

THE DEGREE OF APPROXIMATION
FOR GENERALIZED POLYNOMIALS
WITH INTEGRAL COEFFICIENTS

BY

M. VON GOLITSCHKEK⁽¹⁾

ABSTRACT. The classical Müntz theorem and the so-called Jackson-Müntz theorems concern uniform approximation on $[0, 1]$ by polynomials whose exponents are taken from an increasing sequence of positive real numbers Λ . Under mild restrictions on the exponents, the degree of approximation for Λ -polynomials with real coefficients is compared with the corresponding degree of approximation when the coefficients are taken from the integers.

Let $C[0, 1]$ be the space of all continuous real valued functions defined on the interval $[0, 1]$ and $\|\cdot\|$ the supremum norm on $[0, 1]$ ($\|f\| = \sup\{|f(x)|: 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$). It is well known that the ordinary algebraic polynomials with integral coefficients, i.e. integral polynomials, are dense in the subspace

$$C_0[0, 1] = \{f \in C[0, 1]: f(0) = f(1) = 0\}.$$

This seems to be due originally to Kakeya [10], but many other authors have also studied this or related problems: Pál [17], Okada [16], Bernstein [2], Fekete [3]. Finally, Hewitt and Zuckerman [9] obtained necessary and sufficient conditions. With every closed real interval of length less than 4, they associate a certain finite subset J . A continuous real function f on the interval is arbitrarily uniformly approximable by integral polynomials if and only if f is equal to some integral polynomial on the set J .

In 1931, Kantorovič [11] proved that for any positive integer n and any function $f \in C_0[0, 1]$ there exists an integral polynomial $p_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n b_k x^k$ such that

$$(1) \quad \|f - p_n\| \leq 2E_n(f) + O(n^{-1}) \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty$$

holds, where

Received by the editors February 19, 1975 and, in revised form, November 4, 1975.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 41A25, 41A10.

Key words and phrases. Jackson-Müntz theorem, polynomials with integral coefficients, approximation by polynomials with integral coefficients, degree of approximation.

⁽¹⁾The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft has sponsored this research under Grant No. Go 270/1.

Copyright © 1977, American Mathematical Society

$$E_n(f) = \inf \left\{ \left\| f(x) - \sum_{k=0}^n a_k x^k \right\| : a_k \text{ real} \right\}.$$

Gel'fond [6] and Trigub [18] extended this result to differentiable functions f for the intervals $[0, 1]$ and $[a, b]$, $b - a < 4$, respectively, and obtained analogues of Jackson's and Timan's theorems.

Many theorems, which are well known for ordinary polynomials, are also valid for the so-called Λ -polynomials of the form

$$P_s(x) = \sum_{k=1}^s a_k x^{\lambda_k}, \quad a_k \text{ real},$$

where $\Lambda = \{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a positive increasing sequence of real numbers. Müntz [14] proved that the Λ -polynomials are dense in the subset $\{f \in C[0, 1] : f(0) = 0\}$ of $C[0, 1]$ if and only if $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 1/\lambda_k = \infty$.

Recently, Le Baron O. Ferguson and von Golitschek [4] showed that for every sequence Λ of distinct positive integers the Λ -polynomials with integral coefficients are dense in $C_0[0, 1]$ if and only if Müntz's condition holds. This result is even valid for every sequence Λ of distinct positive real numbers.

Combining Müntz's and Jackson's theorems, Newman [15], von Golitschek [7], [8], Ganelius and Westlund [5], Leviatan [12], Bak and Newman [1] obtained upper and lower bounds for the degree of approximation when functions f are approximated by the Λ -polynomials with real coefficients.

The purpose of this paper is to find analogous Jackson-Müntz theorems for Λ -polynomials with integral coefficients. More precisely, we shall prove the following two theorems which generalize Kantorovič's result (1).

