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## 1. Introduction

Let $\quad T_{m}(x):=\cos (m \arccos x) \quad$ and $\quad U_{m}(x):=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-1 / 2} \sin \{(m+1)$ $\operatorname{arc} \cos x\}$ denote, as usual, the Chebyshev polynomials of the first and second kind, respectively, of degree $m$. Generalizing a classical result of W. A. Markov, it was proved in [5] that if $\lambda, \mu$ are non-negative integers and $P(x):=\sum_{v=0}^{n} a_{v} x^{\nu}$ is a polynomial of degree at most $n$ such that

$$
|P(x)| \leqslant(1-x)^{\lambda / 2}(1+x)^{\mu / 2} \quad \text { for } \quad-1<x<1
$$

then, for $(\lambda+\mu) / 2 \leqslant j \leqslant n$,

$$
\max _{-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1}\left|P^{(j)}(x)\right| \leqslant \max \left\{\max _{-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1}\left|\Lambda_{n}^{(j)}(x)\right|, \max _{-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1}\left|\Lambda_{n-1}^{(j)}(x)\right|\right\},
$$

where

$$
A_{m}(x):=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
(1-x)^{\lambda / 2}(1+x)^{\mu / 2} T_{m-(\lambda+\mu) / 2}(x) \\
\text { if } \lambda, \mu \text { are both even } \\
(1-x)^{(\lambda+1) / 2}(1+x)^{(\mu+1) / 2} U_{m-1-(\lambda+\mu) / 2}(x) \\
\text { if } \lambda, \mu \text { are both odd. }
\end{array}\right.
$$

The case $1 \leqslant j<(\lambda+\mu) / 2$, for $(\lambda+\mu) / 2>1$, was left unresolved. For example, the above result does not say anything about $\max _{-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1}\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right|$, if $\lambda=\mu=2$. The present paper is mainly devoted to this particular problem. We shall also discuss the following related question which was raised by the late Professor P. Turán during a visit to the Université de Montréal in 1975.

QUestion. Given a polynomial $P$ of degree at most $n$ satisfying

$$
0 \leqslant P(x) \leqslant\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \quad \text { for } \quad-1<x<1
$$

how large can $\max _{-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1}\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right|$ be?

## 2. The Derivative of a Polynomial

Whose Modulus is $\leqslant 1-x^{2}$ on $(-1,1)$
2.1. We find it advisable to introduce a few notations.

Let $\mathscr{P}_{m}$ be the set of all polynomials of degree at most $m$. We denote by $F_{m}$ and $F_{m}^{*}$ the subsets consisting of those $P \in \mathscr{P}_{m}$ for which

$$
\|P\|:=\max _{-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1}|P(x)| \leqslant 1
$$

and

$$
\|P\|_{*}:=\sup _{-1<x<1} \frac{|P(x)|}{1-x^{2}} \leqslant 1
$$

respectively.
2.2. First we prove the following proposition which will serve as a lemma.

Proposition 1. If $P \in F_{n}^{*}$ and $P(x)$ is real for real values of $x$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{P^{\prime}(x)\right\}^{2}+\left(n^{2}-4 n\right)\left\{\frac{P(x)}{1-x^{2}}\right\}^{2} \leqslant(n-2)^{2} \quad \text { for } \quad-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Clearly $P(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right) q(x)$ where $q \in F_{n-2}$. Thus $P(\cos \theta)=$ $\left(\sin ^{2} \theta\right) t(\theta)$ where $t(\theta)=q(\cos \theta)$ is a real trigonometric polynomial of degree at most $n-2$ such that $|t(\theta)| \leqslant 1$ for all real $\theta$. By an inequality of van der Corput and Schaake [2]

$$
\left\{t^{\prime}(\theta)\right\}^{2}+(n-2)^{2}\{t(\theta)\}^{2} \leqslant(n-2)^{2} \quad \text { for } \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}
$$

Hence for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\{P^{\prime}(\cos \theta)\right\}^{2} & =\left\{t^{\prime}(\theta) \sin \theta+2 t(\theta) \cos \theta\right\}^{2} \\
& \leqslant\left\{t^{\prime}(\theta)\right\}^{2}+4\{t(\theta)\}^{2} \\
& \leqslant(n-2)^{2}-\left(n^{2}-4 n\right)\{t(\theta)\}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

which is equivalent to (1).
From (1) it follows. in particular, that $\left\|P^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant n-2$. Here the restriction that " $P(x)$ is real for real $x$ " can be dropped using standard reasoning. We may therefore state the following

