

# ON COMPLETENESS OF ORTHOGONAL SYSTEMS AND DIRAC DELTAS

MARIO PÉREZ RIERA AND JUAN L. VARONA MALUMBRES

Given a positive measure  $\mu$  supported on a set  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , an orthonormal system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  and a point  $a \in \Omega$ , we study the relationship among  $\mu(\{a\})$ , the kernels  $K_n(a, a) = \sum_{k=0}^n \varphi_k(a) \overline{\varphi_k(a)}$  and the denseness of  $\text{span}\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  in  $L^2(\mu)$  and in  $L^2(\nu)$ , where  $\nu = \mu + M\delta_a$ .

## 0. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mu$  be a positive measure supported on a subset  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  and  $\{\varphi_n: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\}_{n \geq 0}$  an orthonormal system in  $L^2(\mu) = L^2(\Omega, \mu)$ . Then

$$\int_{\Omega} \varphi_n \overline{\varphi_m} d\mu = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n \neq m; \\ 1, & \text{if } n = m. \end{cases}$$

The system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is said to be complete in  $L^2(\mu)$  if the set  $\text{span}\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  of finite linear combinations is dense in  $L^2(\mu)$  or, in other terms, if for each  $\Phi \in L^2(\mu)$

$$\int_{\Omega} \Phi \overline{\varphi_n} d\mu = 0 \quad \forall n \geq 0 \iff \Phi = 0 \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

(the orthogonality is not required here).

For each  $n \geq 0$ , set  $\Pi_n = \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda_k \varphi_k; \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$ . The best  $L^2(\mu)$  approximant in  $\Pi_n$  of any  $f \in L^2(\mu)$  is given by the  $n$ -th partial sum of its Fourier series with respect to the set  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ . Thus the best approximant is

$$S_n(f, x) = \sum_{k=0}^n c_k(f) \varphi_k(x) = \int_{\Omega} f(y) K_n(x, y) d\mu(y),$$

where

$$c_k(f) = \int_{\Omega} f \overline{\varphi_k} d\mu, \quad K_n(x, y) = \sum_{k=0}^n \varphi_k(x) \overline{\varphi_k(y)}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |c_k(f)|^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} |f|^2 d\mu \quad \forall f \in L^2(\mu) \tag{1}$$

(Bessel's inequality). If the system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is complete in  $L^2(\mu)$ , then (1) becomes an equality (Parseval's equality) and the approximants  $\{S_n(f)\}_{n \geq 0}$  converge to  $f$  in  $L^2(\mu)$ . This leads to an elementary proof of the following result (see [1, p. 63, 114], [6, p. 45] for more elaborate proofs and only in the case of systems of polynomials):

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification: 42C05, 42C30.

Keywords: orthogonal systems, Dirac deltas, moment problem.

Research supported by DGICYT PB89-0181-C02-02 and by IER.

PAPER PUBLISHED IN: *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **58** (1995), 225–231.

PROPOSITION 1. Let  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  be an orthonormal system in  $L^2(\mu)$  and let  $a \in \Omega$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} \geq \mu(\{a\}) \quad \forall n \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

If  $\mu(\{a\}) > 0$  and  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is complete, then

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} = \mu(\{a\}). \quad (3)$$

*Proof.* We can assume  $0 < \mu(\{a\}) < \infty$ , otherwise the statement holds trivially. Let  $f$  be the characteristic function at the point  $a$ ; then  $c_k(f) = \overline{\varphi_k(a)}\mu(\{a\})$ , so that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |c_k(f)|^2 = \mu(\{a\})^2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(a)|^2$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} |f|^2 d\mu = \mu(\{a\}).$$

Now, (2) and (3) follow from Bessel's and Parseval's formula, respectively. ■

Concerning the measure  $\mu$  and the kernels  $K_n(a, a)$ , we have the following well-known, elementary result (see [3, p. 38, theorem 7.3] or [4, p. 4], for example). In fact, inequality (2) can also be obtained as a corollary of lemma 1.

LEMMA 1. Let  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  be an orthonormal system in  $L^2(\mu)$  and let  $a \in \Omega$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} = \min \int_{\Omega} |R_n|^2 d\mu,$$

where the minimum is taken over all  $R_n \in \Pi_n$  such that  $R_n(a) = 1$ . Furthermore, this minimum is attained for  $R_n(x) = K_n(x, a)/K_n(a, a)$ .