THEOREM 1. *Let the positive increasing sequence Λ satisfy*

$$(2) \quad \lambda_1 \geq B, \quad \lambda_{2k} \leq C\lambda_k, \quad \lambda_k \leq Bk \quad \text{for } k \geq k_0,$$

where k_0 is a positive integer and B and C are positive constants. For any function $f \in C_0[0, 1]$ and any positive integer s there exist integers b_j , $1 \leq j \leq s$, such that

$$(3) \quad \left\| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^s b_j x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq 2E_s(f; \Lambda) + O(s^{-1}),$$

where.

$$E_s(f; \Lambda) = \inf \left\{ \left\| f(x) - \sum_{k=1}^s a_k x^{\lambda_k} \right\| : a_k \text{ real} \right\}.$$

THEOREM 2. *Let the positive increasing sequence Λ satisfy*

$$(4) \quad \lambda_{2k} \leq C\lambda_k, \quad \lambda_k \geq Bk \quad \text{for } k \geq 1.$$

For any function $f \in C_0[0, 1]$ and any positive integer s there exist integers $b_j, 1 \leq j \leq s$, such that

$$(5) \quad \left\| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^s b_j x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq 2E_s(f; \Lambda) + O(\varphi(s)^{-B}),$$

where $\varphi(s) = \exp(\sum_{k=1}^s 1/\lambda_k)$.

REMARK 1. The restrictions $\lambda_{2k} \leq C\lambda_k$ ($k \geq k_0$ or $k \geq 1$) in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 are mild. Indeed, many different sequences have this property, for example

$$\lambda_k = k^\beta \quad (k \geq 1), \quad \beta > 0,$$

$$\lambda_k = k \log k \quad (k > 1),$$

and even converging sequences Λ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = \lambda, \lambda > 0$.

REMARK 2. It follows from the theory of width (cf. Lorentz [13, Chapter 9]) that the classes Γ_w of functions,

$$\Gamma_w = \{f \in C[0, 1] : w(f; h) \leq w(h) \text{ for } 0 \leq h \leq 1\},$$

where w is a given modulus of continuity, have the following property. There exists a positive number c not depending on s such that

$$(6) \quad \sup_{f \in \Gamma_w} E_s(f; \Lambda) \geq cw(s^{-1}).$$

It is easy to see that the classes $\Gamma_{w0} = \Gamma_w \cap C_0[0, 1]$ satisfy (6). Therefore the summand $O(s^{-1})$ in (3) of Theorem 1 does not change the rate of convergence if we consider the whole class Γ_{w0} .

Combining Theorem 2 and the Jackson-Müntz theorem [8, Theorem 3] for Λ -polynomials with real coefficients, we are led to the following.

COROLLARY. If (4) holds, then for any function $f \in C_0[0, 1]$ and any positive integer s there exist integers $b_j, 1 \leq j \leq s$, such that

$$(7) \quad \left\| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^s b_j x^{\lambda_j} \right\| = O(w(f; \varphi(s)^{-B^*}))$$

where $B^* = \min\{B; 2\}$ and $w(f; h) = \sup\{|f(x+t) - f(x)| : |t| \leq h, x, x+t \in [0, 1], 0 \leq h \leq 1\}$, denotes the modulus of continuity of f .

REMARK 3. For $B \geq 2$ the rate of convergence in (7) is best possible for classes Γ_{w0} , even if we approximate by Λ -polynomials with real coefficients (cf. Bak and Newman [1]).

Proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. By [4, Lemma 1] there exists for any positive integers q and s , $q < s$, a Λ -polynomial $Q_{qs}(x) = \sum_{i=q+1}^s c_{iqs} x^{\lambda_i}$ such that

$$(8) \quad A_{qs} = \|x^{\lambda_q} - Q_{qs}(x)\| \leq 2 \exp\left(-2\lambda_q \sum_{i=q+1}^s 1/\lambda_i\right)$$

and $Q_{qs}(1) = 1$, where the first equality in (8) serves to define A_{qs} .

