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1. Introduction. Part I of this series of two papers contains the relevant background and a number of references to which we refer here as \([1 - x]\). Additional references added in this paper will be denoted by \([y]\) (references frequently used here from Part I will be listed again). In Part I (ref. [7]) we developed a number of themes in the transmutation framework introduced in [3; 5]. In the present paper we will generalize some constructions of Marčenko [16] (cf. also Koornwinder [14]) in this framework and then, in a sort of canonical manner, develop a procedure for generating Parseval formulas of Gasymov-Marčenko type (cf. [11; 12; 16]). The Parseval formulas will be examined from various points of view and a derivation of the appropriate Gelfand-Levitan equation will also be given (in this connection see also Carroll [6]). Let us mention here also [8; 9] for extensive use of our transmutation framework in studying the interaction of certain scattering theory ideas with the construction of connection formulas of Riemann-Liouville and Weyl type for special functions.

2. Basic constructions. We recall briefly the background ideas from Part I. \(P(D)\) and \(Q(D)\) will be (second order) linear differential operators acting in spaces \(E\) and \(F\) with \(B: E \to F (B: P \to Q)\) a transmutation operator such that \(BP = QB\) acting on suitable objects, and \(\beta = B^{-1}: Q \to P\). As in [3; 4; 7] we consider general eigenfunctions of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
(P(D_x)H(x, \mu) &= \mu H(x, \mu); \ H(0, \mu) = 1; \ H'(0, \mu) = 0 \\
Q(D_x)\theta(y, \nu) &= v \theta(y, \nu); \ \theta(0, \nu) = 1; \ \theta'(0, \nu) = 0 \\
(P^*(D_x)\Omega(x, \mu) &= \mu \Omega(x, \mu); \ Q^*(D_y)W(y, \nu) = v W(y, \nu)
\end{align*}
\]  

where \(P^*\) and \(Q^*\) denote formal adjoints. We assume either that the spectra \(\sigma(P)\) and \(\sigma(Q)\) coincide or that, as occurs in typical examples from [6; 7; 8; 9], \(\mu = \lambda^2 - \rho_p^2\) and \(\nu = -\lambda^2 - \rho_Q^2\) in which case we shift notation and speak of transmuting \(\hat{P} = P + \rho_P^2\) into \(\hat{Q} = Q + \rho_Q^2\) (so \(\sigma(\hat{P}) = \sigma(\hat{Q})\)).

Example 2.1. The basic example here can be written as \(P(D)u = (Au')'/A\) with \(\rho_p = \rho_A = 1/2\lim(\lambda^2)\) as \(x \to \infty\) (\(\lambda^2\) is a common notation). Set
\[ \hat{P} = P + \rho_p^2 \] and consider eigenfunctions \( H = \phi^r_\lambda \) of \( \hat{P}(D)u = -\lambda^2 u \). The hypotheses on \( A \) are such that \( P(D) \) is modeled on the radial part of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on a noncompact Riemannian symmetric space of rank 1. Then eigenfunctions \( \phi^r_\lambda \) satisfying \( \phi^r_\lambda(0) = 1 \) and \( D_\lambda \phi^r_\lambda(0) = 0 \) correspond to spherical functions. One has \( P^*(D)u = (A(u/A))' \) and \( \Omega = \Omega^L_A = \Delta_P \phi^r_\lambda \) satisfies \( P^*(D)\Omega^L_A = -\lambda^2 \Omega^L_A \). Many such examples are discussed in [3; 4; 6; 7; 8; 9; 14] and in Chebli [1-18; 1-19] and Flensted-Jensen [1-25]; we will not dwell on this for the moment. Our constructions will be based on the physically important case \( A = x^{2m+1} \) where \( P(D) = P_m(D) = D^2 + ((2m+1)lx)D \) and \( \rho_p = 0 \). In this case \( P^*(D)u = u'' - (2m+1)(ulx) \) and for basic eigenfunctions we take \( (\mu \sim -\lambda^2) \)

\[
\begin{align*}
H(x, \mu) &= 2^m \Gamma(m+1)(\lambda x)^{-m} \sum_{m}^\infty J_m(\lambda x) = R^P_m(x, \lambda); \\
\Omega(x, \mu) &= 2^{-2m} \Gamma(m+1)^{-2}(\lambda x)^{2m+1} H(x, \mu).
\end{align*}
\]

This choice of \( \Omega \) for \( P_m^* \) was made earlier in [3; 4] for purposes of symmetry and we will retain it now for uniformity of notation; note however \( \Omega = AH \) (\( \Omega = AH \) is a more natural choice of \( \Omega \) in general—see Remark 4.1 in [7]). Let us record here that in fact \( \Omega = R_0(\lambda)A(x)H \) where \( A = x^{2m+1} \) and \( R_0 = \frac{e_m^2}{c_m^{2m+1}} (c_m = 1/2^n \Gamma(m+1)) \) is the density of the associated spectral measure \( dv_p = R_0 d\lambda \). With the above choice of \( \Omega \) we change the associated spectral measure to \( dv_p = d\lambda \).

**Remark 2.2.** We recall some notation for transforms based on a transmutation \( B: P \to Q \) with eigenfunctions \( H = \phi^r_\lambda, \Omega = \Omega^r_\lambda, \theta = \phi^r_\lambda, \) and \( W = \Omega^r_\lambda \). Thus

\[
\begin{align*}
Pf(\lambda) &= \langle f(x), \phi^r_\lambda \rangle = \int_0^\infty \Omega(x, \mu) f(x) dx \\
P^*F(x) &= \langle F(\lambda), H(x, \mu) \rangle = \int_0^\infty F(\lambda) H(x, \mu) dv_p(\lambda)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \mu \sim -\lambda^2 \) in general and \( dv_p \) can be given an explicit form in terms of \( |e(\lambda)|^{-2}(e(\lambda) \) is the Harish-Chandra or Jost function in our examples \( P(D)u = (Au')'/A \). However when (complex) potentials \( q(x) \) are added to \( P(D) \) the spectral pairing may not be given in terms of a measure and we will have a generalized spectral function \( R_p \) such that for suitable \( F(\lambda) \)

\[
P^*F(x) = \langle F, H \rangle = \langle R_p, F(\lambda)H(x, \mu) \rangle
\]

where the last bracket is a distribution pairing in \( \lambda \) (cf. [11; 16; 17]). We remark that it is necessary to study this situation in physics (cf. Chadan-Sabatier [1-17, Coudray-Coz [1-21], Newton [1-39]) and we refer to [10; 17] for nonselfadjoint operators, spectral singularities, etc. In any event we will have the following collection of maps and properties, where \( \langle \Omega, 1 \rangle_\lambda = \delta(x) \) and \( \langle W, 1 \rangle_\mu = \delta(y) : \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\end{align*}
\]
(2.7) \[ \hat{\rho}f(\lambda) = \hat{f}(\lambda) = \langle f(x), H(x, \mu) \rangle; \quad PF(x) = \langle F(\lambda), \Omega(x, \mu) \rangle; \]
\[ \rho F(x) = \langle F(\lambda), H(x, \mu) \rangle. \]
(2.8) \[ Qg(\lambda) = \hat{g}(\lambda) = \langle g(y), W(y, \mu) \rangle; \quad \hat{2}g(\lambda) = \overline{g(\lambda)} = \langle g(y), \Theta(y, \mu) \rangle; \]
\[ QG(y) = \langle G(\lambda), \Theta(y, \mu) \rangle; \quad \hat{QG}(y) = \langle G(\lambda), W(y, \mu) \rangle; \]
\[ \hat{2}G(y) = \langle G(\lambda), \Theta(y, \mu) \rangle. \]
(2.9) \[ \rho = \rho^{-1}; \quad Q = Q^{-1}; \quad P = P^{-1}; \quad Q^* = P; \]
\[ Q^* = Q; \quad \rho^* = \rho; \quad 2^* = 2; \quad B^* = (\rho Q)^* = 2 \rho; \]
\[ B^* = (\rho Q)^* = Q \rho; \quad 2^* = \rho Q; \quad \rho^* = Q 2 \rho. \]

(see here [3; 4; 5; 7; 8; 9; 14] and Chebli [1–18; 1–19], Flensted-Jensen [1–25] for details).

Let us recall here also the expressions for the kernels of \( B = 2P \) and \( B = \rho Q \) which we write as \( Bf(y) = \langle \beta(y, x), f(x) \rangle \) and \( Bg(x) = \langle \gamma(x, y), g(y) \rangle \). Thus
\[ (2.10) \quad \beta(y, x) = \langle \Omega(x, \mu), \Theta(y, \mu) \rangle; \quad \gamma(x, y) = \langle H(x, \mu), W(y, \mu) \rangle. \]

In certain cases it is possible and convenient to work with the kernels in the form \( \beta(y, x) = \delta(x - y) + L(y, x) \) and \( \gamma(x, y) = \delta(x - y) + K(x, y) \). In general \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \) are distributions and a decomposition of this sort with \( L \) and \( K \) functions is only possible in certain circumstances.

We give now a key theorem (cf. [5]), generalizing a result of Marcenko [16] (cf. also Koornwinder [14]). The proof is very simple but the theorem is extremely important in working with Paley-Wiener and Parseval type theorems.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( \hat{f}(y) = (\beta \ast f)(y) = \langle \gamma(x, y), f(x) \rangle \) and \( \hat{g}(x) = (B^* g)(x) = \phi \langle \beta(y, x), g(y) \rangle \). Then
\[ (2.11) \quad 2 \hat{f}(\lambda) = \rho \hat{f}(\lambda); \quad \rho \hat{g}(\lambda) = 2 \hat{g}(\lambda). \]

**Proof.** From (2.9) \( B^* = Q \rho \) and \( B^* = P \) so \( 2 \hat{f} = 2 \beta \ast f = 2Q \rho f = \rho f \) and \( \rho \hat{g} = \rho P \) \( 2 \hat{g} = 2 \hat{g} \) since \( 2 = Q^{-1} \) and \( \rho = P^{-1} \).

This proof uses the transforms indicated and thus depends on spectral data. Let us give an alternative proof of Theorem 2.3 independent of any spectral information or transform theory.

Second proof: The operator \( B : P \rightarrow Q \) can often be constructed by solving \( P(D_x)\phi(x, y) = Q(D_x)\phi(x, y) \) with \( \phi(x, 0) = f(x) \) and \( \phi(x, 0) = 0 \); then \( Bf(y) = \phi(0, y) \) and similar constructions yield \( B = B^{-1} \) (cf. [3; 4; 5; 7; 10; 11] and Carroll-Showalter [1–14], Lions [1–35]). In particular \( B \) and \( \beta \) can often be constructed using Riemann functions in a manner which yields relevant properties of \( \beta \) or \( L \) (resp. \( \gamma \) or \( K \)) quite readily (cf. [18; 19; 21] and Braaksma [1–1], Braaksma-de Snoo [1–2], Levitan [1–33], Lions [1–35]). We know \( \Theta = BH \) and \( H = \beta \Theta \) from [3; 4; 7] so define then \( \hat{f}(y) = (\beta \ast f)(y) \) and \( \hat{g}(x) = (B^* g)(x) \) as in Theorem 2.3 and write for example (formally)
(2.12) \[ \rho f(\lambda) = \langle H(x, \mu), f(x) \rangle = \langle B(\cdot, \mu) \theta(x), f(x) \rangle = \langle \theta(y, \mu), \bar{f}(y) \rangle = 2\bar{f}(\lambda). \]

Similarly \( \rho \bar{g}(\lambda) = 2g(\lambda) \) and we have an alternative proof of Theorem 2.3 independent of any spectral data or a priori transform theory.

**Remark 2.4.** Recall now the \( P_m \) spaces \( \mathcal{E} = \{ f; x^{m+1/2} f(x) \in L^2 \} \), \( \mathcal{E}' = \{ f; x^{-m-1/2} f(x) \in L^2 \} \), \( \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{P} \mathcal{E} \), \( \mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{P} \mathcal{E}' = \rho \mathcal{E} = \{ f; \lambda^{m+1/2} f(\lambda) \in L^2 \} \) (from [3; 5; 7]). For general \( \mathcal{P} \) one can also envision a framework where \( \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{P} \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{P} \mathcal{E}', \rho \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}, \) etc. and similarly the \( Q \)-operators involve \( \mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}' \), etc. For a transmutation \( B \) adapted to such a \(( P-Q)\)-framework (by which we mean a situation as in Theorem 4.3 of [7] or Theorem 4 of [5] whose properties are summarized in (2.9)) one has from [3; 5; 7] \( B = \mathcal{P} \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}' \), and \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} \). Thus \( \rho \bar{g} = \rho B^* g = \rho \mathcal{P} \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} \) and similarly for \( \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{P} \mathcal{Q} \) with \( \mathcal{B}^* = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F}^* \) and \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P} \mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} \) we have \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F}^* f = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{F}^* f \subset \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} \). Hence for \( f, g \) such that \( \bar{f} \) and \( \bar{g} \) make sense we have \( \rho \bar{f} \) and \( 2g \) in \( \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} \) and as an adjunct to theorem 2.3 we state

**Proposition 2.5.** Given a transmutation \( B \) adapted to a \(( P-Q)\)-framework as in Part I, theorem 4.3, \( f \in \mathcal{E} \) and \( g \in \mathcal{F} \) as in Theorem 2.3 we have \( \rho \bar{f} \) and \( 2g \) in \( \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} \).

