A Bound on the L_∞ -Norm of L_2 -Approximation by Splines in Terms of a Global Mesh Ratio

By Carl de Boor*

Abstract. Let $L_k f$ denote the least-squares approximation to $f \in L_1$ by splines of order k with knot sequence $\mathbf{t} = (t_i)_{i=1}^{n+k}$. In connection with their work on Galerkin's method for solving differential equations, Douglas, Dupont and Wahlbin have shown that the norm $\|L_k\|_\infty$ of L_k as a map on L_∞ can be bounded as follows,

$$\|L_k\|_\infty \leq \text{const}_k M_{\mathbf{t}},$$

with $M_{\mathbf{t}}$ a global mesh ratio, given by

$$M_{\mathbf{t}} := \max_i \Delta t_i / \min \{\Delta t_i | \Delta t_i > 0\}.$$

Using their very nice idea together with some facts about B -splines, it is shown here that even

$$\|L_k\|_\infty \leq \text{const}_k (M_{\mathbf{t}}^{(k)})^{1/2}$$

with the smaller global mesh ratio $M_{\mathbf{t}}^{(k)}$ given by

$$M_{\mathbf{t}}^{(k)} := \max_{i,j} (t_{i+k} - t_i) / (t_{j+k} - t_j).$$

A mesh independent bound for L_2 -approximation by continuous piecewise polynomials is also given.

1. Introduction. This note is an addendum to the clever paper by Douglas, Dupont and Wahlbin [2] in which these authors bound the linear map of least-squares approximation by splines of order k with knot sequence $\mathbf{t} := (t_i)$, as a map on L_∞ , in terms of the particular global mesh ratio

$$M_{\mathbf{t}} := \max_i \Delta t_i / \min \{\Delta t_i | \Delta t_i > 0\}.$$

Their argument is very elegant. But their result is puzzling in one aspect: The ratio $M_{\mathbf{t}}$ is not a continuous function of $\mathbf{t}$. If, e.g., $\mathbf{t}$ is uniform, hence $M_{\mathbf{t}} = 1$, and we now let $\mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{t}^*$ by letting just one knot approach its neighbor, leaving all other knots fixed, then

$$\lim_{\mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{t}^*} M_{\mathbf{t}} = \infty, \text{ while } M_{\mathbf{t}^*} = 2.$$

Correspondingly, their bound goes to infinity as $\mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{t}^*$, yet is again finite for the particular knot sequence $\mathbf{t}^*$.

This puzzling aspect is removed below. It is shown that (as asserted in a footnote to [1]) their very nice argument can be used to give a bound in terms of the smaller global mesh ratio

$$(1) \quad M_{\mathbf{t}}^{(k)} := \max_i (t_{i+k} - t_i) / \min_i (t_{i+k} - t_i)$$

Received November 10, 1975

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 41A15.

Key words and phrases. Least-squares approximation by splines, error bounds.

*Sponsored by the United States Army under Contract No. DAAG29-75-C-0024.

which does depend continuously on $\mathbf{t}$ in $\{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \mid t_i \leq t_{i+1}, t_i < t_{i+k}, \text{ all } i\}$.

2. Least-Squares Approximation by Splines of Order k . Let $\mathbf{t} := (t_i)_1^{n+k}$ be a nondecreasing sequence, with $t_i < t_{i+k}$, all i . A spline of order k with knot sequence $\mathbf{t}$ is, by definition, any function of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i N_i$$

with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and N_i the normalized B -spline of order k with knots $t_i, \dots, t_{i+k}$, i.e.,

$$N_i(t) := N_{i,k,\mathbf{t}}(t) := (t_{i+k} - t_i)[t_i, \dots, t_{i+k}](\cdot - t)_+^{k-1}.$$

In words, for each t , $N_i(t)$ is $(t_{i+k} - t_i)$ times the k th divided difference at $t_i, \dots, t_{i+k}$ of $(s - t)_+^{k-1}$ as a function of s .

We denote the totality of all splines of order k with knot sequence $\mathbf{t}$ by $\mathbf{S}_{k,\mathbf{t}}$. More detail about $\mathbf{S}_{k,\mathbf{t}}$ is provided in [1] and its references.

Next, let L_k denote the linear projector on $\mathbf{L}_1$ defined by the condition that $L_k f \in \mathbf{S}_{k,\mathbf{t}}$, and, for all $g \in \mathbf{S}_{k,\mathbf{t}}$, $\int (f - L_k f)g = 0$, i.e., $L_k f$ is the $\mathbf{L}_2$ -approximation to f in $\mathbf{S}_{k,\mathbf{t}}$. We are interested in estimating the norm $\|L_k\|_p$ of L_k as a map on $\mathbf{L}_p$. Since

$$\|L_k\|_p = \|L_k\|_q \quad \text{for } 1/p + 1/q = 1,$$

and $\|L_k\|_2 = 1$, interpolation will give a bound on $\|L_k\|_p$ in terms of $\|L_k\|_\infty = \|L_k\|_1$, as is pointed out in [2]. It therefore suffices to consider $\|L_k\|_\infty$.