LEMMA 1. *Let r and s be positive integers such that $r \leq s + 1 - C \log s < s$. (a) If the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold then*

$$(9) \quad \sum_{q=1}^r A_{qs} = O(s^{-1}) \quad \text{for } s \rightarrow \infty.$$

(b) *If the assumptions of Theorem 2 hold then*

$$(10) \quad \sum_{q=1}^r A_{qs} = O(\varphi(s)^{-B}) \quad \text{for } s \rightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. Let s be so large that $s/2 > C \log s > k_0$.

(a) We apply the inequalities (2) and (8). Then, for $1 \leq q \leq C \log s$ and $q_0 = \max\{q + 1; k_0\}$,

$$(11) \quad A_{qs} \leq 2 \exp\left(-2\lambda_q \sum_{i=q_0}^s 1/(Bi)\right) \leq 2(q_0/s)^{2\lambda_q/B} \leq 2(q_0/s)^2;$$

for $C \log s < q \leq s/2$,

$$(12) \quad A_{qs} \leq 2 \exp\left(-2\lambda_q \sum_{i=q+1}^{2q} 1/\lambda_i\right) \leq 2e^{-2q/C} \leq 2s^{-2},$$

and for $s/2 < q \leq s + 1 - C \log s$,

$$(13) \quad A_{qs} \leq 2 \exp(-2\lambda_q(s - q)/\lambda_s) \leq 2e^{2/C}s^{-2}.$$

Combining (11) through (13) we obtain (9).

(b) We apply the inequalities (4) and (8). Let $1 \leq q \leq s/2$. Since

$$B \sum_{i=1}^q 1/\lambda_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^q 1/i \leq 1 + \log q$$

and

$$\exp\left(-\lambda_q \sum_{i=q+1}^s 1/\lambda_i\right) \leq \exp\left(-\lambda_q \sum_{i=q+1}^{2q} 1/\lambda_i\right) \leq e^{-q/C},$$

we obtain

$$(14) \quad A_{qs} \leq 2e^{-q/C} \exp\left(-B \sum_{i=q+1}^s 1/\lambda_i\right) \leq 2eqe^{-q/C} \varphi(s)^{-B}.$$

Again (13) is valid for $s/2 < q \leq s + 1 - C \log s$. This together with (14) completes the proof of (10) if we take into consideration that $\varphi(s)^{-B} \geq (es)^{-1}$.

LEMMA 2. Let n and m be positive integers and $\alpha_j, n \leq j \leq m$, be real numbers such that

$$(15) \quad \sum_{j=n}^m \alpha_j = 0 \pmod{1}.$$

Then there exist integers $b_j, n \leq j \leq m$, for which

$$(16) \quad \left\| \sum_{j=n}^m (\alpha_j - b_j)x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq 6 \left(\frac{\lambda_m - \lambda_n}{\lambda_n} \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda_m - \lambda_n}{(m - n)\lambda_n}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 2. We may assume that $\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n \geq 4$, because the substitution $x = y^\beta$ does not change the supremum norm in (16) for any positive number β . Applying the method in [4, Lemma 4] we define, recursively, for $j = m, m - 1, \dots, n, d_m = \alpha_m - [\alpha_m]$ and

$$d_j = \begin{cases} \alpha_j - [\alpha_j] & \text{if } \sum_{i=j+1}^m d_i \leq 0 \\ \alpha_j - [\alpha_j] - 1 & \text{if } \sum_{i=j+1}^m d_i > 0 \end{cases}, \quad m - 1 \geq j \geq n,$$

where $[\alpha]$ denotes the largest integer less or equal to α . Then the numbers $\delta_j = \sum_{i=j}^m d_i$ have the properties $\delta_n = 0, |\delta_j| < 1$ for $n < j \leq m$, and

$$p(x) = \sum_{i=n}^m d_i x^{\lambda_i} = \sum_{j=n+1}^m \delta_j (x^{\lambda_j} - x^{\lambda_{j-1}})$$

where the first equality serves to define p .

