

ERROR OF TIKHONOV'S REGULARIZATION FOR INTEGRAL CONVOLUTION EQUATIONS

DANG DUC TRONG AND TRUONG TRUNG TUYEN

ABSTRACT. Let φ be a nontrivial function of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. For each $s \geq 0$ we put

$$p(s) = -\log \int_{|t| \geq s} |\varphi(t)| dt.$$

If φ satisfies

$$(0.1) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p(s)}{s} = \infty,$$

we obtain asymptotic estimates of the size of small-valued sets $B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \leq \epsilon, |x| \leq R_\epsilon\}$ of Fourier transform

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ixt} \varphi(t) dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

in terms of $p(s)$ or in terms of its Young dual function

$$p^*(t) = \sup_{s \geq 0} [st - p(s)], \quad t \geq 0.$$

Applying these results, we give an explicit estimate for the error of Tikhonov's regularization for the solution f of the integral convolution equation

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t-s) \varphi(s) ds = g(t),$$

where $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and φ is a nontrivial function of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying condition (0.1), and g, φ are known non-exactly. Also, our results extend some results of [4] and [5].

1. INTRODUCTION

Let φ be a nontrivial function of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. Then its Fourier transform is defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ixt} \varphi(t) dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Date: October 20, 2018.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 30D15, 31A15, 44A10, 65F22.

Key words and phrases. Class Cartwright; Cartan's theorem; Fourier and Laplace transforms; Integral convolution equation; Tikhonov's regularization; Young dual function.

If φ is of compact support, there associates an entire function of exponential type of Laplace transform type

$$(1.1) \quad \Phi(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{zt} \varphi(t) dt.$$

Generally, if $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{|t|s} |\varphi(t)| dt < \infty,$$

for all $s > 0$ then Φ in (1.1) is defined on all over the complex plane \mathbb{C} and is an entire function, but its order may be any positive number. If $\varphi \geq 0$ then condition (1.2) is also necessary for Φ to be an entire function. Indeed, in this case we have, for every $R > 0$,

$$\max_{|z| \leq R} |\Phi(z)| \geq \frac{1}{2} (\Phi(R) + \Phi(-R)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{|t|R} \varphi(t) dt.$$

As we will show in Section 2, the growth of $\Phi(z)$ is related to the function

$$(1.3) \quad p(s) = -\log \int_{|t| \geq s} |\varphi(t)| dt, \quad s \geq 0.$$

In fact, Theorem 3 show that Young dual function $p^*(s)$ of $p(t)$, defined by

$$p^*(s) = \sup_{t \geq 0} [st - p(t)], \quad s \geq 0,$$

is an appropriate quantity to estimate the growth of $\log |\Phi(z)|$. It turns out that φ satisfies (1.2) if and only if it satisfies

$$(1.4) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p(s)}{s} = \infty.$$

Properties of Fourier and Laplace transforms are of great interest because these functions often occur in different areas of calculus. As a typical application, Fourier transforms give us the direct solution of integral convolution equations. These problems, so-called deconvolution problems (see, e.g.[7]), arise in applications: an input signal f generates an output signal g by the formula

$$Af = \int_D \varphi(x, \gamma) f(\gamma) d\gamma = g(x), \quad x \in D.$$

Often one has

$$(1.5) \quad Af = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(t-s) f(s) ds = g(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\varphi(t) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. The deconvolution problem consists of finding f , given g and $\varphi(x, \gamma)$. For (1.5), another problem, so-called the identification problem, is of practical interest: given f and g , find $\varphi(t)$. The function $\varphi(t)$ characterizes the linear system which generates the output $g(t)$ given the input $f(t)$.

Now if f is the solution of (1.5), applying Fourier transform to both sides of (1.5) we get

$$(1.6) \quad \widehat{f} = \frac{\widehat{g}}{\widehat{\varphi}}.$$

Then apply the inverse Fourier transform we find f . We may see easily from equation (1.6) that f depends nonlinearly on φ .

As easily seen, in case φ has compact support, the set of zeros of $\widehat{\varphi}(z) \equiv \Phi(-iz)$ effects largely the recovering the function f from its Fourier transform. Since $\widehat{\varphi}(z)$ is a function of class Cartwright, that is

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\log^+ |\widehat{\varphi}(t)|}{1+t^2} dt \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\log^+ \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R})}}{1+t^2} dt < \infty,$$

the distribution of its zeros is well known (see, e.g., [6]). In a recent paper [9], Sedletsii obtained some detailed properties of the set of zeros of Φ for a subclass of functions f that is of $L^1(0, 1)$ and positive (see also references in [9]).

However, for really computing the solution f and for the regularization of equation (1.5), we must know more about the structure of the small-valued sets of Φ . This problem goes back to the well-known theorem of Cartan about the size of the small-valued sets $B_\epsilon = \{z \in \mathcal{C} : |P(z)| \leq \epsilon\}$ where $P(z)$ is a polynomial. He proved that B_ϵ is contained in a finite of disks whose sum of radii is less than $C_1 \epsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}$ where n is the degree of $P(z)$ and C_1 is a constant that depends only on the leading coefficient of $P(z)$ and n (see Theorem 3 of §11.2 in [6]). In particular we have

$$(1.7) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} m(B_\epsilon) = 0,$$

where $m(\cdot)$ is the Lebesgue's measure. For general case of entire functions, the conclusion (1.7) does not hold, for even simple functions such as e^z , instead of many results representing the structure of B_ϵ (see, e.g., [6]).

