

AN EXISTENCE THEOREM FOR A POLYNOMIAL WITH A GIVEN SEQUENCE OF EXTREMA

MATHEMATICS

1966

SovietRxiv

View the original and related papers at <https://sovietrxiv.org/items/ru-196601.80857>

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

Abstract

Full Text

UDC 517.512

MATHEMATICS

V. S. VIDENSKII

AN EXISTENCE THEOREM FOR A POLYNOMIAL WITH A GIVEN SEQUENCE OF EXTREMA

(Presented by Academician S. N. Bernstein, 18 I 1966)

1. Let the functions $\{\varphi_k(x)\}_{k=0}^n$, continuous on $[a, b]$, form a Chebyshev system (a T_n -system), and let real numbers v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n be given. Denote by V_n the set of all polynomials in the system $\{\varphi_k(x)\}_{k=0}^n$ satisfying the conditions

$$P(x_i) = v_i \quad (i = 0, 1, \dots, n), \quad (1)$$

where $x_0 = a$, $x_n = b$, and $x_1 < \dots < x_{n-1}$ are arbitrary interpolation nodes from the interval (a, b) .

Theorem 1. *Let points be given*

$$a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{i-1} < x_{i+r} < \dots < x_{n-1} < x_n = b, \quad (2)$$

where i and r are given natural numbers, $i + r \leq n$. If the inequalities

$$v_{i+2j-1} > v_{i+2j}, \quad v_{i+2j+1} > v_{i+2j}$$

$$(j = 0, 1, \dots, m-1); \quad m = [(r+1)/2], \quad (3)$$

hold, and, for even r , in addition, the inequality

$$v_{i+2m-1} > v_{i+2m}, \quad (4)$$

holds, then in the interval (x_{i-1}, x_{i+r}) there exist points

$$x_i < x_{i+1} < \dots < x_{i+r-1} \quad (5)$$

and a polynomial $P(x) \in V_n$ with nodes (2) and (5) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_{i+2j-1} \leq x \leq x_{i+2j+1}} P(x) &= P(x_{i+2j}) = v_{i+2j}, \\ \max_{x_{i+2j-2} \leq x \leq x_{i+2j}} P(x) &= P(x_{i+2j-1}) = v_{i+2j-1} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

for $j = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, and, for even r , in addition,

$$\max_{x_{i+2m-2} \leq x \leq x_{i+2m}} P(x) = P(x_{i+2m-1}) = v_{i+2m-1}. \quad (7)$$

Moreover, the polynomial $P(x) \in V_n$ is uniquely determined by the conditions (6), (7) in the sense that if in them the points (5) are replaced by other points $y_i < \dots < y_{i+r-1}$ from (x_{i-1}, x_{i+r}) , then there does not exist another polynomial $Q(x) \in V_n$ with nodes (2) and y_s , satisfying the conditions (6), (7).

Theorem 1 is a strengthening of the results of the papers ^(1, 2), in which it is assumed, first, that the functions $\{\varphi_k(x)\}_{k=0}^n$ not only form a Chebyshev system, but are also continuously differentiable and such that the derivative of any polynomial in $\{\varphi_k(x)\}_{k=0}^n$ can have $\leq n$ zeros, and, second, that the numbers v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n have successively opposite signs. For $r = n-1$ the question was first considered in the algebraic case ($\varphi_k(x) = x^k$) in a paper of Davis ⁽³⁾.

A polynomial in the Chebyshev system $\{\varphi_k(x)\}_{k=0}^n$ which at certain $n+1$ points of the interval $[a, b]$ attains its greatest absolute value with successively opposite signs will, following S. N. Bernstein ⁽⁴⁾, be called an oscillating polynomial. If in Theorem 1 we put $v_k = (-1)^k$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots, n$), then we may formulate the following

Corollary. For every T_n -system $\{\varphi_k(x)\}_{k=0}^n$ on $[a, b]$ there exists a unique oscillating polynomial $P(x)$, normalized by the condition $P(a) = 1$.