Let q be a given integer, $n < q \leq m$. Let a^*, β_j , and T be defined by

$$a^* = p'(1)/(\lambda_q - \lambda_{q-1}), \quad \beta_j = \lambda_j - \lambda_n, \quad n \leq j \leq m,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T(x) &= x^{-\lambda_n}(p(x) - a^*(x^{\lambda_q} - x^{\lambda_{q-1}})) \\ &= \sum_{j=n+1}^m \gamma_j (x^{\beta_j} - x^{\beta_{j-1}}) \end{aligned}$$

where p' denotes the first derivative of p . The numbers γ_j are defined by $\gamma_j = \delta_j$ for $j \neq q$ and $\gamma_q = \delta_q - a^*$ and satisfy $|\gamma_j| < 1$ for $j \neq q$ and $|\gamma_q| < 1 + |a^*|$. Since $\beta_n = 0$ and $\beta_1 \geq 4$ it is easy to see that

$$\|\beta_j(\beta_j - 1)x^{\beta_{j-2}} - \beta_{j-1}(\beta_{j-1} - 1)x^{\beta_{j-1}-2}\| \leq \beta_j^2 - \beta_{j-1}^2,$$

$n + 1 \leq j \leq m$. Therefore we obtain for the second derivative T'' of T ,

$$\|T''\| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^m |\gamma_j| (\beta_j^2 - \beta_{j-1}^2) \leq \beta_m^2 + |a^*| (\beta_q^2 - \beta_{q-1}^2).$$

Since $|p'(1)| \leq \beta_m$ it follows that $|a^*| \leq \beta_m / (\lambda_q - \lambda_{q-1})$ and

$$(17) \quad \|T''\| \leq 3\beta_m^2.$$

We notice that $T(1) = T'(1) = 0$. Thus, by the mean value theorem,

$$|T(x)| \leq (x - 1)^2 \|T''\| / 2, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1,$$

and by the inequality $\|x^{\lambda_n}(x - 1)^2\| \leq 4\lambda_n^{-2}$, we find

$$(18) \quad |p(x) - a^*(x^{\lambda_q} - x^{\lambda_{q-1}})| = x^{\lambda_n} |T(x)| \leq 6(\lambda_m - \lambda_n)^2 \lambda_n^{-2}.$$

We define the integers $b_j, n \leq j \leq m$, by

$$b_j = \begin{cases} \alpha_j + d_j, & j \neq q, \quad j \neq q - 1, \\ \alpha_q + d_q - [a^*], & j = q, \\ \alpha_{q-1} + d_{q-1} + [a^*], & j = q - 1. \end{cases}$$

It is evident that

$$(19) \quad \left\| \sum_{j=n}^m (\alpha_j - b_j)x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq \|p(x) - a^*(x^{\lambda_q} - x^{\lambda_{q-1}})\| + (a^* - [a^*]) \|x^{\lambda_q} - x^{\lambda_{q-1}}\|.$$

We choose the integer q such that $\lambda_q - \lambda_{q-1} = \inf\{\lambda_j - \lambda_{j-1} : n + 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ and therefore

$$(20) \quad \lambda_q - \lambda_{q-1} \leq (\lambda_m - \lambda_n) / (m - n).$$

Applying the inequalities $\|x^{\lambda_q} - x^{\lambda_{q-1}}\| \leq (\lambda_q - \lambda_{q-1}) / \lambda_q$ and (18) through (20) we obtain (16) and thus conclude the proof of Lemma 2.

REMARK 4. In the proof of [4, Lemma 4] we have constructed the Λ -polynomial p and have proved in [4, Lemma 2] that

$$(21) \quad \|p\| \leq (\lambda_m - \lambda_n) / \lambda_n.$$

Setting $a^* = 0$ and applying (21) we find integers $b_j, n \leq j \leq m$, such that

$$(22) \quad \left\| \sum_{j=n}^m (\alpha_j - b_j)x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq (\lambda_m - \lambda_n) / \lambda_n.$$

However, the upper bound in (22) is larger than in (16) and not small enough to prove the results of our Theorems 1 and 2. Thus the more complicated construction of our Lemma 2 is necessary.

