

MATH 3472

Examples (applications of convolution) :

Recall (or maybe you're seeing it for the first time) that the gamma function is an extension of factorials to all of \mathbb{C} . That is,

$$\Gamma(n) = (n-1)!$$

yet $\Gamma(z)$ is defined $\forall z \in \mathbb{C}$.

It is given by

$$\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty x^{z-1} e^{-x} dx$$

and comes up often in probability/statistics.

It is sometimes called an Euler integral of the second kind. An Euler integral of the first kind is: the beta function:

$$B(p,q) = \int_0^1 x^{p-1} (1-x)^{q-1} dx$$

and is related to the gamma function as follows:

Set $f_p(t) = \begin{cases} t^{p-1} e^{-t} & \text{if } t > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } t \leq 0 \end{cases}$

Then $f \in L(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_p(t) dt = \int_0^{\infty} t^{p-1} e^{-t} dt = \Gamma(p)$$

If we set $h = f_p * f_q$ then applying

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x) e^{-ixu} dx = \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_p(t) e^{-itu} dt \right) \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_q(t) e^{-itu} dt \right)$$

with $u=0$ gives

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x) = \Gamma(p) F(q). \quad (\text{This requires } p \geq 0, q \geq 0 \\ \text{so that } f_p, f_q \in L(\mathbb{R}))$$

On the other hand, we can also calculate the LHS more directly: If $x > 0$ then

$$h(x) = \int_0^x f_p(t) f_q(x-t) dt = \int_0^x t^{p-1} e^{-xt} (x-t)^{q-1} e^{-(x-t)} dt \\ = e^{-x} \int_0^x t^{p-1} (x-t)^{q-1} dt$$

while $h(x)=0$ if $x < 0$. Set $t=ux$, then for $x > 0$
(both vanish on neg axis)

$$h(x) = e^{-x} \int_0^1 (ux)^{p-1} (x-ux)^{q-1} x du$$

(used $dt = x du$)

$$= e^{-x} \cdot x^{p-1} \cdot x^{q-1} \cdot x \int_0^1 u^{p-1} (1-u)^{q-1} du$$

$$= e^{-x} x^{p+q-1} B(p, q).$$

So now

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x} x^{p+q-1} B(p, q) dx = B(p, q) \Gamma(p+q)$$

Overall, by equating our two expressions for $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x)dx$
we have

$$\Gamma(p)\Gamma(q) = B(p,q)\Gamma(p+q)$$

$$\Rightarrow B(p,q) = \frac{\Gamma(p)\Gamma(q)}{\Gamma(p+q)}$$

For all $p \geq 0, q \geq 0$

Poisson summation:

Poisson summation provides a relationship between the Fourier series of a function and its Fourier transform.

Theorem 11.24: Let f be a nonnegative function s.t.

$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)dx$ exists as an improper Riemann integral.

Assume f is increasing on $(-\infty, 0]$ and decreasing on $[0, \infty)$.

Then

$$\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{f(m+) + f(m-)}{2} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t)e^{-2\pi int} dt}_{\text{exp. Fourier transform at } x=n \cdot 2\pi}$$

(Proof next class).

Another formulation, more common in other literature:

Theorem: Let f be a ^{continuous} function for which $|f(x)|$,
 $|f'(x)|$ and $|f''(x)|$ exist for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and

are all bounded by $c(1+|x|)^{-2}$ for some fixed c .

Then writing $\hat{f}(x)$ for the Fourier transform $F(f)$, we have

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{f}(n).$$

Remark: This assumes a definition of

$$F(f) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) e^{-2\pi i xy} dx$$

Without this normalization it gives

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{f}(2n\pi) \quad (\text{a special case of our formula})$$

Application:

Consider $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2 + a^2}$. We would like to calculate

its Fourier transform, $F(f(x))$. Here is a trick:

Let $b(x) = e^{-a|x|}$. Then if $a > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} F(b(x)) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-a|x|} e^{-ixy} dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{ax} e^{-ixy} dx + \int_0^{\infty} e^{-ax} e^{-ixy} dx \\ &= \left[\frac{e^{(a-iy)x}}{a-iy} \right]_{-\infty}^0 + \left[\frac{e^{-(a+iy)x}}{a+iy} \right]_0^{\infty} \\ &= \frac{1}{a-iy} + \frac{1}{a+iy} = \frac{2a}{a^2 + y^2} \end{aligned}$$

Then the Fourier inversion formula gives

$$e^{-1 \times a} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{2a}{a^2 + y^2} e^{iyx} dy$$

