty was already observed in [2] and the above remarks about the proof of the geometrical Paley–Wiener theorems in [3] seem to underline this observation.

REFERENCES

- [1] M.F.E. de Jeu, *The Dunkl transform*, Invent. math. **113** (1993), 147–162.
- [2] M.F.E. de Jeu, *Dunkl operators*, Thesis, Leiden University, 1994.
- [3] K. Trimèche, *Paley–Wiener theorems for the Dunkl transform and Dunkl translation operators*, Integral Transforms Spec. Funct. **13** (2002), 17–38.

M.F.E. DE JEU, MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, LEIDEN UNIVERSITY, P.O. BOX 9512, 2300 RA LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS

E-mail address: mdejeu@math.leidenuniv.nl