**Remark 2.6.** We recall that the operators \( \mathcal{P}, \rho, \) etc. will have realizations in various spaces so we are not always concerned with “pinning down” the \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( Q \) operators in any one framework; similarly \( B \) can act in various spaces. When a framework is to be specified we refer to \( \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_A = \{ f; \lambda^{1/2} f \in L^2 \}, \mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E}_A' = \{ f; \lambda^{-1/2} f \in L^2 \} \), and set \( \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{P} \mathcal{E} \).

### 3. Parseval Formulas.

We will sketch first the kind of procedure followed by Marĉenko [16] to obtain Parseval formulas for operators \( D^2 - q(x) \). Then we will show how to generalize this formally to deal with operators having singularities of the type arising in \( P(D)u = (Au')'/A - q(x) \). Precise results can then be obtained for \( A = x^{2m+1} \), where further information is available, and this gives an independent derivation of Gasymov’s Parseval formula for this case (see [11; 12]). The rigorous extension of this technique to general \( A \) as in Chebli [1-18; 1-19] is in progress. The type of Parseval formula in question can be written

\[(3.1) \quad \langle R, \rho f \rho g \rangle = \langle A^{-1/2} f, A^{-1/2} g \rangle \]

which reduces to the Marĉenko case for \( A = 1 \) and is equivalent to to Gasymov’s formula for \( A = x^{2m+1} \) (where Gasymov works with \( l = m - 1/2 \) integral).

**Remark 3.1.** Consider the case \( P(D) = D^2 - q(x) \) of Marĉenko [16] and
suppose first that spectral information is known (i.e. the \( \nu \) pairing). Let \( \delta_n \) be a sequence of functions, \( \delta_n \in E \) if possible, \( \delta_n(x) = 0 \) for \( x \geq 1/n \), \( \int_0^\infty \delta_n(x) dx = 1 \), \( \delta_n(x) \geq 0 \) (\( x \in [0, 1/n] \)), and \( \delta_n(x) \rightarrow \delta \) in say \( \mathcal{S}' \). Set \( \mathcal{R}_n = \mathcal{P}\delta_n \) and \( U_n(x, y) = T_\nu^\mathcal{R}_n(x, y) \). Then (cf. [3; 7]).

\[
U_n(x, y) = \langle H(y, \mu), \mathcal{R}_n(\lambda)H(x, \mu) \rangle,
\]

Multiply by suitable \( f, g \in E \) and integrate to obtain

\[
\langle g(y), \langle U_n(x, y), f(x) \rangle \rangle = \langle \mathcal{R}_n(\lambda), \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) \rangle.
\]

Given that \( T_\nu^\mathcal{R}_n(x) \) makes sense we have formally \( \langle U_n(x, y), f(x) \rangle \rightarrow \langle T_\nu^\mathcal{R}_n(x, y), f(x) \rangle = (\delta^* f)(y) = f(y) \) (cf. [3; 7]) so the left side of (3.3) tends to \( \langle f(y), g(y) \rangle = \int_0^\infty f(y)g(y) dy \). On the other hand from (2.4) \( \mathcal{R}_n(\lambda) = \mathcal{P}\delta_n(\lambda) \rightarrow R(\lambda) = \Omega(0, \mu) \) which we call \( \mathcal{P}\delta(\lambda) \) if this makes sense and is nonzero. Hence we can state.

**Theorem 3.2.** If the \( \nu \) spectral pairing is known for \( \hat{E} \) and \( T_\nu^\mathcal{R}_n(x) \) makes sense acting as indicated then the spectral function \( \mathcal{R}_n(\lambda) = \Omega(0, \mu) \) yields a Parseval formula

\[
\langle f, g \rangle = \langle \mathcal{R}_n(\lambda), \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) \rangle.
\]

Note that when a singularity is present as in our operators \( P \) based on \( A \) and \( \Omega = AH \) then \( \Omega(0, \mu) = 0 \). This also occurs for \( \Omega \) as in (2.3) and Example 3.5 of Part I shows that \( T_\nu^\mathcal{R}_n(x) = 0 \) in such a case also. With operators such as \( D^2 - q \) however \( \Omega(0, \mu) \) is a sensible function and \( T_\nu^\mathcal{R}_n(x) \) will make sense.

**Remark 3.3.** In general the idea is to discover the \( \nu \) pairing and if one has a transmutation \( B: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \) where the \( \mathcal{Q} \) theory is known then the \( \nu \) pairing can be obtained by a variation on the above argument (cf. Marčenko [16]). With the operator \( \mathcal{P}(D) = D^2 - q(x) \) (for suitable \( q \)) one transmutes \( P \) into \( \mathcal{Q} = D^2 \) of course and we sketch here a version of Marčenko's argument in our framework. It is convenient to use the representation \( \beta(y, x) = \delta(x - y) + L(y, x) \) and \( \gamma(x, y) = \delta(x - y) + K(x, y) \) here where \( K \) and \( L \) will be functions. In particular \( L(y, x) = 0 \) for \( x > y \) and \( K(x, y) = 0 \) for \( y > x \) (such triangularity properties are proved in a general way in Carroll-Gilbert [8; 9]). Let \( L \) and \( K \) be obtained via Riemann functions as in [16] so that no spectral theory is assumed (\( B^{-1} \) refers to spaces like \( \mathcal{E} = C^\infty \) — not \( L^2 \)). We can write \( \tilde{f}(y) = \beta^* f(y) = f(y) + \int_x^\infty K(\xi, y) \times f(\xi) d\xi \) with \( \dot{g}(x) = g(x) + \int_x^\infty L(\xi, x) g(\xi) d\xi \). Let \( K^2(\sigma) \) denote \( L^2 \) functions \( f \) vanishing for \( x > \sigma \) and \( CK^2(\sigma) \) their cosine transform \( \mathcal{R} f(\lambda) \); from the definitions \( f, g \in K^2(\sigma) \) implies \( \tilde{f}, \dot{g} \in K^2(\sigma) \) (since \( K \) and \( L \) are triangular). From (2.12) we see then that \( \rho f(\lambda) \in CK^2(\sigma) \) and \( CK^2(\sigma) \) can be characterized as the
set of even entire functions \( G(\lambda) \in L^2 \) for \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) satisfying \( |G(\lambda)| \leq c \exp |\text{Im } \lambda| \) for \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \). Let \( Z(\sigma) \) denote the space of even entire functions \( G(\lambda) \in L^1 \) for \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) satisfying this same type of estimate for \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \). Let \( Z = \bigcup Z(\sigma) \) and \( \mathcal{C}K^2 = \bigcup \mathcal{C}K^2(\sigma) \) (countably normed—cf. [1–28]) so we have \( Z \subset \mathcal{C}K^2 \). Note that \( F, G \in \mathcal{C}K^2 \) implies \( FG \in Z \) which is the kind of situation one wants in (3.1) (i.e. we will have the product \( \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) \in Z \)). Following a procedure indicated in part already and extended below it can be shown that the spectral function \( R \) of (3.1) lies in \( Z' \). First we go back to \( U_{a}(x, y) = T_{2} \delta_{a}(x) \) which we write in the somewhat different form \( U_{a}(x, y) = \int \hat{R}_{a}(\lambda) H(x, \mu) H(y, \mu) \, d\lambda \). Then \( U_{a}(x, 0) = \delta_{a}(x) = \int \hat{R}_{a}(\lambda) H(x, \mu) \, d\lambda \) (\( \sim \mathcal{P} R_{a}(x) \)). But \( \Theta = BH \) so we want \( (B \delta_{a})(y) = \delta_{a}(y) \) + \( \int_{0}^{y} L(y, x) \delta_{a}(x) \, dx = \int \hat{R}_{a}(\lambda) \Theta(y, \mu) \, d\lambda \) (\( \sim \mathcal{Q} R_{a}(y) \)). Thus we pass the determination of \( \hat{R}_{a} \) from the \( \mathcal{P} \) theory to the (known) \( \mathcal{Q} \) theory but without introducing \( \rho \) the pairing used in specifying \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{Q} \) before; thus the use of \( B \) here bypasses the spectral theory for \( \mathcal{P} \). Now \( \delta_{a} \in \mathcal{E}, B \delta_{a} \in \mathcal{F} \), and we suppose an inversion for the \( \Theta \) transform is known relative to the \( \lambda \) pairing. For example assume the \( \hat{F} - \hat{F'} = \hat{F} \) or \( \omega \) pairing can be passed to \( \lambda \) as \( d\lambda = \omega(\lambda) d\lambda \). Then it follows that \( \int \hat{R}_{a}(\lambda) \Theta(y, \mu) \, d\lambda = \int \hat{R}_{a}(\lambda) \Theta(y, \mu) \omega(\lambda) \, d\omega = \mathcal{Q}(\hat{R}_{a} \omega)(y) \in \mathcal{F} \) so \( \hat{R}_{a} \) can be determined as \( \hat{R}_{a}(\lambda) \omega(\lambda) \in \hat{F} \) by

\[
(3.5) \quad \hat{R}_{a}(\lambda) \omega(\lambda) = \mathcal{Q} B \delta_{a} = \mathcal{Q} [\delta_{a}(y) + \int_{0}^{y} L(y, x) \delta_{a}(x) \, dx].
\]

When \( \mathcal{Q}(D) = D^{2}, \Theta(y, \mu) = \cos \lambda y, F = \mathcal{F}, W(y, \mu) = \frac{2}{\pi} \cos \lambda y \), we have \( \omega(\lambda) = 1 \) and (3.5) works. Once \( \hat{R}_{a} \) is thus determined we multiply \( U_{a}(x, y) \) by \( f(x) g(y) \) and integrate to obtain as in (3.3)

\[
(3.6) \quad \langle g(y), U(x, y), f(x) \rangle = \langle \hat{R}_{a}(\lambda), \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) \rangle_{\lambda}.
\]

Using Riemann functions again it can be shown that (cf. [13; 16; 1–33])

\[
(3.7) \quad U_{a}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} [\delta_{a}(x+y) + \delta_{a}(x-y)] + \int_{x-y}^{x+y} \beta(x, y, t) \delta_{a}(t) \, dt
\]

where \( \beta_{a}(x, y) = \int_{x-y}^{x+y} \beta(x, y, t) \delta_{a}(t) \, dt \) can be estimated and \( \iint f(x) g(y) \beta_{a}(x, y) \times dx dy \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Since \( f, g \) are even the left side of (3.6) tends to \( \langle f(x), g(x) \rangle \) and we write (formally)

\[
(3.8) \quad R = \lim \hat{R}_{a} = \mathcal{Q} [\delta(y) + L(y, 0)] = \frac{2}{\pi} \{1 + \mathcal{C}[L(y, 0)]\} \in Z'.
\]
TRANSMUTATION, GENERALIZED TRANSLATION II

since $Q$ is based on $W = \frac{2}{\pi} \cos \lambda y$ ($C$ denotes the cosine transform). Consequently (3.1) will follow.