Recently, in seeking regularization schemes for the problem of determination of heat source in one and two dimensional, the authors in [4] and [5] proved that Φ in (1.1) has only finitely many zeros on the positive real-axis if φ is of a fairly wide subclass of $L^2(0, 1)$. Indeed, as easily seen, the results in [4] and [5] depend only on the estimate of the size of the set

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbf{R} : |\Phi(x)| \leq \epsilon, |x| \leq R_\epsilon\},$$

where γ, Φ are as above and $R_\gamma > 0$ depends on γ .

In this paper, we will give some asymptotic estimates for the small-valued sets

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbf{R} : |\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \leq \epsilon, |x| \leq R_\epsilon\},$$

to functions φ satisfying condition (1.4) and apply these estimates to the Tikhonov's regularization of Problem (1.5). Also, our results extend some

results in [4] and [5]. For convenience, we recall briefly Tikhonov's regularization before stating results.

The difficulty of applying direct formula (1.6) arises in two aspects: one, in reality we can not have the exact data (φ_0, g_0) but only the measured data $(\varphi_\epsilon, g_\epsilon)$, and two, even for the case in which we have the exact data, the inverse Fourier transform may not be efficiently computed if $\widehat{\varphi_0}$ has zeros on the real axis. Hence a regularization is needed.

Let $\epsilon > 0$, we denote by (φ_0, g_0) the exact data and $(\varphi_\epsilon, g_\epsilon)$ the measured data with the tolerable error ϵ , that is

$$(1.8) \quad \epsilon \geq \max\{\|\varphi_0 - \varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}, \|g_0 - g_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\}.$$

Tikhonov's regularization applied to equation (1.5) is to construct an approximation f_ϵ whose Fourier transform is

$$(1.9) \quad \widehat{f}_\epsilon = \frac{\widehat{g_\epsilon \varphi_\epsilon}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2},$$

where $\delta_\epsilon > 0$ is a regularization parameter appropriately chosen depending on ϵ .

We have the following general estimate for the error $\|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ (see also [2] and Chapter 10 in [3] for similar estimates).

Theorem 1. *Let β be a constant in $(0, \frac{1}{3})$. Let $f_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ be the exact solution of (1.5) corresponding to $\varphi_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, $g_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be small, $\varphi_\epsilon, g_\epsilon$ be as in (1.8) and let f_ϵ be as in (1.9), where $\delta_\epsilon = \sqrt[4]{\frac{C_1}{C_2}} \epsilon^{(1+3\beta)/2}$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= 4(1 + \|g_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|\varphi_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^2), \\ C_2 &= 1 + \|g_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $R_\epsilon > 0$ be a sequence such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} R_\epsilon = \infty.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 &\leq 3 \left[\int_{|\lambda| > R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 d\lambda \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{|\lambda| < R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 d\lambda + 2\sqrt{C_1 C_2} \epsilon^{1-3\beta} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $F(f_0)(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_0(x) e^{-i\lambda x} dx$ is the Fourier transform of f_0 and $\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_0(x) e^{-i\lambda x} dx$ is the Fourier transform of φ_0 .

If φ_0 satisfies condition (1.2), we can show that the bound of $\|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ in above Theorem decreases to zero as ϵ decreases to zero. This

assertion comes easily from

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{|\lambda| > R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 d\lambda + \int_{|\lambda| < R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 d\lambda \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \chi_{\{|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta\}} |F(f_0)|^2 d\lambda = 0, \end{aligned}$$

by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem.

However, to get a more explicit estimate for $\|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}$ some a-priori information about f_0 must be assumed. For example, in Chapter 10 of [3] (see also [2]), the author gave estimates for $\|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}$ in the case the kernel φ_0 is of two special types of L^1 functions (see conditions (10.4) and (10.10) in [3]) and in additionally, the solution f_0 satisfies the condition

$$(1.10) \quad |\widehat{f_0}(\lambda)|^2 \leq C_1(1 + |\lambda|^2)^{-q}, \lambda \in \mathbf{R},$$

for some $q > \frac{1}{2}$.

Condition (10.4) in [3] is a set of four conditions and condition (10.10) in [3] is that

$$(1.11) \quad |\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|^2 \geq C_0 e^{-a\lambda}, \lambda > 0,$$

where $a, C > 0$ are constants. While condition (1.10) imposed on f_0 is natural and is easily verified (for example, if $f_0 \in W^{1,1}(\mathbf{R})$ we have $|\widehat{f_0}(\lambda)|^2 \leq C_0(1 + |\lambda|^2)^{-1}$), conditions (10.4) and (10.10) above may not hold for a general kernel $\varphi_0 \in L^1(\mathbf{R})$ and fairly difficult to verify for a concrete kernel φ_0 in particularly in the case φ_0 is known non-exactly.

In this paper, we will give estimates for error of Tikhonov's regularization for Problem (1.5) for the case the solution f_0 satisfies (1.10) and the kernel φ_0 satisfies (1.4). As we will show in Section 2, this class consists of functions satisfying condition (1.2).

For each $\epsilon > 0$ we put

$$(1.12) \quad s_\epsilon = \inf\{s > 0 : e^{-p(s)} \leq \epsilon\},$$

where $p(s)$ is as in (1.4).

Our main result is the following theorem. The estimate of our result in the case φ_0 has compact support is comparable to the estimate $\|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})} \leq C(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon})^{-q+\frac{1}{2}}$ gave in Theorem 10.8 in [3] (which uses additionally condition (1.11) in its proof).

