

## Another Case of Nonexistence in Rational Chebyshev Approximation with Interpolatory Constraints

DARRELL SCHMIDT

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Oakland University,  
Rochester, Michigan 48063, U.S.A.*

*Communicated by E. W. Cheney*

Received January 28, 1987; revised January 18, 1988

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $I = [0, 1]$  and for nonnegative integers  $n$  and  $m$  let  $R_{n,m} = \{r = p/q: p \in \Pi_m, q \in \Pi_m, \text{ and } q > 0 \text{ on } I\}$ . Here  $\Pi_l$  denotes the space of real algebraic polynomials of degree  $l$  or less. The problem of rational Chebyshev approximation with Lagrange interpolatory constraints is described as follows. We fix  $s$  points  $0 \leq t_1 < \dots < t_s \leq 1$  and for  $f \in C(I)$  we seek  $r^*$  in  $R_{n,m}(f) = \{r \in R_{n,m}: r(t_i) = f(t_i) \text{ (} i = 1, \dots, s)\}$  such that  $\|f - r^*\| = \inf\{\|f - r\|: r \in R_{n,m}(f)\}$  where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the uniform norm over  $I$ . We call such an  $r^*$  a best approximation to  $f$  from  $R_{n,m}(f)$ . It has long been known that there is a difficulty with existence for this problem. When  $n \geq s - 1$ , so that  $R_{n,m}(f) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $f \in C(I)$ , Gilormini [4] announced a positive existence result for this problem along with a characterization theorem. However, Loeb [5] disproved the existence assertion giving an example of a function  $f \in C(I)$  that fails to have a best approximation from  $R_{1,1}(f)$  when  $s = 1$  and  $t_1 = 0$ . In Loeb's example,  $f$  is not normal with respect to  $R_{1,1}$ . (We say that  $f \in C(I)$  is normal with respect to  $R_{n,m}$  if its unique best approximation from  $R_{n,m}$  is in  $R_{n,m} \setminus R_{n-1,m-1}$ .) More recently, when  $s = 1$ , Dunham [3] gave conditions that ensure that a function that is not normal with respect to  $R_{n,m}$  fails to have a best approximation from  $R_{n,m}(f)$ . He also announced an example of a normal function for which existence for the constrained problem fails. It is of interest to determine the extent of this nonexistence phenomenon. Something analogous to a result of Cheney and Loeb [2] that the set of functions in  $C(I)$  that are not normal with respect to  $R_{n,m}$  is nowhere dense in  $C(I)$  would be desirable. To the contrary, however, the principle result of this short note is that the nonexistence phenomenon is quite rampant.

For simplicity, we only consider the case  $s = 1$  and  $t_1 = 0$  so that  $R_{n,m}(f) = \{r \in R_{n,m}: r(0) = f(0)\}$ . When  $n, m \geq 1$ , we give a condition based

on the best approximation to  $f$  from  $R_{n-1, m-1}$  which implies that  $f$  has no best approximation from  $R_{n, m}(f)$ . We then use this result and the continuity properties of the best approximation operator corresponding to  $R_{n-1, m-1}$  to demonstrate a nonempty, open subset of  $C(I)$  all of whose elements fail to have best approximations from  $R_{n, m}$  with the interpolation constraint. A consequence of this result is that for fixed  $f \in C(I)$ ,  $n$  and  $m$  being sufficiently large is not enough to ensure existence for the constrained problem.

## 2. NONEXISTENCE RESULTS

For  $f \in C(I)$  and  $S \subseteq C(I)$ , let  $\text{dist}(f, S) = \inf\{\|f - g\| : g \in S\}$ . We use the following lemma.

