

## Determining Sets and Korovkin Sets on the Circle

MICHAEL D. RUSK\*

*Department of Mathematics, University of Redlands, Redlands, California 92373*

*Communicated by Oved Shisha*

Received October 14, 1975

In this paper we investigate properties of a subspace  $X$  spanned by a Chebyshev system on the circle. In particular we show that the set of operators for which  $X$  is a positive operator Korovkin set is equivalent to the set of operators for which  $X$  is a determining set. These results are obtained by applying uniqueness properties of the moment problem.

Let  $C = C(T)$  be the Banach space of real-valued continuous functions on the circle  $T$  with the uniform norm. We denote by  $\mathcal{B}(C)$  the space of all bounded linear operators on  $C$ . Let  $C^*$  be the space of all bounded linear functionals on  $C$ . For an operator  $S$  in  $\mathcal{B}(C)$  let  $S^*$  be the dual operator defined on  $C^*$ . For a point  $p$  in  $T$ , let  $\hat{p}$  denote the functional in  $C^*$  given by evaluation at the point  $p$ . Suppose  $g$  is a function on a set  $A$  containing the set  $B$ . Then  $g|_B$  is the restriction of  $g$  to  $B$ .

We define  $\mathcal{T}_+$  to be the cone of positive linear operators in  $\mathcal{B}(C)$ ; i.e.,  $S \in \mathcal{T}_+$  if  $f \geq 0$  implies  $Sf \geq 0$ . We say that a subspace  $X$  of  $C$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -determining set for an operator  $S$  in  $\mathcal{T}_+$  if for any  $R$  in  $\mathcal{T}_+$  the equality  $Rf = Sf$  for all  $f$  in  $X$  implies  $R = S$ . This concept was introduced by Shashkin [10]. We say that  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -Korovkin set for an operator  $S$  in  $\mathcal{T}_+$  if for any sequence  $\{S_n\}$  in  $\mathcal{T}_+$  the convergence of  $S_n f$  to  $Sf$  in the uniform norm for all  $f$  in  $X$  implies the convergence of  $S_n f$  to  $Sf$  for all  $f$  in  $C$ . Korovkin sets of this type have been investigated by Micchelli [7, 8], Cavaretta [1], and the author [9]. Let  $\mathcal{L}_+$  be the cone of positive functionals in  $C^*$ ; i.e.,  $\mu \in \mathcal{L}_+$  if  $f \geq 0$  implies  $\mu(f) \geq 0$ . The corresponding concepts of an  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -determining set and an  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -Korovkin set for positive functionals are defined in the obvious way.

Let  $X$  in  $C$  be the linear span of a fixed but arbitrary  $(2m + 1)$ -dimensional Chebyshev system  $\{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{2m}\}$ . Let  $K$  be the positive cone in  $X^*$ . Define

\* This paper is an extension of results included in the author's doctoral dissertation written under the supervision of Professor L. B. O. Ferguson.

$M = \{\hat{p}|_X : p \in T\}$ . Clearly,  $M \subseteq K$ . In fact, for each  $\tau$  in  $K$  there exists an integer  $1 \leq n \leq 2m + 1$  such that

$$\tau = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \hat{p}_i|_X \quad \text{where } \alpha_i \geq 0 \text{ and } p_i \in T \quad (1 \leq i \leq n). \quad (1)$$

We denote the smallest possible  $n$  for which (1) holds by  $I(\tau)$ . If  $\mu$  is a functional in  $\mathcal{L}_+$  with exactly  $n$  points in its support or carrier, then we denote  $n$  by  $I(\mu)$ .

The following is our main result.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $R$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{T}_+$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -Korovkin set for  $R$ ,
- (ii)  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -determining set for  $R$ ,
- (iii) for each  $p$  in  $T$ , we have  $I(R^*\hat{p}) \leq m$ .

First we note that the implication (i)  $\rightarrow$  (ii) follows easily from the observation that if  $S|_X = R|_X$  for some operator  $S$  in  $\mathcal{T}_+$  then a sequence  $\{S_n\}$  in  $\mathcal{T}_+$  is constructed by defining  $S_n = S$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . The implications (ii)  $\rightarrow$  (iii) and (iii)  $\rightarrow$  (i) will follow directly from Lemma 6 and Lemma 5, respectively.

Theorem 1 also holds when the circle  $T$  is replaced by a closed interval  $[a, b]$  of the real line. This result is due to the author [9]. However, the present setting appears to be more appropriate because a more concise theorem and proof are possible.

We use the following two results. The first characterizes Korovkin sets (see Micchelli [7] or Ferguson [3]). The second (see Karlin and Studden [5, p. 181]) gives conditions under which the moment problem has a unique solution.