Corollary 1. If $P \in F_{n}^{*}$, then for $n \geqslant 4$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|P^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant n-2 . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 1. If $P(x):=\left(1-x^{2}\right) T_{n-2}(x)$ then $P \in F_{n}^{*}$ and for odd $n \geqslant 5$

$$
\left|P^{\prime}(0)\right|=\left|T_{n-2}^{\prime}(0)\right|=n-2 .
$$

Thus (2) is sharp at least for odd $n \geqslant 5$. It is also best possible for $n=4$ as the example $P(x):=\left(1-x^{2}\right)\left(2 x^{2}-1\right)$ shows.
2.3. The estimate (2) can be improved for even $n \geqslant 6$. This follows from the next proposition and the fact that if $P \in F_{n}^{*}$, then [5, Theorem 1']

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|P^{\prime}(0)\right| \leqslant n-3 \quad \text { provided } n \text { is even. } \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 2. If $P \in F_{n}^{*}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqslant\left\{(n-2)^{2}-\left(n^{2}-4 n\right) x^{2}\right\}^{1 / 2} \quad \text { for } \quad-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1 . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $\omega(z):=e^{i(n-2) z} \sin ^{2} z$. Then $\omega$ is an entire function of order 1 type $n$ with only real zeros. Since its indicator function $h_{\omega}$ satisfies

$$
h_{\omega}(-\pi / 2)=n>-(n-4)=h_{\omega}(\pi / 2)
$$

it belongs to the class $P$ introduced in [1, p. 129, see 7.8.2]. If we set $f(z):=P(\cos z)$ then the hypothesis implies that $|f(x)| \leqslant|\omega(x)|$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Because $f$ is an entire function of exponential type $n$ we may apply Theorem 11.7.2 of [1] to conclude that $\left|f^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqslant\left|\omega^{\prime}(x)\right|$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence for all real $x$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|P^{\prime}(\cos x)\right| & \leqslant|i(n-2) \sin x+2 \cos x| \\
& =\left\{(n-2)^{2}-\left(n^{2}-4 n\right) \cos ^{2} x\right\}^{1 / 2},
\end{aligned}
$$

and so (4) holds.

Remark 2. Inequality (4) shows, in particular, that for $n>4$ the bound in (2) cannot be attained at a point $x \neq 0$.
2.4. In view of (3) and Proposition 2 it is natural to ask how large

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{n}:=\sup _{P \in F_{n}^{*}}\left\|P^{\prime}\right\| \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

can be if $n$ is an even integer $\geqslant 6$. We prove
Theorem 1. For even $n$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{n}=n-2-\frac{\pi^{2}}{8 n}+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

A standard reasoning allows us to restrict ourselves to polynomials with real coefficients.

Throughout this sub-section, $n$ will be supposed to be an even integer $\geqslant 6$.

The polynomial $P(x):=\left(1-x^{2}\right) T_{n-2}(x)$ belongs to $F_{n}^{*}$. By a direct calculation we find

$$
\left|P^{\prime}\left(\frac{\pi}{2(n-2)}\right)\right| \geqslant n-2-\frac{\pi^{2}}{8 n}+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty
$$

Hence as a first step towards the proof of Theorem 1 we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{n} \geqslant n-2-\frac{\pi^{2}}{8 n}+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now for each $t \in[-1,1]$ let us set

$$
A_{m}(t):=\sup _{P \in F_{m}}\left|P^{\prime}(t)\right| .
$$

As the next step we prove:
Lemma 1. Let c be a fixed positive number and denote by $I_{c}$ the interval ( $0, \pi / 2 n-c / n^{2}$ ). Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{n} \leqslant \sup _{t \in I_{c}}\left(1-t^{2}\right) A_{n-2}(t)+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Proposition 2 implies that if $P \in F_{n}^{*}$ then for $\pi / 2 n-c / n^{2} \leqslant|x| \leqslant 1$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right| & \leqslant\left\{(n-2)^{2}-\left(n^{2}-4 n\right)\left(\frac{\pi}{2 n}-\frac{c}{n^{2}}\right)^{2}\right\}^{1 / 2} \\
& \leqslant n-2-\frac{\pi^{2}}{8 n}+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence from (7) and the obvious symmetry we obtain

$$
\gamma_{n} \leqslant \sup _{P \in F_{n}^{*}} \max _{0 \leqslant x \leqslant \pi / 2 n-c / n^{2}}\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right|+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty
$$