**Remark 3.4.** As indicated before when singularities are present the above argument breaks down at several points (e.g., (3.7) is inaccurate). The formal change needed is basically to replace $\delta(x)$ by $\delta_A(x) = \delta(x)/A(x)$, acting on suitable objects, and rephrase the argument. This applies whether we take $\Omega = AH$ or $\Omega = R_\Omega AH$ as in (2.3). For simplicity take $\Omega = AH$ with $P(D)u = (Au')'/A$ and observe that from (2.4) formally $P\delta_A(\lambda) = \delta_A(\lambda) = 1$ so that from (2.5) $\delta_A(x) = \langle H(x, \mu), 1 \rangle$ (or $\delta(x) = \langle \Omega(x, \mu), 1 \rangle$). Further from [7] $[T_2^*\delta_A(x)]^\wedge = H(y, \mu)$ where $T_2^*$ denotes the generalized translation associated equivalently with $P$ or $\hat{P} = P + \rho_P^*$. Consider as in (3.2) $\delta_A(x) \rightarrow \delta(x)$ and set $\delta_A^*(x) = \delta(x)/A(x)$ with $U_A^*(x, y) = T_2^*\delta_A^*(x)$; however in order to work in $E_A$ for example let $\delta_A \in C_0^\infty$ (see Remark 3.5 for technical comments). Then

\[(3.9)\quad U_A^*(x, y) = \langle H(y, \mu), R_A^*(\lambda)H(x, \mu) \rangle,\]

where $R_A^*(\lambda) = P\delta_A^* \rightarrow 1$. Hence the analogue of (3.3) is

\[(3.10)\quad \langle g(y), U_A^*(x, y), f(x) \rangle = \langle R_A^*(\lambda), \rho f(\lambda)\rho g(\lambda) \rangle \rightarrow \langle 1, \rho f(\lambda)\rho g(\lambda) \rangle, = \int_0^\infty \rho f(\lambda)\rho g(\lambda) d\nu_P(\lambda)\]

since the $\nu$ pairing is given by a measure in this situation. Now, writing $f = f/A \in E_A$,

\[(3.11)\quad \langle U_A^*(x, y), f(x) \rangle = \langle T_2^*\delta_A^*(x), f(x) \rangle = \int_0^\infty T_2^*\delta_A^*(x)f(x) dx = \int_0^\infty T_2^*\delta_A^*(x)f_A(x) \cdot A(x) dx = (\delta_A^* f_A)(y)\]

where we recall from [14] and Flensted-Jensen [1-25] that a generalized convolution is given by $(f*g)(x) = \int T_2^*f(x)g(y)A(y)dy = \int T_2^*f(y)g(y)A(y)dy$ (cf. also Part I). Further one can prove for $f, g \in E_A$ for example that $f* g = g*f$ (cf. Theorem 3.6). Then the left side of (3.10) is formally

\[(3.12)\quad \langle g(y), U_A^*(x, y), f(x) \rangle = \langle g(y), (f_A* \delta_A^*)\rangle (y)\rightarrow \langle g(y), \int_0^\infty \delta_A^*(x)T_2^*f_A(x) \cdot A(x) dx = \langle g(y), T_2^*f_A(x) \rangle \rangle_{x = 0} = \langle g(y), f_A(y) \rangle = \langle A^{-1/2}g, A^{-1/2}f \rangle\]

and hence (3.10) yields a Parseval formula of the form (3.4).

**Remark 3.5.** That $T_2^*$ can be extended to $\delta_A(x)$ is clear (recall that
\[ T_\ast \delta_A(x) = H(y, \mu). \] The manner in which one represents this in the argument of Remark 3.4 is basically a matter of choosing a point of departure. Thus if we work in \( E_A = E \) (which is a convenient place to prove Theorem 3.6 below) then \( \delta_A(x) = \delta_A(x)/A(x) \) must be chosen accordingly. In the precise form which is possible for \( A = x^{2m+1} \) the continuity of \( T_\ast: \mathcal{C}^0(R^4_+) \to \mathcal{C}^0(R^4_+) \) is available (cf. [15; 18] — \( \mathcal{C}^0 \) denotes \( C^0 \) functions with the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets). Hence for various arguments we will be able to work in the dual \( \mathcal{M} \) of \( \mathcal{C}^0 \) (\( \mathcal{M} \) being Radon measures of compact support) and in this context it will be convenient to approximate \( \delta \) by \( \delta_n \in C_0^\infty \) (see Section 4 for more details). In particular let \( L_\delta \subset \mathcal{M} \) be \( L^1 \) functions with compact support and let \( \delta \) be a \( \delta \) approximation as in Remark 3.1. Then choose \( \delta_n \in C_0^\infty \) which converge to \( \delta_n \) in \( L_\delta \) as a \( C_0^\infty \) approximation in \( \mathcal{E}' \) (i.e. in \( \mathcal{M} \)). We denote such \( \delta_n \) by \( \delta_n \) now so that \( \delta_n(x) \in E_A \).

Now for \( f \in E_A \) set \( f = A\tilde{f} \) so that \( f \in E_A \) (cf. Remark 2.6 — \( A^{1/2} \tilde{f} = A^{-1/2} f \)). Then we have

**Theorem 3.6.** Given a \( \nu \) pairing, for \( \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in E_A, \tilde{f} = A\tilde{f}, \tilde{g} = A\tilde{g} \in E_A \) one has

\[
\langle T_\ast \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \rangle = \int_0^\infty T_\ast \tilde{f}(x)\tilde{g}(x)A(x)dx = (T_\ast \tilde{f}, \tilde{g}) = \langle f, T_\ast \tilde{g} \rangle = \int_0^\infty T_\ast \tilde{g}(x)\tilde{f}(x)A(x)dx = \langle T_\ast \tilde{g}, f \rangle.
\]

**Proof.** We generalize and recast an argument of Levitan [15] in our framework. Thus for \( f \in E = E_A \) let

\[
\phi(y, \mu) = \langle T_\ast \tilde{f}(x), \Omega(x, \mu) \rangle = PT_\ast \tilde{f}(x)(\lambda)
\]

Then \( P(D_\lambda)\phi = -\lambda^2\phi \) with \( \phi(0, \mu) = Pf(\lambda) \) and \( \phi_y(0, \mu) = 0 \) (since \( D_\lambda T_\ast \tilde{f}(x) = 0 \) at \( y = 0 \)); here \( \phi(y, \cdot) \in \tilde{E} \) and \( \phi(\cdot, \mu) \in \mathcal{E} \). On the other hand observe that \( \psi(x, y, \mu) = H(x, \mu)H(y, \mu) \) satisfies \( P(D_\lambda)\psi = P(D_\lambda)\psi \) with \( \psi(x, 0) = H(x, \mu) \) and \( \psi_y(x, 0) = 0 \) so

\[
H(x, \mu)H(y, \mu) = T_\ast H(x, \mu)
\]

(cf. Part I — \( H(\cdot, \mu) \in \mathcal{E} \) for example). Consider then (with \( H(y, \cdot) \) a multiplier in \( \tilde{E} \))

\[
\omega(y, \mu) = H(y, \mu)\langle f(x), \Omega(x, \mu) \rangle = H(y, \mu)Pf(\lambda)
\]

Clearly \( P(D_\lambda)\omega = -\lambda^2\omega \) with \( \omega(0, \mu) = Pf(\lambda) \) and \( \omega_y(0, \mu) = 0 \) (\( \omega(\cdot, \mu) \in \mathcal{E} \)). By uniqueness \( \phi(y, \mu) = \omega(y, \mu) \) while \( \omega(y, \mu) \) can be written as (from (3.15))

\[
\omega(y, \mu) = \langle f(x), H(y, \mu)H(x, \mu)A(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), T_\ast H(x, \mu)A(x) \rangle
\]
From (3.14) and (3.17) we obtain then

$$<T\xi f(x), H(x, \mu)A(x)> = <f(x), A(x)T\xi H(x, \mu)>$$

Now let $g(x) = <H(x, \mu), G(\lambda)> = PG(x)\in E$ and take $\nu$ brackets (assumed to exist in general and in fact known explicitly here already) in (3.18) with $G(\lambda)$ to obtain (3.13) for $f, g\in E$, i.e.

$$<T\xi f(x), g(x)A(x)> = <f(x), A(x)T\xi g(x)>$$

Note here that $<G(\lambda), T\xi H(x, \mu)> = T\xi g(x)$ since if

$$\varphi(x, y) = <G(\lambda), H(x, \mu)> = g(x)$$

then $P(D_x)\varphi = P(D_y)\varphi$ with $\varphi(x, 0) = <G(\lambda), H(x, \mu)> = g(x)$ (and $\varphi(x, 0) = 0$) so $\varphi(x, y) = T\xi g(x)$. Also from $T\xi f(x)\in E$ and $g(x)\in E$ one has $A^{\nu}(x)T\xi f(x)\in L^2$ and $A^{\nu}(x)g(x)\in L^2$ so $\int T\xi g(x)g(x)A(x)dx$ for example makes sense. Now in order to get $E = E'$ into the picture let $f, g\in E = E'$. Then note $f\in E' \sim A^{-1}(x)f\in E$ so writing $f(x) = A(x)\tilde{f}(x)$ we have $\tilde{f}(x)\in E$. Hence write (3.19) now as

$$<T\xi f(x), g(x)A(x)> = <f(x), A(x)T\xi g(x)>$$

for a (real) scalar product $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}) = \int f(x)\bar{g}(x)A(x)dx$ and we can write for $f\in E'$, $\tilde{g}\in E$,

$$<\tilde{g}, f> = \int_0^\infty \tilde{g}(x)f(x)dx = \int_0^\infty \bar{g}(x)\tilde{f}(x)A(x)dx = (\tilde{g}, \tilde{f})$$

Actually $\langle, \rangle$ could be a complex scalar product here since $T\xi f(x)$ is real for $f(x)$ real; this may not be true in later sections.

**Remark 3.7.** Problems modeled on the functions $A$ introduced in Example 2.1, and discussed briefly with some specific examples in Part I (for which the preceding analysis based on Remark 3.4 is in fact correct), are treated more extensively in our transmutation framework in Carroll-Gilbert [8; 9]. Properties of the corresponding $H(x, \mu) = \phi^\xi(x)$ etc. are obtained in [14; 1-25] for $A$ of the form $(e^x - e^{-x})^{2\pi + 1}(e^x + e^{-x})^{2\pi + 1}$ or $(e^x - e^{-x})^p(e^{2x} - e^{-2x})^q$. More general $A$ as well as perturbations of $P(D)u = (Au')'\in A$ by a potential are treated in [1-18; 1-19] and the transmutation method for such $A$ is developed in a forthcoming book [24]. Thus at this point we restrict our investigation of general $A$ in asserting only that the preceding argument expounded via Remark 3.4 is valid for $A$ of the type in [14; 1-25; 8; 9] and leads to the following theorem. Note that the theorem is not at all new or surprising ($d\nu_p$ is explicitly known) and has only been proved formally; it is the methodology which is being summarized in its
Theorem 3.8. For \( P(D) = (Au')' | A \) with \( A \) as in \([8; 9; 14; 1-25]\) the above procedure yields the Parseval formula for suitable \( f, g \in E \)

\[
\langle A^{-1/2} f, A^{-1/2} g \rangle = \int_0^\infty \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) d\nu_1(\lambda).
\]

Remark 3.9. Note that, without specifying spaces, the formula (3.18) leads one to write

\[
(T_\alpha)\Omega(x, \mu) = A(x) T_\alpha H(x, \mu).
\]

4. Parseval formulas for \( A = x^{2m+1} \). There remains of course the extension and modification of the argument of Remark 3.3 to discover the pairing for the more general \( A \) of \([1-18; 1-19]\) via a transmutation \( B: P \rightarrow Q \) where the \( Q \) theory is known. Then the \( \nu \) pairing for \( P(D) + q \) can be obtained by a transmutation \( P(D) + q \rightarrow P(D) \) for example using the same method. One wants to isolate the essential features of such arguments in order to arrive at a minimal collection of properties to study by hard analysis. As a step in this direction we examine the case \( A = x^{2m+1} \) in detail. Most of the technique will clearly generalize. First let us mention that the arguments of Levitan [15] on which the proof of Theorem 3.6 is based can be used to prove (cf. [15]).

Theorem 4.1. For continuous \( f \) such that \( \int x^{2m+1} f(x) dx < \infty \) and \( g \in C^0 \cap L^\infty \) one has for the \( T_\alpha \) associated with \( P_m(D) \)

\[
\int_0^\infty T_\alpha f(x) g(x) x^{2m+1} dx = \int_0^\infty T_\alpha g(x) f(x) x^{2m+1} dx.
\]

We take now \( P = P_m \) and \( \Omega \) as in (2.3)( i.e. \( \Omega = R_\alpha A H \) for \( A = x^{2m+1} \) and \( R_\alpha = c_\alpha^2 \lambda^{2m+1} \)). Then \( \delta_\alpha(x) = \delta(x) |x|^{2m+1} \) and \( \rho_\delta(x) = c_\alpha^2 \lambda^{2m+1} = R_\alpha(\lambda) \). With this normalization for \( \Omega \) recall that \( d\nu_\alpha = d\lambda \) and \( R^4(\lambda) = R_\alpha(\lambda) \) so that the Parseval formula of type (3.23) which arises is \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \)

\[
\langle x^{-m-1/2} f, x^{-m-1/2} g \rangle = \langle R_\alpha, \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) \rangle = \int_0^\infty R_\alpha(\lambda) \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) d\lambda
\]

(if \( \Omega = A H \) recall \( d\nu_\alpha = R_\alpha d\lambda \) and \( R^4 = 1 \) as in (3.10)).

Now no transmutation is needed to produce (4.2). Formally we can derive it via Remark 3.4 and a study of \( T_\alpha \) as in Remark 3.5 and Theorem 3.6 (this is made rigorous below). It is also interesting however to see how (4.2) can be derived via a transmutation of \( P = P_m \) into \( Q = D^2 \). This will serve as a model for producing Parseval formulas for \( P = P_m - q \) via a transmutation with \( D^2 \) by displaying in skeletal form how the different order of singularity affects the transmutation kernels etc. Another method on which we prefer to rely for such
$P$ is then developed where the Parseval formula for $P = P_m - q$ is obtained via transmutation into $Q = P_m$.