LEMMA. *Let  $n, m \geq 1$  and  $f \in C(I)$ . Then*

$$\text{dist}(f, R_{n, m}) \leq \text{dist}(f, R_{n, m}(f)) \leq \text{dist}(f, R_{n-1, m-1}).$$

*Proof.* The first inequality is trivial. For the second inequality, let  $r = p/q$  be the best approximation to  $f$  from  $R_{n-1, m-1}$  where  $p \in \prod_{n-1}$ ,  $q \in \prod_{m-1}$ , and  $q > 0$  on  $I$ . If  $\|f - r\| = 0$ , then  $r(0) = f(0)$  and  $\text{dist}(f, R_{n, m}(f)) = \text{dist}(f, R_{n-1, m-1}) = 0$ . Assume  $\|f - r\| > 0$ . For  $k$  a positive integer, define

$$r_k(x) = (xp(x) + f(0)/k)/(xq(x) + 1/k).$$

Note that  $r_k \in R_{n, m}(f)$  and that

$$f(x) - r_k(x) = \frac{xq(x)}{xq(x) + 1/k} (f(x) - r(x)) + \frac{1/k}{xq(x) + 1/k} (f(x) - f(0)).$$

Hence, for  $x \in I$

$$|f(x) - r_k(x)| \leq \frac{xq(x)}{xq(x) + 1/k} \|f - r\| + \frac{1/k}{xq(x) + 1/k} |f(x) - f(0)|. \quad (*)$$

Choose  $\delta > 0$  so that  $|f(x) - f(0)| \leq \|f - r\|$  for  $x \in [0, \delta]$ . Clearly, (\*) implies that  $|f(x) - r_k(x)| \leq \|f - r\|$  for  $x \in [0, \delta]$  and that  $|f - r_k| \rightarrow |f - r|$  uniformly on  $[\delta, 1]$ . Hence

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f - r_k\| \leq \|f - r\|$$

and so  $\text{dist}(f, R_{n, m}(f)) \leq \text{dist}(f, R_{n-1, m-1})$ .

For  $f \in C(I)$ , let  $E(f) = \{x \in I: |f(x)| = \|f\|\}$ . Evidently,  $E(f)$  is compact in  $I$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $n, m \geq 1$ ,  $f \in C(I)$ ,  $r$  be the best approximation to  $f$  from  $R_{n-1, m-1}$ , and let  $x_1$  be the smallest element of  $E(f-r)$ . If  $x_1 > 0$  and  $(f(0) - r(0))(f(x_1) - r(x_1)) < 0$ , then  $f$  does not have a best approximation from  $R_{n, m}(f)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $r = p/q$  (in reduced form) where  $p \in \prod_{n-1}$ ,  $q \in \prod_{m-1}$ , and  $q > 0$  on  $I$ , and let  $d = \min(n - \deg p, m - \deg q)$ . By the alternation theorem for rational approximation (see [1, 2])  $f - r$  exhibits at least  $l + 1 \equiv n + m + 1 - d$  points of alternation in  $E(f - r)$ . That is, there exist points  $x_1 < \dots < x_{l+1}$  in  $I$  where  $(f - r)(x_i) = \sigma(-1)^i \|f - r\|$  ( $i = 1, \dots, l + 1$ ) where  $\sigma = \pm 1$ . Since  $x_1$  is the smallest element of  $E(f - r)$ , we can choose  $x_1$  to be the first point in the alternant.

Assume that  $f$  has a best approximation  $r^* = p^*/q^*$  from  $R_{n, m}(f)$  whence  $p^* \in \prod_n$ ,  $q^* \in \prod_m$ ,  $q^* > 0$  on  $I$ , and  $r^*(0) = f(0)$ . By hypothesis,  $r^*(0) \neq r(0)$  so that  $r^* \neq r$ . By the lemma,  $\|f - r^*\| \leq \|f - r\|$  and thus for  $i = 1, \dots, l + 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(-1)^i (f - r^*)(x_i) &\leq \|f - r^*\| \\ &\leq \|f - r\| = \sigma(-1)^i (f - r)(x_i) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\sigma(-1)^i (r^* - r)(x_i) \geq 0.$$

Since  $-\sigma = \operatorname{sgn}(f - r)(x_1)$ , the hypothesis yields

$$\sigma(-1)^0 (r^* - r)(x_0) = \sigma(f - r)(0) > 0,$$

where  $x_0 = 0$ . Since  $q, q^* > 0$  on  $I$ ,  $\sigma(-1)^i (p^*q - q^*p)(x_i) \geq 0$  ( $i = 0, \dots, l + 1$ ). But  $p^*q - q^*p \in \prod_l$  and thus  $p^*q - q^*p \equiv 0$  so that  $r^* = r$ , a contradiction. Theorem 1 is now proven.