For each $n$ let us choose $p_{n} \in F_{n}^{*}$ and $x_{n}$ in $\left[0, \pi / 2 n-c / n^{2}\right]$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{n} \leqslant\left|p_{n}^{\prime}\left(x_{n}\right)\right|+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, in view of (7) and Proposition 1, we must have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|p_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)\right|=O\left(n^{-1}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Writing $p_{n}(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right) q_{n-2}(x)$ we obtain

$$
p_{n}^{\prime}\left(x_{n}\right)=\left(1-x_{x}^{2}\right) q_{n-2}^{\prime}\left(x_{n}\right)-\frac{2 x_{n}}{1-x_{n}^{2}} p_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)
$$

which, in conjunction with (10), implies that for $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$
\left|p_{n}^{\prime}\left(x_{n}\right)\right|=\left(1-x_{n}^{2}\right) q_{n-2}^{\prime}\left(x_{n}\right)+O\left(n^{-2}\right)
$$

Since $q_{n-2} \in F_{n-2}$, we obtain

$$
\left|p_{n}^{\prime}\left(x_{n}\right)\right| \leqslant\left(1-x_{n}^{2}\right) A_{n-2}\left(x_{n}\right)+O\left(n^{-2}\right)
$$

Using this estimate in (9) we get the desired result.
Now we need to examine the function $A_{m}$ quite closely. Its behaviour has been extensively studied (see $[4,8,3,5]$ ) and much information is already available. However, to the best of our knowledge, the "convexity property" of $A_{m}$, contained in Lemma 2, which we need for our argument has not appeared in print before. Here are some of the known facts.

There is a unique polynomial $p(\cdot, t)$ (called extremal) in $\mathscr{P}_{m}$ with $\max _{-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1}|p(x, t)|=1$ such that

$$
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial x} p(x, t)\right|_{x=t}=A_{m}(t)
$$

For certain values of $t$ the extremal polynomials have been clearly identified. The zeros of the polynomials $(x+1) T_{m}^{\prime \prime}(x)+T_{m}^{\prime}(x)$ and $(x-1) T_{m}^{\prime \prime}(x)+T_{m}^{\prime}(x)$ are simple and lie in the interval $(-1,1)$. If we denote them by $\xi_{1}<\xi_{2}<\cdots<\xi_{m-1}$ and $\eta_{1}<\eta_{2}<\cdots<\eta_{m-1}$, respectively, then

$$
-1<\xi_{1}<\eta_{1}<\xi_{2}<\cdots<\eta_{m-2}<\xi_{m-1}<\eta_{m-1}<1
$$

It is known that for $t$ belonging to any of the intervals

$$
\left[-1, \xi_{1}\right],\left[\eta_{1}, \xi_{2}\right], \ldots,\left[\eta_{m-2}, \xi_{m-1}\right],\left[\eta_{m-1}, 1\right]
$$

(called Chebyshev intervals) the polynomial $p(\cdot, t)$ is either $T_{m}$ or $-T_{m}$. In each of the complementary intervals $\left(\xi_{l}, \eta_{l}\right), l=1,2, \ldots, m-1$, there is a point $\rho_{l}$ where $T_{m-1}$ or $-T_{m-1}$ is extremal. The points

$$
\lambda_{l}:=\left(\sec ^{2} \frac{\pi}{2 m}\right) \zeta_{l}+\tan ^{2} \frac{\pi}{2 m}
$$

lie in $\left(\xi_{l}, \rho_{l}\right)$ for $l=1,2, \ldots, m-1$ and at a point $t$ belonging to the interval ( $\left.\xi_{l}, \lambda_{l}\right], l=1,2, \ldots, m-1$, the extremal polynomial is

$$
T_{m}\left(\frac{\left(1+\xi_{l}\right)(x-t)}{1+t}+\xi_{l}\right) \quad \text { or } \quad-T_{m}\left(\frac{\left(1+\xi_{l}\right)(x-t)}{1+t}+\xi_{l}\right) .
$$