Our aim is to use proposition 1 and lemma 1 to obtain, using elementary techniques, some relations between  $\lim_n K_n(a, a)^{-1}$  and certain properties of completeness of the system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ .

## 1. ADDITION OF A MASS POINT

Obviously, one can not expect (3) to hold if the system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is not complete. If  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is complete but  $\mu(\{a\}) = 0$ , it can also fail, for the values  $\varphi_n(a)$  are  $\mu$ -meaningless; in this case, we will prove that (3) holds if and only if the system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is complete in  $L^2(\nu)$ . Here  $\nu = \mu + M\delta_a$ , where  $\delta_a$  is a Dirac delta on  $a$ ,  $M > 0$  and as a consequence

$$\int_{\Omega} f d\nu = \int_{\Omega} f d\mu + Mf(a).$$

The system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  may not be orthogonal in  $L^2(\nu)$ , but it can be orthonormalized so as to get an orthonormal system  $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  in  $L^2(\nu)$ , such that  $\psi_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda_{n,k} \varphi_k$ , with  $\lambda_{n,n} \neq 0$ . Clearly, if  $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  (or, equivalently,  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ ) is complete in  $L^2(\nu)$ , then  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is also complete in  $L^2(\mu)$ , but the converse is not true, in general.

In view of (3), we will mainly deal with the case  $\mu(\{a\}) = 0$ . However, note that if  $\mu(\{a\}) > 0$  then the measures  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  are equivalent and so  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is complete in  $L^2(\mu)$  if and only if  $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is complete in  $L^2(\nu)$  (for the same reason,  $M$  could be taken equal to 1).

Let us state our first result (another proof of part “a)  $\implies$  b)” can be found in [2, lemma 2]):

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is a complete orthonormal system in  $L^2(\mu)$ ,  $\mu(\{a\}) = 0$  and  $\nu = \mu + M\delta_a$ , then the following properties are equivalent:*

a)  $\lim_n \frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} = 0$ ;

b)  $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is a complete orthonormal system in  $L^2(\nu)$ .

*Proof.* a)  $\implies$  b): Suppose  $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is not complete in  $L^2(\nu)$ ; then, there exists  $\Phi \in L^2(\nu)$ ,  $\Phi \neq 0$ , such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \Phi \bar{\psi}_n d\nu = 0 \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

We can also assume

$$\int_{\Omega} |\Phi|^2 d\nu = 1,$$

so that  $\{\Phi\} \cup \{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is an orthonormal system in  $L^2(\nu)$ . Furthermore,  $\Phi(a) \neq 0$ , otherwise it would be orthogonal to  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  in  $L^2(\mu)$  and therefore  $\Phi = 0$   $\mu$  and  $\nu$  a.e.

Put  $D_n(a, a) = \sum_{k=0}^n |\psi_k(a)|^2$ . Then, by (2) applied to  $\{\Phi\} \cup \{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ , the fact  $\Phi(a) \neq 0$ , and lemma 1 respectively, we have the chain of inequalities

$$M = \nu(\{a\}) \leq \lim_n \frac{1}{|\Phi(a)|^2 + D_n(a, a)} < \lim_n \frac{1}{D_n(a, a)} = \lim_n \frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} + M$$

and so

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} > 0,$$

which is a contradiction.

b)  $\implies$  a): By (3) applied to  $\{\Phi\} \cup \{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  and lemma 1,

$$M = \lim_n \frac{1}{D_n(a, a)} = \lim_n \frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} + M$$

which gives a). ■

Under the conditions of theorem 1, the orthonormal system  $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  may not be complete in  $L^2(\nu)$ , but in this case it becomes complete by adding just one new function:

PROPOSITION 2. Let  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  be a complete system in  $L^2(\mu)$ ,  $\mu(\{a\}) = 0$  and  $\nu = \mu + M\delta_a$  and suppose  $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is not complete in  $L^2(\nu)$ . Then, the system  $\{\Phi\} \cup \{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is orthogonal ( $\Phi$  is not normalized) and complete in  $L^2(\nu)$ , where

$$\Phi(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varphi_k(x) \overline{\varphi_k(a)}, & \text{if } x \neq a; \\ -\frac{1}{M}, & \text{if } x = a. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By theorem 1,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(a)|^2 < \infty.$$