Replacing ∞ by $-x$ and multiplying by $\frac{\pi}{a}$ gives

$$\frac{\pi}{a} e^{-a|x|} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-iyx}}{a^2 + y^2} dy = F(f).$$

So, the Poisson formula gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n) &= \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{n^2 + a^2} \right) + \frac{1}{a^2} \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{f}(2\pi n) = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2\pi}{a} e^{-a(2\pi n)} \right) + \frac{\pi}{a} \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{a} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^n + \frac{\pi}{a} \quad (r = e^{-2\pi a}) \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{a} \left(\frac{1}{1 - e^{-2\pi a}} \right) + \frac{\pi}{a} - \frac{2\pi}{a} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Therefore } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + a^2} = \frac{\pi}{a} \left(\frac{1}{1 - e^{-2\pi a}} \right) = \frac{\pi}{2a} - \frac{1}{2a^2}$$

So, e.g.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + 1} = \frac{\pi}{1 - e^{-2\pi}} = \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + 1} = \frac{\pi}{1 - e^{-2\pi}} + \frac{-\pi + 1}{2}$$

MATH 3472

Recall we were about to prove:

Theorem: Let f be a nonnegative function such that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) dx$ exists as an improper Riemann integral. Assume f increases on $(-\infty, 0]$ and decreases on $[0, \infty)$.

Then $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{f(n+) + f(n-)}{2} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt$,

each being absolutely convergent.

(Note: RHS is $\mathcal{F}(f)(2\pi n)$, summed over $n \in \mathbb{Z}$).

Proof: Define a function F by

$$F(x) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} f(m+x).$$

Claim: The series above converges absolutely $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$, and convergence is uniform on $[0, 1]$.

Proof of claim: As $f(x)$ is decreasing on $[0, \infty)$, we have

$$\text{if } x \geq 0: \sum_{m=0}^N f(m+x) \leq f(0) + \sum_{m=1}^N f(m) \leq f(0) + \int_0^{\infty} f(t) dt$$

↑ rectangles of
 width 1 under $f(x)$
 from $x=0$ to $x=N$.

Since $\int_0^{\infty} f(t) dt$ exists by assumption, the Weierstrass M-test gives uniform convergence of $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} f(m+x)$ on $[0, \infty)$.

Similarly we may show that $\sum_{m=-\infty}^{-1} f(m+x)$ converges uniformly on $(-\infty, 1]$: If $x < 1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{-1} f(m+x) &\leq \sum_{m=-\infty}^{-1} f(m+1) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^0 f(m) \leq f(0) + \int_{-\infty}^0 f(x) dx.\end{aligned}$$

need $x < 1$
here

So again by the Weierstrass M-test, the series converges uniformly on $(-\infty, 1]$. Thus $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n+x)$ converges for all x , and convergence is uniform on

$$(-\infty, 1] \cap [0, \infty) = [0, 1].$$

Thus the claim holds.

Next, note that the sum is periodic with period 1:

$$F(x+1) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n+(x+1)) \underset{n \in \mathbb{Z}}{\circlearrowright} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n+x) = F(x), \text{ note}$$

that this step

uses the fact that the RHS is a rearrangement of the LHS and the series converges absolutely.

Finally we'll see that F is BV on every compact interval. Trick:

If $0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then $f'(m+x)$ is a decreasing function of x if $m > 0$, and an increasing function of x if $m < 0$.

So we can write:

$$F(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} f(m+x) - \sum_{m=-\infty}^{-1} (-f(m+x))$$

So $F(x)$ is a difference of two decreasing functions, so is BV on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
(Remark: This required $f_n(x)$ decreasing on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$

$\Rightarrow \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n(x)$ decreasing which is a nontrivial fact to check).

We can argue similarly + show $f(x)$ is BV on $[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$, and then by periodicity $F(x)$ is BV on every compact interval.

Now consider the Fourier series of $F(x)$, in exponential form:

$$F(x) \sim \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n e^{2\pi i n x}$$

where $a_n = \int_0^1 F(x) e^{-2\pi i n x} dx$, this uses the fact

that F is BV $\Rightarrow F$ is Riemann integrable on $[0, 1]$.

Now we may apply Jordan's test to conclude that the Fourier series converges for every x , and

$$\frac{F(x+) + f(x-)}{2} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n e^{2\pi i n x}$$

Let us express the coefficients a_n in another way to get the Poisson summation formula.

$$a_n = \int_0^1 F(x) e^{-2\pi n x} dx$$

$$= \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} f(m+x) \right) e^{-2\pi n x} dx$$

$$= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^1 f(m+x) e^{-2\pi n x} dx \quad (\text{by uniform convergence})$$

Set $t = m+x$

$$= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_m^{m+1} f(t) e^{-2\pi n t} dt$$

Note here: $e^{-2\pi i n m t} = 1$
made this expression simpler after substitution.

