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Abstract. For a weight function $\omega$ let $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$) denote the nonquasianalytic class of $\omega$-ultradifferentiable functions of Beurling type (resp. Roumieu type) on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Recently, Meise and Taylor (resp. Bonet, Meise, and Taylor) have characterized those weight functions $\omega$ for which the analogue of E. Borel's theorem holds for $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$). In the present note it is shown that for those weight functions and arbitrary compact sets $K$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ even the analogue of Whitney's extension theorem holds. In the Roumieu case, the proof is a modification of the one given by Bruna [5]. However, the existence of appropriate cut-off functions is now reduced—by Hörmander's solution of the $\bar{\partial}$-problem—to the existence of subharmonic functions with very special properties. The Beurling case can be reduced to the Roumieu case.

Various versions of Whitney's extension theorem and of E. Borel's theorem for different classes of ultradifferentiable functions have been presented by many authors. We only mention Carleson [6], Ehrenpreis [8], Komatsu [14], Bruna [5], Meise and Taylor [16], Petzsche [18], and Bonet, Meise, and Taylor [3], since they influenced our research. In the present paper we use the classes $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}$ introduced by Beurling [1] and by Petzsche and Vogt [19], where we assume that $\omega$ is a weight function in the sense of Braun, Meise, and Taylor [4]. This means that $\omega: [0, \infty] \to [0, \infty]$ is a continuous function which satisfies

(a) $\omega(2t) = O(\omega(t))$,  
(b) $\int_0^\infty (\omega(t)/t^2) dt < \infty$,  
(c) $\omega: t\mapsto \omega(t^2)$ is convex.

Let $\varphi^*$ denote the Young conjugate of $\varphi$. Then for open sets $\Omega \neq \emptyset$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ one defines the spaces

$\mathcal{E}_{\omega}^{-1}(\Omega) := \{ f \in C^\omega(\Omega): \text{for each } K \subset \Omega \text{ compact there is } m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } \sup_{x \in K} f^{(m)}(x) \exp \left( -m^{-1} \varphi^* (m|x|) \right) < \infty \}$,

$\mathcal{E}_{\omega}(\Omega) := \{ f \in C^\omega(\Omega): \text{for each } K \subset \Omega \text{ compact and each } m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ there is } \sup_{x \in \partial K} f^{(m)}(x) \exp \left( -m\varphi^* (|x|/m) \right) < \infty \}$.

They are nonquasianalytic for each weight function $\omega$.
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The main result of the present paper is to characterize for which of these classes the analogue of Whitney's extension theorem holds. Extending previous results of Meise and Taylor [16] and Bonet, Meise and Taylor [3], we show that the following assertions are equivalent:

1. There exists $C > 1$ so that for all $y > 0$  
\[ \int_0^y \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} \, dt \leq C \omega(y) + C. \]

2. For each closed set $A$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and each Whitney jet $F$ of type $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ on $A$ there exists $f \in \mathcal{H}(\omega)(\mathbb{R}^N)$ so that $F$ is the restriction of $f$ to $A$.

3. For each closed set $A$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and each Whitney jet $F$ of type $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ on $A$ there exists $g \in \mathcal{H}(\omega)(\mathbb{R}^N)$ so that $F$ is the restriction of $g$ to $A$.

For the precise definition of a Whitney jet $F$ of type $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$) we refer to Definition 3.2 (resp. 4.1).

The basic idea for the proof of this result in the case $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ goes back to Bruna [5], who indicated that the analogue of Whitney's extension theorem holds in a class of nonquasianalytic functions if it holds for a point and if the class contains cut-off functions satisfying certain estimates. Since it had been shown in [16] and [3] that Whitney's extension theorem for a point holds in $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ if and only if $\omega$ satisfies condition (1), the main step in the proof is to construct these special cut-off functions whenever $\omega$ satisfies (1). This is done in Section 2 of the present paper, using Hörmander's $\mathcal{H}$-method. In order to apply it, we show that (1) implies the following: There exists $A \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that for each $0 < r < r_0$ there exist a subharmonic function $u_k, r$ and $B(k, r) > 0$ so that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

\[ r|\text{Im} z| - \frac{A}{k} \omega(|z|) - B(k, r) \leq u_k, r(z) \leq r|\text{Im} z| - \frac{1}{k} \omega(|z|) \]

where $B(k, r)$ can be estimated from above in a certain sense (see 2.9). Then the case $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ is treated in Section 3 in the same way as Bruna [5] proved his version of Whitney's extension theorem. The case $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ is reduced to the case $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ in Section 4.

It should be noted that our main result implies that Whitney's extension theorem holds for the Carleman classes $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\omega)$ (see Komatsu [13]) whenever $(M_{\omega})$ satisfies the conditions (M1), (M2) and (M3) (see 3.11). Hence it extends the results of Bruna [5], Kantor [12] (see 4.8), and Chung and Kim [7].

The results of the present paper were used by Kaballo [11] to derive estimates for the distribution of the eigenvalues of integral operators with ultradifferentiable kernels.
(c) For a compact set \( K \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) we let
\[
\mathcal{B}_\omega(K) := \{ f \in \mathcal{E}_\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) : \text{supp } f \subset K \}
\]
and we endow \( \mathcal{B}_\omega(K) \) with the induced topology. For an open set \( \Omega \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) we define
\[
\mathcal{B}_\omega(\Omega) := \bigcup_{K \subset \Omega} \mathcal{B}_\omega(K).
\]

1.4. Remark. In Braun, Meise and Taylor [4] it is shown that for each weight function \( \omega \) the spaces \( \mathcal{B}_\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \) are nontrivial, i.e. that the classes \( \mathcal{B}_\omega \) are nonquasianalytic. By [4], 4.9, \( \mathcal{E}_\omega(\Omega) \) is a nuclear Fréchet space, while \( \mathcal{E}_\omega(\Omega) \) is complete, nuclear and reflexive for each open set \( \Omega \neq \emptyset \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

1.5. Example. The following functions \( \omega : [0, \infty[ \rightarrow [0, \infty[ \) are examples of weight functions:
\begin{enumerate}
    
    \item \( \omega(t) := t^\alpha, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1 \),
    
    \item \( \omega(t) := (\log(1 + t))^\beta, \quad 0 < \beta < 1 \),
    
    \item \( \omega(t) := t(\log(1 + t))^\beta, \quad 0 < \beta < 1 \),
    
    \item \( \omega(t) := \exp(\beta(\log(1 + t))^\beta), \quad 0 < \alpha < 1, \beta > 0 \).
\end{enumerate}

Note that for \( \omega(t) = t^\alpha, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1 \), the space \( \mathcal{E}_\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \) is the classical Gevrey class \( G^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) for \( d := -\alpha^{-1} \).

1.6. Definition. (a) Let \( u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be a continuous function satisfying
\[
\lim_{t \to \pm \infty} \frac{|u(t)|}{1 + t^2} \, dt < \infty.
\]
Then we define its harmonic extension \( P_u : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) by
\[
P_u(x + iy) := \begin{cases}
    \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{u(t)}{(t-x)^2 + y^2} \, dt & \text{if } |y| > 0, \\
    u(x) & \text{if } y = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

(b) For a weight function \( \omega \) we extend \( \omega \) to \( \mathbb{C} \) by the definition \( z \rightarrow \omega(|z|) \).

By \( P_u \) we denote the harmonic extension of \( t \rightarrow \omega(t) \).

Note that for \( u \) as in 1.6(a), the function \( P_u \) is continuous on \( \mathbb{C} \) and harmonic in the open upper and lower half plane. Moreover, we have \( \omega \leq P_u \) for each weight function \( \omega \).

From Meise and Taylor [16], 3.10, and Bonet, Meise and Taylor [3], 3.8, we recall:

1.7. Theorem. For a weight function \( \omega \) the following assertions are equivalent:
\begin{enumerate}
    
    \item There exists \( C > 0 \) with \( \int_0^y \frac{\omega(t)}{t^{\alpha+1}} \, dt \leq C \omega(y) + C \) for all \( y > 0 \).
    
    \item \( \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{\omega(t)}{\omega(t) - t} = 0 \).
    
    \item There exists \( K > 1 \) with \( \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{\omega(Kt)}{\omega(t)} < K \).
    
    \item There exists \( D > 0 \) so that \( P_u(z) \leq D \omega(z) + D \) for all \( z \in \mathbb{C} \).
    
    \item For each positive integer \( N \) and each family \( (a_n)_{n=0}^\infty \) of complex numbers satisfying \( \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} |a_n| \exp(-m^p |m|^{1/p}) < \infty \) for all \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), there exists \( f \in \mathcal{E}_\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \) such that \( f^{(m)}(0) = a_n \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{N} \).
    
    \item For each positive integer \( N \) and each family \( (a_n)_{n=0}^\infty \) of complex numbers satisfying \( \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} |a_n| \exp(-m^p |m|^{1/p}) < \infty \) for all \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), there exists \( f \in \mathcal{E}_\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \) such that \( f^{(m)}(0) = a_n \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{N} \).
\end{enumerate}

1.8. Definition. A weight function \( \omega \) is called a strong weight function if it satisfies one of the equivalent conditions in 1.7.

1.9. Remark. (a) For each strong weight function \( \omega \) there exists a strong weight function \( \kappa \) which is concave and satisfies \( \kappa(0) = 0 \), and such that there exists \( A \geq 1 \) such that
\[
A^{-1} \kappa(t) - A \leq \omega(t) \leq A \kappa(t) + A \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.
\]

This holds by [16], 1.3, and implies \( \mathcal{E}_\omega = \mathcal{E}_\kappa \) and \( \mathcal{E}_\omega = \mathcal{E}_\kappa \).

(b) Note that by 1.1(d) each concave weight function is differentiable on \( [0, \infty[ \).