First let us deal with the limiting passage in (3.10) and (3.12) for $A = x^{2m+1}$. As mentioned in Remark 3.5 one knows $T_y: \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_0^*) \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_0^*)$ is continuous and we assume Theorem 4.1 is known (as well as Theorem 3.6 for $E = E_A = \{ f; x^{m+1/2}f(x) \in L^2 \}$). Recall also the notation for $\mathcal{M}$ and $L_0^1$ from Remark 3.5 and set $\tilde{E} = \{ \tilde{\delta}; x^{2m+1}\tilde{\delta} \in L_0^1 \}$ (one is thinking of $\delta_n/x^{2m+1} = \tilde{\delta} \in \tilde{E}$ where $\delta_n \in L_0^1$ is a $\delta$ approximation in $\mathcal{M}$). For $\tilde{\delta} \in \tilde{E}$ set $x^{2m+1}\tilde{\delta} = \tilde{\delta} \in L_0^1$ and approximate $\phi$ by $C_0^\infty$ functions $\phi_k$ (recall that $C_0^\infty$ is dense in $L^1$ and $\text{supp} \phi \subset [0, x_d]$). Then $\tilde{\delta} \phi = \phi_k/x^{2m+1} \in \tilde{E}$ is continuous and (4.1) can be invoked for $g \in C^0 \cap L^\infty$; thus

$$
\int_0^\infty T_y \tilde{\delta} \phi_k(x) g(x) x^{2m+1} dx = \int_0^\infty T_y \tilde{\delta} \phi_k(x) x^{2m+1} dx - \int_0^\infty T_y g(x) \phi_k(x) dx
$$

and one extends (4.1) to $\tilde{\delta} \phi \in \tilde{E}$ by this limiting procedure. In order to provide a representation for the limiting values note that for $g \in \mathcal{S}'$ and $\tilde{\delta} \in \tilde{E}$ the map

$$
g \to \int_0^\infty \tilde{\delta} x^{2m+1} T_y g(x) dx = M_y(g): \mathcal{S}' \to C
$$

is continuous so we can write

$$
M_y(g) = \langle \Phi_y, g \rangle
$$

for $\Phi_y \in \mathcal{M}$ and we set $\Phi_y(x) = x^{2m+1} T_y \tilde{\delta}(x)$ to determine $T_y \tilde{\delta}(x)$. Thus the version of (4.1) obtained by limiting procedures from (4.1) can be written

$$
\int_0^\infty T_y \tilde{\delta} \phi_k(x) x^{2m+1} dx = \langle T_y \tilde{\delta} g(x), \phi_k(x) x^{2m+1} \rangle = \langle x^{2m+1} T_y \tilde{\delta} \phi_k(x), g(x) \rangle
$$

($\langle , \rangle$ denotes $\mathcal{S}' - \mathcal{M}$ duality). Now let $\tilde{\delta} \phi_k(x) x^{2m+1} = \delta_n(x) \in L_0^1$ where $\delta_n \to \delta$ in $\mathcal{M}$. The left side of (4.5) tends to $T_y \tilde{\delta} g(x)|_{x=0} = g(y)$ in $\mathcal{S}' - \mathcal{M}$ duality and hence in $\mathcal{M}$

$$
x^{2m+1} T_y \delta_n(x)/x^{2m+1} \to \delta(x-y) = x^{2m+1} T_y \delta(x)/x^{2m+1}.
$$

We summarize this in

**Lemma 4.2.** For $\tilde{\delta} \in \tilde{E}$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}'$ (4.5) holds in $\mathcal{S}' - \mathcal{M}$ duality and extends (4.1). By limiting procedures we then arrive at (4.6).

Now to derive (4.2) we consider (3.11)–(3.12) for $A = x^{2m+1}$, $\delta_n(x) = \delta_n(x)/A(x) \in E_A = E$, and $f \in E' = E$ (i.e. use $C_0^\infty$ approximations to $\delta$). The $f_n * \delta_n \to f_\delta * f_A$ interchage is then justified by Theorem 3.6 actually and the limit in (3.12) is correct if $T_y f_A(x) \in C^0$. Hence approximate $f = A^{1/2} f_\delta = A^{-1/2} f \in L^2$ by $C_0^\infty$ functions $f_\delta$ in $L^2$ so $f_\delta = A^{-1/2} f_\delta$ is continuous. Therefore for $g \in E$ (3.12) yields ($f_\delta = A^{1/2} f_\delta$)
Note that Lemma 4.2 says

\[ A(x)T_x\delta_A(x) = \delta(x-y) \]

and this can be applied directly in (3.11) (to continuous \( f_A(x) \) at least) without using Theorem 3.6. Thus it appears that we can use either Theorem 3.6 or Lemma 4.2 in order to obtain (4.7). Note however that the existence of a \( \nu \) pairing is used in proving Theorem 3.6. Also observe that a corresponding Lemma 4.2 for general \( A \) however involves knowing that \( T_yx : \mathcal{S}^0 \to \mathcal{S}^0 \) is continuous for the associated \( T_x \).

It remains to show that (cf. (3.10) and recall that \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda \))

\[ \langle R^4_\lambda, \rho f_\lambda \rho g_\lambda \rangle \to \int_0^\infty R_\lambda(\lambda) \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) d\lambda \]

where (cf. (2.3)) \( R^4_\lambda = P\delta_A^4(\lambda) = \langle \delta_A^4(x), \Omega(x, \mu) \rangle = c^2_\lambda \lambda^{2m+1} \delta_n(x), H(x, \mu) \rangle \).

Now \( \rho : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}' = \{ f; \lambda^{m+1}f(\lambda) \in L^1 \} \) is continuous and we denote by \( \mathcal{E}' \) the space \( \mathcal{E}' = \{ h; \lambda^{m+1}h(\lambda) \in L^1 \} \) so that for \( f, g \in \mathcal{E} \) we have \( \rho f \rho g \in \mathcal{E}' \).

Further from \( f_\lambda \to f = A^{-1/2}f \) in \( L^2 \)we have \( f_\lambda = A^{1/2}f_\lambda \to f \) in \( \mathcal{E} \) by definitions. Since \( \rho \) is continuous we have \( \rho f_\lambda \to \rho f \) in \( \mathcal{E}' \) and hence \( \rho f_\lambda \rho g \to \rho f \rho g \) in \( \mathcal{E}' \). If we show that \( R^4_\lambda \to R_0 \) weakly (weak *) in \( \mathcal{E}' = \{ \psi; \lambda^{-2m-1}_n \psi \in L^2 \} \) then (4.9) holds. To do this note first that

\[ |R^4_\lambda(\lambda)\lambda^{-2m-1}| = c^2_\lambda |\delta_n(x), H(x, \mu)| \leq c^2_\lambda h \int_0^\infty |\delta_n(\lambda)| d\lambda = c^2_\lambda h \]

where \( |H(x, \mu)| \leq h \) and we can take \( \delta_n \geq 0 \) with \( \int_0^\infty \delta_n dx = 1 \). Hence \( R^4_\lambda \in \mathcal{E}' \).

On the other hand

\[ |R_0 - R^4_\lambda| \lambda^{-2m-1} = c^2_\lambda (1 - \langle \delta_n, H \rangle). \]

We know \( H(\cdot, \mu) \in \mathcal{S} \) so we need only show \( \langle \delta_n, H \rangle \to 1 \) weakly in \( L^2 \) as \( \delta_n \to \delta \) in \( \mathcal{S}' \) (or \( \mathcal{M} \)). For \( \lambda \) fixed \( \langle \delta_n, H \rangle \to 1 \) since \( H(0, \mu) = 1 \) and for fixed \( f \in L^1 \) we have \( \langle f, (1 - \langle \delta_n, H \rangle) \rangle \to 0 \) by dominated convergence in \( L^1 \). Hence we have proved

**Theorem 4.3.** For \( P_m = D^m + ((2m+1)/x)D \) the Parseval formula (4.2) holds for \( f, g \in \mathcal{E} \).

**Remark 4.4.** We emphasize again that this procedure is given in detail to indicate clearly some of the ingredients which go into general Parseval formulas in our framework. In this direction let us also consider a derivation based on a transmutation \( B : P = P_m \to Q = D^2 \). Thus (cf. Remark 3.3 now) write \( U_\lambda(x, y) \)
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\[ (4.12) \quad U_\alpha(x, y) = \langle R_\alpha^\mu(\lambda), H(x, \mu)H(y, \mu) \rangle_\omega \]

where \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\omega = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda \) in fact \( \delta_\alpha(x) = \delta_\alpha(x)/x^{2m+1} \) as before. Then

\[ (4.13) \quad \delta_\alpha^\mu(x) = \langle R_\alpha^\mu(\lambda), H(x, \mu) \rangle_\omega = \rho R_\alpha^\mu \]

(\( \rho \) suitably extended) and we operate on (4.13) with \( B = 2 P \) to get

\[ (4.14) \quad (B\delta_\alpha^\mu)(y) = Q R_\alpha^\mu \]

since \( 2^{-1} = P \rho Q (2P \rho = Q^{-1} = Q) \). Thus the determination of the spectral function \( R \) is passed to the \( Q \) theory and

\[ (4.15) \quad R_\alpha^\mu(\lambda) = Q B \delta_\alpha^\mu = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty (B\delta_\alpha^\mu)(y) \cos \lambda y dy. \]

We know from multiplying (4.12) by \( f(x)g(y) \) and integrating as before that (4.2) should follow and since \( d\omega = d\lambda \) this means that \( R_\alpha^\mu(\lambda) \rightarrow R_\alpha(\lambda) \). Thus in order to apply the transmutation method of determining the spectral function \( R \) being a distribution of order \( >0 \) and basically arises out of the different type of singularity in \( P_m \) and \( D^2 \). Since this method will be important in determining Parseval formulas for \( P \alpha = (Au')'/A \) with general \( A \) as in [1–18; 1–19] we will give some further discussion here of (4.15) and related formulas. The groundwork for this was developed in Part I, Section 4 (Theorem 4.6) where a formula for \( B\delta_A \) was derived. We recall this here (cf. equation (4.23) in [7]).

\[ (4.16) \quad (B\delta_A)(y) = \beta_m y^{-2m-2} = \alpha_m \int_0^\infty \lambda^{2m+1} \cos \lambda y d\lambda \]

where \( \beta_m = 2\Gamma(1/2)/\Gamma(m+1)\Gamma(-1/2-m) \) and \( y^{-2m-2} \) is to be interpreted as \( y_+^{2m-2} + y_-^{2m-2} \) where \( y_+ \) denotes the standard pseudofunction of Schwartz (cf. [1–43]). Various formulas for the kernel \( \beta(y, x) \) of \( B \) were given in [7] (cf. also [3; 4]) but there is no need to repeat these here. Now we need only show that \( R_\alpha^\mu(\lambda) \rightarrow R_\alpha(\lambda) \) weakly in \( E' \) in order to pass from (4.12) to (4.2) (since the passage \( \langle g(y), U_\alpha(x, y), f(x) \rangle \rightarrow \langle x^{-m-1/2}g, x^{-m-1/2}f \rangle \) has already been established). For this let us show first.

**Lemma 4.5.** The image of \( \tilde{E} = \{ \phi; \phi x^{2m+1} \in L^1_\beta \} \) under \( B \) consists of distributions \( B\phi \) of the form \( \psi = \phi x^{2m+1}, \eta = y^2, \xi = x^2 \)

\[ (4.17) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta}} (B\phi)(\sqrt{\eta}) = \frac{\Gamma(1/2)}{\Gamma(m+1)} \left( Y_{-m-1/2}^* \frac{\psi}{\sqrt{\xi}} \right). \]
Proof. The formula (4.12) of Part I for $B\phi$ becomes here

\[(4.18) \quad (B\phi)(y) = \gamma_\eta^n y \left(\frac{1}{y} D_y\right)^n \int_0^y \psi(x) (y^2 - x^2)^{n-m-\frac{3}{2}} dx\]

where $\gamma_\eta^n = \Gamma(1/2) / \Gamma(m+1) \Gamma(n-m-1/2)$ and $-1/2 < m < n-1/2$. One can take $n > m + 3/2$ to insure that everything makes sense for $\psi \in L^1$. Now set $x = \sqrt{\xi}$, $y = \sqrt{\eta}$, and $(1/y) D_y = 2D_\eta$ and recall the definitions of the pseudo-functions $Y_\alpha$ from [7] (based on Schwartz [1–43] and Gelfand–Šilov [1–28]). Write (4.18) now as

\[(4.19) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta}} (B\phi)(\sqrt{\eta}) = \frac{\Gamma(1/2) \int_0^\eta \psi^{(\sqrt{\xi})}(\eta - \xi)^{n-m-\frac{3}{2}} d\xi}{\Gamma(m+1) \Gamma(n-m-1/2)} = \frac{\Gamma(1/2) \int_0^\eta \psi^{(\sqrt{\xi})} \theta^{n-m-1/2} d\xi}{\Gamma(m+1) \Gamma(n-m-1/2)} \]

and recall that $D(S^* T) = DS^* T$ with $D_\eta Y_n^{m-1/2} = Y_{m-1/2}$ to obtain (4.17). QED