Further, the points $\mu_{l}:=\left(\sec ^{2}(\pi / 2 m)\right) \eta_{l}-\tan ^{2}(\pi / 2 m)$ lie in $\left(\rho_{l}, \eta_{l}\right)$ for $l=1,2, \ldots, m-1$ and the extremal polynomial at a point $t$ belonging to $\left[\mu_{l}, \eta_{l}\right)$ is either $T_{m}\left(\left(1-\eta_{l}\right)(x-t) /(1-t)+\eta_{l}\right)$ or $-T_{m}\left(\left(1-\eta_{l}\right)(x-t) /\right.$ $\left.(1-t)+\eta_{l}\right)$. Extremal polynomials corresponding to points belonging to intervals of the form ( $\lambda_{l}, \rho_{l}$ ) or to those of the form ( $\rho_{l}, \mu_{l}$ ) are known to be Zolotarev polynomials. The intervals themselves are called (proper) Zolotarev intervals. Extremal polynomials corresponding to distinct values of $t$ in the same Zolotarev interval are distinct. They are not easy to work with; however, it turns out that if $m$ is even then $\rho_{m / 2-1}=0$ and $\mu_{m / 2-1}=$ $\pi / 2 m-\left(\pi^{2} / 4+1\right)\left(1 / m^{2}\right)+O\left(m^{-3}\right)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Now taking $m=n-2$ we deduce that for any $c>\pi^{2} / 4+1-\pi$ and all sufficiently large (even) integer $n$ the interval $I_{c}$ of Lemma 1 is contained in the Zolotarev interval $\left(\rho_{(n-2) / 2-1}, \mu_{(n-2) / 2-1}\right)=\left(0, \mu_{(n-2) / 2-1}\right)$. This is the reason why it is a bit hard to determine the supremum of $\left(1-t^{2}\right) A_{n-2}(t)$ for $t \in I_{c}$. In fact, we need the following.

Lemma 2. Let $m$ be even. Then the restriction of $A\left(=A_{m}\right)$ to the interval $\left[0, \mu_{m / 2-1}\right)$ is an increasing two times continuously differentiable convex function.

Proof. It follows from the investigations of Voronovskaja (see [8, Theorem 68; Remark, p. 166]) that $A^{\prime}(0)=0$ and $A^{\prime}(t)>0$ for $0<t<\mu_{m / 2-1}$. Hence $A(t)$ increases monotonically on $\left[0, \mu_{m / 2-1}\right)$ and attains its minimum value $m-1$ on $\left[0, \mu_{m / 2-1}\right.$ ) at $t=0$. Besides, it has been shown by Gusev (see [8, pp. 193-195]) that $A$ is two times continuously differentiable not only at the points of the interval $\left[0, \mu_{m / 2-1}\right.$ )
but throughout $[-1,1]$ except at the points $\left(\xi_{k}\right)_{k=1}^{m-1},\left(\eta_{k}\right)_{k=1}^{m-1},\left(\lambda_{k}\right)_{k=1}^{m-1}$, and $\left(\mu_{k}\right)_{k=1}^{m-1}$. All we need to show is that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{\prime \prime}(t) \geqslant 0 \quad \text { for } \quad 0<t<\mu_{m / 2-1} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

For this we shall use the ideas of W . A. Markov in the way they were presented in [5]. We recall that in [5] partial derivatives of a function $f(x, t)$ are denoted by

$$
f_{j, k}(x, t):=\frac{\partial^{\prime+k}}{\partial x^{j} \partial t^{k}} f(x, t)
$$

The more general function $A$ given there reduces to the one considered here on setting $n=m, j=1$, and $\lambda=\mu=0$. In the notation of [5] we have (see the first and the third expressions for $\left.A^{\prime \prime}(t)[5, \mathrm{p} .728]\right)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{\prime \prime}(t)=p_{3,0}(t, t)-\frac{N}{2} d_{0}(t) \frac{F_{2,0}(t, t)}{\varphi_{1,0}(t, t)} F_{2,0}(t, t) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
A^{\prime \prime}(t)= & \frac{F_{2,0}(t, t)}{\varphi_{1,0}(t, t)} \frac{1}{\beta(t)-t} \\
& \times\left\{A(t)\left(\frac{\Psi_{0,0}(t, t)}{F_{2,0}(t, t)} \frac{p_{3,0}(t, t)}{p_{1,0}(t, t)}+2\right)+4 t A^{\prime}(t)\right\} \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

We already know that

$$
p_{1,0}(t, t)=A(t)>0
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{\prime}(t)>0 \quad \text { for } \quad 0<t<\mu_{m / 2-1} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