Then, as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left| \sum_{k=n}^m \varphi_k(x) \overline{\varphi_k(a)} \right|^2 d\nu(x) \\ &= M \sum_{k=n}^m |\varphi_k(a)|^2 + \int_{\Omega} \left| \sum_{k=n}^m \varphi_k(x) \overline{\varphi_k(a)} \right|^2 d\mu(x) = (M+1) \sum_{k=n}^m |\varphi_k(a)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

the series  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varphi_k(x) \overline{\varphi_k(a)}$  converges in  $L^2(\nu)$  because its partial sums constitute a Cauchy sequence in  $L^2(\nu)$ . So  $\Phi$  is a well defined function in  $L^2(\nu)$ . Now,

$$\int_{\Omega} \varphi_n \overline{\Phi} d\nu = M\varphi_n(a) \overline{\Phi(a)} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varphi_k(a) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_n \overline{\varphi_k} d\mu = 0$$

for every  $n \geq 0$ ; therefore, we also have

$$\int_{\Omega} \psi_n \overline{\Phi} d\nu = 0 \quad \forall n \geq 0$$

and  $\{\Phi\} \cup \{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is an orthogonal system in  $L^2(\nu)$ . In order to prove that it is complete in  $L^2(\nu)$ , it is enough to check that

$$f \in L^2(\nu), \quad \int_{\Omega} f \overline{\psi_n} d\nu = 0 \quad \forall n \geq 0 \quad \implies \quad f = C\Phi \quad \nu\text{-a.e.}$$

If

$$\int_{\Omega} f \overline{\psi_n} d\nu = 0 \quad \forall n \geq 0$$

then

$$\int_{\Omega} f \overline{\varphi_n} d\nu = 0 \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} (f + Mf(a)\Phi)\overline{\varphi}_n d\mu = \int_{\Omega} (f + Mf(a)\Phi)\overline{\varphi}_n d\nu = 0 \quad \forall n \geq 0,$$

i.e.,

$$f + Mf(a)\Phi = 0 \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

and so

$$f + Mf(a)\Phi = 0 \quad \nu\text{-a.e.} \blacksquare$$

EXAMPLE. Let  $\mathbb{T}$  be the unit circle,  $\Omega = \mathbb{T} \cup \{0\}$  and  $\mu$  the measure

$$\int_{\Omega} f d\mu = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(e^{i\theta}) d\theta.$$

Let  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be given by  $\varphi_n(z) = z^n$  for  $n \geq 0$  and  $\varphi_n(z) = (\overline{z})^{-n}$  for  $n < 0$  (the system is indexed in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , but this makes no difference). This system is orthonormal and complete in  $L^2(\mu)$ . Take  $\nu = \mu + \delta_0$ . Then, the system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is not complete in  $L^2(\nu)$  and  $\Phi(0) = -1$ ,  $\Phi(z) = 1$  for  $z \in \mathbb{T}$ .

Given any finite positive measure  $\nu$  supported on the unit circle, the orthonormal system obtained from  $\{z^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is complete in  $L^2(\nu)$  (see, e.g. [1, p. 180, theorem 5.1.2]). Then, if we consider a finite positive measure  $\mu$  supported on the unit circle and the orthonormal system  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  obtained from  $\{z^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , part b) in theorem 1 holds, so that part a) also holds.

In contrast, the real case is more interesting, as we see in the next section.

## 2. ORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS ON THE REAL LINE

In the following we will consider a system  $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  of polynomials ( $p_n$  of degree  $n$ ) orthonormal with respect to some positive measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

The measure  $\mu$  is said to be determinate if there does not exist any other positive measure  $\eta$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} x^n d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^n d\eta(x) \quad \forall n \geq 0;$$

otherwise,  $\mu$  is said to be indeterminate.

The system  $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is complete in  $L^2(d\mu)$  if and only if  $\mu$  is *N-extremal* (see [5]). Every determinate measure is *N-extremal*, and every indeterminate *N-extremal* measure is a countable sum of Dirac deltas (see [2]).