Next in order to describe the $R^\omega_\alpha$ of (4.15) we want to characterize the cosine transforms of $B\phi$ where $B\phi$ is given by Lemma 4.5. First observe that we already know the answer since $R^\omega_\alpha = R^\omega_\alpha = \delta_\alpha$ must coincide with $R^\omega_n$ (recall $\psi = \phi = \delta_\alpha$, $\lambda = \phi = \delta_\alpha$ here and compare (4.12) with (3.9)). Hence for $\phi_\alpha \eta^{2m+1} = \psi$, one has ($c_m = 1/2^n \Gamma(m+1)$)

\[(4.20) \quad R^\omega_\alpha = \langle \delta_\alpha(x), \Omega(x, \mu) \rangle = c_m \lambda^{2m+1} \int \delta_\alpha(x) H(x, \mu) dx = c_m \lambda^{2m+1} \int \delta_\alpha(x)(\lambda x)^{-\alpha} f_\alpha(\lambda x) dx \]

and we want to arrive at this formula without knowledge of the $\nu$ pairing or the identification $R^\omega_\alpha = R^\omega_\alpha$. Thus write from (4.15) and (4.17) ($\psi = \phi_\alpha \eta^{2m+1}$)

\[(4.21) \quad R^\omega_\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty (B\phi)(\sqrt{\eta}) \cos \lambda \eta d\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty (B\phi)(\sqrt{\eta}) \cos \lambda \sqrt{\eta} \eta d\eta = \Gamma(1/2) \int_0^\infty (Y_{m-1/2} \psi^{(\sqrt{\xi})}(\eta^{n-m-1/2}) \psi^{\sqrt{\xi}}(\eta) \cos \lambda \sqrt{\eta} d\eta \]

Then writing formally $Y_\alpha * (\psi^{(\sqrt{\xi})}(\sqrt{\xi})) = 2 \int_0^\infty Y_\alpha (y^2 - \xi^2) \psi(x) dx = 2 \langle \psi^{(\sqrt{\xi})}(\sqrt{\xi}), \psi(x) \rangle / \Gamma(\alpha) (\alpha = -m-1/2)$ and setting $k_m = 2 \Gamma(1/2) / \pi \Gamma(m+1)$ we obtain

\[(4.22) \quad R^\omega_\alpha(\lambda) = k_m \int_0^\infty \langle (y^2 - \xi^2)^{\alpha-1}, \psi(x) \rangle \cos \lambda \sqrt{\eta} d\eta = k_m \lambda \int_0^\infty \psi(x) \left( \int_0^\infty (y^2 - \xi^2)^{\alpha-1} \right) \sin \lambda \eta d\eta dx \]
where some basically routine calculation has been omitted in (4.22). Now the last integral in (4.22) can be evaluated by a formula in Bryčkov-Prudnikov [1-3]. Indeed setting \(1/2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{sgn}(y) (y^2 - x^2)^{\alpha} \sin \lambda y \, dy = \Xi(x, \lambda)\) we have

\[
\Xi(x, \lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(\alpha + 1)}{2} \text{sgn}(\lambda) \left( \frac{|\lambda|}{2x} \right)^{-\alpha-1/2} J_{-\alpha-1/2}(x|\lambda|).
\]

Since \(\alpha = -m - 1/2\) we obtain for \(\lambda \geq 0\) the formula

\[
R^\alpha_\phi(\lambda) = \tilde{k}_m \int_0^\infty \lambda^{m+1/2} \psi(x)x^{-m} J_m(\lambda x) \, dx
\]

where \(\tilde{k}_m = k_m \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(-m+1/2)/2^{m+1/2} (-m-1/2) = c_m\) which has the desired form (4.20). Thus

\[\text{Lemma 4.6.}\] The image of \(\mathcal{E}\) under \(QB\) consists of elements of the form (4.24) \((\psi = \phi x^{m+1} \in L_0^2)\) and lies in \(\mathcal{E}_c\). If \(\phi_n \to \delta x^{m+1}\) via \(\psi_n \to \delta\) in \(\mathcal{S}'\) then \(R^\alpha_n \to R_\alpha^\phi\) in \(\mathcal{E}_c'\) weakly.

Proof. The formula (4.24) has been established and the remaining statements can be proved exactly as in the proof of Theorem 4.3. QED

Using the background discussion for Theorem 4.3 with Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 we can summarize by stating

\[\text{Theorem 4.7.}\] The Parseval formula (4.2) can be proved via a transmutation \(B : P_m \to D^2\) as indicated.

5. Parseval formulas with singularities and potential. Having “discovered” the \(\nu\) pairing for \(P_m(D)\) via a transmutation with \(Q(D) = D^2\) for example let us turn to \(P(D) = P_m(D) - q(x)\) and set \(Q(D) = P_m(D)\). There will be some interplay here with \(P_m(D) = D^2 - (m^2 - 1/4)/x^2\) and we observe that \(x^{m+1/2} P_m(D) \psi = P_m(D) \{x^{m+1/2} \psi\}\) (\(P_m\) is the form usually studied in quantum mechanics). It will be convenient to use here some results of Braaksma [1-1], Braaksma-deSnoo [1-2], Gasymov [11; 12], Siersma [18], Staşevskaya [19; 20], Volk [21], et al., where transmutation kernels connecting \(P = P_m - q\) and \(\tilde{P}_m\) are constructed using Riemann functions (cf. also [1; 2]). In the present situation where there is a singularity of the same order of magnitude \((1/x^2)\) in \(\tilde{P}\) and \(\tilde{P}_m = \tilde{Q}\) (with the same coefficient) it is possible (for suitable \(q\)) to transmute \(\tilde{P}\) into \(\tilde{Q}\) via formulas \(\tilde{B}\tilde{P} = \tilde{Q}\tilde{B}\) with inverse \(\tilde{B}^{-1} = \tilde{B}\) where

\[
\tilde{B} \tilde{f}(y) = \tilde{f}(y) + \int_0^x L(y, x) \tilde{f}(x) \, dx;
\]

\[
\tilde{B} \tilde{g}(y) = \tilde{g}(x) + \int_0^x \tilde{K}(x, y) \tilde{g}(y) \, dy.
\]
Let us set \( L(y, x) = y^{-m-1/2}f(y) x^{m+1/2} \) and \( K(x, y) = x^{-m-1/2}K(x, y) y^{m+1/2} \) with \( f(y) = y^{m+1/2}f(y) \) and \( g(x) = x^{-m+1/2}g(x) \). Further let \( B = y^{-m-1/2}B x^{m+1/2}(x \to y) \) and \( \beta = x^{-m-1/2}B \beta x^{m+1/2} (y \to x) \). We are thinking here of \( P \) and \( Q \) in \( E = F = \{ f; x^{m+1/2}f = \bar{f} \in L^2 \} \). Then (5.1) is equivalent to

\[
\begin{align*}
Bf(y) &= f(y) + \int_0^y L(y, x)f(x)dx; \\
\beta g(x) &= g(x) + \int_0^x K(x, y)g(y)dy
\end{align*}
\]

and \( BP = QB \) with \( B^{-1} = \beta \). We emphasize that the transmutation operators exist even though the spectra of \( P \) and \( Q \) are not the same.

**Remark 5.1.** There are various hypotheses on \( q(x) \) which are used in literature mentioned above (cf. also Chadan-Sabatier [1-17] for hypotheses in physics). Regarding behavior near \( x = 0 \) we mention for example Siersma [18] where it is assumed that: \( n - 1/2 < Re m < n + 1/2 \) (for \( m \neq 0 \)) or \( m = n + 1/2; M = \max (2, n); \alpha > 0 \) (where in addition \( \alpha > 3/2 - \text{Rem} \) for \( n = 1 \) and \( \alpha > 1/2 - \text{Rem} \) for \( n = 0 \)); and \( q \in C^0(0, a) \) with \( D^k q(x) = 0(x^{m-k-1}) \) as \( x \to 0 \) for \( 0 \leq k \leq M \). Then (working on \([0, a], a < \infty \) arbitrary) there exists a continuous \( L(y, x) \) such that \( B \) given by (5.1) is a transmutation operator \( P \to Q \) in \( L^2 \). The domain of \( P \) and \( Q \) involves here \( \bar{f} \sim x^{m+1/2}(1 + 0(1)) \) and \( D(x^{-m-1/2}f(x)) \sim 0(x^{\gamma}) \) as \( x \to 0 \) where \( \gamma = 1 + \text{Rem} - |\text{Rem}| \) (\( \gamma = 1 \) for \( \text{Rem} \geq 0 \)). We prefer to leave \( D(P) \) and \( D(Q) \) unspecified in noting that various realizations are possible \((x^{-m-1/2}f(x) \sim 0(1) \) is retained however). Further \( |\bar{L}(y, x)| \leq Ky^m(x/y)^{\text{Rem}+1/2} \) \((0 \leq x \leq y) \) so that (taking \( m \) real for simplicity) \( |\bar{L}(y, x)x^{-m-1/2}| \leq Ky^{-m-1/2} \) and it will make sense to talk about \( \bar{L}(y, x)x^{-m-1/2} \) as \( x \to 0 \); \( \bar{L}(y) \) will come up later in our development as it does in Gasymov [11-12]. For smoothness, Gasymov [11-12] takes \( l = m - 1/2 \) integral and assumes \( q(x) \) has \( l \) locally summable derivatives with \( q^{(l)}(0) \in L^2_{\infty} \) in which case, in particular, it follows that \( L(x, y) = y^{l}L(y, x)x^{-l-1} = y^{m-l}L(y, x)x^{-m-1/2} \) \((0 \leq x \leq y) \) has \( l+1 \) locally summable derivatives and \( \bar{L} \) has \( l \) continuous derivatives. Here \( \bar{L}(y, x)x^{-l-1} = y^{-l}L_0(y, x) \) so \( \bar{L}(y) = y^{-l}L_0(y, 0) \) and \( L_0(y, x) \) is continuous in \((y, x)\) down to \( x = 0 \). Staševskaya [19] assumes \( \int_0^\infty |xq(x)|^{2+l}dx < \infty \) but the results are generally weaker regarding properties of \( \bar{L} \). Volk [21] assumes \( q \in C^0(0, a) \) which is stronger than necessary. The behavior of \( q(x) \) at \( \infty \) does not play a role in constructing \( \bar{L} \) or \( \bar{K} \) since basically we are dealing with hyperbolic problems having compact domains of dependence. It will come up later however in [6] when we consider Jost solutions and the Marčenko equation; it also plays a role in determining the number of bound states (i.e. eigenvalues).

We go now to the construction of Parseval formulas based on the technique indicated in Remark 3.3, so this can be considered as an extension of Marčenko's
procedure. Along the way we will indicate some of Gasymov's development for comparison (where \( l - m - 1/2 \) is an integer). Recall that we are basically interested in the "structure" of such theorems and will confine our attention to a singular term \((m^2 - 1/4)x^2\) in \( \bar{P}(D) \). The machinery extends then in an obvious manner to other operators with comparable singularity (in particular to \( P(D)u = (Au)'/A \)) and indicates a "canonical" direction for more general operators. Moreover in view of the various types of detail available (see e.g. Remark 5.1) for different hypotheses on \( q \) we do not make an explicit choice of such hypotheses and only note when necessary that the properties we want are available for suitable \( q \). In this section then \( \bar{P}(D) = \bar{P}_m(D) - q(x) \) (\( q \) suitable) and \( \bar{Q}(D) = \bar{P}_m(D) \) so we write out

\[
(5.3) \quad \Theta(y, \mu) = c_m^{\mu}(\lambda y)^{-\mu} J_m(\lambda y); \quad W(y, \mu) = c_m^\mu(\lambda y)^{2m+1} \Theta(y, \mu)
\]

\((c_m = 1/2^m \Gamma(m+1))\). We will assume \( m \) real, \( m \geq -1/2 \), but \( q(x) \) may be complex; \( m \) complex, \( \text{Re } m > -1/2 \), could be included but we omit this for convenience. The function \( H(x, \mu) \) is now a solution of \( P(D)H = \mu H, H(0, \mu) = 1, H'(0, \mu) = 0 \) whose explicit form is not known. Thus we are obliged to work with a \( \omega \) pairing (\( \nu \) is unknown) and think of \( U_n(x, y) \) in the form \((4.12) \quad (d\omega = d\lambda) \) with \( R_n(\lambda) = QB\varphi_n \); we only need \( BH = \Theta \)—no spectral comparison is required. From the previous development we know here that \( \phi_n(x) = \delta_n(x) = \delta_n(x)/\delta^{2m+1} \) with \( \delta_n \rightarrow \delta \) is the right kind of object to introduce in dealing with the Parseval formula for \( P(D) \). Now take \( B \) in the form \((5.2) \) so that

\[
(5.4) \quad B\varphi_n(y) = \varphi_n(y) + \int_0^y L(y, x)\varphi_n(x) dx = \varphi_n(y) + \int_0^y y^{-m-1/2} L(y, x) x^{-m-1/2} \delta_n(x) dx.
\]

Then formally as \( \delta_n \rightarrow \delta \) and \( \varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi = \delta/\delta^{2m+1} \) we have \( B\varphi_n \rightarrow B\varphi \) where

\[
(5.5) \quad B\varphi(y) = \varphi(y) + \int_0^y y^{-m-1/2} \Theta(y, \mu) dy.
\]

(cf. Remark 5.1 for \( \bar{I}(y) \)). Hence formally \( R_n^\mu = QB\varphi_n \rightarrow R = QB\varphi \) with (cf. \((5.3) \) and \((3.8) \))

\[
(5.6) \quad R(\lambda) = \langle W(y, \mu), B\varphi(y) \rangle = c_m^\mu \lambda^{2m+1} + c_m^\mu \lambda^{2m+1} \int_0^\infty y^{m+1/2} \int_0^\infty \Theta(y, \mu) dy
\]

Thus \( R = R_0 + R_q \) where \( R_q \) measures the effect of \( q \).

Remark 5.2. Note that \( R(\lambda) \) could have genuine distribution components
arising from \( R_q \). For example a conceivable \( I \) is \( I(y)=D_0[\delta(y)] \) in which case (cf. [23])

\[(5.7) \quad R_q = c_m \lambda^{m+1/2} \int_0^\infty I(y)(\lambda y)^{1/2} J_m(\lambda y) dy = c_m \lambda^{m+1/2} (-1)^q \delta^{(q)}(\lambda-a). \]

Now to model a Parseval formula on the procedure of Remark 3.3 we take \((4.12)\), multiply it by suitable \( f, g \in E \), and integrate to obtain

\[(5.8) \quad \langle g(y), \langle U_n(x, y), f(x) \rangle \rangle = \langle R_n(\lambda), \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) \rangle_\omega. \]

Here \( f, g \) will have to be selected so that \( \rho f \rho g \in W \subset \tilde{E}_s \) with \( R_s \rightarrow R' \) in \( W' \) (\( \tilde{E}_s \) itself will not do in general since \( R \in \tilde{E}_s \)—cf. Remark 5.2). The correct spaces \( W \) were found by Gasymov [11; 12] and are defined below \( (W \) is analogous to the \( Z \) of Remark 3.3). Then a version of Lemma 4.2 (i.e. \( U_n(x, y) = T_q \phi_n(x) \rightarrow \]

\[ \text{Here } f, g \text{ will have to be selected so that } \rho f \rho g \in W \subset \tilde{E}_s \text{ with } R_s \rightarrow R' \text{ in } W' \text{ (} \tilde{E}_s \text{ itself will not do in general since } R \in \tilde{E}_s \text{—cf. Remark 5.2). The correct spaces } W \text{ were found by Gasymov [11; 12] and are defined below } (W \text{ is analogous to the } Z \text{ of Remark 3.3). Then a version of Lemma 4.2 (i.e. } U_n(x, y) = T_q \phi_n(x) \rightarrow \]

\[ \text{For example if } m > -1/2 \text{ (} m \neq 0 \text{) and say } g \in C_0[0, a] \text{ one obtains from Siersma [18]}

\[(5.9) \quad T_q f(x) = \int_{x-y}^{x+y} \beta(x, y, \xi) f(\xi) d\xi \]

where \( \beta \) is continuous and for \( x-y \xi < x+y \) \( (0 < y \leq x) \) there is a bound \( |\beta(x, y, \xi)| \leq M(\xi/x)^{m+1/2} y^{-2m} \left[ y^2 - (x-\xi)^2 \right]^{m-1/2} \). However observe that
(5.10) \[
\int_{x-y}^{x+y} \left( \frac{\xi}{x} \right)^{m+1/2} y^{-2m}[y^2-(x-\xi)^2]^{m-1/2} \, d\xi
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{y} \int_{-y}^{y} \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\xi} \right)^{m+1/2} \left( 1 - \frac{x^2}{\xi^2} \right)^{m-1/2} \, d\xi
\]
\[
\leq \frac{2}{y} \int_{0}^{y} \left( 1 - \frac{x^2}{\xi^2} \right)^{m-1/2} \, d\xi = K_m
\]
since \(1 - \frac{x^2}{\xi^2} \leq 2\) and \(y \int_{0}^{y} \left( 1 - \frac{x^2}{\xi^2} \right)^{m-1/2} \, d\xi = y\int_{0}^{1} (1 - \eta^2)^{m-1/2} \, d\eta = yB(1/2, m+1/2) = y\Gamma(1/2)\Gamma(m+1/2)/2\Gamma(m+1)\) (cf. [1–36]); thus \(K_m = 2^{m+1/2}\Gamma(1/2)\Gamma(m+1/2)/\Gamma(m+1)\). Consequently \(T'_x\) given by (5.9) maps \(L^\omega(R^2_+^l)\rightarrow L^\omega(R^2_+^l)\) and \(\delta^\omega(R^2_+^l)\rightarrow \delta^\omega(R^2_+^l)\) continuously. The argument of Lemma 4.2 can then be repeated to obtain

**Lemma 5.4.** The formula (4.5) holds for \(T'_x\sim P(D), f \in E, \) and \(g \in \delta^\omega\) and (4.6) determines \(x^{2m+1}T'_x(\delta(x)/x^{m+1})\).

Hence, as in the proof of Theorem 4.3, the calculation based on (3.11)–(3.12) is valid for \(f, g \in E\) and leads to (4.7). It remains to examine the convergence \(R^\omega_x \rightarrow R\) (cf. (5.6)). At this point we will introduce some spaces utilized by Gasymov [11]. Recall first from Remark 3.3 that \(K^2(\sigma)\) denotes \(L^2\) functions \(f(x)\) satisfying for \(x>\sigma (L^2 = L^2(0, \infty))\) and set \(K^2 = \bigcup K^2(\sigma)\). For \(f\) such that \(x^{-m-1/2}f(x) \in K^2(\sigma)\) consider

\[
F(\lambda) = \mathcal{F}(f(x)) = \langle f(x), \Theta(x, \mu) \rangle = \tilde{f}(\lambda) \\
= c_m^{-1} \int_{0}^{\infty} f(x)(\lambda x)^{-m} J_m(\lambda x) \, dx.
\]

Gasymov calls \(c_mF(\lambda)\) the Fourier-Bessel transform and notes that \(F \in W_m^2\) where (cf. Remark 5.9)

**Definition 5.5.** Let \(W_m^2\) be the space of even entire functions satisfying

a) \(|F(\lambda)| \leq c |\lambda|^{-m-1/2} \exp \sigma |\text{Im} \, \lambda|\) for \(|\lambda|\) large (some \(\sigma\)—here \(\sigma\) is related to \(f\)) and also

b) \(\int_{0}^{\infty} |\lambda|^{2m+1} |F(\lambda)|^2 \, d\lambda < \infty\). One says that a sequence \(F_n(\lambda) \rightarrow 0\) in \(W_m^2\) if a) holds for a fixed \(\sigma\) in the form \(|F_n(\lambda)| \leq c \exp \sigma |\text{Im} \, \lambda|\) and

\(\int_{0}^{\infty} |F_n(\lambda)|^2 |\lambda|^{2m+1} \, d\lambda \rightarrow 0\). Let \(W_m^1\) denote even entire functions satisfying a) \(|F(\lambda)| \leq |\lambda|^{-2m} \exp \sigma |\text{Im} \, \lambda|\) for \(|\lambda|\) large (some \(\sigma\)) and b) \(\int_{0}^{\infty} |\lambda|^{2m+1} |F(\lambda)|^2 \, d\lambda < \infty\).

A sequence \(F_n(\lambda) \rightarrow 0\) in \(W_m^1\) if \(|F_n(\lambda)| \leq c \exp \sigma |\text{Im} \, \lambda|\) for a fixed \(\sigma\) and

\(\int_{0}^{\infty} |F_n(\lambda)|^2 |\lambda|^{2m+1} \, d\lambda \rightarrow 0\).

We note that if \(F \in W_m^1\) then \(F\) is bounded for \(\lambda\) real so \(|F(\lambda)|^2 \lambda^{2m+1} \leq c |F(\lambda)| \lambda^{2m+1}\) and \(F \in W_m^2\) will follow. \(W_m^1\) will serve as the space \(W\) alluded
Lemma 5.6. \( W_m \subset W^2_m \) is dense and \( F, G \in W^2_m \) implies \( FG \in W^2_m \).

Now recall the format of Remark 3.3 and observe the difference in notation \( f = \beta f \) and \( f = x^{2m+1} f \). Let us proceed (up to a point) as in Remark 3.3. From (5.2) we have \( \beta f(y) = f(y) + \int_y^\infty K(s, y) f(x) dx \). If \( f \in F(=E) \) and \( f(x) x^{-m-1/2} \subset K^2 \) then from (5.11) \( 2f = \int W_m^2 \) and \( f = QF \). If \( F \in W_m^2 \) and \( f = QF \) we say \( x^{-m-1/2} f \subset K_m^1 \); in this event \( \supp f \) is compact (cf. [11]). Now let \( f \in E \approx E' \) so \( f = \beta f \in F \approx F' \) and \( f \subset [0, \sigma] \) implies \( \supp f \subset [0, \sigma] \); consequently \( x^{-m-1/2} f \subset K_\sigma^2 \). By Theorem 2.3 \( 2f = \rho f \in W^2_m \) (similarly \( 2g = \rho g \in W^2_m \)) hence \( \rho f, \rho g \in W^2_m \) by Lemma 5.6. Recall now (cf. (4.12)) \( U_n(x, y) = T_2 f_n(x) = \langle R_n^*, H(x, \mu) H(y, \mu) \rangle \) so that \( \varphi_n(x) = \langle R_n^*, H(x, \mu) \rangle \) and \( B_n(x, y) = \langle R_n^*, \Theta(x, \mu) \rangle = \langle R_n^*, QB_n \rangle \). Again we will have an equation (5.8) of the form \( \langle f(y), U_n(x, y), g(x) \rangle = \langle R_n^*, \rho f \rho g \rangle \) and the left side tends to \( \langle y^{-m-1/2} f, y^{-m-1/2} g \rangle \) (i.e. to (4.7) — using Lemma 5.4 for \( g \in C^0 \)) and then passing to \( \tilde{g} \in L^2 \) as in the proof of Theorem 4.3). Consider now a function \( H \in W^2_m, H = 2h \), so that \( x^{-m-1/2} h \subset K_m^1 \) and in the formula \( \langle R_n^*, \Theta \rangle = Q R_n^* = B \varphi_n = \varphi_n(y) + \int_y^\infty L(y, x) \varphi_n(x) dx \) (cf. (5.4)) multiply by \( h(y) \) to obtain

\[
\langle R_n^*(\lambda), H(\lambda) \rangle = \langle \varphi_n(y), h(y) \rangle + \langle h(y), \int_y^\infty L(y, x) \varphi_n(x) dx \rangle
\]

\[
= \langle \delta_n(y), y^{-m-1} h(y) \rangle + \langle y^{-m-1} h(y), \int_y^\infty L(y, x) x^{-m-1/2} \delta_n(x) dx \rangle.
\]

We can suppose \( \supp \delta_n(x) \subset [0, 1/n] \) for example and all the terms in (5.12) make sense (recall from Remark 5.1 that \( L(y, x) x^{-m-1/2} = I(y, x) \) is continuous in \( x \) with \( I(y, x) \to I(y) \) as \( x \to 0 \) — also supp \( h \) is compact). In this respect we note that since \( h = QH \) one has

\[
h(y) y^{-2m-1} = \langle W(y, \mu), H(\lambda) \rangle y^{2m+1} = c_m^2 \int_0^\infty \lambda^{2m+1} H(\lambda) \Theta(y, \mu) d\lambda.
\]

But for \( H \in W^2_m, \lambda^{2m+1} H(\lambda) \in L^1 \) and since \( z^{-m} J_m(z) = \alpha_m \int_0^{\sqrt{z^2}} \cos(z \cos \theta) \sin^{2m} \theta d\theta \) for \( \alpha_m = 2^{1-m} \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(m+1/2) \) (cf. [22]) it follows that \( |\Theta(y, \mu)| \leq c(m) \) and consequently \( \Theta(y, \cdot) \in L^m \). Therefore \( h(y) y^{-2m-1} \) is well defined (and continuous) with

\[
\lim_{y \to 0} h(y) y^{2m+1} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle \varphi_n(y), h(y) \rangle = c_m^2 \int_0^\infty \lambda^{2m+1} H(\lambda) d\lambda.
\]
In particular we can define $R_0 = (W_m')'$ by (cf. [11])

\begin{equation}
(5.15) \quad \langle R_0, \bar{h} \rangle = \langle c_m^2, \chi^{2m+1}, \bar{h}(\lambda) \rangle = \lim_{y \to 0} h(y)y^{2m+1}
\end{equation}

(clearly $R_0 = c_m^2 \chi^{2m+1}(W_m')'$). Now from (5.13) if a sequence $H_p \to 0$ in $W_m^1$ then $h_p(y)y^{2m+1} \to 0$ in $L^\infty$ say. Hence for $\psi \in \bar{B} = \{\psi; \chi^{2m+1} \psi \in L_2^1\}$ we have $\langle \psi, h \rangle = \langle \chi^{2m+1} \psi, h \rangle \to 0$. Thus $h \in \bar{B}'$ and the map $H \to h: W_m^1 \to \bar{B}'$ is continuous (sequential limits as indicated in Definition 5.5 are quite sufficient here). In particular the first term in (5.12) is well defined for $\varphi \in \bar{B}$ and one can determine then $R_0^* = \bar{h} \to \langle \varphi, h \rangle \in (W_m^1)'$ which we write as

\begin{equation}
(5.16) \quad \langle R_0^*, \bar{h} \rangle = \langle \varphi, h \rangle
\end{equation}

(cf. [11] for an essentially equivalent version). In view of (5.15) we have then $R_0^* \to R_0$ in $(W_m^1)'$ weakly.