Let $f \in C_0[0, 1]$ and s be sufficiently large. We denote $t = [(s + 1)/2]$ and consider the set of all pairs of integers $\Phi = \{(u, v) : v = u + [C \log s], t \leq u < v \leq s\}$. We choose $(r, m) \in \Phi$ such that $\lambda_m - \lambda_r = \min \{\lambda_v - \lambda_u : (u, v) \in \Phi\}$. Then it follows that

$$(23) \quad \frac{\lambda_m - \lambda_r}{\lambda_r} \leq \frac{(\lambda_s - \lambda_r)C \log s}{\lambda_r(s - t - C \log s)} \leq \frac{C(C - 1) \log s}{s - t - C \log s} \leq 3C(C - 1)s^{-1} \log s.$$

For r and s , we proceed as in the proof of [4, Lemma 4]. There exist real coefficients $a_{j0}, 1 \leq j \leq s$, such that

$$(24) \quad \left\| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^s a_{j0} x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq 2E_s(f; \Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^s a_{j0} = 0.$$

We define the integers $b_j, 1 \leq j \leq r$, and the real coefficients $a_{jq}, 1 \leq q \leq r$ and $q + 1 \leq j \leq s$, by the induction on q which has been described in the proof of [4, Lemma 4]. Thus we obtain real coefficients $a_{jr}, r + 1 \leq j \leq s$, for which the inequalities

$$(25) \quad \left\| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^r b_j x^{\lambda_j} - \sum_{j=r+1}^s a_{jr} x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq 2E_s(f; \Lambda) + \sum_{q=1}^r A_{qs}$$

and

$$(26) \quad \sum_{j=1}^r b_j + \sum_{j=r+1}^s a_{jr} = 0$$

are satisfied.

If $m < s$ we define the integers $b_j, m + 1 \leq j \leq s$, by $b_j = [a_{jr}]$. There exist Λ -polynomials $Q_q(x) = \sum_{i=r+1}^m c_{iq} x^{\lambda_i}, m + 1 \leq q \leq s$, such that

$$(27) \quad \|x^{\lambda_q} - Q_q(x)\| \leq 2 \prod_{i=r+1}^m \frac{\lambda_q - \lambda_i}{\lambda_q + \lambda_i} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_q(1) = 1.$$

(Cf. [7, Lemma 2] and [4, Lemma 1].) We apply the inequality $(1 - x)/(1 + x) \leq e^{-2x}$ factorwise for $x = \lambda_i/\lambda_q$ and obtain from (27),

$$\|x^{\lambda_q} - Q_q(x)\| \leq 2 \exp\left(-2 \sum_{i=r+1}^m \lambda_i/\lambda_q\right).$$

Since $\lambda_q \leq C\lambda_r$ and $m - r \geq -1 + C \log s$ we get

$$(28) \quad \|x^{\lambda_q} - Q_q(x)\| \leq 2 \exp(-2(m - r)\lambda_r/\lambda_q) \leq 2e^{2/C} s^{-2}.$$

In the next step we define the real coefficients $\alpha_j, r + 1 \leq j \leq m$, by

$$(29) \quad \alpha_j = a_{jr} + \sum_{q=m+1}^s (a_{qr} - b_q)c_{jq}$$

and obtain from (25) and (28)

$$(30) \quad \left\| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^r b_j x^{\lambda_j} - \sum_{j=m+1}^s b_j x^{\lambda_j} - \sum_{j=r+1}^m \alpha_j x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq 2E_s(f; \Lambda) + \sum_{q=1}^r A_{q_s} + e^{2/C} s^{-1}.$$