If  $\mu$  is determinate, then

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} = \mu(\{a\}) \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R} \quad (4)$$

(see, e.g., [6, p. 45, corollary 2.6]), while if  $\mu$  is indeterminate then

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{K_n(a, a)} > 0 \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{C} \quad (5)$$

(see, e.g., [1, p. 50] and [6, p. 50, corollary 2.7]).

Now, the previous results provide a simple proof of the following:

THEOREM 2. Let  $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  be a system of polynomials orthonormal with respect to a positive measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $M > 0$ ,  $\nu = \mu + M\delta_a$ . Then:

- a)  $\mu$  indeterminate  $N$ -extremal,  $\mu(\{a\}) = 0 \implies \nu$  indeterminate not  $N$ -extremal.
- b)  $\mu$  indeterminate  $N$ -extremal,  $\mu(\{a\}) > 0 \implies \nu$  indeterminate  $N$ -extremal.
- c)  $\mu$  indeterminate not  $N$ -extremal  $\implies \nu$  indeterminate not  $N$ -extremal.
- d)  $\mu$  determinate,  $\mu(\{a\}) = 0 \implies \nu$  determinate or indeterminate  $N$ -extremal.
- e)  $\mu$  determinate,  $\mu(\{a\}) > 0 \implies \nu$  determinate.

*Proof.* a), b) and c): since  $\mu$  is indeterminate,  $\nu = \mu + M\delta_a$  is also indeterminate. Now, if  $\mu$  is not  $N$ -extremal (i.e. the polynomials are not dense in  $L^2(\mu)$ ) then clearly  $\nu$  is not  $N$ -extremal. If  $\mu$  is  $N$ -extremal and  $\mu(\{a\}) > 0$ , then  $\nu$  is also  $N$ -extremal, for both measures are equivalent. Finally, if  $\mu(\{a\}) = 0$ , from (5) and theorem 1 it follows that the polynomials are not dense in  $L^2(\nu)$ .

d) and e): if  $\mu$  is determinate, from (4) and theorem 1 it follows that the polynomials are dense in  $L^2(\nu)$ , so that  $\nu$  is either determinate or indeterminate  $N$ -extremal. This proves d). Now, assume  $\mu(\{a\}) > 0$ . Then,  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are equivalent measures. Take  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mu(\{b\}) = 0$ . Applying d), the measure  $\mu + \delta_b$  is  $N$ -extremal. Since  $\mu + \delta_b$  is equivalent to  $\nu + \delta_b$ , this measure is also  $N$ -extremal. By part a),  $\nu$  can not be indeterminate  $N$ -extremal, so that it is determinate. ■

REMARK. Both cases in part d) can actually occur. Indeed, if

$$\nu = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} M_k \delta_{a_k}$$

is either indeterminate  $N$ -extremal (every indeterminate  $N$ -extremal measure is of this form) or determinate (take, for example,  $\{a_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  bounded), it can be shown that the measure

$$\mu = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k \delta_{a_k}$$

is determinate. A proof can be seen in [2]; it is also a consequence of inequality (5) and theorem 1.

In this context, let us mention that, in case d), if the measure  $\mu$  is not discrete, then  $\nu$  is not discrete; therefore, it must be also determinate.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] N. I. Akhiezer, *The Classical Moment Problem* (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1965).
- [2] C. Berg and J. P. R. Christensen, Density questions in the classical theory of moments, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **31** (1981), 99–114.
- [3] T. S. Chihara, *An Introduction to Orthogonal Polynomials* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1978).
- [4] P. Nevai, Orthogonal Polynomials, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **213** (1979).
- [5] M. Riesz, Sur le problème des moments et le théorème de Parseval correspondant, *Acta Litt. Ac. Sci. Szeged* **1** (1923), 209–225.

[6] J. A. Shohat and J. D. Tamarkin, *The Problem of Moments* (Math. Surveys No. 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1970).

Mario Pérez Riera  
Dpto. de Matemáticas  
Universidad de Zaragoza  
50009 Zaragoza  
Spain.

Juan L. Varona Malumbres  
Dpto. de Matemáticas y Computación  
Universidad de La Rioja  
26004 Logroño  
Spain.

e-mail: [jvarona@cc.unizar.es](mailto:jvarona@cc.unizar.es)