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{-2\pi n t} dt.$$

So if we plug this in place of a_n in the eqn arising from Jordan's test:

$$\frac{F(x+) + F(x-)}{2} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{-2\pi n t} dt \cdot e^{2\pi n x}$$

Set $x=0$. Then

$$\frac{F(0+) + F(0-)}{2} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{-2\pi n t} dt$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F(0+) + F(0-)}{2} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} f(m+0^+) + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} f(m+0^-) \right) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{f(m+) + f(m-)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

and the theorem follows.

Remarks: We already saw that when f iscts the left hand side becomes

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n).$$

- The monotonicity requirements on $f(x)$ can be relaxed. For example: The conclusion of the theorem:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{f(n+) + f(n-)}{2} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{-2\pi i nt} dt$$

depends linearly on $f(x)$. So if $f(x) = ag(x) + bh(x)$, where $g(x), h(x)$ satisfy the hypotheses of the theorem (but $f(x)$ does not), then we still get

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{f(n+) + f(n-)}{2} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{-2\pi i nt} dt.$$

In particular, this means that if $f = u + iv$, where u and v are real-valued functions of real variables, then the theorem holds for f .

Example: The hyperbolic cotangent is

$$\coth(x) = \frac{e^{2x} + 1}{e^{2x} - 1}, \text{ and}$$

$$\coth(x) = \frac{1}{x} + 2x \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^2 + (in)^2}.$$

Then from last day:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + a^2} = \frac{\pi}{a} \left(\frac{1}{1 - e^{-2\pi a}} \right) - \frac{\pi}{2a} - \frac{1}{2a^2}$$

Choose $a = \frac{x}{\pi}$. Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\pi^2}{\pi^2 \left(n^2 + \left(\frac{x}{\pi} \right)^2 \right)} = \frac{\pi}{\frac{x}{\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - e^{-2\pi(\frac{x}{\pi})}} \right) - \frac{\pi}{2\left(\frac{x}{\pi}\right)} - \frac{1}{2\left(\frac{x}{\pi}\right)^2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi^2 n^2 + x^2} = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \left(\frac{\pi^2}{x} \left(\frac{1}{1 - e^{-2x}} \right) - \frac{\pi^2}{2x} - \frac{\pi^2}{2x^2} \right)$$

$$\Rightarrow 2x \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi^2 n^2 + x^2} = \frac{2}{1 - e^{-2x}} - 1 - \frac{1}{x}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{x} + 2x \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi^2 n^2 + x^2} = \frac{2 - (1 - e^{-2x})}{1 - e^{-2x}} = \frac{1 + e^{-2x}}{1 - e^{-2x}}.$$

$$= \coth(x).$$

(Sign mistake?)

nope

$$\frac{1 + e^{-2x}}{1 - e^{-2x}} = \frac{e^{2x} + 1}{e^{2x} - 1} \quad (\text{check}).$$

MATH 342

Final lecture: A summary of Fourier series.

Fix a collection $\{\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots\}$, an orthonormal system on an interval I . The Fourier coefficients

$$c_k = (f, \varphi_k)$$

of a function f are so defined because the partial sums

$$S_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n c_k \varphi_k$$

best approximate f in the mean. I.e if $\sum_{k=0}^n b_k \varphi_k = t_n$ is any other sum, then

$$\|f - S_n\| \leq \|f - t_n\|$$

with equality iff $c_k = b_k$.

For general Fourier series we have:

Thm: If $f \in L^2(I)$ and $f(x) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n \varphi_n$, then

a) $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |c_n|^2 \leq \|f\|^2$ (Bessel)

b) $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |c_n|^2 = \|f\|^2$ iff $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - S_n\| = 0$

Of course in general, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - S_n\|$ may not be zero,

So even if $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |c_n|^2$ exists, it may not be equal to $\|f\|^2$. It is, however, equal to $\|g\|^2$ for some $g \in L^2(I)$:

Thm: (Riesz-Fischer) Suppose $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |c_k|^2$ converges.

Then $\exists g \in L^2(I)$ such that

a) $(g, \varphi_k) = c_k \quad \forall k \geq 0$, and

b) $\|g\|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |c_k|^2$.