Let $L_k f = \sum \alpha_j N_j$. Then $\|L_k f\|_\infty \leq \|\alpha\|_\infty$ since $N_i \geq 0$, all i , and $\sum_j N_j \leq 1$, while

$$\sum_j \int N_i N_j \alpha_j = \int N_i f \leq [(t_{i+k} - t_i)/k] \|f\|_\infty, \quad \text{all } i,$$

since $N_i \geq 0$ and $\int N_i = (t_{i+k} - t_i)/k$. Therefore,

$$(2) \quad \|L_k\|_\infty \leq \|G^{-1}\|_\infty$$

with

$$(3) \quad G := G_\infty = E^{1/2} G_2 E^{-1/2},$$

where E is a diagonal matrix,

$$(4) \quad E := \lceil k/(t_{k+1} - t_1), \dots, k/(t_{k+n} - t_n) \rceil,$$

and G_2 is the Gramian matrix for the basis $(N_i)_1^n$ of $\mathbf{S}_{k,\mathbf{t}}$, i.e.

$$(5) \quad G_2 := \left(\int N_i N_j \right)_{i,j=1}^n$$

and

$$(6) \quad N_i^p := [k/(t_{i+k} - t_i)]^{1/p} N_i.$$

With this normalization, we are assured of the existence of a positive constant D_k depending only on k and not at all on $\mathbf{t}$ or n so that

$$(7) \quad D_k^{-1} \|\alpha\|_p \leq \left\| \sum_j \alpha_j N_j^p \right\|_p \leq \|\alpha\|_p, \quad \text{all } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$$

(see the theorem on p. 539 of [1]). This inequality implies that

$$(8) \quad \|G_2^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \text{const}_k$$

for some const_k depending only on k as we will show below; and, on combining this with (2)–(4), we obtain the desired conclusion

$$(9) \quad \|L_k\|_\infty \leq \text{const}_k (M_t^{(k)})^{1/2}.$$

3. A Bound for $\|G_2^{-1}\|_\infty$. With $(\alpha_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n := G_2^{-1}$, let $f_i := \sum_j \alpha_{ij} N_j^2$. Then

$$\int f_i N_j = \delta_{ij}, \quad \text{all } j;$$

hence

$$\int \alpha_{ii} N_i^2 f_i + \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_{ij} N_j^2 f_i = \alpha_{ii},$$

i.e.,

$$(10) \quad \|f_i\|_2^2 = \alpha_{ii}.$$

Therefore, by (7),

$$D_k^{-2} \alpha_{ii}^2 \leq D_k^{-2} \sum_j |\alpha_{ij}|^2 \leq \|f_i\|^2 = \alpha_{ii},$$

hence, as $\alpha_{ii} = \|f_i\|_2^2 \neq 0$ (G_2^{-1} is invertible!), we have $\alpha_{ii} \leq D_k^2$; and so, $\|f_i\|_2 \leq D_k$ and

$$(11) \quad \left(\sum_j |\alpha_{ij}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq D_k \|f_i\|_2 = D_k (\alpha_{ii})^{1/2} \leq D_k^2.$$

This shows that

$$\|G_2^{-1}\|_\infty = \max_i \sum_j |\alpha_{ij}| \leq n^{1/2} \max_i \left(\sum_j |\alpha_{ij}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq n^{1/2} D_k^2$$

and so bounds $\|G_2^{-1}\|_\infty$ in terms of only k and n . From this, one obtains

$$\|G^{-1}\|_\infty \leq (n M_t^{(k)})^{1/2} D_k^2,$$

a bound in terms of the desired global mesh ratio, except that the bound goes to infinity with the number of mesh points. Note that we can express $M_t^{(k)}$ in terms of n and the local mesh ratio

$$m_t^{(k)} := \max_{|i-j|=1} (t_{i+k} - t_i) / (t_{j+k} - t_j);$$

hence, we even have a bound on $\|G^{-1}\|_\infty$ in terms of that *local* mesh ratio but, alas, involving also n .

In order to remove this dependence on n , we use the ideas of Douglas, Dupont and Wahlbin [2] to prove the following lemma.