**Theorem 5.7.** One can write $R_0^* = R_0^* + R_q^*$ in (5.12) and $R_0^* \to R_0 + R_q = R$ weakly in $(W_m^1)'$ where $R$ is given by (5.6) as $R = R_0 + R_q$, $R_0 = c_m^2 \chi^{2m+1}$, $\langle R_q, \bar{h} \rangle = \int_0^\infty h(y)y^{-m-1/2}I(y)dy$ for $h \in W_m^1$ ($\bar{h} = 2h$) and formally, as a distribution,

\begin{equation}
(5.17) \quad R_q = c_m^2 \chi^{2m+1} \int_0^\infty y^{m+1/2} I(y) \Theta(y, \mu)dy .
\end{equation}

Proof. Writing $y^{m+1/2} L(y, x)x^{-m-1/2} = y^{m+1/2} I(y, x)$ the remaining term in (5.12) becomes

\begin{equation}
(5.18) \quad \Xi_n = \langle \psi, \bar{h} \rangle = \int_0^\infty \int_0^y y^{m+1/2} I(y, x) \delta_n(x)dx \rangle.
\end{equation}

Now as noted in Remark 5.1 it is appropriate to assume $y^{m+1/2} I(y, x) \leq K$ for $0 \leq x \leq y \leq (y \leq \sigma$ say) so we write $y^{m+1/2} I(\psi, \bar{h}) \in L^\infty_\infty$; here $h \in [0, \sigma]$ will be compact and one can assume $y \leq \sigma$ in this discussion. The function $\psi_n(y) = \int_0^y y^{m+1/2} I(y, x) \delta_n(x)dx$ is continuous since $\delta_n \in L^1$ and $L_n(y, x) = y^{m-1/2} I(y, x)$ is continuous in $(y, x)$ (cf. Remark 5.1). Hence if $H_p = \bar{h} \to 0$ in $W_m^1$ then as above $h_p(y)y^{2m+1} \to 0$ in $L^\infty$ so there exists $R_q^* \in (W_m')'$ such that $\Xi_n = \langle h(y)y^{-2m-1}, \psi_n(y) \rangle \langle R_q^*, \bar{h} \rangle$. Now as $n \to \infty \psi_n(y) \to \psi(y) = y^{m+1/2} I(y)$ pointwise boundedly—hence in $L^1$ by dominated convergence—and therefore $\langle R_q^*, \bar{h} \rangle = \Xi_n = \langle h(y)y^{-2m-1}, y^{m+1/2} I(y) \rangle = \Xi$. But as above $\Xi = \langle R_q^*, \bar{h} \rangle (y^{m+1/2} I(y)$ is continuous) and we have then $R_q^* \to R_q$ in $(W_m')'$ weakly. As explicit formula for $R_q^*$ is unnecessary and for $R_q$ formally the last expression in (5.6) is required. We note in this respect that given $\bar{h} \in W_m^1$ with supp $h \in [0, \sigma]$, where (by (5.13)) $h(y)y^{-2m-1} = c_m^2 \int_0^\infty y^{m+1/2} I(y) \Theta(y, \mu)dy$, we have formally (cf. also (5.6) and (3.8))
which gives (5.17). We emphasize that in equation (5.19) in general \( R_q \) is a distribution.

Thus for \( f, g \in E \) with \( x^{-\frac{m-1}{2}}f \) and \( x^{-\frac{m-1}{2}}g \in K \) we have proved the Parseval formula

\[
< y^{-\frac{m-1}{2}}f(y), y^{-\frac{m-1}{2}}g(y) > = < R, \rho f(\lambda)\rho g(\lambda) > \omega
\]

for \( R \in W'=(W_m')' \) (this coincides in form with (3.1) since \( d\omega = d\lambda \)). We state this formally as

**Theorem 5.8.** Let \( f, g \in E \) with compact supports. Then there exists a generalized spectral function \( R=R_0+R_q \in W'=(W_m')' \), where \( R_0=c_2\lambda^{2m+1} \) and \( R_q \) is determined by Theorem 5.7, such that the Parseval formula (5.20) holds \((d\omega = d\lambda)\).

**Remark 5.9.** In Chebli [1–18; 1–19] operators of the form \( P(D)u=(Au')'/A-q(x)u \) are considered for real \( A \) and \( q(\lambda)/\lambda \) generally of the form \( \lambda/x \) near \( x=0 \) and various hypotheses on \( q \) at 0 and \( \infty \) (cf. also [14] and [1–25] for special \( A \) with \( q=0 \)). Paley-Wiener type theorems are obtained there using analyticity properties of transforms \( \rho f(\lambda), Pf(\lambda), \) etc. and the analysis there should lead to the construction of suitable spaces \( W \) for general Parseval formulas (as in Definition 5.5). In particular (cf. Remark 4.1 in Part I) given a spectral measure \( d\nu=\delta^2(\lambda)d\lambda \) for the principal part \( (Au')'/A \) of \( P(D)u \) the function \( \delta^2(\lambda) \) should play the role of the weight function \( \lambda^{2m+1} \) in \( W^2_m \) or \( W^1_m \). The technique of utilizing \( \delta g=\delta^2g \) for \( \delta g=\delta^2g \) (cf. Theorem 2.3), which we extracted from Marčenko [16], is also used in Koornwinder [14] for studying Paley-Wiener type theorems and this is analyzed in Carroll-Gilbert [8; 9].

**6. The Gelfand-Levitan equation.** We will give a sketch here of Gasymov's proof of the Parseval formula in [11] since it can be recast in our framework in a meaningful way and brings the Gelfand-Levitan equation into the picture (the Marčenko equation will be studied in [6]). The discussion will be formal in general but precision can easily by supplied following Sections 2–5. First one observes that if there is a Parseval formula of the form (5.20) say, then, for \( f_i \in E, \overline{f}_i=x^{-\frac{m-1}{2}}f_i \in K^2, F_i=\rho f_i=2\beta^if_i \in W^2_m \), and \( F_iF_j \in W^1_m \) with \( f=Q(F_iF_j) \), the action of \( R \) is specified formally in \( (W_m')' \) by the rule
(6.1) \[ \langle R, F_1 F_2 \rangle_\omega = \lim_{r \to 0} \int_0^r y^{m+1} f(y) \tilde{I}(y) dy. \]

The point here is to deduce this without recourse to \( T \) and then to show that this formal stipulation allows us to determine \( R \).

**Lemma 6.1.** Given (5.20) and \( \tilde{I}(y) = \lim L(y, x)x^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \) as before it follows that (6.1) holds formally and describes the action of \( R \) on \( \psi F^2 \).

**Proof.** Note that
\[
\langle R, \rho f(\lambda) \rho g(\lambda) \rangle_\omega = \langle R, \int f(x)H(x, \mu) dx \int g(y)H(y, \mu) dy \rangle_\omega = \int \int f(x)g(y) \langle R, H(x, \mu)H(y, \mu) \rangle_\omega dx dy
\]
so formally \( \langle R, H(x, \mu)H(y, \mu) \rangle_\omega = \delta(x-y)/y^{2m+1} \) (equivalently \( \delta(x-y)/|x|^{2m+1} \)). Now recall \( \Theta = BH \) and take \( B \) in the form (5.2) so \( H(y, \mu) = \Theta(y, \mu) - \int_0^y L(y, t)H(t, \mu) dt \). Put this in the expression for \( \langle R, HH \rangle_\omega \) to obtain
\[
(6.2) \quad \langle R, H(x, \mu) \Theta(y, \mu) \rangle_\omega = \delta(y-x)/y^{2m+1} + \delta(y-x) \int_0^y L(y, t) \delta(t-x) dt
\]
\[
= \delta(y-x) + y^{-m-1/2} L(y, x)x^{-m-1/2}.
\]
Let now \( x \to 0 \) in (6.2) to obtain
\[
(6.3) \quad \langle R, \Theta(y, \mu) \rangle_\omega = \delta(y) y^{2m+1} + y^{-m-1/2} \tilde{I}(y).
\]

Multiply (6.3) now by \( f \) as in (6.1) with \( F = 2f \); this gives (6.1) upon integration (with \( F = F_1 F_2 \)).

Q.E.D.

Equation (6.1) shows what \( R \) must do acting on \( F_1 F_2 \) and we now refer to Section 5 to confirm that there is an element \( R = R_0 + R_1 \in (W^1) \) which fulfills this. Thus by (5.15) \( \langle R_0, \vec{h} \rangle = \lim H(y)|y^{2m+1} \) and as in (9.15) \( \langle R_q, \vec{h} \rangle = \int_0^\infty h(y)|y^{-m-1/2} \tilde{I}(y) dy. \) Hence

**Lemma 6.2.** The formal requirement (6.1) (with \( d\omega = d\lambda \)) is fulfilled by choosing \( R = R_0 + R_1 \in (W^1) \) and this determines \( R \).

Since \( F_1 = 2g_1 \) for \( g_1 = B^* f_i \) the Parseval formula for \( Q \) transforms derived in Section 4 allows us to say that
\[
(6.4) \quad \lim_{r \to 0} \int_0^r y^{2m+1} f(y) \tilde{I}(y) dy = c \int_0^\infty F_1(\lambda)F_2(\lambda) \lambda^{2m+1} d\lambda = \langle x^{-m-1/2} g_1(\lambda) \lambda^{-m-1/2} g_2(\lambda) \rangle .
\]
Let us write out this last term using the relation $g_i(x) = f_i(x) + \int_x^\infty K(\xi, x)f_i(\xi)d\xi$ to get

$$\int_0^\infty x^{-2m-1}g_i(x)g_2(x)dx = \int_0^\infty x^{-2m-1}f_i(x)g_2(x)dx + \int_0^\infty x^{-2m-1}f_2(x).$$

$$\times f_2(\xi)d\xi \right)d\xi + \int_0^\infty x^{-2m-1}f_2(x)\left(\int_x^\infty K(\xi, x)f_i(\xi)d\xi\right)d\xi + \int_0^\infty x^{-2m-1}. \left(\int_x^\infty K(\xi, x)f_i(\xi)d\xi\right) \times \left(\int_x^\infty K(\eta, x)f_2(\eta)d\eta\right) \right)dx = \int_0^\infty x^{-2m-1}f_1(x)f_2(x)dx + I_1 \text{ (we will compress some calculations here).}$$

Next set $I_2 = \langle R - R_0, F_1F_2 \rangle = \int_0^\infty y^{-m-1/2}f(y)I(y)dy = \int_0^\infty \left[ I(y)/y^{m+1/2}\right]Q\{\mathcal{Q}[f_1(x) + \int_x^\infty K(\xi, x)f_i(\xi)d\xi]\} dy$ where $\mathcal{Q}[f_2(x) + \int_x^\infty K(\xi, x)f_2(\eta)d\eta] \rangle$ dy

$$I_2 = \int_0^\infty \mathcal{Q}[f_1(x) + \int_x^\infty K(\xi, x)f_i(\xi)d\xi].$$

$$\mathcal{Q}[f_2(x) + \int_x^\infty K(\eta, x)f_2(\eta)d\eta] \rangle$$

and set formally $(W(y, \mu) = \mathcal{Q}(\lambda y)^{x_{m+1}} \tilde{R}(y, \lambda)$ and $\Theta(x, \mu) = \mathcal{Q}(\lambda x)^{-m} J_m(\lambda x) = \tilde{R}(x, \lambda)$)

$$F(x, \xi) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathcal{Q}[f_1(x) + \int_x^\infty K(\xi, x)f_i(\xi)d\xi] \times d\xi d\lambda x \Theta(x, \mu) \Theta(\xi, \mu) dyd\lambda$$

$$= c_m^{-1}(\lambda x)^{-m} J_m(\lambda x)$$

$$\text{and formal} \quad (\mathcal{Q}(\lambda y)^{x_{m+1}} \tilde{R}(y, \lambda)}$$