Theorem 2. *Let assumptions be as in Theorem 1. In additional, assume that f_0 satisfies condition (1.10) and φ_0 satisfies condition (1.4). For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough choose s_ϵ as in (1.12) and $R_\epsilon > 0$ satisfying*

$$[(q + \frac{1}{2}) \log R_\epsilon + \log(15e^3)][\log \|\varphi_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R})} + 2es_\epsilon R_\epsilon] = -\log(\epsilon^\beta + \epsilon).$$

Then

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} R_\epsilon = \infty,$$

and there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ independent of ϵ such that

$$\|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})} \leq C_3 R_\epsilon^{-q+\frac{1}{2}},$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. In particular, in case φ_0 is of compact support then s_ϵ is bounded for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, hence

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log R_\epsilon}{\log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}} = 1.$$

Proof. The existence of R_ϵ is easily seen by considering the function

$$f(R) = [(q + \frac{1}{2}) \log R + \log(15e^3)] [\log \|\varphi_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R})} + 2es_\epsilon R], \quad R \geq 0.$$

Condition (1.4) gives

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} R_\epsilon = \infty.$$

By Theorem 1 and condition (1.10), there exists $C_4 > 0$ such that

$$\|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})} \leq C_4 (R^{-q+\frac{1}{2}} + m(B_\epsilon) + \epsilon^{1-3\beta}),$$

where $m(B_\epsilon)$ is the Lebesgue's measure of the set

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbf{R} : |\widehat{\varphi_0}(x)| \leq \epsilon^\beta, |x| \leq R_\epsilon\}.$$

Now apply Theorem 5 we get the conclusion of Theorem 2. \square

The rest of this paper consists of three sections. In Section 2 we explore some properties of entire functions of Laplace transform type. In Section 3 we state and prove estimates of the size of small-valued sets for entire functions of Laplace transform type and for Fourier transforms. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.

2. PROPERTIES OF LAPLACE TRANSFORMS

In this section we explore some properties of entire functions of type (1.1), where $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbf{R})$ satisfies condition (1.2).

First we consider the case φ has a compact support. Without loss of generality, we assume the support of φ is contained in $[0, 1]$. So the function Φ in (1.1) take a simpler form

$$\Phi(z) = \int_0^1 e^{zt} \varphi(t) dt,$$

where $\varphi(t)$ is a nontrivial function of $L^1(0, 1)$.

We put

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \inf\{a \in [0, 1] : \varphi|_{[a, 1]} = 0 \text{ a.e.}\}, \\ \mu &= \sup\{a \in [0, 1] : \varphi|_{[0, a]} = 0 \text{ a.e.}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1. *(On order and type of Φ)*

- i) *Order of Φ is unity.*
- ii) *Type of Φ is σ .*
- iii) *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(R)|}{R} &= \sigma, \\ \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{R} &= -\mu.\end{aligned}$$

Before proving Lemma 1 we recall that (see e.g. [6]) if $\Phi(z)$ is an entire function then its order ρ (or $\text{ord}(\Phi)$ for short) and type σ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log M_{\Phi}(r)}{\log r}, \\ \sigma &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M_{\Phi}(r)}{r^{\rho}},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_{\Phi}(r) = \max_{|z| \leq r} |\Phi(z)|.$$

Proof. i) We have

$$|\Phi(z)| \leq C e^{|z|},$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $C = \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. It follows that $\text{ord}(\Phi) \leq 1$.

Now we show $\text{ord}(\Phi) = 1$. Assume by contradiction that $\text{ord}(\Phi) < 1$.

Applying Theorem 1 in §6.1 in [6] for domains $\{-\frac{\pi}{2} < \arg z < \frac{\pi}{2}\}$ and $\{\frac{\pi}{2} < \arg z < \frac{3\pi}{2}\}$, noting that Φ is bounded on the imaginery-axis, we have that Φ is bounded on \mathbb{C} . Thus Φ is a constant, so $\Phi'(z) \equiv 0$. Thus we have $t\varphi \equiv 0$ or equivalently $\varphi \equiv 0$, since

$$\Phi'(z) = \int_0^1 e^{zt} t \varphi(t) dt,$$

which is a contradiction.

ii) We have the type of Φ is less than or equal to σ because

$$|\Phi(z)| = \left| \int_0^{\sigma} e^{zt} \varphi(t) dt \right| \leq e^{\sigma|z|} \int_0^{\sigma} |\varphi(t)| dt.$$

We prove an equivalent result: If $a \in [0, 1]$ is so that φ is not identity to zero in $[a, 1]$ then the type of Φ is greater than or equal to a .

We assume by contradiction that the type of Φ is less than a .

We consider the function

$$\Gamma(z) = e^{-az} \int_a^1 e^{zt} \varphi(t) dt.$$

If $z > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(z)| &= |e^{-az}\Phi(z) - e^{-az} \int_0^a e^{zt}\varphi(t)| \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

when $z \rightarrow +\infty$ on \mathbb{R} . Indeed, because of our contradiction assumption that the type of Φ is less than a it follows

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} e^{-az}\Phi(z) = 0,$$

while by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem applied to the sequence $g_z(t) = e^{z(t-a)}\varphi(t)$ on $[0, a]$ it follows that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} e^{-az} \int_0^a e^{zt}\varphi(t)dt = \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^a g_z(t)dt = 0.$$

If $z < 0$, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem as above we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(z)| &= e^{a|z|} \left| \int_a^1 e^{-|z|t}\varphi(t)dt \right| \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

when $z \rightarrow -\infty$ on \mathbb{R} .