LEMMA 1. *There exist const_k and $\lambda_k \in (0, 1)$ independent of n or t so that, for all i and j ,*

$$|\alpha_{ij}| \leq \text{const}_k (\lambda_k)^{|i-j|}.$$

Proof. We observed earlier that the function $f_i = \sum_j \alpha_{ij} N_j^2$ is orthogonal to $\text{span}(N_j)_{j \neq i}$. Hence, for any $m > i$,

$$f_{i,m} := \sum_{m \leq j} \alpha_{ij} N_j^2$$

is orthogonal to f_i and, therefore, also orthogonal to $f_{i,m-k+1}$ since the latter function agrees with f_i on the support of $f_{i,m}$. This proves that

$$(12) \quad \|f_{i,m-k+1}\|_2^2 + \|f_{i,m}\|_2^2 = \|f_{i,m-k+1} - f_{i,m}\|_2^2$$

from which we conclude that

$$\left\| \sum_{m-k < j} \alpha_{ij} N_j^2 \right\|_2^2 \leq \left\| \sum_{m-k < j < m} \alpha_{ij} N_j^2 \right\|_2^2$$

or, with the inequality (7),

$$(13) \quad \sum_{m-k < j < m} |\alpha_{ij}|^2 \geq D_k^{-2} \sum_{m-k < j} |\alpha_{ij}|^2, \quad m = i+1, i+2, \dots$$

Faced with a similar inequality, Douglas, Dupont and Wahlbin [2] make use of what amounts to the following discrete Gronwall inequality:

LEMMA 2. *If the sequence $a_0, a_1, \dots$ satisfies*

$$(14) \quad |a_m| \geq c \sum_{m \leq j} |a_j|, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

for some $c \in (0, 1)$, then $\lambda := 1 - c \in (0, 1)$ and

$$(15) \quad |a_m| \leq |a_0| \lambda^m / c, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Proof. Let $A_m := \sum_{m \leq j} |a_j|$. Then (14) reads

$$A_m - A_{m+1} \geq c A_m, \quad \text{all } m,$$

or, $A_{m+1} \leq (1 - c) A_m$, all m , therefore, with $\lambda := 1 - c$,

$$A_{m+j} \leq \lambda^j A_m, \quad \text{all } m, j,$$

and so,

$$|a_m| = A_m - A_{m+1} \leq A_m \leq \lambda^m A_0 \leq |a_0| \lambda^m / c. \quad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

In order to apply this lemma to (12), we pick $m_0 > i$ and let

$$J_m := \{j \in \mathbb{Z} \mid m_0 + (k-1)(m-1) \leq j < m_0 + (k-1)m\}, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots$$

Then, with

$$a_m := \sum_{j \in J_m} |\alpha_{ij}|^2, \quad \text{all } m,$$

we obtain from (12) that

$$a_m \geq D_k^{-2} \sum_{m \leq j} a_j, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

hence, from the lemma,

$$\max_{j \in J_m} |\alpha_{ij}| \leq a_m^{1/2} \leq D_k (1 - D_k^{-2})^{m/2} a_0^{1/2}$$

while, by (11),

$$a_0^{1/2} \leq \left(\sum_j |\alpha_{ij}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq D_k^2.$$

This proves the asserted exponential decay of $|\alpha_{ij}|$ for $j > i$; but G_2 is symmetric. Q.E.D.

It follows at once that

$$(16) \quad \|G_2^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \text{const}_k 2/(1 - \lambda_k).$$

In view of the discussion at the end of Section 2, we have therefore proved the following theorem.

THEOREM 1. *There exists a constant c depending only on k so that the norm $\|L_k\|_\infty$ of L_2 -approximation by splines of order k with knot sequence $\mathbf{t}$, as a map on L_∞ , satisfies*

$$\|L_k\|_\infty \leq c(M_{\mathbf{t}}^{(k)})^{1/2}$$

with the global mesh ratio $M_{\mathbf{t}}^{(k)}$ given by

$$M_{\mathbf{t}}^{(k)} := \max_{i,j} (t_{i+k} - t_i)/(t_{j+k} - t_j).$$

There seems to be little hope that this argument would even support a bound in terms of $\hat{m}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(k)}$, let alone a bound independent of the mesh $\mathbf{t}$.

4. A Mesh Independent Bound for L_2 -Approximation by C^0 -Piecewise Polynomials. Pick $k > 1$. Let $\xi = (\xi_i)_1^r$ in (a, b) with $a =: \xi_0 < \dots < \xi_{r+1} := b$, and let Pf be the L_2 -approximation to f by elements of $\mathbf{P}_{k,\xi} \cap C^0 := \{f \in C[a, b] \mid f|_{(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1})} \in \mathbf{P}_k\}$. Todd Dupont [3] has shown some time ago that P can be bounded as a map on L_∞ independently of ξ by constructing a basis for $\text{ran } P$ for which a certain matrix related to the Gramian is strictly diagonally dominant. We take the occasion to give a proof in terms of B -splines.