We also need the following facts, namely $(15)-(18)$. Since $\beta(t) \geqslant 1$ for even $\lambda$ (see [5, pp. 716-717 or p. 730]) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta(t)-t>0 \quad \text { for } \quad 0<t<\mu_{m / 2-1} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further [5. p. 730]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\Psi_{0,0}(t, t)}{F_{2,0}(t, t)} \leqslant 0 \quad \text { for } \quad 0<t<\mu_{m / 2-1} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

and (see [5, p. 726, Formula (57)])

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{F_{2,0}(t, t)}{\varphi_{1,0}(t, t)} \geqslant 0 \quad \text { for } \quad 0<t<\mu_{m / 2-1} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, by applying Lemma $6^{\prime}$ of [5] to the functions

$$
g(x)=F(x, t) \quad \text { and } \quad h(x)=\frac{p(x, t)}{d_{0}(t)}
$$

we obtain, as in [5, p. 729] (note the misprint in the third line from below; the inequality holds in the opposite direction),

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{2,0}(t, t) \frac{p_{1,0}(t, t)}{d_{0}(t)} \leqslant 0 \quad \text { for } \quad t \in\left(0, \mu_{m / 2-1}\right) \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we argue as follows. If $p_{3,0}(t, t) \geqslant 0$, then applying (17) and (18) we obtain the desired result from (12); but in the case $p_{3,0}(t, t)<0$ the same conclusion follows from (13) in conjunction with (14), (15), (16), and (17).
2.5. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1. In Lemma 1 take $c=\pi^{2} / 4$ $\left(>\pi^{2} / 4+1-\pi\right)$ and set $\alpha_{n}:=\pi / 2 n-\pi^{2} / 4 n^{2}$. Then on $I_{c}$

$$
A_{n-2}(t) \leqslant A_{n-2}(0)+\frac{A_{n-2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)-A_{n-2}(0)}{\alpha_{n}} t
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sup _{t \in I_{4}}\left(1-t^{2}\right) A_{n-2}(t) \\
& \quad \leqslant \sup _{t \in I_{c}}\left\{A_{n-2}(0)+\frac{A_{n-2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)-A_{n-2}(0)}{\alpha_{n}} t-A_{n-2}(0) t^{2}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since

$$
\frac{A_{n-2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)-A_{n-2}(0)}{2 \alpha_{n} A_{n-2}(0)} \sim \frac{1}{\pi} \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

we conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sup _{t \in I_{c}}\left(1-t^{2}\right) A_{n-2}(t) \\
& \quad \leqslant A_{n-2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)-A_{n-2}(0) \frac{\pi^{2}}{4 n^{2}}+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \\
& \quad \leqslant \frac{n-2}{\sqrt{1-\alpha_{n}^{2}}}-A_{n-2}(0) \frac{\pi^{2}}{4 n^{2}}+O\left(n^{-2}\right) \quad \text { by Bernstein's inequality } \\
& \\
& \quad=n-2-\frac{\pi^{2}}{8 n}+O\left(n^{-2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.,

$$
\gamma_{n} \leqslant n-2-\frac{\pi^{2}}{8 n}+O\left(n^{-2}\right)
$$

This, in conjunction with (7), implies (6) and the proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

> 3. The Derivative of a Polynomial Satisfying $0 \leqslant P(x) \leqslant\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$ on $(-1,1)$

If $P \in \mathscr{P}_{n}$ and $0 \leqslant P(x) \leqslant 1$ for $-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1$ then the polynomial

$$
f: x \mapsto 2 P(x)-1
$$

belongs to $F_{n}$. The classical inequality of Markov may be applied to obtain

$$
\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right|=\frac{1}{2}\left|F^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{2} n^{2} \quad \text { for } \quad-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1 \text {, }
$$

which is of course, well known. Thus requiring $P(x)$ to be non-negative on $[-1,1]$ improves the bound for $\max _{-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1}\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right|$ by the factor $\frac{1}{2}$. If a polynomial $P \in \mathscr{P}_{n}$ satisfies $|P(x)| \leqslant\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$ for $-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1$, then [6]

$$
\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqslant 2(n-1) \quad \text { for } \quad-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1 .
$$

Shall we again get an improvement by the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ if we require $P(x)$ to be non-negative on $[-1,1]$ ? Since we are assuming the graph of $P$ on $[-1,1]$ to lie inside the upper half $D^{+}$of the unit disk it is reasonable to expect that an extremal polynomial "will oscillate between 0 and $\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2 "}$ as often as the restriction on its degree will allow. The example which follows is "relevant" from this point of view.