If  $f \in C(I)$  is normal with respect to  $R_{n-1, m-1}$ , then the alternation theorem implies that  $E(f - r)$  contains at least  $n + m$  points where  $r$  is the best approximation to  $f$  from  $R_{n-1, m-1}$ . In Theorem 1, if  $f$  is normal and  $E(f - r)$  contains precisely  $n + m$  points, then all functions sufficiently near  $f$  fail to have best approximations from  $R_{n, m}$  with the interpolatory constraint.

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $f \in C(I)$  satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1, and further suppose that  $f$  is normal with respect to  $R_{n-1, m-1}$  and that  $E(f - r)$  contains precisely  $n + m$  points. Then there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for every  $g \in C(I)$  with  $\|g - f\| < \varepsilon$ ,  $g$  does not have a best approximation from  $R_{n, m}(g)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $l = n + m$  and  $E(f - r) = \{x_1, \dots, x_l\}$  where  $0 < x_1 < \dots < x_l \leq 1$ . Assume the conclusion is false. Then there is a sequence  $(g_k)$  in  $C(I)$  such that  $\|g_k - f\| \rightarrow 0$  and each  $g_k$  has a best approximation from  $R_{n,m}(g_k)$ . Let  $r_k$  denote the best approximation to  $g_k$  from  $R_{n-1,m-1}$  and let  $\xi_1^k$  be the smallest element of  $E(g_k - r_k)$ . By the continuity of the best approximation operator at each normal function [6],  $\|r_k - r\| \rightarrow 0$ .

Moreover, the set of functions that are normal with respect to  $R_{n-1,m-1}$  is open in  $C(I)$  (see [2]). Thus for  $k$  sufficiently large,  $g_k$  is normal with respect to  $R_{n-1,m-1}$  and we may then choose an alternant  $\xi_1^k < \dots < \xi_l^k$  for  $g_k - r_k$  consisting of  $l$  points in  $E(g_k - r_k)$ . We now extract a subsequence and relabel so that each  $g_k$  is normal with respect to  $R_{n-1,m-1}$  and  $\xi_i^k \rightarrow \xi_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, l$ ) where  $\xi_1 \leq \dots \leq \xi_l$ . The convergent sequence  $(g_k - r_k)$  is precompact in  $C(I)$  and thus is equicontinuous. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |(f - r)(\xi_i)| &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |(g_k - r_k)(\xi_i^k)| \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|g_k - r_k\| = \|f - r\| \end{aligned}$$

( $i = 1, \dots, l$ ). So each  $\xi_i \in E(f - r)$ . But for  $i = 1, \dots, l - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (f - r)(\xi_i)(f - r)(\xi_{i+1}) &= \lim (g_k - r_k)(\xi_i^k)(g_k - r_k)(\xi_{i+1}^k) \\ &= -\|f - r\|^2 < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\xi_1 < \dots < \xi_l$ , and so,  $\xi_i = x_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, l$ ). Finally,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (g_k - r_k)(0)(g_k - r_k)(\xi_1^k) = (f - r)(0)(f - r)(x_1) < 0.$$

So for  $k$  sufficiently large,  $\xi_1^k > 0$  and  $(g_k - r_k)(0)(g_k - r_k)(\xi_1^k) < 0$  and by Theorem 1,  $g_k$  has no best approximation from  $R_{n,m}(g_k)$ . We have a contradiction and Theorem 2 is proven.