**THEOREM 2.** *For a functional  $\mu$  in  $\mathcal{L}_+$ , a subspace  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -Korovkin set for  $\mu$  if and only if  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -determining set for  $\mu$ . For an operator  $R$  in  $\mathcal{T}_+$ , a subspace  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -Korovkin set for  $R$  if and only if  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -determining set for  $R^*\hat{p}$  for each  $p$  in  $T$ .*

**THEOREM 3.** *A functional  $\tau$  in  $K$  is a boundary point of  $K$  if and only if  $I(\tau) = m$ . Furthermore, each boundary point admits only one representation (1). Similarly, for each interior point of  $K$  and any  $t$  in  $T$  there exists a unique representation (1) such that  $n = m + 1$  and  $t$  is in the support.*

The following two lemmas parallel Micchelli's results [7] for continuous functions on a compact interval of the real line.

**LEMMA 4.** *The subspace  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -Korovkin set for  $\mu$  in  $\mathcal{L}_+$  if and only if  $I(\mu) = m$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -Korovkin set for  $\mu$ . By Theorem 2,  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -determining set for  $\mu$ . If  $\mu|_X$  is an interior point of  $K$ , then for each  $t$  in  $T$  there exists a representation (1) with  $t$  in the support. However, these representations would not all have the same extension to  $C$ . This is a contradiction. Therefore  $\mu|_X$  is a boundary point of  $K$ . By Theorem 3,  $I(\mu) = m$ .

Conversely, suppose  $I(\mu) \leq m$ . By Theorem 3,  $\mu|_X$  is a boundary point of  $K$  and  $\mu|_X$  admits a unique representation (1). Suppose there exists  $\tau$  in  $\mathcal{L}_+$  such that  $\tau|_X = \mu|_X$ , but  $\tau(g) \neq \mu(g)$  for some  $g$  in  $C$ . There exists (see Holmes [4, p. 84])  $\alpha_i > 0$  and  $p_i$  in  $T$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m + 1$  such that for

$$\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i \hat{p}_i \tag{2}$$

we have  $\sigma|_X = \tau|_X = \mu|_X$ , but  $\sigma(g) = \tau(g) \neq \mu(g)$ . This contradicts the uniqueness of representation (1). Therefore,  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -determining set for  $\mu$ . By Theorem 2,  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -Korovkin set for  $\mu$ . The lemma is proved.

LEMMA 5. *The subspace  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{F}_+$ -Korovkin set for an operator  $R$  in  $\mathcal{F}_+$  if and only if for each  $p$  in  $T$  we have  $I(R^*\hat{p}) = m$ .*

*Proof.* This result is a consequence of Theorem 2 and Lemma 4.

Shashkin [10] investigated the  $\mathcal{F}_+$ -determining sets for an operator from  $C(Q)$  to  $B(Q)$  where  $Q$  is a compact metric space and  $B(Q)$  is the space of bounded real-valued functions on  $Q$  with the supremum norm. He has shown: If a positive operator  $S$  has an  $n$ -dimensional  $\mathcal{F}_+$ -determining set, then the support of the functional  $S^*\hat{p}$  for each  $p$  in  $Q$  contains at most  $n + 1$  points. The proof of this result depends upon the fact that the range space is  $B(Q)$  and does not extend to the present case. Using different techniques we obtain a similar result in the more natural situation where the operator has the same domain and range.

LEMMA 6. *If  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{F}_+$ -determining set for an operator  $R$  in  $\mathcal{F}_+$ , then for each  $p$  in  $T$  we have  $I(R^*\hat{p}) = m$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{F}_+$ -determining set for  $R$  in  $\mathcal{F}_+$ . First, we show how to define an operator  $S$  (depending on  $t$  in  $T$ ) by defining  $S^*\hat{p}$  for every  $p$  in  $T$ . The operator  $S$  will satisfy  $I(S^*\hat{p}) \leq m + 1$  and agree with  $R$  on  $X$  and, therefore, on  $C$ . We then show  $I(R^*\hat{p}) \leq m$ .