If $\mathbf{t} = (t_i)_{i=1}^{n+k}$ is the nondecreasing sequence which contains a and b exactly k times and each of $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r$ exactly $k-1$ times (and nothing else), then

$$\mathbf{P}_{k,\xi} \cap C^0 = \mathbf{S}_{k,\mathbf{t}},$$

hence then $P = L_k$ introduced in Section 2, therefore, $\|P\| \leq \|G^{-1}\|$ with G given by (3)–(6) in terms of $\mathbf{t}$ as determined from ξ .

THEOREM 2. *Let $\hat{G} := (k \int_0^1 N_i N_j)_{i,j=1}^k$ be the matrix G in the special case $r = 0$, $[a, b] = [0, 1]$. Then, for all ξ , $\|G^{-1}\|_\infty = \|\hat{G}^{-1}\|_\infty$. In particular, $\|P\| \leq \|\hat{G}^{-1}\|_\infty$ for all ξ . Hence (T. Dupont) $\sup_\xi \|P\| < \infty$.*

Proof. Let $\xi_{-1} = a$, $\xi_{r+2} = b$. Then, for $m = 0, \dots, r+1$, $N_{m(k-1)+1}$ has its support on the two intervals (ξ_{m-1}, ξ_{m+1}) of ξ . All other N_i have their support in just one interval. Correspondingly, the matrix G is almost block diagonal, with $r+1$ $k \times k$ blocks overlapping in just one row and column. For $k = 4$ (the cubic case) and $r = 2$ this looks like

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
x & x & x & x & & & \\
x & x & x & x & & & \\
x & x & x & x & & & \\
x & x & x & x & x & x & x \\
& & x & x & x & x & \\
& & x & x & x & x & \\
& & x & x & x & x & x & x & x \\
& & & x & x & x & x & \\
& & & x & x & x & x & \\
& & & & x & x & x & x
\end{array}$$

Since the linear change of the independent variable taking $[\xi_m, \xi_{m+1}]$ to $[0, 1]$ carries

$$N_{m(k-1)+i} \text{ on } [\xi_m, \xi_{m+1}] \text{ to } \hat{N}_i \text{ on } [0, 1], \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

we have

$$(17) \quad G_{m(k-1)+i, m(k-1)+j} = \begin{cases} (\Delta \xi_m / (\xi_{m+1} - \xi_{m-1})) \hat{G}_{1j}, & i = 1 \\ \hat{G}_{ij}, & i = 2, \dots, k-1 \\ (\Delta \xi_m / (\xi_{m+2} - \xi_m)) \hat{G}_{kj}, & i = k \end{cases}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k,$$

for $m = 0, \dots, r$. This says that each of the $r+1$ blocks of G is essentially equal to $\hat{G}$.

G is totally positive by [1]. Its inverse is therefore a checkerboard matrix, hence (see [1, p. 541])

$$(18) \quad \text{if } y \text{ is such that } \sum_j G_{ij}(-)^{i+j} y_j = 1, \quad \text{all } i, \text{ then } \|G^{-1}\|_\infty = \|y\|_\infty.$$

But such a y is easily constructed. Take $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ so that

$$(19) \quad \sum_j \hat{G}_{ij}(-)^{i+j} x_j = 1, \quad \text{all } i,$$

and extend x to a $(k-1)$ -periodic function $y = (y_i)_1^n$ on all of $(1, \dots, n)$. This is possible since $x_k = x_1$ by symmetry. Then, for $i = m(k-1) + I$, we have from (17) and (19) that

$$\sum_j G_{ij}(-)^{i+j} y_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \hat{G}_{Ij}(-)^{I+j} x_j = 1, \quad I = 2, \dots, k-1; m = 0, \dots, r,$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_j G_{ij}(-)^{i+j} y_j &= (\Delta \xi_{m-1} / (\xi_{m+1} - \xi_{m-1})) \sum_j \hat{G}_{kj}(-)^{k+j} x_j \\
&\quad + (\Delta \xi_m / (\xi_{m+1} - \xi_{m-1})) \sum_j \hat{G}_{1j}(-)^{1+j} x_j = 1
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{for } I = 1; m = 0, \dots, r+1.$$

This proves with (18) that

$$\|G^{-1}\|_\infty = \|y\|_\infty = \|x\|_\infty = \|\hat{G}^{-1}\|_\infty. \quad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

Mathematics Research Center
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

1. C. de BOOR, "Bounding the error in spline interpolation," *SIAM Rev.*, v. 16, 1974, pp. 531–544. MR 50 # 13976.
2. J. DOUGLAS, JR., T. DUPONT & L. WAHLBIN, "Optimal L_∞ error estimates for Galerkin approximations to solutions of two-point boundary value problems," *Math. Comp.*, v. 29, 1975, pp. 475–483. MR 51 # 7298.
3. T. DUPONT, Private communication.