Moreover, this corollary can be derived directly from the works of S. N. Bernstein ⁽⁴⁾, § 12 and ⁽⁵⁾.

For the proof of Theorem 1 we apply the method of successive approximations ^(1, 2) and induction with respect to the number r . Fix i and put $r = 1$; in this case inequalities (3) will be $v_{i-1} > v_i$, $v_{i+1} > v_i$. Adjoin to the points (2) an arbitrary point y_i from (x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}) and construct a polynomial $A(x)$ from the conditions $A(x_k) = v_k$ ($k \neq i$), $A(y_i) = v_i$. If

$$\min_{x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_{i+1}} A(x) = A(y_i) = v_i, \quad (8)$$

then y_i is the desired point, and $A(x)$ the desired polynomial. If, however,

$$\min_{x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_{i+1}} A(x) < A(y_i) = v_i, \quad (9)$$

then construct a polynomial $B(x)$ from the conditions $B(x_k) = 0$ ($k \neq i$) and consider the polynomial $C(x; \lambda) = A(x) + \lambda B(x)$. Since $B(x) \neq 0$ for $x_{i-1} < x < x_{i+1}$, it is possible to choose such a value $\lambda = \lambda_1$ that

$$\min_{x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_{i+1}} C(x; \lambda_1) > v_i. \quad (10)$$

Since $\min C(x; \lambda)$ on $[x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}]$ is a continuous function of λ , and $C(x; 0) = A(x)$, it follows from (9) and (10) that there is a $\lambda = \lambda_0$, $0 < \lambda_0 < \lambda_1$, such that

$$\min_{x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_{i+1}} C(x; \lambda_0) = v_i.$$

Denote the point at which the minimum of $C(x; \lambda_0)$ is attained by x_i , and $P(x) = C(x; \lambda_0)$ is a polynomial satisfying the conditions of the theorem. Suppose that there exists another polynomial $Q(x)$ such that $Q(x_k) = v_k$ ($k \neq i$),

$$\min_{x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_{i+1}} Q(x) = Q(\xi_i) = v_i, \quad x_i < \xi_i < x_{i+1}.$$

From $P(x_i) = v_i < Q(x_i)$ and $P(\xi_i) > v_i = Q(\xi_i)$ it follows that the polynomial $P(x) - Q(x)$ has a zero in (x_i, ξ_i) ; in addition, it has n other zeros x_k ($k \neq i$), which is impossible.

Assume, by induction, that Theorem 1 has been proved for some number r ($1 \leq r \leq n - 2$) for any i , and show that it is true for the number $r + 1$. For definiteness put $r = 2m - 1$. Let the inequalities (3), (4) be satisfied and let the points be given

$$a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{i-1} < x_{i+2m} < \dots < x_n = b. \quad (11)$$

Adjoin to them an arbitrary point x'_{i+2m-1} , $x_{i-1} < x'_{i+2m-1} < x_{i+2m}$. By the induction hypothesis, in (x_{i-1}, x'_{i+2m-1}) there will be points

$$x'_i < \dots < x'_{i+2m-2}$$

and a uniquely determined polynomial $P_1(x) \in V_n$ with nodes x_k, x'_s , which satisfies conditions (7) at the points x'_s ($s = i, \dots, i + 2m - 2$). If

$$\max_{x'_{i+2m-2} \leq x \leq x_{i+2m}} P_1(x) = P_1(x'_{i+2m-1}) = v_{i+2m-1}, \quad (12)$$

then $P_1(x)$ is the desired polynomial. If, however, (12) is not satisfied, then at certain points y of the interval (x'_{i+2m-2}, x_{i+2m}) the equality

$$P_1(y) = v_{i+2m-1}$$

holds. Since $P_1(x)$ is a polynomial in a T_n -system, the number of these points is finite; denote by y'_{i+2m-1} the nearest of them to the point x'_{i+2m-1} , and put, for definiteness, $x'_{i+2m-1} < y'_{i+2m-1}$. Choose