Now we investigate: when does a Fourier series converge, and to what? For this we need to choose a particular orthonormal family, since convergence results can depend on the basis $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$,

So we study

$$f(x) \sim \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k \cos kx + b_k \sin kx).$$

For this investigation, we had to prepare a bunch of lemmas/propositions surrounding the complicated integrals and limits which arise. They were:

Thm (Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma) If $f \in L^1(I)$, then

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \int_I f(t) \sin(\alpha t + \beta) dt = 0$$

Jordan's and Dini's conditions for the evaluation of Dirichlet integrals:

Jordan: If f is BV on $[0, \delta]$ then

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\delta g(\alpha t) \frac{\sin(\alpha t)}{t} dt = g(0^+)$$

Dini: If $g(0^+)$ exists and $\int_0^\delta \frac{g(t) - g(0^+)}{t} dt$ exists,

then

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\delta g(t) \frac{\sin(\alpha t)}{t} dt = g(0^+).$$

Our first convergence result came in the form of the Riemann localization theorem. It said

Theorem (Riemann Localization) Paraphrasing:

The Fourier series of a function $f(x)$ converges at x_0 iff $\exists \delta$ with $0 < \delta < \pi$ s.t.

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\delta \frac{f(x+t) + f(x-t)}{2} \frac{\sin((n+\frac{1}{2})t)}{t} dt \text{ exists.}$$

Jordan's and Dini's tests can both be applied to this limit, so we found:

Theorem: If $f(x)$ satisfies the conditions of either Jordan's or Dini's test, then (ie for some $x \exists \delta > 0$ s.t...) then the Fourier series converges at x to

$$\frac{f(x+) + f(x-)}{2}.$$

So if $f(x)$ is continuous at a point x_0 and satisfies either Jordan or Dini there, then the Fourier series of $f(x)$ converges to $f(x_0)$.

In fact this is true in general, for any continuous function (not just ones that additionally satisfy the hypotheses of Jordan's or Dini's theorem). The proof is a consequence of Fejér's theorem:

Theorem: If $f \in L([0, 2\pi])$ and is ~~continuous~~ and 2π -periodic, then the Fourier series of f $(C,1)$ -sums to

$$\frac{f(x+) + f(x-)}{2}$$

wherever the above limit exists. If f is continuous it always exists, and the $(C,1)$ convergence is uniform.

This yields; since $(C,1)$ summing gives the same limit as the usual summing when both limits exist:

Thm: If f is cts on $[0, 2\pi]$ and 2π -periodic, then its Fourier series, when it converges, converges to $f(x)$.

Proof: If $\{s_n(x)\}$ has a limit, its limit is the same as $\{\sigma_n(x)\}$, and $\{\sigma_n(x)\}$ always has $f(x)$ as a limit by Fejér's theorem.

Fejér's theorem also gave:

a) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - s_n\| = 0$,

b) Parseval's thm holds,

c) Fourier series can be integrated term-by-term.

Remark: Fourier series cannot, in general, be differentiated term-by-term.

We then moved on to study integral representations of functions, rather than representations as sums.

Thm: (Fourier integral theorem)

Assume f satisfies the hypotheses of either Jordan's or Dini's test, and $f \in L(\mathbb{R})$. Then we have cosine form:

$$\frac{f(x+) + f(x-)}{2} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \left[\int_{-\infty}^\infty f(u) \cos(v(u-x)) du \right] dv, \text{ and}$$

And exponential form:

$$\frac{f(x+) + f(x-)}{2} = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \left[\int_{-\infty}^\infty f(u) e^{iv(u-x)} du \right] dv.$$

This can all be re-explained in terms of Fourier transforms.

Note

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty f(u) e^{iv(u-x)} du dv$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-ivx} \left[\int_{-\infty}^\infty f(u) e^{ivu} du \right] dv$$

Change v to $-v$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ivx} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(u) e^{-ivu} du \right] dv$$

Note: Set $w = -v$,
then $dv = -dw$
and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}$ becomes
 $\int_{\infty}^{-\infty}$, which flip
back and cancels
with $-dw$

$$\frac{f(x+) + f(x-)}{2} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F(f) e^{ivx} dv. \text{ Thus the}$$

Fourier transform, via the Fourier integral theorem,
has an "inverse"; because if f is continuous then the
LHS is just f again.

Convolution tells us how the Fourier inversion
formula behaves with respect to products (we already
know it's linear):

$$F^{-1}(F(s)G(s)) = f * g.$$

and last, Poisson summation relates the limit of
the Fourier series of f to its Fourier integral:

Theorem: If f increases on $(-\infty, 0]$, decreases on
 $[0, \infty)$, is nonnegative and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) dx$ exists, then

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{f(nt) + f(n-)}{2} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} F(f)(2n\pi)$$