If we denote by $P_{m}$ the Legendre polynomial of degree $m$ with the normalization $P_{m}(1)=1$, then $[7$, p. 165 , see (7.3.8)]

$$
\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 4}\left|P_{m}(x)\right|<(2 / \pi)^{1 / 2} m^{-1 / 2} \quad \text { for } \quad-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1 .
$$

Hence if $n$ is even, then

$$
P_{*}(x):=\frac{\pi}{2} \frac{n-2}{2}\left(1-x^{2}\right) P_{(n-2) / 2}^{2}(x)
$$

is a polynomial of degree $n$ whose graph lies in $D^{+}$. Further, we note that

$$
P_{*}^{\prime}(1)=\frac{\pi}{2}(n-2) .
$$

This shows that the supremum $M_{n}$ of $\left\|P^{\prime}\right\|$ taken over all polynomials $P \in \mathscr{P}_{n}$ satisfying $0 \leqslant P(x) \leqslant\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$ can be at least as large as $(\pi / 2)(n-2)$; i.e., $M_{n} \geqslant(\pi / 2)(n-2)$. We believe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{n}=\frac{\pi}{2} n+\gamma_{n} \quad \text { where } \quad n^{-1} \gamma_{n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

but we are able to prove much less. Our upper bound for $M_{n}$ is contained in:

Theorem 2. If $P \in \mathscr{P}_{n}$ and $0 \leqslant P(x) \leqslant\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$ for $-1 \leqslant x \leqslant 1$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|P^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text { odd }}}^{n-1}\left(1 / \sin ^{2} \frac{(2 k-1) \pi}{4(n-1)}\right) \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the proof of Theorem 2 we need the following
Lemma 3. Let

$$
l(x):=\left(x^{2}-1\right) T_{n-1}(x)=2^{n-2}\left(x^{2}-1\right) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1}\left(x-x_{k}\right)
$$

where $\quad x_{k}:=\cos ((2 k-1) \pi / 2(n-1)), \quad k=1, \ldots, n-1$. Further, let $x_{0}=1$, $x_{n}=-1$ and for $k=0,1, \ldots, n-1, n$ denote the quotient $l(x) /\left(x-x_{k}\right)$ by $l_{k}(x)$. Then $l_{k}^{\prime}(x) \geqslant 0$ for $x \in[\cos (\pi / 3(n-1)), 1]$ and $k=0,1, \ldots, n-1, n$.

Proof. Let $y_{n, 1}$ denote the largest zero of $l_{n}^{\prime}$. Then clearly $l_{n}^{\prime}(x) \geqslant 0$ for all $x \geqslant y_{n, 1}$. Further, if $y_{n, 1} \leqslant x \leqslant 1$ then $l_{n}(x)<0$ since all the zeros of $l_{n}$ except 1 lie to the left of $y_{n, 1}$. Since $l_{k}(x)=(x+1) l_{n}(x) /\left(x-x_{k}\right)$ we conclude that for $y_{n, 1} \leqslant x \leqslant 1$,

$$
l_{k}^{\prime}(x)=\frac{(x+1) l_{n}^{\prime}(x)}{x-x_{k}}-\frac{1+x_{k}}{\left(x-x_{k}\right)^{2}} l_{n}(x) \geqslant 0
$$

for $k=0,1, \ldots, n-1$ as well. It is now enough to show that $\cos (\pi / 3(n-1)) \geqslant y_{n, 1}$. For this we only need to check that $l_{n}^{\prime}(\cos (\pi / 3(n-1))) \geqslant 0$. But clearly $l_{n}^{\prime}(\cos (\pi / 3(n-1))) \geqslant 0$ if and only if

$$
-\sqrt{3}(n-1) \sin \frac{\pi}{6(n-1)}+\cos \frac{\pi}{6(n-1)} \geqslant 0
$$

i.e., $\tan (\pi / 6(n-1)) \leqslant 1 / \sqrt{3}(n-1)$ which is true $($ since $\tan x \leqslant(2 \sqrt{3} / \pi) x$ for $0 \leqslant x \leqslant \pi / 6$ ).