$x''_{i+2m-1} = 0.5(x'_{i+2m-1} + y'_{i+2m-1})$, adjoin it to the points (11) and repeat the preceding arguments. In the interval (x_{i-1}, x''_{i+2m-1}) there will be points $x''_i < x''_{i+1} < \dots < x''_{i+2m-2}$ and a polynomial $P_2(x) \in V_n$ with nodes x_k, x''_s , which satisfies conditions (7) at the points x''_s ($s = i, \dots, i + 2m - 2$). If $P_2(x)$ does not satisfy the equality

$$\max_{x''_{i+2m-2} \leq x \leq x_{i+2m}} P_2(x) = P_2(x''_{i+2m-1}) = v_{i+2m-1}, \quad (13)$$

then one must continue the process of constructing the points $x_s^{(k)}$ and the polynomials $P_k(x) \in V_n$ according to the same scheme. Suppose that the process does not terminate at any finite step, and let us prove its convergence.

Thus, let $P_2(x)$ fail to satisfy (13). We shall show that

$$P_2(x) < P_1(x) \quad \text{for } x \in I = (x'_{i+2m-1}, y'_{i+2m-1}). \quad (14)$$

Suppose that $P_1(\xi_{i+2m-1}) = P_2(\xi_{i+2m-1}) = v_{i+2m-1}^*$, $\xi_{i+2m-1} \in I$. Adjoin ξ_{i+2m-1} to (11) and denote by V_n^* the set of polynomials obtained from V_n by replacing v_{i+2m-1} by v_{i+2m-1}^* . Then $P_1(x) \in V_n^*$, $P_2(x) \in V_n^*$, and both polynomials satisfy conditions (6) at x'_s and x''_s ($s = i, \dots, i + 2m - 2$), respectively. This contradicts the inductive assumption on the uniqueness of such a polynomial. Hence $P_1(x) \neq P_2(x)$ for $x \in I$. On the other hand, the point y'_{i+2m-1} was chosen so that $P_1(x) > v_{i+2m-1}$ for $x \in I$, and, in particular, $P_1(x''_{i+2m-1}) > P_2(x''_{i+2m-1}) = v_{i+2m-1}$. Similarly to the preceding, we find in (x''_{i+2m-2}, x_{i+2m}) such a point y''_{i+2m-1} that $P_2(y''_{i+2m-1}) = v_{i+2m-1}$. By (14), $y''_{i+2m-1} \in I$ and

$$|y''_{i+2m-1} - x''_{i+2m-1}| < 0.5 |y'_{i+2m-1} - x'_{i+2m-1}|. \quad (15)$$

We prove that the inequalities

$$x'_i \leq x''_i, \dots, x'_{i+2m-2} \leq x''_{i+2m-2}. \quad (16)$$

hold. Denote by z the leftmost of the points of I at which $P_2(x) = v_{i+2m-1}$. Choose a point q_{i+2m-1} from (x'_{i+2m-1}, z) , adjoin it to (11), and construct a polynomial $Q(x) \in V_n$ which satisfies conditions (6) at the points $q_i < \dots < q_{i+2m-2}$ from (x_{i-1}, q_{i+2m-1}) . Arguing as in the derivation of (14), we obtain $P_2(x) < Q(x) < P_1(x)$ for $q_{i+2m-1} < x < z$. It follows that, as $q_{i+2m-1} \rightarrow x'_{i+2m-1}$, the polynomial $Q(x)$ tends uniformly to $P_1(x)$ on $[x'_{i+2m-1} + \varepsilon, z]$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and hence on the whole $[a, b]$. Clearly, $Q(x)$ depends continuously on