If z is purely imaginary, we have

$$|\Gamma(z)| \leq C.$$

Applying Theorem 1 in §6.1 in [6] for domains $\{0 < \arg z < \frac{\pi}{2}\}$, $\{\frac{\pi}{2} < \arg z < \pi\}$, $\{\pi < \arg z < \frac{3\pi}{2}\}$ and $\{\frac{3\pi}{2} < \arg z < 2\pi\}$ we get $|\Gamma(z)| \leq C$ for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$, which implies that $\Gamma(z) = \text{constant}$, a contradiction (qed).

iii) We prove similarly to the proof of ii). We prove first that

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{R} = -\mu.$$

If $R > 0$ we have

$$|\Phi(-R)| = \left| \int_{\mu}^1 e^{-Rt}\varphi(t)dt \right| \leq e^{-R\mu} \|\varphi\|_{L^1(0,1)},$$

hence

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{R} \leq -\mu.$$

Thus, in order to prove the equality required, we need to show only that: if $a > \mu$ then

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{R} \geq -a.$$

Assume by contradiction that

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{R} < -a,$$

for some $a > \mu$. We consider

$$\Gamma(z) = e^{-az} \int_0^a e^{zt} \varphi(t) dt.$$

By arguments in ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} |\Gamma(R)| &= 0, \\ \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} |\Gamma(-R)| &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} |e^{aR} \Phi(-R) - e^{aR} \int_a^1 e^{-Rt} \varphi(t) dt| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus as in ii) we have $\Gamma(z)$ is a constant, which is a contradiction. The proof of

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(R)|}{R} = \sigma$$

is similar and indeed was contained in the proof of ii). \square

Lemma 2. (*On zeros of Φ*)

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} n(R) = \infty$$

and

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(R)}{R} = \frac{d}{\pi} := \frac{\sigma - \mu}{\pi},$$

where $n(R) = \{z : |z| \leq R, \Phi(z) = 0\}$.

Proof. First we show that Φ has infinitely many zeros. Indeed, if Φ has only finitely many zeros, since Φ is of order 1, by Hadamard's theorem we may write

$$\Phi(z) = e^{az} P(z),$$

where P is a polynomial.

So if we differentiate $e^{-az} \Phi(z)$ m times, where m is greater than the order of $P(z)$ we obtain

$$\int_0^1 e^{z(t-a)} (t-a)^m \varphi(t) dt \equiv 0,$$

so $\varphi \equiv 0$, a contradiction.

We have $|\Phi(it)| \leq C = \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ if $t \in \mathbb{R}$. So

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\log^+ |\Phi(it)|}{1+t^2} dt \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\log^+ C}{1+t^2} dt < \infty.$$

Thus $\Phi(iz)$ is of class Cartwright (see Lecture 16 in [6]).

Applying Theorem 1 of §17.2 in [6], we have

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(R)}{R} = \frac{d}{\pi}$$

where d is the width of the indicator diagram of $\Phi(iz)$, i.e.

$$d = \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(R)|}{R} + \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{R}.$$

By Lemma 1 iii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(R)|}{R} &= \sigma, \\ \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{R} &= -\mu. \end{aligned}$$

So $d = \sigma - \mu$. \square

Lemma 3. (*On representation of Φ*). Denote $\mathcal{C}^+ = \{z \in \mathcal{C} : \operatorname{Im} z > 0\}$. i.e. \mathcal{C}^+ is the upper half-plane. Then

$$\Phi(z) = Cz^m e^{\frac{\sigma+\mu}{2}z} \prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{R}} \left(1 - \frac{z}{z_i}\right) \prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{C}^+} \left(1 - z\left(\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\bar{z}_i}\right) + \frac{z^2}{|z_i|^2}\right),$$

where $C \in \mathcal{R}$.

Proof. Applying Theorem 1 of §17.2 in [6] for $\Phi(iz)$, if $\{z_k\}$, $z_k \neq 0$ are zeros of Φ then

$$\sum_k \left| \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{z_k} \right| < \infty.$$

Applying Hadamard's theorem, noting that $\Phi(\bar{z}) = \overline{\Phi(z)}$, we may write

$$\Phi(z) = Cz^m e^{az} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left[\prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{R}, |z_i| \leq r} \left(1 - \frac{z}{z_i}\right) \prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{C}^+, |z_i| \leq r} \left(1 - \frac{z}{z_i}\right) \left(1 - \frac{z}{\bar{z}_i}\right) e^{z\left(\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\bar{z}_i}\right)} \right].$$

Since $\operatorname{ord}(\Phi) = 1$ we have

$$\sum_{z_i} \frac{1}{|z_i|^2} < \infty.$$

This, combined with the event that $\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\bar{z}_i} = 2\operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{z_i}$ and the inequality above

$$\sum_k \left| \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{z_k} \right| < \infty,$$

allows us to write

$$\Phi(z) = Cz^m e^{bz} \prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{R}} \left(1 - \frac{z}{z_i}\right) \prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{C}^+} \left(1 - \frac{z}{z_i}\right) \left(1 - \frac{z}{\bar{z}_i}\right).$$

That $C, b \in \mathcal{R}$ is easy to see. Now we show that $b = \frac{\sigma+\mu}{2}$.