In [16], 3.10, and [3], 3.8, it was also shown that strong weight functions are characterized by the fact that for compact sets \( K \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( K \neq \emptyset \) which are convex or \( K = \emptyset \), where \( G \) is open and \( \partial G \) is real-analytic one can describe the image of the restriction map \( \partial K : \mathcal{E}_\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow C(K) \) in a certain way. Subsequently we want to extend this result to arbitrary compact sets in \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

2. Existence of optimal cut-off functions in \( \mathcal{E}_\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \). Bruna [5] has noticed that Whitney’s extension theorem for nonquasianalytic classes of Roumieu type holds on arbitrary compact sets if it holds for points and if there exist cut-off functions in the class which satisfy certain estimates. In a different setting and with a different proof we show in this section that such cut-off functions can be constructed in \( \mathcal{E}_\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \) whenever \( \omega \) is a strong weight function. To give a precise statement, we first introduce the Young conjugate \( \omega^* \) of \( \omega \), which was used already by Peetre and Vogt [19] in a related context.

2.1. Definition. For a weight function \( \omega \) its Young conjugate \( \omega^* \) on \( [0, \infty[ \rightarrow [0, \infty[ \) is defined by
\[
\omega^*(s) := \sup_{t \geq 0} (\omega(t) - ts).
\]

Note that \( \omega^*(s) \) is finite by 1.2(b) and that \( \omega^* \) is decreasing and convex.
22. PROPOSITION. Let \( \omega \) be a strong weight function which is concave and satisfies \( \omega(0) = 0 \). Then for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) there exist \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), \( M > 0 \) and \( 0 < r_0 < 1/2 \) such that for each \( 0 < r < r_0 \) there exists \( f_{n,r} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \) which has the following properties:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad 0 \leq f_{n,r} \leq 1, \quad \text{supt } f_{n,r} = [-9r/8, 9r/8], \quad f_{n,r}|[-r, r] \equiv 1, \\
(2) & \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{N}} |f_{n,r}^{(y)}(x)| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(m)\right) \leq M \exp\left(\frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(\alpha r)\right).
\end{align*}
\]

The proof of Proposition 2.2 requires several steps and will be given at the end of this section. The underlying idea is to use Hörmander’s \( L^2 \)-method to construct first certain entire functions \( F_{n,r} \), and to use then the theorem of Paley–Wiener to get the desired functions \( f_{n,r} \) from the functions \( F_{n,r} \).

23. LEMMA. Let \( \omega \) be a weight function. Then there exists \( A > 0 \) so that for each \( 0 < r < 1 \), each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and each subharmonic function \( u \) on \( \mathbb{C} \) which satisfies

\[(*) \quad u(z) \leq r(1 + \frac{1}{k} \omega(z)) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C}, \]

there exists an entire function \( F \) on \( \mathbb{C} \) which satisfies \( F(0) = 1 \) and

\[|F(z)| \leq A \exp\left(r(1 + \frac{1}{k} \omega(z) + 3 \log(1 + |z|^2)) \sup_{|w| < 1} (-u(w))\right) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C}. \]

**Proof.** Choose \( \chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \) which satisfies \( 0 \leq \chi \leq 1 \), \( \chi(z) = 1 \) for \( |z| \leq 1/2 \) and \( \chi(z) = 0 \) for \( |z| \geq 1 \) and let \( B := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\partial_1 \chi(x)| \). Then we have (\( \lambda \) the Lebesgue measure on \( \mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C} \))

\[
\int_{|z| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|z|^2} \exp(-2u(z)) d\lambda(z) \leq B^2 \sup_{|z| \leq 1} (-2u(z)) \int_{|z| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|z|^2} |d\lambda(z)| = B^2 2 \log 2 \sup_{|w| < 1} (-2u(w)).
\]

By Hörmander [10], 4.4.2, this implies the existence of \( v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \) which satisfies \( \vartheta v(z) = (1/2) \partial_1 \chi(z) \) for \( z \in \mathbb{C} \) and

\[
\int_{|w| \leq 1} \vartheta v(z)^2 \exp(-2u(z)) (1 + |z|^2)^2 \leq B^2 \pi \log 2 \sup_{|w| < 1} (-2u(w)).
\]

Then the function

\[ F : z \mapsto \chi(z) - z v(z) \]

is in \( C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \) and satisfies \( \vartheta F - z \partial_1 v = 0 \) as well as \( F(0) = \chi(0) = 1 \).

Moreover, with \( A := \left(\max(\pi B^2, \pi \exp(\omega(1)))\right)^{1/2} \) we get from (*)

\[
\left( \int_{|z| \leq 1} F(z) \exp\left(-r |\operatorname{Im} z| + \frac{1}{k} \omega(z) - 3 \log(1 + |z|^2)\right) d\lambda(z) \right)^{1/2} \leq \left( B^2 \pi \right)^{1/2} \sup_{|w| < 1} \left( -u(w) + \left( \pi \exp\left(\frac{1}{k} \omega(1)\right) \right) \right)^{1/2} \leq A \sup_{|w| < 1} (-u(w)),
\]

since \( u(0) \leq 0 \). By the properties of \( \omega \), this estimate and standard arguments imply the desired estimate for \( F \).

24. LEMMA. For each weight function \( \omega \) there exists \( L \in \mathbb{N} \) so that for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists \( B > 0 \) so that for each \( 0 < r < 1/2 \) the following holds: If there is an entire function \( F \) with \( F(0) = 1 \) which satisfies for some \( M > 0 \) the estimate

\[
(*) \quad |F(z)| \leq M \exp\left(r \left(1 + \frac{1}{k} \omega(z)\right)\right) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C},
\]

then there exists \( \psi \in \mathcal{E}(\omega)(\mathbb{R}) \) satisfying

\[
(1) \quad 0 \leq \psi \leq 1, \quad \psi(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \leq -r, \quad \psi(x) = 1 \quad \text{for } x \geq r,
\]

(2) \[
\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{N}} |\psi^{(y)}(x)| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2Lk} \varphi^*(2Lk)\right) \leq BM^2.
\]

**Proof.** By [4], 1.3, we can choose \( L \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( y_0 > 0 \) so that

\[
\varphi^*(y) - y \geq L \varphi^*(y/L) - L \quad \text{for all } y \geq y_0.
\]

Now fix \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( 0 < r < 1/2 \) and an entire function \( F \) which satisfies (\( \ast \)) and \( F(0) = 1 \). By the theorem of Paley–Wiener there exists \( f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \) with \( \sup f = \left[ -r, r \right] \) so that

\[
F(z) = \tilde{f}(z) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{-itz} dt.
\]

Since \( \omega \) satisfies 1.1(\( \gamma \)), we can choose \( D \), depending on \( \omega \) and \( k \), so that

\[
\log(1 + t^2) \leq \frac{1}{2k} \omega(t) + D \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.
\]

Then [4], 3.3(a), in connection with (\( \ast \)) implies

\[
\|f\|_{2k} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{N}} |f^{(y)}(x)| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2k} \varphi^*(2k)\right) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(t)| \exp\left(\frac{1}{2k} \omega(t)\right) dt \leq \frac{M}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{1 + t^2} = \frac{M}{2}.
\]
Next note that $g := \text{Re} f$ is in $D_0(\mathbb{R})$ and satisfies $\sup_{[-r, r]} |g| \leq (M/2) e^D$. Therefore $h := g^2$ is in $D_0(\mathbb{R})$ by [4], 4.4, and the proof of [4], 4.4, shows that there exists $E$, depending on $L$ and $k$, so that

$$\|h\|_{L^2} \leq E \|g\|_{L^2} = M^2 e^{2D}.$$ 

Now $0 < r < 1/2$ implies

$$1 = \int^r_{-r} g(t) dt \leq \left( \int^r_{-r} g(t) dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \int^r_{-r} 1 dt \right)^{1/2} \leq \int^r_{-r} h(t) dt.$$

Next we define $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\psi(x) := \left( \int^x_{-\infty} h(t) dt \right)^{-1} \int^x_{-\infty} h(s) ds.$$

Then $\psi$ satisfies

$$0 \leq \psi \leq 1, \quad \text{supp} \psi \subset [-r, \infty[,$$

$$|\psi(x)| \leq \int^r_x h(s) ds \leq 2r \max_{x \in [-r, r]} h(x), \quad \text{max}_{x \in [-r, r]} |h(x)|,$$

$$|\psi^{(i)}(x)| \leq |h^{(i-1)}(x)| \quad \text{for} \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $\varphi^*(m)/m \geq \varphi^*(m(j-1))/m$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we get from this with $B := \frac{1}{2} e^{2D}$

$$\|\psi\|_{L^2} \leq \|h\|_{L^2} \leq M^2 e^{2D} = BM^2.$$

2.5. Lemma. Let $\omega$ be a strong weight function which is concave and satisfies $\omega(0) = 0$. For $T > 1$ we define $\omega_T : [0, \infty[ \to [0, \infty[$ by

$$\omega_T : t \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{\omega(t)}{2T} - \frac{\omega(T)}{2} & \text{if } |t| \geq T, \\ \omega(T) & \text{if } |t| < T. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists $D > 0$ so that for all $T > 1$ we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_{\omega_T}(x + i) \leq D \frac{\omega(T)}{T}.$$ 

Proof. Note that

$$\pi \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_{\omega_T}(x + i) = \int^x_{-\infty} \frac{t}{(x + t)^2 + 1} \omega_T(x + t) dt = \int^x_{-\infty} \frac{s - x}{(s - x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds.$$

Let $C$ be the constant from 1.7(1). Depending on the relation between $x$ and $T$, we will cut the real line into three or four intervals and give different estimates for each one. Luckily, the first two of these intervals can be treated in the same way for all $x$. Since $\omega$ is an even function, it suffices to consider $x > 0$.

$$\int_T^{+\infty} \frac{s - x}{(s - x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds \leq \int_T^{+\infty} \frac{s + x}{(s + x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds \leq \int_T^{+\infty} \frac{s}{s + x} \omega_T(s) ds \leq \frac{\omega(T)}{T}.$$

where $C_1 = C(1 + \omega(1))$.