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $\left(x_{k}\right)_{k=0}^{n}$ be as in Lemma 3. By the interpo-
lation formula of Lagrange $P(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n}\left(P\left(x_{k}\right) / l^{\prime}\left(x_{k}\right)\right) l_{k}(x)$ and so $P^{\prime}(x)=$ $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\left(P\left(x_{k}\right) / l^{\prime}\left(x_{k}\right)\right) l_{k}^{\prime}(x)$. Since $l^{\prime}\left(x_{k}\right)=(-1)^{k}(n-1) \sin ((2 k-1) \pi / 2(n-1))$ we indeed have

$$
P^{\prime}(x)=\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\left((-1)^{k} P\left(x_{k}\right) / \sin \frac{(2 k-1) \pi}{2(n-1)}\right) l_{k}^{\prime}(x)
$$

Now let $\cos (\pi / 3(n-1)) \leqslant x \leqslant 1$. Using Lemma 3 and the fact that $0 \leqslant P\left(x_{k}\right) \leqslant \sin ((2 k-1) \pi / 2(n-1))$ we easily conclude that

$$
\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text { odd }}}^{n-1} l_{k}^{\prime}(x) .
$$

Note that $l_{k}^{\prime}(x)$ increases with $x$ on the interval in question, i.e., $l_{k}^{\prime}(x) \leqslant l_{k}^{\prime}(1)$ and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text { odd }}}^{n-1}\left(1 / \sin ^{2} \frac{(2 k-1) \pi}{4(n-1)}\right) . \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Due to obvious symmetry the preceding estimate also holds for $-1 \leqslant x \leqslant-\cos (\pi / 3(n-1))$. In order to prove (21) for $|x|<\cos (\pi / 3(n-1))$ we use the fact [6] that

$$
\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqslant\left\{(n-1)^{2}+x^{2} /\left(1-x^{2}\right)\right\}^{1 / 2} \quad \text { for } \quad-1<x<1,
$$

if $P \in \mathscr{P}_{n}$ and $|P(x)| \leqslant\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$ for $-1<x<1$. This result shows that for $|x|<\cos (\pi / 3(n-1))$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|P^{\prime}(x)\right| & <\left\{(n-1)^{2}+\cot ^{2} \frac{\pi}{3(n-1)}\right\}^{1 / 2} \leqslant\left(1+\frac{9}{\pi^{2}}\right)^{1 / 2}(n-1) \\
& <\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\
k \text { odd }}}^{n-1}\left(1 / \sin ^{2} \frac{(2 k-1) \pi}{4(n-1)}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e., (21) holds for $|x|<\cos (\pi / 3(n-1))$ as well. With this, the proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

Remark 3. It can be shown that if $N_{n}$ denotes the right hand side of (21) and $G:=0.915965594177219015 \cdots$ is Catalan's constant, then $N_{n}=\left(1+\left(8 / \pi^{2}\right) G\right) n+O(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence if $P \in \mathscr{P}_{n}$ and $0 \leqslant P(x) \leqslant$ $\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|P^{\prime}\right\|<(1.7424537 \cdots) n+O(1) \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

which, we admit, is a far cry from " $\left.\left\|P^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant(\pi / 2)+o(1)\right) n$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ ".

## References

1. R. P. Boas, Jr., "Entire Functions," Academic Press, New York, 1954.
2. J. G. van der Corput and G. Schaake, Ungleichungen für Polynome und trigonometrische Polynome, Compositio Math. 2 (1935), 321-361.
3. V. A. Gusev, Derivative functionals of algebraic polynomials and W. A. Markov's theorem, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. 25 (1961), 367-384 [Russian]; English translation, Appendix, in "Transl. Math. Monographs," Vol. 28, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1970.
4. W. A. Markov, Uber Polynome, die in einem gegebenen Intervalle möglichst wenig von Null abweichen, Math. Ann. 77 (1916), 218-258.
5. R. Pierre and Q. I. Rahman, On a problem of Turán about polynomials II, Canad. J. Math. 23 (1981), 701-733.
6. Q. I. Rahman, On a problem of Turán about polynomials with curved majorants, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 163 (1972), 447-455.
7. G. Szegö, Orthogonal polynomials, in "American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications 23," 3rd ed., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1967.
8. E. V. Voronovskaja, The functional method and its applications, in "Translations of Mathematical Monographs 28," Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1970.