We point out that functions  $f \in C(I)$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2 are easy to come by. Start with  $r \in R_{n-1,m-1} \setminus R_{n-2,m-2}$  and let  $f = r + h$  where  $h \in C(I)$ ,  $|h| < \rho$  on  $I \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_{n+m}\}$  where  $0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{n+m} \leq 1$  are arbitrary,  $h(0) > 0$ , and  $h(x_i) = (-1)^i \rho$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n + m$ ) where  $\rho > 0$ . Thus Theorem 2 indeed demonstrates nonempty open subsets of  $C(I)$  over which existence for the constrained problem fails.

We now turn our attention to the existence question with  $f$  fixed and  $n$  and  $m$  varying. A consequence of the construction above is that for fixed  $f \in C(I)$  existence of a best approximation from  $R_{n,m}(f)$  is not guaranteed for  $n$  and  $m$  sufficiently large.

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $(n(k))$  and  $(m(k))$  be sequences of positive integers with  $n(k) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Then there exists  $f \in C(I)$  such that for infinitely many  $k$ ,  $f$  does not have a best approximation from  $R_{n(k),m(k)}(f)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A_k = \{g \in C(I): g \text{ has a best approximation from } R_{n(k),m(k)}(g)\}$  and  $F_k = \bigcap_{j \geq k} A_j$ . Evidently  $F_k$  is closed, and we show that each  $F_k$  has an empty interior in  $C(I)$ . Let  $g \in F_k$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the Weierstrass theorem choose a polynomial  $p$  so that  $\|p - g\| < \varepsilon/2$ . Now choose  $j \geq k$  so that  $\deg p \leq n(j) - 1$ . By adding a suitably small multiple of  $x^{n(j)-1}$  to  $p(x)$ , we may assume that  $\deg p = n(j) - 1$ . Then  $p \in R_{n(j)-1, m(j)-1} \setminus R_{n(j)-2, m(j)-2}$ , and the construction above with  $r = p$ ,  $n = n(j)$ ,  $m = m(j)$ , and  $\rho = \varepsilon/2$  yields  $f \notin A_j$  with  $\|f - g\| < \varepsilon$ . Hence,  $F_k$  has an empty interior. By the Baire category theorem,  $C(I)$  contains some  $f$  not in  $\bigcup_{k \geq 1} F_k$ . In particular, for each  $k$ ,  $f$  has no best approximation from  $R_{n(j),m(j)}(f)$  for some  $j \geq k$ . The proof is complete.

We conclude this note by mentioning that one can obtain sufficient conditions for  $f \in C(I)$  to have a best approximation from  $R_{n,m}(f)$ . Such conditions include  $\text{dist}(f, R_{n,m}(f)) < \text{dist}(f, R_{n-1,m-1})$  or  $(f - r_0)(0)(f - r_1)(0) < 0$  where  $r_i$  denotes the best approximation to  $f$  from  $R_{n-i,m-i}$  ( $i = 0, 1$ ). Proofs are similar to that of the theorem on p. 155 in [1] with an additional argument preventing cancellations.

#### REFERENCES

1. E. W. CHENEY, "Introduction to Approximation Theory," McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.
2. E. W. CHENEY AND H. L. LOEB, Generalized rational approximation, *J. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. Ser. B* **1** (1964), 11-25.
3. C. B. DUNHAM, Difficulties in rational Chebyshev approximation, in "Constructive Theory of Functions," pp. 319-327, Sofia, Bulgaria, 1984.
4. C. GILORMINI, Approximation rationnelle de Tchebycheff avec des nœuds, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Ser. A-B* **264** (1967), A359-A360.
5. H. L. LOEB, Un contre-exemple a un resultat de M. Claude Gilormini, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Ser. A-B* **266** (1968), A237-A238.
6. H. MAEHLY AND CH. WITZGALL, Tschebyscheff-Approximationen in kleinen Intervallen II, *Numer. Math.* **2** (1960), 293-307.