Let  $t$  be a fixed, but arbitrary element of  $T$ . For each  $p$  in  $T$  we select a representation denoted by  $\tau(p)$  for  $(R^*\hat{p})|_X$  of the form (1). Given such a representation there exists the natural extension denoted by  $\sigma(p)$  to all of  $C$  of the form (2). The choice of representation (1) depends on the location of  $(R^*\hat{p})|_X$  as follows: If  $(R^*\hat{p})|_X$  is in the boundary of  $K$ , then by Theorem 3 there exists a unique representation  $\tau(p)$  in  $X^*$  of the form (1) such that for

the extension  $\sigma(p)$  we have  $I(\sigma(p)) \leq m$ . If  $(R^*\hat{p})|_X$  is not a boundary point of  $K$ , then there exists a unique representation  $\tau(p)$  of the form (1) with  $t$  in the support and  $I(\sigma(p)) = m + 1$ . Let  $S$  be the operator on  $C$  defined by  $(Sf)(p) = (\sigma(p))(f)$ .

According to the standard representation theorem (see Dunford and Schwartz [2, Theorem VI.7.1]),  $S$  is an operator in  $\mathcal{B}(C)$  if

- (i)  $\sup\{ \|\sigma(p)\| : p \in T \}$  is finite;
- (ii) the map  $p \mapsto \sigma(p)$  is continuous with the weak\* topology of  $C^*$ .

Since  $X$  is spanned by a Chebyshev system there exists a function  $g$  in  $X$  such that  $g \geq 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(p)\| &= (\sigma(p))(1) \leq (\sigma(p))(g) \\ &= (\tau(p))(g) = (R(g))(p) \\ &\leq \|Rg\| = c. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Therefore (i) holds. This last equality defines the constant  $c$ .

We claim  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is a continuous function into  $C^*$  with the weak\* topology: i.e., if  $p_n \rightarrow p$  in  $T$ , then  $(\sigma(p_n))(f) \rightarrow (\sigma(p))(f)$  for all  $f$  in  $C$ . If  $\tau(p)$  is in the boundary of  $K$ , then, since  $I(\sigma(p)) \leq m$  and  $(\sigma(p_n))(f) \rightarrow (\sigma(p))(f)$  for all  $f$  in  $X$ , we have, by Lemma 4 that  $(\sigma(p_n))(f) \rightarrow (\sigma(p))(f)$  for all  $f$  in  $C$ .

Suppose  $\tau(p)$  is not in the boundary of  $K$ . Let  $cB_{C^*}$  be the closed ball in  $C^*$  centered at 0 of radius  $c$ . By (3),  $cB_{C^*}$  contains  $\{\sigma(p_n)\}$ . By the Banach–Alaoglu theorem,  $cB_{C^*}$  is weak\* compact. Hence, it is sufficient to show that the only weak\* cluster point of  $\{\sigma(p_n)\}$  is  $\sigma(p)$ . Let  $\mu$  be any cluster point of  $\{\sigma(p_n)\}$ . Since  $C$  is separable  $cB_{C^*}$  is metrizable. Thus, there exists a subsequence  $\{\sigma(p_{n_j})\}$  such that  $\sigma(p_{n_j}) \rightarrow \mu$  in the weak\* topology of  $C^*$ . It is easily seen that  $I(\mu) \leq m + 1$ . Since

$$\sigma(p_{n_j})|_X = (R^*\hat{p}_{n_j})|_X \rightarrow (R^*\hat{p})|_X = \sigma(p)|_X$$

we have  $\mu|_X = \sigma(p)|_X$ .

We wish to show that  $t$  is in the support of  $\mu$ . We assume not and arrive at a contradiction. Let

$$\sigma(p_{n_j}) = \rho(p_{n_j}) + \beta_{n_j} \hat{t}$$

where  $\beta_{n_j} \geq 0$  and such that  $t$  is not in the support of  $\rho(p_{n_j})$ . This is possible since  $I(\sigma(p_n)) \leq m + 1$ . From the construction and by Theorem 3, it is easily seen that  $I(\rho(p_{n_j})) \leq m$ .

By Urysohn’s lemma there exists a nonnegative function  $g$  in  $C$  such that  $g(t) = 1$  and  $\mu(g) = 0$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma(p_{n_j}))(g) &= (\rho(p_{n_j}))(g) + \beta_{n_j} \\ &\rightarrow \mu(g) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $(\rho(p_n))(g) \geq 0$  we have  $\beta_{n_j} \rightarrow 0$ . As  $\rho(p_n) \rightarrow \mu$  in the weak\* topology, we get  $I(\mu) \leq m$ . By Theorem 3,  $\mu|_X = \sigma(p)|_X = \tau(p)$  is a boundary point of  $K$  which contradicts our original assumption. Hence,  $t$  is in the support of  $\mu$ .

Since  $t$  is in the support of  $\mu$  and  $I(\mu) \leq m - 1$ , by the uniqueness of the representation  $\tau(p)$  we have  $\sigma(p) = \mu$ . Since  $\sigma(p)$  is the only limit point of  $\{\sigma(p_n)\}$ , (ii) holds. By the representation theorem  $S$  is an operator in  $\mathcal{T}_+$ .

