

COCONVEX APPROXIMATION IN THE UNIFORM NORM: THE FINAL FRONTIER

K. KOPOTUN (Winnipeg)¹, D. LEVIATAN (Tel Aviv) and I. A. SHEVCHUK (Kyiv)²

Abstract. The paper deals with approximation of a continuous function, on a finite interval, which changes convexity finitely many times, by algebraic polynomials which are *coconvex* with it. We give final answers to open questions concerning the validity of Jackson type estimates involving the weighted Ditzian–Totik moduli of smoothness.

1. Introduction

Our main interest in this paper is approximation of a continuous function, on a finite interval, which changes convexity finitely many times, by algebraic polynomials which are *coconvex* with it. This topic has received much attention in recent years, and the purpose of this paper is to give final answers to open questions concerning the validity of Jackson type estimates involving the weighted Ditzian–Totik (D-T) moduli of smoothness.

Let $\mathbf{C}[a, b]$ denote the space of continuous functions f on $[a, b]$, equipped with the uniform norm $\|f\|_{[a,b]} := \max_{x \in [a,b]} |f(x)|$. When dealing with the generic interval $[-1, 1]$, we omit the special reference to the interval, namely, we write $\|f\| := \|f\|_{[-1,1]}$.

To make the notion of *coconvexity* more precise we first denote by \mathbf{Y}_s , $s \geq 1$, the set of all collections $Y_s := \{y_i\}_{i=1}^s$, such that $y_{s+1} := -1 < y_s < \dots < y_1 < 1 =: y_0$, and $Y_0 := \{\emptyset\}$. Let $\Delta^2(Y_s)$ denote the collection of all functions $f \in \mathbf{C}[-1, 1]$ that change convexity at the points of the set Y_s , and are convex in $[y_1, 1]$. In particular, $\Delta^2 := \Delta^2(Y_0)$ is the set of all convex functions $f \in \mathbf{C}[-1, 1]$. Also with $\Pi(x) := \prod_{i=1}^s (x - y_i)$, if $f \in \mathbf{C}^2(-1, 1) \cap$

¹Supported by NSERC of Canada.

²Supported by grant “Dnipro”.

Key words and phrases: coconvex approximation by polynomials, degree of approximation.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 41A10, 41A25, 41A29.

$\mathbf{C}[-1, 1]$, then $f \in \Delta^2(Y_s)$ if and only if

$$(1.1) \quad f''(x)\Pi(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in (-1, 1).$$

In fact, in this paper we will be able to use (1.1), as the results for functions that are not in $\mathbf{C}^2(-1, 1)$, are already known.

We say that functions f and g are coconvex if both of them belong to the same class $\Delta^2(Y_s)$ (note that it is possible for a function to belong to more than one class $\Delta^2(Y_s)$, for example, $f \equiv 0$ is in $\Delta^2(Y_s)$ for *all* sets Y_s).

Let \mathbf{P}_n be the space of all algebraic polynomials of degree $\leq n - 1$, and denote by

$$E_n(f) := \inf_{p_n \in \mathbf{P}_n} \|f - p_n\| \quad \text{and} \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) := \inf_{p_n \in \mathbf{P}_n \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)} \|f - p_n\|$$

the degrees of best uniform polynomial approximation and best uniform coconvex polynomial approximation of f , respectively. In particular,

$$E_n^{(2)}(f) := E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_0) = \inf_{p_n \in \mathbf{P}_n \cap \Delta^2} \|f - p_n\|$$

is the degree of best uniform convex polynomial approximation of $f \in \Delta^2$.

It is now known that the following equivalence relation is valid.

THEOREM 1.1. *For $f \in \Delta^2$ and any $\alpha > 0$, we have*

$$E_n(f) = O(n^{-\alpha}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty \quad \iff \quad E_n^{(2)}(f) = O(n^{-\alpha}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Despite the simplicity of its statement, Theorem 1.1 remained unresolved for quite some time, and while its particular cases have been known from as early as 1986, in its final form it appeared only very recently in [6] where the case for $\alpha = 4$ (which surprisingly turned out to be the most evasive case of all) has been proved (see [6] for more details).

One of the consequences of the results of this paper is an analog of Theorem 1.1 for coconvex polynomial approximation.