Thus the interval that has to be considered is $[-T, T]$. Note that $\omega_T(x) \downarrow \omega(x)/T$ since $\omega$ is concave.

$$\int_T^{+\infty} \frac{s - x}{(s - x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds = \int_T^{+\infty} \frac{1}{(s + x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds = \frac{\omega(T)}{T} \int_T^{+\infty} \frac{1}{(s + x)^2 + 1} ds = \frac{\omega(T)}{T} \left[ \frac{x}{2} \log((s + x)^2 + 1) - \arctan(s + x) \right]_T^{+\infty}.$$

Thus we have

$$\int_T^{+\infty} \frac{s - x}{(s - x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds \leq \frac{\omega(T)}{T} \left[ \frac{x}{2} \log((s + x)^2 + 1) - \arctan(s + x) \right]_T^{+\infty}.$$

The first term on the right hand side of (1) has correct size. The second one is negative and will be used to cancel another term in certain cases.

With $a := \max(T, 2x)$ we have

$$\int_T^{+\infty} \frac{s - x}{(s - x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds \leq \frac{\omega(T)}{T} \left[ \frac{x}{2} \log((s + x)^2 + 1) - \arctan(s + x) \right]_T^{+\infty}.$$

Case $2x \leq T$: In this case $a = T$ and (2) completes the proof.

Case $2x > T$: Then (2) gives the right estimate for

$$\int_T^{+\infty} \frac{s - x}{(s - x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds.$$

To treat the remaining interval, we have to consider two subcases.

Subcase $x < T$:

$$\int_T^{+\infty} \frac{s - x}{(s - x)^2 + 1} \omega(s) ds \leq \omega(x) \left[ \frac{2x}{T} \log((s + x)^2 + 1) \right]_T^{+\infty} = \omega(x) \left[ \frac{2x}{T} \log((s + x)^2 + 1) \right]_{T - x}^{+\infty}.$$

Since $\varphi^*(m)/m \geq \varphi^*(m(j-1))/m$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we get from this with $B := \frac{1}{2} e^{2D}$

$$\|\psi\|_{L^2} \leq \|h\|_{L^2} \leq M^2 e^{2D} = BM^2.$$ 

2.5. Lemma. Let $\omega$ be a strong weight function which is concave and satisfies $\omega(0) = 0$. For $T > 1$ we define $\omega_T : [0, \infty[ \to [0, \infty[$ by

$$\omega_T : t \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{\omega(t)}{2T} - \frac{\omega(T)}{2} & \text{if } |t| \geq T, \\ \omega(T) & \text{if } |t| < T. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists $D > 0$ so that for all $T > 1$ we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_{\omega_T}(x + i) \leq D \frac{\omega(T)}{T}.$$ 

Proof. Note that

$$\pi \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_{\omega_T}(x + i) = \int^x_{-\infty} \frac{t}{(x + t)^2 + 1} \omega_T(x + t) dt = \int^x_{-\infty} \frac{s - x}{(s - x)^2 + 1} \omega_T(s) ds.$$
Together with (1) this gives
\[
\frac{2^x}{\pi (s-x)^2 + 1} \omega'(s) ds \\
\leq 6 \frac{\omega(T) + \omega'(T)}{T} \left( \log \frac{x^2 + 1}{(T+x)^2 + 1} \left( 1 - \frac{x}{T} \right) \log \left( \frac{x^2 + 1}{(T+x)^2 + 1} \right) \right) \\
\leq 6 \frac{\omega(T) + \omega'(T)}{T} \left( \log \frac{1-x/T}{1+x/T} \right) \log \left( \frac{1-x/T}{1+x/T} \right).
\]

Note that for \( a, b, c > 0 \) the inequality \( b > a \) implies \((a + c)(b + c) > a/b\). This implies
\[
\frac{(1-x/T)^2 + 1/T^2}{(1+x/T)^2 + 1/T^2} \leq \frac{1-x/T}{1+x/T}.
\]

Thus, we have with \( C_2 := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1/T} (-\xi \log \xi) \)
\[
\int_{-T}^{2^x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} \omega'(s) ds \leq 6 \frac{\omega(T)}{T} + \omega'(T) \left( \frac{x}{T - 1} \right) \log \left( 1 + \frac{x}{T} \right) \\
\leq 6 \frac{\omega(T)}{T} + \omega'(T) \left( \frac{x}{T - 1} \right) \log \left( 1 + \frac{x}{T} \right) + \left( \frac{1-x/T}{1+x/T} \right) \log \left( 1 + \frac{x}{T} \right) \\
\leq 6 \frac{\omega(T)}{T} + \omega'(T) \left( \frac{1}{C_2 + \log 2} \right).
\]

Subcase \( T \leq x \): As \( \omega \) is concave, \( \omega' \) is decreasing, hence
\[
\int_{-T}^{2^x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} \omega'(s) ds = \int_{-T}^{x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} \omega'(s) ds + \int_{x}^{2^x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} \omega'(s) ds \\
\leq \omega'(x) \int_{-T}^{x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} ds + \omega'(x) \int_{x}^{2^x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} ds \\
= \omega'(x) \int_{-T}^{x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} ds + \omega'(x) \int_{x}^{2^x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} ds \\
\leq \omega'(T) \left( \frac{1}{C_2 + \log 2} \right) \frac{x^2 + 1}{(T-x)^2 + 1}.
\]

If \( T \leq x/2 \), then \( x - T \geq x/2 \) and \((x^2 + 1)/(T-x)^2 + 1) \leq 4\), which completes the proof in this case. If, on the other hand, we have \( x/2 \leq T \leq x \), then we get
\[
\int_{-T}^{2^x} \frac{s-x}{(s-x)^2 + 1} \omega'(s) ds \leq 6 \frac{\omega(T) + \omega'(T)}{T} \left( \log \frac{x^2 + 1}{(T-x)^2 + 1} \right) \\
\leq 6 \frac{\omega(T) + \omega'(T)}{T} \left( \log \frac{x^2 + 1}{(T-x)^2 + 1} \right) + \log \left( \frac{x^2 + 1}{(T-x)^2 + 1} \right) \\
\leq 6 \frac{\omega(T)}{T} + \omega'(T) \left( \frac{x}{T - 1} \right) \log \left( \frac{x^2 + 1}{(T-x)^2 + 1} \right) \\
\leq 6 \frac{\omega(T)}{T}.
\]

This concludes the proof of the lemma.

2.6. DEFINITION. For \( \omega \) as in 2.5 and \( T > 1 \) let \( \omega_T \) be defined as in 2.5. Then we define \( h_T : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \)
\[
h_T(z) := \begin{cases} \frac{P_{\omega_T}(z+i) \omega_T(z)}{1+m} & \text{if } 1+m \neq 0, \\
\frac{P_{\omega_T}(z-i) \omega_T(z)}{1+m} & \text{if } 1+m < 0. 
\end{cases}
\]

Note that by the symmetry properties of \( \omega_T \) and of the Poisson kernel, \( h_T \) is continuous on \( \mathbb{C} \).

2.7. LEMMA. For \( \omega \) as in 2.5 there exist \( E, F, G > 0 \) so that for all \( T > 1 \) and all \( z \in \mathbb{C} \) we have
\[
E^{-1} h_T(z) - F \omega(T) \leq \omega(z) \leq h_T(z) + G.
\]

Proof. First we note that

(1)
\[
\omega_T(t) - \omega(t) \leq \omega(t) \leq \omega_T(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and all } T > 1.
\]

The first inequality follows from the definition of \( \omega_T \) and \( \omega'(T) \leq \omega(T)/T \). The second one is consequence of the fact that the convex function \( \omega_T \) and the concave function \( \omega \) have the same derivative at \( T \).

Next denote by \( h \) the function which we get if we replace \( \omega_T \) in 2.6 by \( \omega \). Then (1) and the properties of the Poisson kernel imply

(2)
\[
h_T(z) - \omega_T(t) \leq h_T(z) \leq h_T(z) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and all } T > 1.
\]

Now note that \( \omega(0) = 0 \) and the concavity of \( \omega \) imply that \( \omega \) is subadditive on \( \mathbb{R} \) (see e.g. [1], p. 121) and hence \( |\omega(x+y) - \omega(x)| \leq \omega(s) \) for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R} \). Consequently, we have

(3)
\[
|P_{\omega}(z+s) - P_{\omega}(z)| \leq \omega(1) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C}, s \in [-1, 1].
\]
Furthermore, we get for $0 < y \leq 1$

$$|P_n(x+i)-P_n(x)| = \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\omega(t)}{\pi \sqrt{(t-x)^2+y^2}} \, dt - \omega(x) \right|$$

$$\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\omega(t)-\omega(x)|}{\pi \sqrt{(t-x)^2+y^2}} \, dt \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\omega(t-x)}{\pi \sqrt{(t-x)^2+y^2}} \, dt = P_n(iy) \leq \max_{0 \leq y \leq 1} P_n(iy) =: Q.$$

Since $P_n(x+i)-P_n(x)$ is the harmonic extension of $x \mapsto P_n(x+i)-P_n(x)$, this implies

$$|P_n(x+i)-P_n(x)| \leq Q$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and $y \in [-1, 1]$.

Now (4) and (3) imply that for $G := 2Q + \omega(1)$ we have

$$|P_n(z+w)-P_n(w)| \leq G$$

for all $z, w \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|w| \leq 1$.