Since  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -determining set for  $R$  and since  $S|_X = R|_X$  we have  $S = R$ . Consequently,  $I(R^*\hat{p}) = I(S^*\hat{p}) = I(\sigma(p)) \leq m - 1$  for all  $p$  in  $T$ .

Suppose there exists  $p$  in  $T$  such that  $I(R^*\hat{p}) = m - 1$ , i.e.,  $(R^*\hat{p})|_X$  is in the interior of  $K$ . Let  $t$  be a point in  $T$  such that  $t$  is not in the support of  $R^*\hat{p}$ . Since  $t$  was arbitrary in the above argument, there exists  $S$  in  $\mathcal{T}_+$  such that  $t$  is in the support of  $S^*\hat{p}$  and  $S = R$ . Therefore,  $t$  is in the support of  $R^*\hat{p}$ . This is a contradiction. The lemma is proved.

If  $X$  is not spanned by a Chebyshev system, Theorem 1 is not true as the following example shows. Let  $Q = [-\pi, \pi]$  and let  $X$  be the linear span of  $\{1, \sin, \cos\}$ . We claim that  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -determining set for the identity operator  $I$  on  $C = C(Q)$ .

Suppose for some positive operator  $S$  in  $\mathcal{B}(C)$  that  $S|_X = I|_X$ . For any  $p$  in  $(-\pi, \pi)$  there exists a function  $g$  in  $X$  such that  $g(p) = 0$ , but  $g(q) > 0$  for  $q$  in  $Q, q \neq p$ . Namely,  $g(t) = 1 - \cos p \cos t - \sin p \sin t$ . Since  $(Sg)(p) = (Ig)(p) = 0$  and since  $S^*\hat{p}$  is a positive functional, the support of  $S^*\hat{p}$  is contained in the set  $\{p\}$ . However,  $(S1)(p) = (I1)(p) = 1$ . Hence,  $S^*\hat{p} = \hat{p}$  for all  $p$  in  $(-\pi, \pi)$ . Since  $S$  is in  $\mathcal{B}(C)$  we have  $S^*\hat{p} = \hat{p}$  for all  $p$  in  $[-\pi, \pi]$ , i.e.,  $S = I$ . The claim is true. However, since  $\hat{\pi}|_X = (-\pi)^+|_X$  and by Theorem 2,  $X$  is not a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -Korovkin set for  $I$ . By the same argument we have the following corollary.

**COROLLARY 7.** *Let  $Q$  be a compact Hausdorff space, let  $R$  be a positive operator in  $\mathcal{B}(C)$  where  $C = C(Q)$ , and let  $X$  be a subspace of  $C$ . If there exists a dense set  $P$  in  $Q$  such that for  $p$  in  $P$  we have that  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_+$ -determining set for  $R^*\hat{p}$ , then  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_+$ -determining set for  $R$ .*

REFERENCES

1. A. S. CAVARETTA, JR., A Korovkin theorem for finitely defined operators, in "Approximation Theory," (G. G. Lorentz, Ed.), Academic Press, New York, 1973.
2. N. DUNFORD AND J. T. SCHWARTZ, "Linear Operators part I: General Theory," Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 7, Interscience, New York, 1958.
3. L. B. O. FERGUSON AND M. D. RUSK, Korovkin sets for an operator on a space of continuous functions, *Pacific J. Math.* **65**, No. 2 (1976), 337-345.
4. R. B. HOLMES, "A Course on Optimization and Best Approximation", Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 257, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.

5. S. KARLIN AND W. STUDDEN, "Tchebycheff Systems: With Applications in Analysis and Statistics," Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 15, Interscience, New York, 1966.
6. P. P. KOROVKIN, The conditions for the uniqueness of the problem of moments and the convergence of sequences of linear operators, (Russian) *Uch. Zap. Kalininsk. Gos. Ped. Inst.* **26** (1958), 95-102.
7. C. A. MICCHELLI, Chebyshev subspaces and convergence of positive linear operators, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **40** (1973), 448-452.
8. C. A. MICCHELLI, Convergence of positive linear operators on  $C(X)$ , *J. Approximation Theory* **13** (1975), 305-315.
9. M. D. RUSK, "Korovkin type theorems for finitely defined operators," Dissertation, U. C. Riverside, March 1975.
10. YU. A. SHASHKIN, Finitely defined linear operators in spaces of continuous functions, (Russian) *Uspeki Mat. Nauk* **20** (1965), No. 6 (126), 175-180.