If $z_i \notin \mathcal{R}$ and $z \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(1 - \frac{z}{z_i})(1 - \frac{\bar{z}}{\bar{z}_i})| &= |1 - z(\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\bar{z}_i}) + \frac{z^2}{|z_i|^2}| \\ &\leq 1 + |z| |\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\bar{z}_i}| + \frac{|z|^2}{|z_i|^2} \\ &\leq (1 + |z| |\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\bar{z}_i}|)(1 + \frac{|z|^2}{|z_i|^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $z \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$|\Phi(z)| \leq |e^{bz}| F_1(|z|) F_2(|z|) F_3(|z|)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(z) &= |C| z^m \prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{R}} (1 + \frac{z}{|z_i|}), \\ F_2(z) &= \prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{C}^+} (1 + |z| |\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\bar{z}_i}|), \\ F_3(z) &= \prod_{z_i \in \mathcal{C}^+} (1 + \frac{z^2}{|z_i|^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_k |Re \frac{1}{z_k}| < \infty,$$

we have that F_1 and F_2 are of minimal type. Moreover it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |F_1(R)|}{R} = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |F_2(R)|}{R} = 0.$$

Now if we arranges $\{z_k\}$, $z_k \in \mathcal{C}^+$ increasingly by norms $0 < |z_1| = |\bar{z}_1| \leq |z_2| = |\bar{z}_2| \leq |z_3| = |\bar{z}_3| \dots$ and put $\lambda_k = |z_k|$ then Theorem 1 of §17.2 in [6] gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\lambda_n} = \frac{d}{2\pi} = \frac{\sigma - \mu}{2\pi}.$$

So we can apply Theorem 2 of §12.1 in [6] for $F_3(iz)$ to get

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |F_3(R)|}{R} = \frac{d}{2} = \frac{\sigma - \mu}{2}.$$

Now if $R > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log |\Phi(R)|}{R} &\leq b + \frac{\log |F_1(R)|}{R} + \frac{\log |F_2(R)|}{R} + \frac{\log |F_3(R)|}{R}, \\ \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{-R} &\geq b + \frac{\log |F_1(R)|}{-R} + \frac{\log |F_2(R)|}{-R} + \frac{\log |F_3(R)|}{-R}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma &= \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(R)|}{R} \leq \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left[b + \frac{\log |F_1(R)|}{R} + \frac{\log |F_2(R)|}{R} + \frac{\log |F_3(R)|}{R} \right] \\
&= b + \frac{\sigma - \mu}{2}, \\
\mu &= \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(-R)|}{-R} \geq \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left[b + \frac{\log |F_1(R)|}{-R} + \frac{\log |F_2(R)|}{-R} + \frac{\log |F_3(R)|}{-R} \right] \\
&= b - \frac{\sigma - \mu}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

From above two inequalities we get

$$b = \frac{\sigma + \mu}{2}.$$

□

Now we consider the general case of kernel $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying condition (1.2).

Lemma 4. *A function $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies condition (1.2) if and only if it satisfies condition (1.4). In this case $\Phi(z)$ defined by (1.1) is an entire function.*

Proof. If φ satisfies condition (1.2), for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $A_n < \infty$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{n|t|} |\varphi(t)| dt \leq A_n.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \int_{|t| \geq s} e^{|t|n} |\varphi| dt}{s} \\
&\geq \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \int_{|t| \geq s} e^{sn} |\varphi| dt}{s} \\
&= n + \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \int_{|t| \geq s} |\varphi| dt}{s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Because n is arbitrary, we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \int_{|t| \geq s} |\varphi(t)| dt}{s} = -\infty.$$

So φ satisfies (1.4).

Conversely, if φ satisfies (1.4), we take $p(s)$ be as in (1.3), that is

$$p(s) = -\log \int_{|t| \geq s} |\varphi(t)| dt, \quad s \geq 0.$$

Consider the function

$$H(s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{|t|s} |\varphi(t)| dt.$$

Because $\frac{d}{ds}e^{-p(s)} = -(|\varphi(s)| + |\varphi(-s)|)$ and φ satisfies (1.4), using integration by parts we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(s) &= -e^{ts-p(t)}|_0^\infty + s \int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)} dt \\ &= \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + s \int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)} dt < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for any $s \geq 0$, so φ satisfies (1.4).

When φ satisfies (1.4), $\Phi(z)$ is clearly an entire function and

$$|\Phi(z)| \leq H(|z|).$$

□

As Lemma 4 shows, the growth of $\Phi(z)$ is determined by the function

$$(2.1) \quad G(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)} dt.$$

From now on we assume that φ satisfies (1.2). For the sake of simplicity, we assume also that φ has a non-compact support, so $p(s) < \infty$ for all $s \geq 0$.

It turns out that the growth of $G(s)$ in (2.1) is related to Young dual function $p^*(s)$ of $p(s)$, which is defined by

$$p^*(s) = \sup_{t \geq 0} [st - p(t)], \quad s \geq 0.$$

It is easy to verify that p^* is convex and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} p(t) + p^*(s) &\geq st, \quad s, t \geq 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p^*(s)}{s} &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

(see for e.g. Lecture 25 in [6]). So we can define Young dual function p^{**} of p^* . This function satisfies $p^{**}(t) \leq p(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

We have the following result

Theorem 3. *Let φ be a function of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ with non-compact support. Define $p(s)$ as in (1.3) and Young dual function $p^*(s)$ and Young double-dual function $p^{**}(s)$ as above. Define $G(s)$ by (2.1). Then*

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \geq 1,$$

and for any $\kappa > 0$

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s + \kappa)} \leq 1.$$

If additionally we have one of the following two conditions

$$(2.2) \quad \exp\{-p(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma}p(t\gamma)\} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

for all $1 > \gamma > 0$ close enough to 1, or

$$(2.3) \quad \exp\{-p^{**}(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma}p^{**}(t\gamma)\} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

for all $1 > \gamma > 0$ close enough to 1, then

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} = 1.$$

Proof. Because of properties of $p(s)$, for each $s > 0$ large enough we can find a $t_s > 0$ such that

$$st_s \geq p(t_s) + p^*(s) - \frac{1}{2},$$

and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} t_s = \infty.$$

We have

$$G(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)} dt \geq \int_{t_s-1}^{t_s} e^{ts-p(t)} dt.$$

Now fixed γ be any number less than 1. By above inequality we have

$$e^{-\gamma p^*(s)} G(s) \geq e^{(1-\gamma)p^*(s)} \int_{t_s-1}^{t_s} e^{ts-p(t)-p^*(s)} dt.$$

Because $p(t)$ in (1.3) is increasing, for $t_s - 1 \leq t \leq t_s$ we have

$$ts - p(t) - p^*(s) \geq s(t_s - 1) - p(t_s) - p^*(s) \geq -s - \frac{1}{2}.$$

So

$$e^{-\gamma p^*(s)} G(s) \geq e^{(1-\gamma)p^*(s)-s-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Because of

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p^*(s)}{s} = \infty,$$

we get that

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \geq 1.$$

Now for any $\kappa > 0$ we have $p(t) + p^*(s + \kappa) \geq st + \kappa t$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-p^*(s+\kappa)} G(s) &= \int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)-p^*(s+\kappa)} dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-\kappa t} dt = \frac{1}{\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s + \kappa)} \leq 1.$$

Now assume that (2.2) or (2.3) is satisfied. Fixed $1 > \gamma > 0$ close enough to 1. We have

$$\sup_{s \geq 0} [st - \frac{1}{\gamma} p^*(s)] = \frac{1}{\gamma} \sup_{s \geq 0} [s(\gamma t) - p^*(s)] = \frac{1}{\gamma} p^{**}(\gamma t).$$

Hence for all $t \geq 0$ we have

$$st - p(t) - \frac{1}{\gamma} p^*(s) \leq -p(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} p^{**}(\gamma t).$$

Because $p^{**}(t) \leq p(t)$ from above inequality we get

$$st - p(t) - \frac{1}{\gamma} p^*(s) \leq \min\{-p(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} p(\gamma t), -p^{**}(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} p^{**}(\gamma t)\}.$$

Hence

$$e^{st - p(t) - \frac{1}{\gamma} p^*(s)} \leq \min\{e^{-p(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} p(\gamma t)}, e^{-p^{**}(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} p^{**}(\gamma t)}\},$$

for all $s \geq 0$.

We have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} e^{st - p(t) - \frac{1}{\gamma} p^*(s)} = 0,$$

for all $t \geq 0$, so we can apply Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem to get

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma},$$

for all $1 > \gamma > 0$ close enough to 1, so it follows

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \leq 1.$$

Because we proved before that

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \geq 1,$$

we get that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} = 1.$$

□

Remark 1. If $\varphi \geq 0$ then $\Phi(z)$ in (1.1) satisfies

$$\max_{|z| \leq s} |\Phi(z)| \geq \frac{1}{2} H(s),$$

where $H(s)$ is the function defined in the proof of Lemma 4. So Theorem 3 shows that $p^*(|z|)$ is an appropriate quantity to estimate the growth of $\log |\Phi(z)|$.

Remark 2. If φ has the support in $[0, 1]$ and

$$\sigma = \inf\{a \in [0, 1] : \varphi|_{[a, 1]} = 0 \text{ a.e.}\},$$

then it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p^*(s)}{\sigma s} = 1,$$

so by Theorem 3 we obtain again the familiar result

$$\limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(z)|}{|z|} \leq \sigma.$$

Remark 3. The class of functions $p(t)$ satisfying conditions (1.4) and (2.2) are fairly large. For example we can take $p(t) = t \log t$ or $p(t) = t^\gamma$ for any $\gamma > 1$.

3. THE SIZE OF SMALL-VALUED SETS

In this section, we estimate the size of small-valued sets of Fourier transforms, i.e., estimate the Lebesgue measure of the sets

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \leq \epsilon, |x| \leq R_\epsilon\},$$

where φ is a nontrivial function of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying condition (1.4), R_ϵ depends on small numbers ϵ and

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-itx} \varphi(t) dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We will estimate these small-valued sets in terms of the function $p(s)$ defined by (1.3) or in terms of its Young dual function $p^*(s)$.

First we obtain estimates in terms of $p(s)$. We define

$$\varphi^\epsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \varphi(t) & \text{if } |t| \leq s_\epsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } |t| > s_\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^\epsilon(z) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{zt} \varphi^\epsilon(t) dt \equiv \int_{-s_\epsilon}^{s_\epsilon} e^{zt} \varphi(t) dt, \\ \widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(z) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-izt} \varphi^\epsilon(t) dt \equiv \int_{-s_\epsilon}^{s_\epsilon} e^{-izt} \varphi(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where s_ϵ is defined by (1.12).

It is easy to see that $\Phi^\epsilon(-iz) = \widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(z)$ are entire functions of order 1 and type $\leq s_\epsilon$. More explicitly

$$|\widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(z)| \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} e^{s_\epsilon |z|}.$$

By the definition of s_ϵ , we see that if $x \in \mathbb{R}$ then

$$|\widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(x) - \widehat{\varphi}(x)| \leq \epsilon.$$

First we estimate the size of small-valued sets of Φ^ϵ . We have the following result

Theorem 4. *Let s_ϵ , Φ^ϵ , be as above. Let $q > \frac{1}{2}$, $\beta > 0$ be constants. For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough we choose R_ϵ to satisfy*

$$[(q + \frac{1}{2}) \log R_\epsilon + \log(15e^3)][\log \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + 2es_\epsilon R_\epsilon] = -\log(\epsilon^\beta + \epsilon).$$

If ϵ small enough then

$$m(B_{\epsilon^\beta + \epsilon}) \leq R_\epsilon^{-q + \frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$B_{\epsilon^\beta + \epsilon} = \{z \in \mathcal{C} : |\Phi^\epsilon(z)| \leq \epsilon^\beta + \epsilon, |z| \leq R_\epsilon\}.$$

Proof. Because $\|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \neq 0$, there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}(x_0) \neq 0$. Then there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$|\widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(x_0)| \geq C_0,$$

if ϵ is small enough. Changing variable if necessarily, we may assume that $|\Phi^\epsilon(0)| \geq C_0$ if ϵ is small enough. If we choose

$$\eta_\epsilon = R_\epsilon^{-q - \frac{1}{2}},$$

then by Theorem 4 of §11.3 in [6] if $|z| \leq R_\epsilon$ then

$$|\Phi^\epsilon(z)| \geq \exp\{-(q + \frac{1}{2})R_\epsilon + \log(15e^3)\}[\log \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + s_\epsilon R_\epsilon] = \epsilon^\beta + \epsilon,$$

except a set of disks whose sum of radii is less than

$$\eta_\epsilon R_\epsilon \equiv R_\epsilon^{-q + \frac{1}{2}}.$$

□

Because $|\widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(x)| \leq \epsilon^\beta + \epsilon$ if $|\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \leq \epsilon^\beta$, by Theorem 4 we have immediately

Theorem 5. *Let assumptions and choose R_ϵ as in Theorem 4. If ϵ small enough then*

$$m(B_{\epsilon^\beta}) \leq R_\epsilon^{-q + \frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$B_{\epsilon^\beta} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \leq \epsilon^\beta, |x| \leq R_\epsilon\}.$$

From Theorem 3 we have

$$(3.1) \quad |\Phi(z)| \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + |z|e^{p^*(|z|+1)},$$

for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$. So applying Theorem 4 of §11.3 in [6] directly to $\Phi(z)$ we get the following result

Theorem 6. *Let φ have a non-compact support. Let $q > \frac{1}{2}$ be a constant. For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, define R_ϵ by*

$$[(q + \frac{1}{2})R_\epsilon + \log(15e^3)][1 + \log(R_{2\epsilon}) + p^*(2R_\epsilon + 1)] = -\log \epsilon.$$

Then

$$m(B_\epsilon) \leq R_\epsilon^{-q+\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $m(B_\epsilon)$ is the Lebesgue's measure of the set

$$B_\epsilon = \{z \in \mathcal{C} : |\Phi(z)| \leq \epsilon, |z| \leq R_\epsilon\}.$$

Moreover we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log p^*(2R_\epsilon + 1)}{\log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}} = 1.$$

Proof. The conclusion about the size of B_ϵ is obtained similarly that of Theorems 4 and 5. Because

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p^*(s)}{s} = \infty,$$

in view of the definition of R_ϵ we get

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log p^*(2R_\epsilon + 1)}{\log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}} = 1.$$

□

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Because $f_0, f_\epsilon \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$\|f_0 - f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \|F(f_0) - F(f_\epsilon)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2,$$

where $F(f_0)(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_0(x)e^{-i\lambda x} dx = \widehat{f_0}$, $F(f_\epsilon)(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_\epsilon(x)e^{-i\lambda x} dx = \widehat{f_\epsilon}$.

We have

$$\|F(f_0) - F(f_\epsilon)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \frac{\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2} - \frac{\widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2} \right|^2.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2} - \frac{\widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2} \right| &\leq \left| \frac{\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2} - \frac{\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2} \right| + \left| \frac{\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2} - \frac{\widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g_0}| |\widehat{\varphi_0}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2 (\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)} + \frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|}{(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2)} \\ &\quad + \frac{|\widehat{\varphi_0}| |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}| |\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|}{(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now using Cauchy's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0| |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2 (\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)} &\leq \min \left\{ \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{\widehat{\varphi}_0} = |F(f_0)|, \frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^3} \right\}, \\ \frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0 \widehat{\varphi}_0 - \widehat{g}_\epsilon \widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|}{(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|^2)} &\leq \frac{|\widehat{g}_0 \widehat{\varphi}_0 - \widehat{g}_\epsilon \widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|}{\delta_\epsilon} \\ \frac{|\widehat{\varphi}_0| |\widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon| |\widehat{g}_0 \widehat{\varphi}_0 - \widehat{g}_\epsilon \widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|}{(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|^2)} &\leq \frac{|\widehat{g}_0 \widehat{\varphi}_0 - \widehat{g}_\epsilon \widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|}{\delta_\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{R}} |F(f_0) - F(f_\epsilon)|^2 d\lambda &\leq 3 \left[\int_{\mathbf{R}} \left(\frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0| |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2 (\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)} \right)^2 + \int_{\mathbf{R}} \left(\frac{|\widehat{g}_0 \widehat{\varphi}_0 - \widehat{g}_\epsilon \widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|}{\delta_\epsilon} \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbf{R}} \left(\frac{|\widehat{g}_0 \widehat{\varphi}_0 - \widehat{g}_\epsilon \widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|}{\delta_\epsilon} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= 3 \left[\int_{\mathbf{R}} \left(\frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0| |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2 (\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbf{R}} |\widehat{g}_0 \widehat{\varphi}_0 - \widehat{g}_\epsilon \widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbf{R}} |\widehat{g}_0 \widehat{\varphi}_0 - \widehat{g}_\epsilon \widehat{\varphi}_\epsilon|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{R}} \left(\frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0| |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2 (\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)} \right)^2 \\ &= \int_{|\lambda| > R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} \left(\frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0| |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2 (\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)} \right)^2 + \int_{|\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| > \epsilon^\beta} \left(\frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0| |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2 (\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{|\lambda| < R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} \left(\frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0| |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2 (\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2)} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \int_{|\lambda| > R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} \left(\frac{\widehat{g}_0 |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2} \right)^2 + \int_{|\widehat{\varphi}_0(i\lambda)| > \epsilon^\beta} \left(\frac{\delta_\epsilon |\widehat{g}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^3} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{|\lambda| < R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} \left(\frac{\widehat{g}_0 |\widehat{\varphi}_0|}{|\widehat{\varphi}_0|^2} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \int_{|\lambda| > R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 + \frac{\delta_\epsilon^2}{(\epsilon^{3\beta})^2} \int_{|\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| > \epsilon^\beta} |\widehat{g}_0|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{|\lambda| < R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 \\ &\leq \int_{|\lambda| > R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 + C_2 \frac{\delta_\epsilon^2}{(\epsilon^{3\beta})^2} + \int_{|\lambda| < R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi}_0(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\|\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R})} \leq \|\varphi_0 - \varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R})}$, a standard procedure give easily that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}^2 = 0$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}^2 &\leq 2[\|\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R})}^2 \|\widehat{g_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\widehat{g_0}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}^2 \|\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R})}^2] \\ &\leq 2((\|\varphi_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R})} + \epsilon)^2 + \|g_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}^2) \epsilon^2 \\ &\leq 2(\|\varphi_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R})}^2 + \|g_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}^2 + 1) \epsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have

$$\|\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}^2 \leq 2(\|\varphi_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R})}^2 + \|g_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R})}^2 + 1) \epsilon^2.$$

So we have

$$\frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbf{R}} |\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2 + \frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbf{R}} |\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2 \leq C_1 \frac{\epsilon^2}{\delta_\epsilon^2}.$$

Combining estimates above we get the conclusion of Theorem 1.

REFERENCES

- [1] Saleh Abdullah, *Solvability of convolution equations in D'_{L^p}* , Hokkaido Math. J. 29 (2000), 247–254.
- [2] M. V. Aref'eva, *Asymptotic estimates for the accuracy of optimal solutions of an equation of the convolution type*, Zh. vychisl. Mat. mat. Fiz. 14 (1974), 838–851.
- [3] Johann Bausmeier, *Stable solutions of inverse problems*, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig/Wiesbaden, 1987.
- [4] Dang Duc Trong, Nguyen Thanh Long and Pham Ngoc Dinh Alain, *Non homogeneous heat equations: Identification and regularization for the inhomogeneous term*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 312 (2005), 93–104.
- [5] D. D. Trong, P. H. Quan and P. N. Dinh Alain, *Determination of a two-dimensional heat source: Uniqueness, regularization and error estimate*, J. Comp. Appl. Maths. 191 (2006), 50–67.
- [6] B. Ya. Levin, *Lectures on Entire Functions*, Trans. of Math. Monographs, Vol. 150, AMS, Providence, Rhode Island, 1996.
- [7] Alexander G. Ramm, *Inverse problems: mathematical and analytical techniques with applications to engineering*, Springer, Boston, 2005.
- [8] Walter Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, Mladinska Knjiga, Ljubljana, 1970.
- [9] A. M. Sedletskii, *On the Zeros of Laplace Transforms*, Mathematical Notes 76 (6), 2004, 824–833.
- [10] A. F. Voronin, *The Volterra convolution equation of the first kind on a segment*, Fundam. Prikl. Mat. 8 (4), 2002, 955–966.
- [11] A. F. Voronin, *An analogue of Picard's theorem for a convolution of the first kind with a smooth kernel*, Russian Math. (Iz. VUZ) 46 (7), 2002, 1–5.
- [12] A. F. Voronin, *A uniqueness theorem for a convolution of the first kind with a differentiable kernel on an interval*, Differ. Equation. 37 (10), 2001, 1412–1419.

ERROR OF TIKHONOV'S REGULARIZATION FOR INTEGRAL CONVOLUTION EQUATIONS 23

DANG DUC TRONG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HOCHIMINH CITY NATIONAL
UNIVERSITY, 227 NGUYEN VAN CU, Q5, HOCHIMINH CITY, VIETNAM

E-mail address: `ddtrong@mathdep.hcmuns.edu.vn`

TRUONG TRUNG TUYEN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOM-
INGTON, RAWLES HALL, IN 47405

E-mail address: `truongt@indiana.edu`