q_{i+2m-1} . Choose $\delta > 0$ so small that the δ -neighborhoods of the points x'_s ($s = i, \dots, i + 2m - 2$) do not intersect, and then choose $q_{i+2m-1} \in I$ so close to x'_{i+2m-1} that the inequalities $|x'_i - q_i| < \delta, \dots, |x'_{i+2m-2} - q_{i+2m-2}| < \delta$ hold. In each δ -neighborhood there lies at least one zero of the polynomial $Q(x) - P_1(x)$; moreover, its zeros include the points (11). Consequently, in each δ -neighborhood there lies exactly one zero. We show that $x'_{i+2m-2} \leq q_{i+2m-2}$. If $x'_{i+2m-2} > q_{i+2m-2}$, then $Q(x) - P_1(x)$ would have at least two zeros in $(q_{i+2m-2}, x'_{i+2m-1})$, because of the inequalities $Q(q_{i+2m-2}) - P_1(q_{i+2m-2}) < 0$, $Q(x'_{i+2m-2}) - P_1(x'_{i+2m-2}) > 0$, $Q(x'_{i+2m-1}) - P_1(x'_{i+2m-1}) < 0$. Suppose that

$$x'_{i+2m-2} = q_{i+2m-2}, x'_{i+2m-3} = q_{i+2m-3}, \dots, x'_{i+k} = q_{i+k}, x'_{i+k-1} \neq q_{i+k-1}. \quad (17)$$

If $q_{i+k-1} < x'_{i+k-1}$, then $(-1)^{2m-k} \{Q(q_{i+k-1}) - P_1(q_{i+k-1})\} > 0$, $Q(x'_{i+2m-1}) - P_1(x'_{i+2m-1}) > 0$. Consequently, the number of zeros of the polynomial $Q(x) - P_1(x)$ in (q_{i+k-1}, x'_{i+2m-1}) exceeds the number of points (17) by an odd number, and hence the number of zeros in (a, b) is greater than n . Similarly one proves the inequalities $x'_{i+2m-3} \leq q_{i+2m-3}, \dots, x'_i \leq q_i$, from which (16) follows by continuity.

If $\{P_k(x)\} \subset V_n$ is our sequence, then

$$[x_{i+2m-1}^{(k+1)}, y_{i+2m-1}^{(k+1)}] \subset [x_{i+2m-1}^{(k)}, y_{i+2m-1}^{(k)}]$$

and inequalities similar to (15) and (16) hold:

$$|y_{i+2m-1}^{(k+1)} - x_{i+2m-1}^{(k+1)}| < 0.5 |y_{i+2m-1}^{(k)} - x_{i+2m-1}^{(k)}|, \quad x_i^{(k)} \leq x_i^{(k+1)}, \dots, x_{i+2m-2}^{(k)} \leq x_{i+2m-2}^{(k+1)}.$$

It follows that the limits $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_s^{(k)} = x_s$ exist for $s = i, \dots, i + 2m - 1$. Moreover, $x_s \neq x_{s+1}$; if $x_s = x_{s+1}$, then $\{P_k(x)\}$ would converge to a discontinuous function, which is impossible, since $\{P_k(x)\}$ is uniformly bounded on I . Put $P(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P_k(x)$. It is clear that

$$P(x) \in V_n$$

and that it satisfies conditions (6) and (7).

It remains to prove the uniqueness of the polynomial $P(x)$. Suppose that there exists another polynomial $Q(x) \in V_n$ which satisfies conditions (6) and (7) at the points $y_i < \dots < y_{i+2m-1}$. If $x_{i+2m-1} = y_{i+2m-1}$, then there would exist two polynomials $P(x) \in V_n$ and $Q(x) \in V_n$ satisfying conditions (6), which contradicts the inductive assumption on uniqueness. Let, for definiteness, $x_{i+2m-1} < y_{i+2m-1}$. From the preceding it follows that the polynomial $P(x)$ is

uniquely determined by the initial choice of the point x'_{i+2m-1} . Therefore we must assume that some points x'_{i+2m-1} from the interval (x_{i+2m-1}, y_{i+2m-1}) lead to the system of points $x_i < \dots < x_{i+2m-1}$ and to the polynomial $P(x)$, while others lead to the system of points $y_i < \dots < y_{i+2m-1}$ and to the polynomial $Q(x)$. But this is impossible, since the points $x_i < \dots < x_{i+2m-2}$ are continuous monotone functions of x'_{i+2m-1} . Indeed, if by ξ_{i+2m-1} we denote the upper bound of those x'_{i+2m-1} which generate the system of points $x_i < \dots < x_{i+2m-1}$, then, by continuity, both the point ξ_{i+2m-1} itself and the point $\xi_{i+2m-1} + \Delta\xi$, for sufficiently small $\Delta\xi > 0$, will lead to the same system of points, which contradicts the definition of ξ_{i+2m-1} . Theorem 1 is proved.

2. A system $\{\varphi_k(x)\}_{k=0}^n$ of continuous functions on $[a, b]$, such that $\varphi_k(a) = \varphi_k(b)$, is called a ⁽⁴⁾ periodic T_n -system on $[a, b]$ if every polynomial with respect to this system has $\leq n$ zeros for $a \leq x < b$. We note that n must be an even number, since $P(a) = P(b)$ for every polynomial, while there are polynomials that change sign n times. In this case Theorem 1 can be supplemented as follows.

Theorem 2. Let $\{\varphi_k(x)\}_{k=0}^{2m}$ form a periodic T_{2m} -system on $[a, b]$, and let numbers $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{2m-1}$ be given satisfying the inequalities

$$v_0 > v_1, \quad v_0 > v_{2m-1}, \quad v_{2j} > v_{2j-1}, \quad v_{2j} > v_{2j+1} \quad (j = 1, \dots, m-1).$$

Then there exists a system of points

$$a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{2m-1} < x_{2m} = b$$

and a uniquely determined polynomial $P(x)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x_0 \leq x \leq x_1} P(x) = P(x_0) = v_0, & \quad \max_{x_{2m-1} \leq x \leq x_{2m}} P(x) = P(x_{2m}) = v_0, \\ \max_{x_{2j-1} \leq x \leq x_{2j+1}} P(x) = P(x_{2j}) = v_{2j}, & \quad \min_{x_{2j} \leq x \leq x_{2j+2}} P(x) = P(x_{2j+1}) = v_{2j+1} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, m-1$.

Put $v_0 = v_{2m}$ and consider an arbitrary sequence

$$a < b_1 < b_2 < \dots$$

converging to b . On the interval $[a, b_k]$, by Theorem 1, one can uniquely construct a polynomial $P_k(x)$ satisfying (18) at certain points

$$a = x_0^{(k)} < x_1^{(k)} < \dots < x_{2m}^{(k)} = b_k.$$

It can be proved that

$$x_s^{(k)} \leq x_s^{(k+1)} \quad (s = 1, \dots, 2m),$$

whence it follows that $\{P_k(x)\}$ converges uniformly to a polynomial $P(x)$ satisfying conditions (18).

Leningrad Electrotechnical Institute of Communications
named after M. A. Bonch-Bruевич

Received
16 I 1966

CITED LITERATURE

1. V. S. Videnskii, DAN, 162, No. 2, 251 (1965).
2. V. S. Videnskii, Collection of Scientific Works of the Leningrad Mechanical Institute, No. 50, 1966.
3. Ch. Davis, *Am. Math. Monthly*, 64, No. 9, 679 (1957).
4. S. N. Bernstein, *Extremal Properties of Polynomials*, L.—M., 1937.
5. S. N. Bernstein, Collection of Works, 2, Article No. 76, 1954, p. 287.
6. Ch. Davis, *Am. Math. Monthly*, 64, No. 9, 679 (1957).

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.