Next we recall from (1.7) that there exists $D > 1$ so that

$$\omega(z) \leq P_n(z) \leq D \omega(z)+1$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

From (6), (5) and (2) we now get for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\text{Im} z > 0$

$$\omega(z) \leq P_n(z) \leq P_n(z+i) + G = h(z) + G \leq h_T(z) + G.$$

Since the same arguments apply to $\text{Im} z < 0$, we have

$$\omega(z) \leq h_T(z) + G.$$

This proves the second inequality in our claim. On the other hand, (6), (2) and (5) give for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$

$$1 + \omega(z) \geq D^{-1} P_n(z) \geq D^{-1} (h(z) - G) \geq D^{-1} (h_T(z) - \omega(T) - G).$$

Therefore we can find $F$, depending only on $\omega$, so that

$$D^{-1} h_T(z) - F \omega(T) \leq \omega(z)$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

2.8. Lemma. Let $\omega$ be a strong weight function which is concave and satisfies $\omega(0) = 0$. Then for each $v \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m > 0$ and $0 < r_0 < 1/2$ such that for each $0 < r < r_0$ there exists $g_r \in C^v(\mathbb{R})$ which has the following properties:

1. $0 \leq g_r \leq 1$, $g_r(x) = 0$ for $x \leq -r$, $g_r(x) = 1$ for $x \geq r$,

2. $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} |g_r(x)| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{m} \phi^*(mj)\right) \leq M \exp\left(\frac{1}{v} \phi^*(vr)\right)$.

Proof. Denote by $A, B, D, E, F, G$ the constants from Lemmata 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.7. Without restriction we can assume that $L, D, E$ and $F$ are natural numbers. Then for $v \in \mathbb{N}$ let $k := (2EF+D)v \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m := 4Lk \cdot 4(2EF+D)v$. Next choose $0 < r_0 < 1/2$ so that the equation $\omega(t)/t = r_0 k/D$ has a solution $t > 1$. Then fix $0 < r < r_0$ and choose $T = (k, r) > 1$ so that

$$\omega(T) = T^{r k/D}.$$

Now define $u_r : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u_r(z) := r \text{Im} z \cdot \frac{1}{k} h_T(r) - \frac{G}{k}.$$

Note that Lemma 2.7 implies for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$

$$u_r(z) \leq r \text{Im} z \cdot \frac{1}{k} \phi^*(k \text{Im} z),$$

$$-u_r(z) \leq r \text{Im} z + \frac{E}{k} \phi^*(k \text{Im} z) + \frac{EF}{k} \omega(T) + \frac{G}{k}.$$

Next observe that $u_r$ is subharmonic in the open upper and lower half plane and that by the definition of $h_T$ and Lemma 2.5 we get from (3)

$$\frac{1}{k \partial y} P_n(x+i) \geq \frac{D \omega(T)}{k} = -r$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Therefore we have for each $g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfies $g \geq 0$

$$\left\{ u_r(z) \partial g(dz) = 2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( r \frac{1}{k} \partial y - h_T(x) \right) g(x) \, dx \right\} \sup_{|z| = 1} \exp(-u_r(z)) \geq 0,$$

which proves that $u_r$ is subharmonic on $\mathbb{C}$. From Lemma 2.3 and (4) we get then the existence of an entire function $F_r$, which satisfies $F_r(0) = 1$ and

$$|F_r(z)| \leq A \exp\left(r \text{Im} z \cdot \frac{1}{k} \phi^*(k \text{Im} z) + 3 \log(1+|z|^2)\right) \sup_{|z| = 1} \exp(-u_r(z))$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. From this, (4) and (1.1(y)) we get the existence of $C = C(v)$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$

$$|F_r(z)| \leq C \exp\left(r \text{Im} z \cdot \frac{1}{k} \phi^*(k \text{Im} z) \right) \exp\left(\frac{EF}{k} \omega(T)\right).$$

Hence Lemma 2.4 implies the existence of $B(v) > 0$ and $g_r \in C^v(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfies (1) and

(5) $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} |g_r(x)| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4Lk} \phi^*(4Lkmj)\right) \leq B(v) \phi^*(v)^2 \exp\left(\frac{EF}{k} \omega(T)\right).$

Now note that the definitions of $\omega^*$ and of $T = T(k, r)$ give

$$\omega^*(v) \geq \omega(T) - vr = \omega(T) - vr(Dv(T)) \frac{r k}{r k} = \omega(T) \left(1 - \frac{v D}{k}\right).$$
Hence our choice of $k$ implies
\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{v} \omega^*(vr) \geq \omega(T) \left( \frac{1 - \frac{D}{k}}{k} \right) = \omega(T) \frac{2EF + Dv - Dv}{vk} = \frac{2EF}{k} \omega(T).
\end{equation}
From this and (5) together with our choice of $m$ we get (2) if we let $M = B(\omega)(C(v))^2$.

Proof of Proposition 2.2. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $v := 16n$. For this $v$ choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $M > 0$ and $0 < r_0 < 1/2$ according to Lemma 2.8. Then fix $0 < r < r_0$, define $s := r/16$ and choose $g_{s,r}$ so that the conditions 2.8(1) and 2.8(2) hold with $r$ replaced by $s$. Then define
\[ f_{s,r}(x) := \begin{cases} g_{s,r}(x + \frac{1}{2}r) & \text{for } x \leq 0, \\ g_{s,r}(-x - \frac{1}{2}r) & \text{for } x > 0, \end{cases} \]
and note that by 2.8(2) we have
\[ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} |f_{s,r}(x)| \exp\left( -\frac{1}{m} \omega^*(mz) \right) \leq M \exp\left( \frac{1}{v} \omega^*(vz) \right) \]
\[ \leq M \exp\left( \frac{16}{v} \omega^*\left( \frac{vz}{16} \right) \right) = M \exp\left( \frac{1}{n} \omega^*(vn) \right). \]
Hence 2.2(2) is satisfied. From 2.8(1) it follows easily that also 2.2(1) holds.

2.9. Remark. Note that the following is implied by combining 2.8(4) with 2.8(6): There exist $A, E, G \in \mathbb{N}$, depending only on $\omega$, so that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $0 < r_0 < 1/2$ so that for each $0 < r < r_0$ there exists a subharmonic function $u_{s,r}$ on $C$ so that we have for all $z \in C$
\[ r |\text{Im} z| - \omega(z) - \frac{G}{v} \leq u_{s,r}(z) \leq r |\text{Im} z| - \frac{1}{A_v} \omega(z). \]
Because of $\omega(0) = 0$ this gives
\[ -\frac{1}{v} \omega^*(vz) - \frac{G}{v} \leq u_{s,r}(0) \]
and this lower bound is essential for our purposes. The following consideration shows that this lower bound is optimal to a certain extent: Whenever $u_{s,r}$ satisfies the given upper estimate, then the subaveraging property of $u_{s,r}$ implies for each $q > 0$
\[ u_{s,r}(0) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u_{s,r}(ae^{it}) dt = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega(|\sin t|) dt = \frac{2}{\pi} \omega(1) = \frac{1}{A_v} \omega(1). \]
Taking the infimum over $q > 0$, this and $v = Ak$ give
\[ u_{s,r}(0) \leq \frac{1}{k} \omega^*\left( \frac{2kr}{\pi} \right) = \frac{1}{A_v} \omega^*\left( \frac{2A}{\pi} vr \right). \]
3. The extension theorem for the classes $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}(n)$. In this section, we characterize those Whitney jets on closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$ which are restrictions of functions in $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\omega$ a strong weight function. To do this, we use the idea of proof of Bruni [5] together with the main result of the previous section.

3.1. Definition. Let $A \neq \emptyset$ be a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. A jet on $A$ is a family $F = (f^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} \in C(A)^{\mathbb{N}^N}$. For a jet $F$ on $A$ and for $x, y \in A$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^N_0$ with $|\alpha| \leq m$ define
\[ (T_{x,y}^m F)(z) := \sum_{|\beta| \leq m} \frac{1}{|\beta|!} (x - y)^\beta f^\beta(x), \]
\[ (R_{x,y}^m F)(\gamma) := f^\gamma(y) - \sum_{|\beta| + |\gamma| \leq m} \frac{1}{|\beta|!} f^\beta(x) (y - x)^\gamma. \]
$F$ is called a Whitney jet if it satisfies
\[ |(R_{x,y}^m F)(\gamma)| = o(|x - y|^{m - |\gamma|}) \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad \text{and } |\gamma| \leq m \quad \text{as } |x - y| \to 0. \]

3.2. Definition. Let $\omega$ be a weight function and let $A \neq \emptyset$ be a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. A Whitney jet $F = (f^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N}$ on $A$ is called an $\omega$-Whitney jet of Roumieu type if the following holds: For each compact set $K \subset A$ there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M > 0$ such that
\begin{enumerate}
\item[(1)] \[ \sup_{x \in K} \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} |f^\alpha(x)| \exp\left( -\frac{1}{m} \omega^*(m|\alpha|) \right) \leq M, \]
\item[(2)] \[ |R_{x,y}^m F)(\gamma)| \leq M |x - y|^{l + 1 - |\gamma|} \left( \frac{l + 1 - |\gamma|}{l + 1 - |\gamma|} \right)^{m(l + 1)} \exp\left( \frac{1}{m} \omega^*(m(l + 1)) \right). \]
\end{enumerate}
By $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}(A)$ we denote the linear space of all $\omega$-Whitney jets of Roumieu type on $A$.

3.3. Remark. For each weight function $\omega$ and each closed set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ the restriction map $\varphi_\omega: f \mapsto (f^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N}$ maps $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ into $\mathcal{E}_{\omega}(A)$.

For a singleton $A$, condition 3.2(2) is empty. Moreover, Bouet, Meise, and Taylor [3], 3.8 (see 1.7), shows that in this case $\varphi_\omega$ is surjective if and only if $\omega$ is a strong weight function. To show that for each strong weight function $\omega$, the map $\varphi_\omega: \mathcal{E}_{\omega}(\mathbb{R}^N) \to \mathcal{E}_{\omega}(A)$ is surjective for each closed set $A$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, we need some preparation.