Since $Q_q(1) = 1$ for $m+1 \leq q \leq s$ it follows by (26) and (29) that

$$(31) \quad \sum_{j=r+1}^m \alpha_j = 0 \pmod{1}.$$

If $m = s$ we define the real numbers α_j by $\alpha_j = a_{j_r}$, $r+1 \leq j \leq m$. Then, by (26), the equality (31) is also valid. Now we can apply Lemma 2 for m and $n = r+1$. We find integers b_j , $r+1 \leq j \leq m$, for which (16) is satisfied. Hence by (30) (if $m < s$) or (25) (if $m = s$), (16), (23) and the inequality $m - r \geq C \log s - 1$ we are led to

$$(32) \quad \left\| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^s b_j x^{\lambda_j} \right\| \leq 2E_s(f; \Lambda) + \sum_{q=1}^r A_{q_s} + O(s^{-1}).$$

Finally we combine (32) and Lemma 1. This concludes the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. For the latter we apply that $\varphi(s)^{-B} \geq (es)^{-1}$ if (4) holds.

REFERENCES

1. J. Bak and D. J. Newman, *Müntz-Jackson theorems in $L^p[0, 1]$ and $C[0, 1]$* , Amer. J. Math. 94 (1972), 437–457. MR 46 #9605.
2. S. N. Bernštein, *Sobranie sočinenii*. I, Izdat. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Moscow, 1952, pp. 468–471, 517–519. MR 14, 2.
3. M. Fekete, *Über die Verteilung der Wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Koeffizienten*, Math. 17 (1923), 228–249.
4. Le Baron O. Ferguson and M. von Golitschek, *Müntz-Szász theorem with integral coefficients*. II, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 213 (1975), 115–126.
5. T. Ganelius and S. Westlund, *The degree of approximation in Müntz's theorem*, Proc. Internat. Conf. Mathematical Analysis, Jyväskylä, Finland, 1970.
6. A. O. Gel'fond, *On uniform approximations by polynomials with integral rational coefficients*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk 10 (1955), no. 1 (63), 41–65. (Russian) MR 17, 30.
7. M. von Golitschek, *Erweiterung der Approximationssätze von Jackson im Sinne von C. Müntz*. II, J. Approximation Theory 3 (1970), 72–86. MR 41 #2273.
8. ———, *Jackson-Müntz Sätze in der L_p -Norm*, J. Approximation Theory 7 (1973), 87–106. MR 49 #5641.
9. E. Hewitt and H. S. Zuckerman, *Approximation by polynomials with integral coefficients, a reformulation of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem*, Duke Math. J. 26 (1959), 305–324. MR 26 #6656.
10. S. Kakeya, *On approximate polynomials*, Tôhoku Math. J. 6 (1914–1915), 182–186.
11. L. Kantorovič, *Some remarks on the approximation of functions by means of polynomials with integral coefficients*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, (1931), 1163–1168. (Russian)
12. D. Leviatan, *On the Jackson-Müntz theorem*, J. Approximation Theory 10 (1974), 1–5.
13. G. G. Lorentz, *Approximation of functions*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1966. MR 35 #4642; erratum, 36, p. 1567.

14. C. Müntz, *Über den Approximationssatz von Weierstrass*, Schwarz-Festschrift, 1914, 302–312.
15. D. J. Newman, *A Müntz-Jackson theorem*, Amer. J. Math. 87 (1965), 940–944. MR 32 #4429.
16. Y. Okada, *On approximate polynomials with integral coefficients only*, Tôhoku Math. J. 23 (1923), 26–35.
17. J. Pál, *Zwei kleine Bemerkungen*, Tôhoku Math. J. 6 (1914–1915), 42–43.
18. R. M. Trigub, *Approximation of functions by polynomials with integer coefficients*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser Math. 26 (1962), 261–280. (Russian) MR 25 #373.

INSTITUT FÜR ANGEWANDTE MATHEMATIK UND STATISTIK, 87 WÜRZBURG,
AM HUBLAND, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY