

## Derivative Bounds for Müntz Polynomials\*

D. J. NEWMAN

*Belfer Graduate School of Science, Yeshiva University, New York, New York 10033*

*Communicated by Oved Shisha*

Received July 10, 1975

Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite set of positive numbers,  $\lambda$ , and consider expressions of the form  $C_0 + \sum_{\Lambda} C_{\lambda} x^{\lambda}$ . We wish to determine just how much such a function can be magnified by differentiation on  $[0, 1]$ . Since 0 is a peculiar point (where  $x^{\lambda}$  can even have an infinite derivative), we find it more natural to consider the operator  $x(d/dx)$ . Equivalently we may transform variables by  $x = e^{-t}$  which reduces our operator to  $d/dt$  and our interval to  $[0, \infty)$ .

So call the expressions  $P(t) = C_0 + \sum_{\Lambda} C_{\lambda} e^{-\lambda t}$   $\Lambda$ -polynomials and introduce the norm  $\|f(t)\| = \text{Sup}_{[0, \infty)} |f(t)|$ .

Our problem, in precise terms, is to find  $\|d/dt\|_{\Lambda} = \text{Sup}_P \|P'(t)\|/\|P(t)\|$  taken over all nontrivial  $\Lambda$ -polynomials.

For example, when  $\Lambda$  consists of the first  $n$  integers, then this reduces to the classical Tchebychev polynomial case and the answer is known to be  $2n^2$ . One corollary of our present results is that if  $\Lambda$  consists of *any*  $n$  distinct integers, then  $\|d/dt\|_{\Lambda} \geq \frac{1}{3}n^2$ . (Perhaps this is even true with  $2n^2$  replacing  $\frac{1}{3}n^2$ , but we cannot obtain this precision.)

**THEOREM.** *For every set  $\Lambda$  we have*

$$\frac{2}{3} \sum_{\Lambda} \lambda \leq \|d/dt\|_{\Lambda} \leq 11 \sum_{\Lambda} \lambda.$$

*Proof.* We may assume, w.l.o.g., that  $\sum_{\Lambda} \lambda = 1$  as this can always be achieved by a mere change of scale,  $t' = ct$ . So set  $B(z) = \prod_{\Lambda} ((z - \lambda)/(z + \lambda))$  and define

$$T(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{e^{-zt}}{B(z)} dz, \quad \Gamma \text{ the circle } |z - 1| = 1. \tag{1}$$

A direct application of the residue theorem shows that  $T(t)$  is indeed a  $\Lambda$ -polynomial.

\* Supported in part by National Science Foundation Grant No. M.P.S. 75-08002.

To obtain our desired estimates we will need the following

LEMMA. All along  $\Gamma$ ,  $|B(z)| \geq \frac{1}{3}$ .

*Proof.* The function  $(z - \lambda)/(z + \lambda)$  maps  $\Gamma$  onto the circle whose diameter is the interval  $[-1, (2 - \lambda)/(2 + \lambda)]$  so that, on  $\Gamma$ , we certainly have

$$\left| \frac{z - \lambda}{z + \lambda} \right| \geq \frac{2 - \lambda}{2 + \lambda} = \frac{1 - (\lambda/2)}{1 + (\lambda/2)}$$

and therefore

$$|B(z)| \geq \prod \frac{1 - (\lambda/2)}{1 + (\lambda/2)}.$$

To estimate this product, note that, for  $x$  and  $y \geq 0$ ,

$$\frac{1 - x}{1 + x} \frac{1 - y}{1 + y} = \frac{1 - (x + y)}{1 + x + y} + \frac{2xy}{(1 + x)(1 + y)(1 + xy)} \geq \frac{1 - (x + y)}{1 + x + y},$$

and this inequality used repeatedly gives

$$\prod \frac{1 - (\lambda/2)}{1 + (\lambda/2)} \geq \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum \lambda}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum \lambda} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2}}{1 + \frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{3},$$

as required.

We can now prove our lower bound. For the  $\mathcal{A}$ -polynomial  $T(t)$  we have by (1) and our lemma,

$$|T(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma} \left| \frac{e^{-zt}}{B(z)} \right| |dz| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot 3 \cdot 2\pi = 3, \quad (2)$$

while, again by (1),  $T'(0) = -(1/2\pi i) \int_{\Gamma} (z/B(z)) dz$  and this integral can be evaluated by taking the residue at  $\infty$ , there being no poles outside of  $\Gamma$ . We have, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{B(z)} &= \prod \frac{1 + (\lambda/z)}{1 - (\lambda/z)} = 1 + \frac{2 \sum \lambda}{z} + \frac{2(\sum \lambda)^2}{z^2} + \dots \\ &= 1 + \frac{2}{z} + \frac{2}{z^2} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

so that  $z/B(z) = z + 2 + (2/z) + \dots$ , the residue is 2, and we obtain

$$T'(0) = -2. \quad (4)$$

Our lower bound is implied by (2) together with (4).

Our upper bound is more complicated and we begin with an estimate for  $\int_0^\infty |T''(t)| dt$ . To this end we see from (1) that

$$T''(t) = (1/2\pi i) \int_{\Gamma} (z^2 e^{-zt}/B(z)) dz, \quad (5)$$

so that, writing  $z = 1 + e^{i\theta}$  and applying our lemma, we obtain  $|T''(t)| \leq (3/2\pi) \int_0^{2\pi} 2(1 + \cos \theta) e^{-(1+\cos \theta)t} d\theta$ , which yields

$$\int_0^\infty |T''(t)| dt \leq \frac{3}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} 2(1 + \cos \theta) \frac{1}{1 + \cos \theta} d\theta = 6. \quad (6)$$

Next we evaluate  $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} T''(t) dt$ ,  $\lambda \in A$ . From (5) we have  $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} T''(t) dt = (1/2\pi i) \int_{\Gamma} (z^2 dz/B(z)(z + \lambda))$  and as before there are no poles outside of  $\Gamma$  and we need only find the residue at  $\infty$ . Again, by (3), we have  $1/B(z) = 1 + (2/z) + (2/z^2) + \dots$  and we also have  $1/(z + \lambda) = (1/z) - (\lambda/z^2) + (\lambda^2/\lambda^3) \dots$  so that combining gives  $z^2/B(z)(z + \lambda) = z + 2 - \lambda + ((\lambda^2 - 2\lambda + 2)/z) + \dots$ . Thus  $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} T''(t) dt = \lambda^2 - 2\lambda + 2$ , and taking linear combinations results in

$$\int_0^\infty P(t + a) T''(t) dt = P''(a) - 2P'(a) + 2P(a) \quad (7)$$

for any  $A$ -polynomial.

Applying our estimate (6) to (7), then, gives the bound  $|P''(a)| \leq 2|P'(a)| + 8\|P(t)\|$  and letting  $a$  vary yields

$$\|P''\| \leq 2\|P'\| + 8\|P\| \quad (8)$$

It is a well-known result, however (see [1]), that for any  $C^2$  function on  $[0, \infty)$ ,  $\|f'\|^2 \leq 4\|f\| \cdot \|f''\|$ . If this is applied to (8) we obtain  $\frac{1}{4}(\|P'\|/\|P\|)^2 \leq 2(\|P'\|/\|P\|) + 8$  which trivially ensures  $\|P'\|/\|P\| \leq 11$ , our upper bound.

(It might seem circuitous to have to resort to *second*-derivative estimates, but the direct approach, via  $\int_0^\infty |T'(t)| dt$ , does not appear to lend itself to uniform estimates.)

#### REFERENCE

1. A. KOLMOGOROV, Inequalities on successive derivatives..., *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 207 (1938), 764-765.