3.4. Lemma. Let $\omega$ be a weight function. Then for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $0 < s_0 < 1$ such that for each $0 < s < s_0$ we have
\[ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0} \frac{s}{m \omega^*(m|\gamma|)} \geq \left( \frac{1}{m} \omega^*(3ms) \right). \]
Proof. First note that we can find \( a \geq 1 \) and a weight function \( \kappa \) with \( \kappa([0, 1]) = 0 \) so that \( \kappa([a, \infty]) = \omega([a, \infty]) \). This implies the existence of \( s_a > 0 \) so that for all \( 0 < s < s_a \) we have \( \omega^*(s) = \kappa^*(s) \). Hence we can assume that \( \omega \) satisfies \( \omega([0, 1]) = 0 \), which implies \( \varphi^{**} = \varphi \) by 1.2(b). Now fix \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) and choose \( 0 < s_m < (3e)^{-1} \) so that

\[
\omega^*(ms) = \sup_{t \geq 1} (\omega(t) - ms) \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 < s < s_m.
\]

Then we get for \( 0 < s < s_0 \)

\[
\frac{1}{m} \omega^*(ms) = \sup_{t \geq 1} \left( \frac{1}{m} \varphi(\log t) - ts \right) = \sup_{t \geq 1} \left( \frac{1}{m} \varphi^{**}(\log t) - ts \right)
\]

\[
= \sup_{t \geq 1} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sup_{y > 0} (y \log y - \varphi(y)) - ts \right)
\]

\[
= \sup_{y > 0} \left( \sup_{t \geq 1} \left( \frac{y}{m} \log y - ts \right) - \frac{1}{m} \varphi(y) \right)
\]

\[
= \sup_{y > 0} \left( \frac{y}{m} \log y - 1 \right) - \frac{1}{m} \varphi(y) = \sup_{z > 0} \left( z \log z - 1 - \frac{1}{m} \varphi(y) \right)
\]

\[
= \sup_{y > 0} \left( \frac{y}{m} \log y - 1 \right) - \frac{1}{m} \varphi(y) = \sup_{z > 0} \left( z \log z - 1 - \frac{1}{m} \varphi(y) \right)
\]

Since \( n! \geq (n/3)^n \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), we get from this for \( 0 < s < s_0 \)

\[
\sup_{j \geq 0} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(mj) \right) = \exp \sup_{j \geq 0} \left( \log(j!) - j \log j - \frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(mj) \right)
\]

\[
= \exp \sup_{j \geq 0} \left( \log(j+1) - j \log j - \frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(mj) \right)
\]

\[
\geq \exp \sup_{j \geq 0} \left( \log\left(\frac{j+1}{3}\right) - j \log j - \frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(mj) \right)
\]

\[
= \exp \sup_{z > 0} \left( z \log\left(\frac{z}{3}\right) - z \log z - \frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(mz) \right)
\]

\[
= \exp \sup_{z > 0} \left( z \log\left(\frac{z}{3}\right) - z \log z - \frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(mz) \right)
\]

\[
= \exp \sup_{z > 0} \left( z \log\left(\frac{z}{3}\right) - z \log z - \frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(mz) \right)
\]

\[
= \exp 3 \sup_{z > 0} \left( z \log\left(\frac{z}{3}\right) - z \log z - \frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(mz) \right)
\]

\[
\leq \exp \left( -\frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(3mz) \right)
\]

\[
\leq \exp \left( -\frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(3mz) \right)
\]

Next we state Bruna’s version of Whitney’s cover of the complement of a compact set in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), which is convenient also for our purposes (see Bruna [5], 3.2, or Stein [20], Chapter VI).

3.6 Lemma. Let \( K \neq \emptyset \) be a compact subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Then there exists a collection of closed cubes \( (Q_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) with sides parallel to the axes such that

(a) \( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} Q_j \),

(b) \( Q_j \cap Q_i = \emptyset \) for \( i \neq j \),

(c) \( \text{diam } Q_j \leq \text{dist}(Q_j, K) \leq 4 \text{diam } Q_j \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \),

(d) let \( Q^*_j \) denote the cube which has the same center as \( Q_j \), expanded by \( 9/8 \); then there exist \( m_0, M_0 > 0 \) so that

\[
m_0 \text{ diam } Q_j \leq \text{dist}(z, K) \leq M_0 \text{ diam } Q_j \quad \text{for all } z \in Q^*_j.
\]

(e) \( \forall j \in \mathbb{N} \): \( Q^*_j \cap Q^*_i \neq \emptyset \) \( \leq 12^{2n} \) for each \( i \in \mathbb{N} \),

(f) there exist \( m_1, M_1 > 0 \) so that for \( i, j \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( Q^*_i \cap Q^*_j \neq \emptyset \) we have

\[
m_1 \text{ diam } Q_j \leq \text{diam } Q_j \leq M_1 \text{ diam } Q_j.
\]

Now Proposition 2.2, Lemma 3.6, [4], 4.4, [16], 3.3.4(4), and the arguments of the proof of Bruna [5], 3.3, show that the following holds:

3.7. Lemma. Let \( \omega \) be a strong weight function which is concave and satisfies \( \omega(0) = 0 \). Furthermore, let \( K \neq \emptyset \) be a compact subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and let \( (Q_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) and \( (Q^*_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) be as in Lemma 3.6. Then we have, in the notation of Lemma 3.6: For each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) there exist \( p \in \mathbb{N} \), \( 0 < r_0 < 1/2, C > 0 \) and a sequence \( (\Phi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) in \( \mathcal{B}^{(p)}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) which satisfy

(a) \( \Phi_j \geq 0 \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \),

(b) \( \sup_j \Phi_j = \Phi^*_j \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \),

(c) \( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \Phi_j(x) = 1 \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K \),

(d) if \( \text{dist}(Q_j, K) < r_0 M_0^{-1} \) then

\[
\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{R}^n} \Phi_j(x) \exp \left( -\frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(p|x|) \right)
\]

\[
\leq C \exp \left( \frac{N 12^{2n}}{n} \omega^*(\frac{m}{2^{1/2}} \text{ diam } Q_j) \right)
\]

3.8. Lemma. Let \( \omega \) be a strong weight function, let \( K \neq \emptyset \) be a compact subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and let \( F = (F_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) be in \( \mathcal{B}^{(p)}(\mathbb{R}^n) \). Then there exist a compact cube \( H \) with \( K \subset H \), \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( A > 0 \) so that for each \( x \in H \) there is \( f_x \in \mathcal{B}^{(p)}(H) \) such that

(1) \( f^x_j(x) = f^x_j(x) \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{N} \), and all \( x \in K \),

(2) \( \sup_{x \in K} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{N}^*} \left| f^x_j(y) \right| \exp \left( -\frac{1}{m} \varphi^*(j|x|) \right) \leq A. \)
Moreover, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $B > 0$ and $d_0 > 0$ so that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ and all $x, y \in K$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $|x - y| + |y - z| < d_0$, we have

$$|f_x - f_y|^\alpha(z) \leq B \exp \left( \frac{1}{k} \phi^*(k|z|) \right) \exp \left( \frac{1}{k} \omega^*(k(z - x) + |y - z|) \right).$$

Proof. Condition 3.2(1) implies that $\{(f^*o)_{x \in K}\}$ is a bounded subset of $\mathcal{E}_\omega(0)$, so we can appeal to Section 3.1 to get a weak limit topology. Since $\omega$ is a strong weight function, then $\mathcal{E}_\omega(0)$ is a bounded set in $\mathcal{E}_\omega(0)$, which is the image of a bounded set in $\mathcal{E}_\omega(0)$, and $f^* = f^*(x)$ for all $x \in K$. Obviously, this implies the first part of the assertion.

To prove the second one, fix $x, y \in K$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ with $|\alpha| \leq l$. Then note that by Malgrange [15], p. 3, we have

$$T^*_\phi(F)(z) - T^*_\phi(F)(z) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq l} \frac{1}{m|\alpha|} (z - x)^p (R^*_{\phi})_\phi(x).$$

Since $F$ satisfies condition 3.2(2), there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A > 0$ so that for all $x, y \in K$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we have

$$|T^*_\phi(F)(z) - T^*_\phi(F)(z)| \leq A \exp \left( \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \right) \frac{|x - y|^{l + 1 - |\alpha|}}{(l + 1 - |\alpha|)!} \exp \left( \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \right).$$

Now note that by [4], 1.4, there exist $L > 1$ and $D > 0$ such that

$$\omega^*(t) - t \geq L \omega^*(t/L) - D$$

for all $t > 0$.

Evaluating at $t = Lm(l + 1)$, we get

$$|T^*_\phi(F)(z) - T^*_\phi(F)(z)| \leq A \exp \left( \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \right) \frac{|x - y|^{l + 1 - |\alpha|}}{(l + 1 - |\alpha|)!} \exp \left( \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \right).$$

On the other hand, Taylor's formula and (2) imply the existence of $A_0 > 0$ so that for each $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ with $|\alpha| \leq l$ and all $x \in K$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we have

$$|f_x - f_y|^\alpha(z) \leq A_0 \frac{|z - x|^{l + 1 - |\alpha|}}{(l + 1 - |\alpha|)!} \exp \left( \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \right).$$

Now choose $B > 3m(A_0, A^\alpha)$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $\nu > 2\max(j, lM)$; then (4) and (5) give for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ with $|\alpha| \leq l$ and all $x, y \in K$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$

$$|f_x - f_y|^\alpha(z) \leq B \frac{|z - x| + |y - z|^{l + 1 - |\alpha|}}{(l + 1 - |\alpha|)!} \exp \left( \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \right).$$

because of the convexity of $t \mapsto (2t)^{\alpha}(t)$.

Now observe that this and Lemma 3.4 imply (3) by taking the infimum over $l$.

3.9. Theorem. For each strong weight function $\omega$ and each compact set $K \neq \emptyset$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ the restriction map $\mathcal{E}_\omega(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_\omega(0)$ is surjective.

Proof. Because of Remark 1.9 we can assume that $\omega$ is concave and satisfies $\omega(0) = 0$. Fix $F = (f^*o)_{x \in K}$. Then there exist numbers $k, j, A, B$, and $d_0$ as in 3.8. Let $m_0, M_0$, and $m_1$ be as in 3.6 and assume $m_0 < 1$. Because of 3.5, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|x - y| \leq \frac{n}{M_0}$$

for all $x, y \in K$. Therefore, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have

$$|x - y| \leq |x - z| + |z - y| \leq |x - z| + |z - y| \leq \frac{n}{M_0}.$$

On the other hand, $|x - y| \leq \frac{n}{M_0}$, hence,

$$\text{dist}(z, K) \leq \frac{6}{m_0} \text{dist}(z, K).$$

Now we define

$$f^*(z) = \sum_{i=1}^L \phi_i(z) f_i(z)$$

for $z \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus K$.

Now we define

$$f^*(z) = \sum_{i=1}^L \phi_i(z) f_i(z)$$

for $z \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus K$.

We establish the following claim: There are $P \geq k$ and $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $x \in K$ and $z \in K$ with $|x - z| < \min(m_0 d_0 \gamma, m_0 r_0 (4M_1))$ we have for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$

$$|f_x - f_y|^\alpha(z) \approx \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \exp \left( \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \right).$$

Now choose $B > 3m(A_0, A^\alpha)$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $\nu > 2\max(j, lM)$; then (4) and (5) give for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ with $|\alpha| \leq l$ and all $x, y \in K$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$

$$|f_x - f_y|^\alpha(z) \leq B \frac{|z - x| + |y - z|^{l + 1 - |\alpha|}}{(l + 1 - |\alpha|)!} \exp \left( \frac{1}{m} \phi^*(m(l + 1)) \right).$$

because of the convexity of $t \mapsto (2t)^{\alpha}(t)$.

Now observe that this and Lemma 3.4 imply (3) by taking the infimum over $l$.
To prove the claim, fix $x \in K$, $z \notin K$ satisfying the above inequality and let $\gamma \in N_0^n$. Then

$$f(z - f_x) = \sum_{\beta \geq 0} \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \prod_{i=1}^n \Phi^{(\beta)}(f_{x_i} - f_x) \omega^{-(\beta)}(z).$$

First we estimate the term with $\beta = 0$. If $z \in \text{supp} \Phi_1 \subseteq Q^+_s$, then (2) and $m_0 \leq 1$ imply

$$|x - z| + |x_i - z_i| \leq |x - z| + 6m_0^{-1} \text{dist}(z, K) \leq 7m_0^{-1}|x - z| \leq d_0.$$

Therefore 3.8(3) shows that the term with $\beta = 0$, multiplied by $\exp(-(1/\rho) \phi^*(P|\gamma|))$, is estimated by the first term on the right hand side of (3) with $C_1 = B$.

Next fix $\beta \neq 0$ and choose $z \in K$ with $|x - z| = \text{dist}(z, K)$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Phi^{(\beta)}(z_i) = 0$$

implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Phi^{(\beta)}(z_i)(f_{x_i} - f_x) \omega^{-(\beta)}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Phi^{(\beta)}(z_i)(f_{x_i} - f_x) \omega^{-(\beta)}(z) + (f_x - f_x) \omega^{-(\beta)}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Phi^{(\beta)}(z_i)(f_{x_i} - f_x) \omega^{-(\beta)}(z).$$

Because of this and $|x - z| + |z_i - z| \leq (6m_0^{-1} + 1) \text{dist}(z, K) \leq 7m_0^{-1}|x - z| \leq d_0$, we can apply 3.8(3) to get

$$|f_{x_i} - f_x| \leq C \exp\left(\frac{1}{\hat{k}} \phi^*(k) |\gamma| \right) \left(\frac{\hat{k} \omega^*}{m_0} \text{dist}(z, K) \right).$$

On the other hand, if $z \notin \text{supp} \Phi_1$, we have

$$\text{dist}(Q, K) \leq 4 \text{diam} Q \leq \frac{4}{m_0} \text{dist}(z, K) \leq \frac{4}{m_0} |x - z| \leq \frac{r_0}{M_1},$$

and because of $\text{diam} Q \geq M_0^{-1} \text{dist}(z, K)$, Proposition 3.7(d) yields

$$(6) \quad \Phi^{(\beta)}(z) \leq C \exp\left(\frac{1}{\rho} \phi^*(P|\gamma|)\right) \left(\frac{12^{2^n} N}{n} \omega^* \left(\frac{M_0}{n \sqrt{2^{12^n} N}} \text{dist}(z, K)\right)\right).$$

Taking into account that by 3.6(e) no more than $12^{2^n}$ of the $\Phi_i(z)$ are nonzero, we get estimates for every term in (4) if we combine (5) and (6). We have $\sum_{\beta \geq 0} \gamma = 2^{\gamma}$. Thus we have shown (3) because, as in the proof of 3.8(4), there are $P > p$ and $C_2 > 0$ with

$$C2^{|\gamma|} \exp\left(\frac{1}{P} \phi^*(P|\gamma|)\right) \leq C_2 \exp\left(\frac{1}{P} \phi^*(P|\gamma|)\right) \quad \text{for all } \gamma.$$

Now, given $x \in N_0^n$, we define

$$\tilde{f}_x(z) = \begin{cases} f^0(z) & \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K, \\ f^*(z) & \text{for } z \in K. \end{cases}$$

We want to show that $\tilde{f}$ is a $C^0$-function with $\tilde{f}^0 = \tilde{f}_x$ for all $x \in N_0^n$. By Hestenes [9], Lemma 1, it suffices to show that all $\tilde{f}_x$ are continuous. This is clear near points $x \notin K$, so let $x$ be in $K$. Then by 3.1 we have for $x \in K$

$$|\tilde{f}_x(z) - \tilde{f}_x(x)| = |R^0 x| \cdot |f^0(z)| = o(1).$$

If $z \notin K$ and $|x - z|$ is small enough, then

$$|\tilde{f}_x(z) - \tilde{f}_x(x)| = |f^0(x) - f^*(x)|$$

$$\leq |f^0(x) - f^0(z)| + |f^0(z) - f^*(z)|$$

$$\to 0 \quad \text{as } z \to x,$$

where we apply (3)(1), and $\lim_{z \to x} \phi^*(x) = 0 = \lim_{z \to x} \phi^*(x)$

and finally the continuity of $f^0$ for the other.

To see that $\tilde{f}$ is in $\sigma_{(0)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, let $n \in N$ be as in (1), find $d > 0$ so that $g(y) \leq 0$ for all $0 < y < d$, and choose $\nu = \min(d, A, d_2 M_0/7, m_0 r_0 A M_0)$.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ with dist$(z, K) < \epsilon$, we take $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|x - z| = \text{dist}(z, K)$. Then for $x \in N_0^n$, we apply (3) and 3.8(2) to get

$$|\tilde{f}^0(x)| \leq |f^0(x) + |f^0(x) - f^*(x)|$$

$$\leq A \exp\left(\frac{1}{P} \phi^*(P|\gamma|)\right) + (C_1 + C_2) \exp\left(\frac{1}{P} \phi^*(P|\gamma|)\right).$$

For $x \in K$ we use 3.8(2) alone. In both cases we see that

$$|\tilde{f}^0(x)| \leq C_2 \exp\left(\frac{1}{P} \phi^*(P|\gamma|)\right) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with dist}(z, K) \leq \epsilon.$$
Next fix a closed set $A \neq \emptyset$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and a Whitney jet $F = (f^a)_{a \in \mathbb{N}^m}$ in $\mathcal{E}(A)$. For $a \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the jet $(f^a|_{(B_{n+1}(x, B_{n-1}))} a \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Obviously, $f_a$ is in $\mathcal{E}(B_{n+1}(B_{n-1}))$. Hence Theorem 3.9 implies the existence of $f_a \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ so that $f_{a+1}(B_{n+1}(B_{n-1}), f_a) = F$. Now (3) implies that

$$f_a(x) = \sum_{a=1}^{N} \varphi_n(x) f_a(x)$$

is in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. To show that $g_n(f) = F$, we fix $x \in A$. Then there exists a unique natural number $m$ so that $x \in B_m \setminus B_{m-1}$. Because of (3), this implies $\varphi_n(x) = 0$ for $m \notin \{m - 1, m\}$. Hence we get

$$f_a(x) = \sum_{a=1}^{N} \varphi_n(x) f_a(x) = \varphi_{m-1}(x) f_{m-1}(x) + \varphi_m(x) f_m(x)$$

$$= (\varphi_{m-1}(x) + \varphi_m(x)) f^0(x) = f^0(x).$$

Similarly it follows that $f^0(x) = f^0(x)$ for each $x \in A$ and each $a \in \mathbb{N}^N$.

In the classical theory, a simpler description of Whitney jets is possible, provided the compact set has Whitney's property (P). To show that the same holds in our setting, we first recall the definition of property (P) (see Whitney [21]).

3.11. Definition. A closed subset $A$ of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $\bar{A} = A$ has property (P) if for every compact subset $K$ of $A$ there is a constant $C > 0$ such that any two points $x$ and $y$ of $K$ are joined by a rectifiable curve $\alpha$ in $A$ of length not exceeding $C|x - y|$.

3.12. Corollary. Let $\omega$ be a strong weight function and let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be closed. Assume that $\bar{A} = A$ and that $A$ has property (P). Let $(f^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^m}$ be a family in $C(A) \cap C^\infty(\bar{A})$ satisfying

1. $f^\alpha(x) = (f^0)^{\alpha_0}(x)$ for all $x \in \bar{A}, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^m$,
2. for each compact set $K \subset A$ there are $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in K} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} |f^\alpha(x)| \exp \left(\frac{1}{m} \varphi^m(m|\alpha|)\right) \leq M.$$ 

Then there exists $g \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $g^{\alpha}(x) = f^\alpha(x)$ for all $x \in A$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^m$.

Proof. In view of 3.9 it suffices to show that $F = (f^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^m}$ is in $\mathcal{E}(A)$. Choose a compact $K \subset A$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $K \subset \{x \in A : |x| < k\}$. Let $K_1 = \{x \in A : |x| \leq k\}$ and let $C$ be the constant belonging to $K_1$ in property (P). Let $K_2 = \{x \in A : |x| \leq (2C + 1)k\}$, and apply (2) to $K_2$ to get $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M > 0$. Let now $x, y \in K$ be given. Then there are sequences $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^m}$ and $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^m}$ in $K_1$ tending to $x$ and $y$ respectively. By property (P) there is for fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a rectifiable curve $q$ in $A$ from $x_n$ to $y_n$ of length not exceeding $C|x_n - y_n|$.

Since $x_n, y_n \in A$ we may perturb $q$ to a $C^1$-curve $s$ joining $x_n$ and $y_n$ of length at most $2C|x_n - y_n|$ which is parametrized by arc length. Note that $s$ must lie in $K_2$. Whitney [21], Lemma 3, states that for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $A \in \mathbb{N}^N$ with $|\alpha| \leq l$

$$|R_n^k F A(y_n) | \leq \frac{N!}{(l - |\alpha|)!} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} |f^\alpha(x) - f^\alpha(y)|.$$ 

Assuming $\sigma(0) = x_n$ and using that $s$ is parametrized by arc length, we have by the mean value theorem for each $t$ in the domain of $s$

$$|f^\alpha(s_t) - f^\alpha(s_t)| \leq |t| \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} |f^\alpha(x) - f^\alpha(y)|.$$ 

Combining this with (2) we have

$$|R_n^k F A(y_n) | \leq \frac{N!}{(l - |\alpha|)!} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N} |f^\alpha(x) - f^\alpha(y)|.$$ 

Letting $n$ tend to infinity we get 3.2(2) if we apply the procedure used to prove 3.8(4) to swallow the extra factor $(2CN)^{l - |\alpha|}(l + 1 - |\alpha|)$.

3.13. Remark. Let $(M_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}^m}$ be a sequence of positive numbers which has the following properties (see Komatsu [13]):

M1. $M_p \leq M_{p-1} M_{p+1}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$,

M2. there exist $A, H > 1$ with $M_p \leq A H^p \min M_q M_{p+1}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$,

M3. there exists $A > 0$ with $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}^m} \frac{M_p}{M_q} \leq A M_1 M_{p+1}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$,

and define $\omega_M: [0, \infty[ \to [0, \infty[ \text{ by}$

$$\omega_M(t) := \begin{cases} \omega_M(t) := \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}^m} \frac{t^p M_p}{M_{p+1}} & \text{for } t > 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then Meise and Taylor [16], 3.11, shows that $\omega_M$ is a strong weight function for which we have $\mathcal{E}(\omega_M)(\Omega) = \mathcal{E}(M) \Omega)$ for each open set $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, where

$$\mathcal{E}(\omega_M)(\Omega) := \{f : f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \text{ for which } F \subset \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \text{ for each open set } \Omega \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N, \text{ such that }$$

$$\sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{N}^m} \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{N}^m} |f^\alpha(x)| \exp \left(\frac{1}{m} \varphi^m(m|\alpha|)\right) \leq M.$$ 

From this and Theorem 3.9 it follows that Theorem 3.1 of Bruna [5] holds, whenever $(M_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}^m}$ satisfies (M1)–(M3). Hence some of the hypotheses in [5], 3.1, are superfluous. This has been remarked independently also by Chung and Kim [7].
4. The extension theorem for the classes $\mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}$. In this section, we characterize those Whitney jets on closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$ which are restrictions of functions in $\mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\omega$ a strong weight function.

4.1. Definition. Let $\omega$ be a weight function and let $A \neq \emptyset$ be a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. A Whitney jet $F = (f, m_{\omega})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $A$ is called an $\omega$-Whitney jet of Beurling type if the following holds: For each compact set $K \subset A$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in K} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |f^{(n)}(x)| \exp\left(-nm\omega(|x|/m)\right) \leq M,$$

(1)

for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, each $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $|a| \leq l$ and all $x, y \in K$

$$|R_i y f(x)| \leq M \frac{|x-y|^{l+1-|a|}}{(l+1-|a|)!} \exp\left(m\omega\left(\frac{l+1}{m}\right)\right).$$

By $\mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}(A)$ we denote the linear space of all $\omega$-Whitney jets of Beurling type on $A$.

4.2. Remark. For each weight function $\omega$ and each closed set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ the restriction map $\mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}(A)$ maps $\mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ into $\mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}(A)$.

For a singleton $A$, condition 4.1(2) is empty. Moreover, Meise and Taylor [16], 3.10 (see 1.7), shows that in this case $\mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}$ is surjective if and only if $\omega$ is a strong weight function. We will show in the sequel that $\mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_c^{(\omega)}(A)$ is surjective for each closed set in $\mathbb{R}^N$, provided that $\omega$ is a strong weight function. To obtain this by a reduction argument from Theorem 3.9, we prove the following two lemmas.

4.3. Lemma. Let $(M_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive numbers and let $(\psi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of differentiable functions on $[0, \infty]$ which satisfies for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$:

(i) $\psi_j$ is convex and increasing and $\psi_j(0) = 0$,

(ii) $\psi_j(t) > \psi_{j+1}(t)$ for all $t > 0$,

(iii) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi_j(t) - \psi_{j+1}(t) = \infty$,

(iv) $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi_j(t) = \infty$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then there exists a sequence $(N_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers and a convex function $h : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that

(1) $h(t) \geq \inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} (\psi_j(t) + M_j)$ for all $t > 0$,

(2) $h(t) \leq \psi_j(t) + N_j$ for all $t > 0$ and all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. It is easy to check that by enlarging the numbers $M_j$ if necessary, we can find a strictly increasing sequence $(t_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty]$ with $t_0 = 0$ so that

$$m(t) := \inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} (\psi_j(t) + M_j) = \psi_j(t) + M_j \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [t_{j-1}, t_j].$$

Then we distinguish two cases:

Case 1: There exist $A, B > 0$ so that $At + B \geq m(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then the hypothesis implies that we can choose $h : t \mapsto At + B$.

Case 2: Not case 1. We claim that in this case we can find a strictly increasing sequence $(n_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{N}$, a sequence $(s_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty]$ and a continuous convex function $h : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, satisfying (1) and (2), so that the following holds:

(4) $s_0 = 0$ and $s_j \in [t_{n_j-1}, t_{n_j}]$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

(5) $h(t) = m(t)$ for $s_{j-1} \leq t \leq s_j$,

(6) $h(t) = m(t_n) + \psi_n(t_n) - s_n$ for $t_n \leq t \leq s_j$.

To prove this by induction, we define $s_0 := 0$ and $n_1 := 1$. Assume that $n_j$ and $s_{j-1}$ have been chosen already. Then define $h_j : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$h_j(t) := m(t_n) + \psi_n(t_n) - s_n$$

and note that the hypothesis of case 2 implies that

$$\Sigma_j := \{s \geq t_n : h_j(s) < m(s)\}$$

is not empty. Hence

$$s_j := \inf \{s \in \Sigma_j : s \geq t_n\},$$

and we can choose $n_{j+1}$ so that $s_j \in [t_{n_{j+1}-1}, t_{n_{j+1}}]$. Because of (ii), it is clear that $n_{j+1} > n_j$. From this choice it is evident that

$$h : t \mapsto \begin{cases} m(t) & \text{for} \quad s_{j-1} \leq t \leq s_j, \\ h_j(t) & \text{for} \quad t_n \leq t \leq s_j. \end{cases}$$

is continuous and satisfies (5) and (6). To prove the convexity of $h$, note that for $s_j \in [t_{n_{j+1}-1}, t_{n_{j+1}}]$ we have $m(s_j) = h_j(s_j), \psi_1(s_j) = h_1(s_j)$ and for some $\delta > 0$, $m(t) > h_j(t)$ for $s_j < t < s_j + \delta$. Therefore an easy calculus argument shows

$$h_+ - h_- = \psi_1(s_j) - \psi_1(s_j) = m_+ - m_-(s_j) = h_+(s_j).$$

The convexity in $t_n$ is clear.

Next note that $h$ satisfies (1) by construction. To prove (2), fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s_j \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $s_j < t_n$. Then (5) and (3) give

$$h(t) = m(t) = \psi_j(t) + M_j \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in [t_n, s_j].$$

For $t \in [t_n, s_j]$ we get (assuming $s_j > t_n$) from (6) and (3)

$$\psi_j(t) + M_j \geq h(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_j(t) + M_j \geq \psi_j(t_n) + M_j.$$
4.4. Lemma. Let \( \omega \) be a strong weight function and assume that \( h: [0, \infty[ \to [0, \infty[ \) satisfies \( \omega = o(h) \). Then there exists a strong weight function \( \sigma \) so that \( \omega = o(\sigma) \) and \( \sigma = o(h) \).

Proof. Since \( \omega \) is a strong weight function, 1.7(3) implies the existence of \( K > 1 \) so that

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \sup_t \omega(Kt)/\omega(t) < K.
\]

Next note that 1.1(\( \gamma \)) and the hypothesis imply \( \lim_{t \to \infty} h(t) = \infty \). Therefore we can define inductively a sequence \( (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) in \( [0, \infty[ \) with \( x_1 = 0 \) and \( \omega(x_2) > 0 \) which has the following properties:

1. \[
\int_{x_{i+1} \in [0, \infty[} \frac{\omega(t)}{1 + t^2} dt \leq (n+1)^{-1},
\]

2. \( x_{i+1} \geq Kx_i \)

3. \( \omega(x_{i+1}) \geq 2^{i-1} \omega(x_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \),

4. \( h(x) \geq n^2 \omega(x) \) for all \( x \geq x_n \).