When $\xi \to 0, c_m^{-1}(\lambda y)^{-m} J_m(\lambda x) \to 1$ and we have

$$F(x, \xi) \to x^{-m-1/2}H_m[H_m[I(y)]] = I(x) \frac{x_{m+1/2}}{x_{m+1/2}}.$$

Further (formally) $Q(D_x)F = Q(D_x)F$ so that we can write

$$F(x, \xi) = S[I(x)x_{m-1/2}]$$

where $S$ is the generalized translation associated with $Q$ (cf. Part I). Since $F(t, \tau) = F(\tau, t), I_2$ can be written (with (6.5) as a model) $I_2 = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty f_1(x)f_2(\xi)F(x, \xi) \times d\xi d\lambda x + \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty f_1(x)f_2(\xi)K(\xi, s)F(s, x)d\xi d\lambda x + \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty f_1(x)f_2(\xi)K(\xi, s)F(s, \xi)d\xi d\lambda x + \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty f_1(x)f_2(\xi)K(\xi, t)K(\xi, \tau)F(\tau, t)d\xi d\lambda x.$

In order to deal with $I_2$ further we need a few facts relating $K$ and $L$. 
First recall (using (5.2)) \( H(x, \mu) = \beta \theta = \theta(x, \mu) + \int_0^x K(x, t) \theta(t, \mu) dt \) and \( \theta(y, \mu) = BH = H(y, \mu) + \int_0^y L(y, \xi) H(\xi, \mu) d\xi \). The relation \( Q2 = I \) also says that \( \langle W(y, \mu), \theta(x, \mu) \rangle = \delta(x-y) \). Writing out \( \theta(y, \mu) = BH = \beta \theta = \theta(x, \mu) + \int_0^y L(y, \xi) (\beta \theta)(\xi, \mu) d\xi \) one obtains then (since \( K(\xi, y) = 0 \) for \( y > \xi \))

\[
K(x, y) + L(x, y) + \int_0^x L(x, \xi) K(\xi, y) d\xi = 0.
\]

We will state the next relation as a theorem because of its general importance. Equation (6.11) is the Gelfand-Levitan equation and we give a derivation below in our framework. First set \( F(x, \xi) = (x \xi)^{-m-1/2} \tilde{F}(x, \xi) \) with \( \tilde{K} \) and \( \tilde{L} \) as before.

**Theorem 6.3.** The following formulas hold under the hypotheses indicated in Section 5, a somewhat neater formulation being given in (6.21).

\[
\hat{F}(\xi) + \int_0^\xi \hat{K}(t, x) \hat{F}(x, \xi) dt = \hat{L}(\xi, t) - \hat{K}(t, \xi) + \int_0^t \hat{L}(x, \xi) - \hat{K}(\xi, x) d\xi,
\]

For \( \xi < t, \hat{L}(\xi, t) = 0 \) in (6.10) and we have an integral equation for \( \hat{K}(t, \xi) \) (phrased in \( (x, y) \) variables for convenience later, \( y < x \))

\[
y^{-2m-1} K(x, y) + F(x, y) + \int_0^x K(x, t) F(t, y) dt = 0;
\]

\[
\hat{K}(x, y) + \hat{F}(x, y) + \int_0^x \hat{K}(x, \xi) \hat{F}(\xi, y) d\xi = \hat{l}(\xi, \eta) - \hat{K}(\xi, \eta) + \int_0^\xi \hat{L}(x, \xi) - \hat{K}(\xi, x) d\xi.
\]

We defer the proof of Theorem 6.5 for a moment (see Remark 6.5) in order to return to \( I_2 \). Thus, using the relations above between \( K \) and \( L \) we have

\[
I_2 = \int \int f(x) f_2(x) \hat{F}(x, \xi) dxd\xi + \int \int f_1(x) f_2(\xi) [-\hat{F}(x, \xi) + \hat{L}(x, \xi) - \hat{K}(\xi, x)] dxd\xi
\]

\[
= \int \int f_1(x) f_2(\xi) [-\hat{F}(x, \xi) + \hat{L}(x, \xi) - \hat{K}(\xi, x)] dxd\xi + \int \int f_1(x) f_2(\xi) \int_0^\xi \hat{K}(x, t) [-\hat{F}(t, \xi) + \hat{L}(t, \xi) - \hat{K}(\xi, x)] dxd\xi + \int \int f_1(x) f_2(\xi) \int_0^\xi \hat{L}(x, \xi) - \hat{K}(\xi, x) dxd\xi.
\]

Note here for example one can write

\[
\int \int f_1(x) f_2(\xi) \int_0^\xi K(\xi, s) F(s, x) dxd\xi = \int \int f_1(x) f_2(\xi) (x \xi)^{m+1/2} \int_0^\xi \xi^{-m-1/2} K(\xi, s) s^{m+1/2} d\xi = \int \int f_1(x) f_2(\xi) \int_0^\xi \hat{K}(\xi, s) \hat{F}(s, x) dxd\xi.
\]

Now \( K(x, y) \) and \( L(x, y) \) vanish for \( y > x \) so from (6.9) we can write \( \int_0^x K(x, s) L(s, \xi) ds = 0 \) for \( \xi > x \) and one can show as in (6.9) that for \( \xi < x \) \( \int_0^x K(x, s) L(s, \xi) ds = -L(x, \xi) \).
\[ -K(x, \xi). \] The same formulas then hold for \( K \) and \( L \). Consequently in the last expression for \( I_2 \) we have for example \[ \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \tilde{f}_1(x) \tilde{f}_2(t) \tilde{K}(x, t) d\omega d\lambda = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \tilde{f}_1(x) [-L(x, \xi) - K(x, \xi)] d\xi dx \] and hence \( I_2 \) becomes \[ I_2 = -\int_0^\infty \tilde{f}_1(x) \times \int_0^\infty \tilde{f}_2(t) \tilde{K}(x, \xi) d\xi dx - \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty d\xi \int_0^\infty \tilde{f}_1(x) \tilde{f}_2(t) d\xi dx \times \tilde{K}(\xi, s) ds. \] Now look at \( I_1 \), and write for example \[ \int x^{-2m-1} f_1(x) \int_0^\infty K(\xi, x) f_2(\xi) d\xi dx = \int \tilde{f}_1(x) \left( \int_0^\infty \tilde{K}(\xi, x) f_2(\xi) d\xi \right) dx. \] It follows that \( I_1 + I_2 = 0 \) and \( \langle R, F_1 F_2 \rangle = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle \) which is the desired Parseval formula. We summarize this in

**Theorem 6.4.** The Parseval formula (5.20) with \( R=R_0+R_q \) as before (and \( d\omega = d\lambda \)) can be established as above (without recourse to \( T_\omega \)).

**Remark 6.5.** We will prove Theorem 6.3 now in our framework of spaces and maps. The proof is modeled on a procedure of Marcenko [16] but our representation in terms of generalized translation exhibits the facts more meaningfully. Recall first

\[ R - R_0 = c_m^2 \lambda^{2m+1} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{m+1/2} \tilde{I}(x) \tilde{R}(x, \lambda) dx = \langle W(x, \mu), \tilde{I}(x) \rangle = Q[\tilde{I}(x)] \]

where \( \tilde{I}(x) = I(x)x^{-m-1/2} \). Note that when \( m = -1/2 \), \( c_m = \sqrt{2/\pi} \) and \( R_0 = c_m^2 \lambda^{2m+1} = \frac{2}{\pi} \cos \gamma \lambda \); further \( R - \frac{2}{\pi} C = \frac{2}{\pi} L(y, 0) \) where \( C \) denotes the cosine transform. Recall also that \( L(y, t) = y^{-m-1/2} \tilde{L}(y, t) t^{-m+1/2} \) and \( \tilde{I}(y) = \lim \tilde{L}(y, t) t^{-m+1/2} \) as \( t \to 0 \) so that \( \tilde{I}(y) = \tilde{L}(y) y^{m+1/2} \) is the limit \( \tilde{L}(y, t) t^{-m+1/2} \) as \( t \to 0 \) when \( m = -1/2 \). Now write \( H(x, \mu) = (\beta \theta)(x, \mu) = \theta(x, \mu) + \int_0^\infty K(x, t) \theta(t, \mu) dt \) and consider the product \( (R - R_0) H(x, \mu) \) in \( (W_\mu')' \). Let us ask for \( \phi(\xi, x) \) such that \( (R - R_0) \theta(x, \mu) = Q[\phi(y, x)] \). Formally this says that

\[ \phi(y, x) = Q[(R - R_0) \theta(x, \mu)] = \langle \theta(y, \mu), \theta(x, \mu) \rangle \langle \tilde{W}(x, \mu), \tilde{I}(\xi) \rangle = \langle \gamma(y, x, \xi), \tilde{I}(\xi) \rangle = S\tilde{I}(x) \]

where \( \gamma(y, x, \xi) \) is the kernel of \( S \) given in Part I as \( \gamma(y, x, \xi) = \int \theta(y, \mu) \theta(x, \mu) \times \tilde{W}(\xi, \mu) d\omega \). Hence one can say (from \( H = \theta + \int \theta \))

\[ (R - R_0) H(x, \mu) = Q[S\tilde{I}(x)] + \int_0^\infty K(x, t) Q[S\tilde{I}(t)] dt \]

Now consider \( F(\lambda) = 2f(\lambda) \in W_\mu' \) so that from Theorem 2.3
(6.15) \[ F(\lambda) = 2f(\lambda) = \langle f(x), \theta(x, \mu) \rangle = \langle f(x), (BH)(x, \mu) \rangle \]
\[ = \langle H(t, \mu), B^*f(t) \rangle = \langle f(t) + \int_{t}^{\infty} f(x)L(x, t)dx, H(t, \mu) \rangle \]
\[ = \rho(B^*f)(\lambda). \]

Recall if \( g = B^*f \) then \( 2g = 2Q \rho f = \rho f \) and now for \( f = B^*f \) we have \( \rho h = \rho(P^2)f = 2f \). Suppose we have a Parseval formula (5.20) for \( f, g \in F \) suitable. In a standard way now this extends to say \( g(x) = \delta(x - y) \) with \( \rho g = H(y, \mu) \) and one has \( \langle \rho f, H(y, \mu)R_\omega \rangle = y^{-2m-1} f(y) \). Since \( F(\lambda) = \rho(B^*f) \) we have then

(6.16) \[ \langle F(\lambda), H(x, \mu)R_\omega \rangle = x^{-2m-1}(B^*f)(x) \]
\[ = x^{-2m-1}f(x) + x^{-2m-1}\int_{x}^{\infty} f(y)L(y, x)dy. \]

On the other hand \( R_\omega \) is the spectral function for \( Q \) so that \( \langle 2f, 2g, R_\omega \rangle_x = \langle x^{-m-1/2} f, x^{-m-1/2} g \rangle \). Hence \( \langle 2f, \theta(x, \mu)R_\omega \rangle_x = x^{-2m-1} f(x) \) and

(6.17) \[ \langle F(\lambda), H(x, \mu)R_\omega \rangle_x = \langle 2f, H(x, \mu)R_\omega \rangle_x \]
\[ = \langle 2f, [\Theta(x, \mu) + \int_{x}^{\infty} K(x, t)\Theta(t, \mu)dt]R_\omega \rangle_x \]
\[ = x^{-2m-1}f(x) + \int_{0}^{\infty} K(x, t)t^{-2m-1}f(t)dt. \]

Consequently

(6.18) \[ \langle F(\lambda), (R-R_\omega)H(x, \mu) \rangle_x = \Xi \]
\[ = x^{-2m-1}\int_{x}^{\infty} f(y)L(y, x)dy - \int_{0}^{x} f(t)K(x, t)t^{-2m-1}dt. \]

Since \( K(x, t) = 0 \) for \( t > x \) and \( L(y, x) = 0 \) for \( y > x \) we can write these as integrals over \( (0, \infty) \) and obtain

(6.19) \[ \Xi = \int_{0}^{\infty} f(y)[x^{-m-1}L(y, x) - y^{-2m-1}K(x, y)]dy. \]

Now \( \langle 2f, (R-R_\omega)H(x, \mu) \rangle_x = \langle f, 2^*[2(R-R_\omega)H(x, \mu)] \rangle \) and here \( 2^* = Q \) so that we can write

(6.20) \[ (R-R_\omega)H(x, \mu) = Q[x^{-2m-1}L(y, x) - y^{-2m-1}K(x, y)]. \]

Equating (6.20) and (6.14) we get (6.10) in the form

(6.21) \[ x^{-2m-1}L(y, x) - y^{-2m-1}K(x, y) = S_0^2s(t)x + \int_{0}^{x} K(x, t)s_0^2s(t)dt \]
from which the Gelfand-Levitan equation (6.11) follows.

Q.E.D.

Remark 6.6. The importance and use of the Gelfand-Levitan equation in
quantum physics is well known and we will not comment on this here (cf. [1–17; 1–39]). For connections of the Gelfand-Levitan equation with transmutation and special functions see [3; 6; 16; 24].
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