Then we define \( \sigma: [0, \infty[ \to [0, \infty[ \) by

\[
\sigma(x) := n \omega(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega(x_i) \quad \text{for} \quad x \in [x_n, x_{n+1}].
\]

Obviously, \( \sigma \) is continuous and satisfies 1.1(\( \delta \)). Moreover, for \( n \geq 2 \) and \( x \in [x_n, x_{n+1}] \) we have

\[
\sigma(x) = \left( n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\omega(x_i)}{\omega(x)} \right) \omega(x) \geq \left( (n-2) \omega(x) \right) \geq (n-2) \omega(x)
\]

and hence

\[
\omega(x) \leq \frac{1}{n-2} \sigma(x) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in [x_n, x_{n+1}] \quad \text{and} \quad n \geq 2.
\]

This proves \( \omega = o(\sigma) \) and consequently \( \sigma \) satisfies 1.1(\( \gamma \)). From (4) and the definition of \( \sigma \) we get

\[
\sigma(x) \leq n \omega(x) \leq \frac{1}{n} h(x) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \geq x_n,
\]

and hence \( \sigma = o(h) \).

Next choose \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) so that

\[
\omega(Kt)/\omega(t) \leq K - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all} \quad t \geq x_n,
\]

fix \( x \geq x_N \) and distinguish the following two cases:

Case 1: \( x_n \leq x \leq Kx \leq x_{n+1} \) for an appropriate \( n \geq N \). Then (5) and (6) give

\[
\sigma(Kx) - \sigma(x) = n(\omega(Kx) - \omega(x)) \leq n(K - \varepsilon) \omega(x)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{n}{n-2} (K - \varepsilon - 1) \sigma(x).
\]

Case 2: \( x_n \leq x \leq x_{n+1} < Kx \) for an appropriate \( n \geq N \). Then (2) implies

\[
\sigma(Kx) - \sigma(x) = (n+1) \omega(Kx) - \omega(x_{n+1}) - n \omega(x)
\]

\[
\leq (n+1) \omega(Kx) - \omega(x) \leq \frac{n+1}{n-2} (K - \varepsilon - 1) \sigma(x).
\]

Altogether, this proves that

\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} \sup_x \sigma(Kx)/\sigma(x) \leq K - \varepsilon < K.
\]

Since it is no restriction to assume \( K \geq 2 \), this implies that \( \sigma \) satisfies 1.1(\( \mu \)). Now note that (1) implies that \( \sigma \) satisfies 1.1(\( \beta \)) (see the proof of Braun, Meise and Taylor [4], 1.6). Hence (7) shows that \( \sigma \) is a strong weight function which has all the desired properties.

4.5. Theorem. For each strong weight function \( \omega \) and each compact set \( K \neq \emptyset \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) the restriction map \( \delta_{\omega}: \delta(\omega)(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \delta(\omega)(K) \) is surjective.

Proof. Fix a compact set \( K \neq \emptyset \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and fix \( F = (f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) in \( \delta_{\omega}(K) \). For \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) let

\[
a_n := \sup_{|x| = n} |f(x)|, \quad b_n := \sup_{|x| = n} \sup_{x \in K, x \neq y} \left| (R^n_y f)_n(y) \right| \frac{(n+1-|x|)!}{|x-y|^{n+1-|x|}}.
\]

and define \( g: [0, \infty[ \to \mathbb{R} \) by

\[
g(t) := \max\{a_n, b_n, 1\} \quad \text{for} \quad n \leq t < n+1.
\]

Since \( \omega^* \) is increasing and since \( F \) is in \( \delta_{\omega}(K) \), we get from 4.1 the existence of a sequence \( (M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) in \( [0, \infty[ \) so that

\[
g(t) \leq \omega^*(t/J) + M_n \quad \text{for all} \quad t \geq 0, j \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

Now define \( \psi_j: t \mapsto \omega^*(t/j) \) and note that w.l.o.g. we can assume that \( \omega \) is \( C^1 \) with \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \omega'(t) = \infty \). Then \( \omega^* = (\omega')^{-1} \) and \( (\psi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 4.3. Therefore, (1) implies the existence of a convex function \( h: [0, \infty[ \to [0, \infty[ \) and of a sequence \( (M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) so that

\[
g \leq h \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} (\psi_j + M_n).
\]
From this and the definition of \( \psi \), we get for each \( j \in \mathbb{N} \)

\[
\psi_j(x) \geq j \psi^*(x) - N_j = j \varphi(x) - N_j.
\]

Now define \( f: t \mapsto \psi_t(\max(0, \log t)) \) and note that by (3) we have for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) and all \( t \geq 1 \)

\[
\omega(t) = \varphi(\log t) \leq \frac{1}{j} (\psi^*(\log t) + N_j) = \frac{1}{j} f(t) + \frac{1}{j} N_j.
\]

This proves \( \omega = o(f) \). Therefore, Lemma 4.4 implies the existence of a strong weight function \( \sigma \) and of \( A \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \omega \in \mathcal{S} \), so that

\[
\omega = o(\sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma \leq f + A.
\]

Hence, we have

\[
\psi(x) = \sigma(e^x) \leq f(e^x) + A = \psi^*(x) + A \quad \text{for all} \ x \geq 0.
\]

Therefore, (2) implies \( g \leq h = \psi^* + A \). From this and the definition of \( g \) it follows that \( F \) is in \( \mathcal{S}_{\omega}^*(K) \). Since \( \sigma \) is a strong weight function, Theorem 3.9 gives the existence of \( f \in \mathcal{S}_\omega(R^n) \) with \( \varphi_K(f) = F \). This proves the theorem, since (4) together with [4], 3.9 and 4.5, implies \( \mathcal{S}_\omega(R^n) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\omega}^*(R^n) \).

**4.6. Corollary.** For a weight function \( \omega \) the following assertions are equivalent:

1. For each closed set \( A \neq \emptyset \) in \( R^n \), the restriction map \( \varphi_A: \mathcal{S}_{\omega}^*(R^n) \to \mathcal{S}_{\omega}(A) \) is surjective.

2. \( \omega \) is a strong weight function.

**Proof.** (1) \( = \) (2). Choosing \( A = \{0\} \), this follows from Meise and Taylor [16], 3.10 (see 1.7).

(2) \( \Rightarrow \) (1). This follows from Theorem 4.5 by the same arguments which were used in the proof of Corollary 3.10.

The following corollary is the analogue to 3.12 for the Beurling case.

**4.7. Corollary.** Let \( \omega \) be a strong weight function and let \( A \subset R^n \) be closed. Assume that \( \tilde{A} = A \) and that \( A \) has property (P) (see 3.11). Let \( (f_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a family in \( C(A) \cap C^\infty \) satisfying

1. \( f_j(x) = (f_0)^{(j)}(x) \) for all \( x \in A, \ a \in N_j \),

2. for each compact set \( K \subset A \) and each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) there is \( M > 0 \) such that

\[
\sup_{x \in K} \sup_{a \in N_{a,j}} |f^m|(x) = f^m(x) \quad \text{for all} \ x \in A, \ a \in N_{a,j}.
\]

Then there exists \( g \in \mathcal{S}_{\omega}(R^n) \) with \( g^{(a)}(x) = f^m(x) \) for all \( x \in A, \ a \in N_{a,j} \).

\[
4.8. \text{Remark.} \ \text{For a sequence} \ (M_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{satisfying} (M1) - (M3), \text{define} \ \omega_M \text{as in} \ 3.13. \ \text{Then Meise and Taylor [16], 3.11, shows that} \ \mathcal{S}_{\omega}^*(\Omega) = \mathcal{S}^{(M_j)}(\Omega) \text{for each open set} \ \Omega \in R^n, \ \text{where}
\]

\[
\mathcal{S}^{(M_j)}(\Omega) = \{ f \in C^\infty(\Omega) : \ \text{for each} \ K \subset \Omega \ \text{compact and each} \ h > 0 \}
\]

\[
\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{n \in K} |f^{(n)}|(x) = \mathcal{S}^{(M_j)}(\Omega) \text{are strongly integrably convergent and}
\]

\[
\text{(h)} \mathcal{M}_{16} \text{uniformly converge on each compact subset of} \ \Omega \}.
\]

Since \( \omega_M \) is a strong weight function, Corollary 4.6 implies that Theoreme 1.3.3 of Kantor [12] holds for \( M = R^n \), whenever \( (M_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) satisfying (M1) – (M3). Note that Kantor [12] states Theoreme 1.3.3 for sequences \( (M_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) satisfying only (M1) and (M3). By Petzsche [18], 3.5 and 1.1, and also by Meise and Taylor [16], 3.10, his statement is not correct.

Note that an easy modification of the proof of 4.4 together with the idea of proof of Braun, Meise and Taylor [4], 1.9, shows the following:

**4.9. Lemma.** Let \( \omega \) be a weight function, \( h: [0, \infty[ \to [0, \infty[ \) so that \( \omega = o(h) \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \). Then there exists a weight function \( \sigma \) with \( \omega = o(\sigma) \) and \( \sigma = o(h) \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \).

From this one derives as in the proof of 4.5:

**4.10. Corollary.** For each weight function \( \omega \), each open subset \( \Omega \) of \( R^n \) and each \( f \in \mathcal{S}_{\omega}(\Omega) \) there is a weight function \( \sigma \) with \( \omega = o(\sigma) \) and \( f \in \mathcal{S}_{\sigma}(\Omega) \).
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