THEOREM 1.2. *For any $s \geq 0$, $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, $f \in \Delta^2(Y_s)$, and any $\alpha > 0$, we have*

$$E_n(f) = O(n^{-\alpha}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty \quad \iff \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) = O(n^{-\alpha}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Theorem 1.2 follows from the Jackson type estimates involving the weighted D-T moduli of smoothness (see, e.g., [12]), which we now introduce together with some related function spaces.

Throughout this paper we will have parameters k, l, m, r, s all of which will denote nonnegative integers, with $k + r > 0$.

With $\varphi(x) := \sqrt{1 - x^2}$, we denote by \mathbf{B}^r , $r \geq 1$, the space of all functions $f \in \mathbf{C}[-1, 1]$ with locally absolutely continuous $(r - 1)$ st derivative in $(-1, 1)$ such that $\|\varphi^r f^{(r)}\| < \infty$, where for $g \in \mathbf{L}_\infty[-1, 1]$, we write

$$\|g\| = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in [-1, 1]} |g(x)|.$$

This obviously conforms with our previous notation of the norm for $g \in \mathbf{C}[-1, 1]$.

Let

$$\varphi_\delta(x) := \sqrt{(1 - x - \delta\varphi(x)/2)(1 + x - \delta\varphi(x)/2)} = \sqrt{(1 - \delta\varphi(x)/2)^2 - x^2}.$$

The weighted D-T modulus of smoothness of a function $f \in \mathbf{C}(-1, 1)$, is defined by

$$\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t) := \sup_{0 < h \leq t} \|\varphi_{kh}^r(\cdot) \Delta_{h\varphi(\cdot)}^k(f, \cdot)\|,$$

where

$$\Delta_h^k(f, x) := \begin{cases} \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} (-1)^{k-i} f(x - kh/2 + ih), & \text{if } |x \pm kh/2| < 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is the k th symmetric difference.

If $r = 0$ and $f \in \mathbf{C}[-1, 1]$, then

$$\omega_k^\varphi(f, t) := \omega_{k,0}^\varphi(f, t) = \sup_{0 < h \leq t} \|\Delta_{h\varphi(\cdot)}^k(f, \cdot)\|,$$

is the (usual) D-T modulus. Also, if $\varphi(\cdot)$ in the above definition is replaced by 1, then we get the ordinary k th modulus of smoothness:

$$\omega_k(f, t) := \sup_{0 < h \leq t} \|\Delta_h^k(f, \cdot)\|.$$

Since $\varphi_\delta(x) \leq \varphi(x) \leq 1$, it is clear from the above definitions that, if $f \in \mathbf{C}[-1, 1]$, then

$$(1.2) \quad \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t) \leq \omega_k^\varphi(f, t) \leq \omega_k(f, t).$$

Also, for $f \in \mathbf{C}(-1, 1)$ and $k \geq 1$ we have

$$(1.3) \quad \omega_{k+1,r}^\varphi(f, t) \leq c\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t),$$

and

$$(1.4) \quad \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t) \leq c\|\varphi^r f\|.$$

Here and in the sequel, we write c for positive constants which may depend only on k , r , and s , while the constants C may depend on other parameters.

Finally, we need $\omega_k(f, t, [a, b])$, the ordinary k th modulus of smoothness on $[a, b] \subseteq [-1, 1]$, i.e.,

$$\omega_k(f, t, [a, b]) := \sup_{0 < h \leq t} \|\Delta_h^k(f, \cdot)\|_{[a+kh/2, b-kh/2]}.$$

The modulus $\omega_{k,r}^\varphi$ has many of the properties of the usual and D-T moduli of smoothness. In particular, for any $k \geq 1$, $r \geq 0$, and $f \in \mathbf{C}(-1, 1)$,

$$\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, \lambda t) \leq c(\lambda + 1)^k \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t), \quad \lambda > 0.$$

This, in turn, implies that if a function f is not a polynomial of degree $\leq k - 1$, then, for some $C = C(f) > 0$,

$$(1.5) \quad \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t) \geq Ct^k, \quad \text{for all } 0 < t \leq 1.$$

For arbitrary $f \in \mathbf{C}(-1, 1)$, the function $\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t)$ may be unbounded. However, it was shown in [8, 12] that a necessary and sufficient condition for $\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t)$ to be bounded for all $t > 0$ is that $\varphi^r f \in \mathbf{L}_\infty[-1, 1]$. Moreover, if $r \geq 1$, then $\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, t) \rightarrow 0$, as $t \rightarrow 0$, if and only if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm 1} \varphi^r(x)f(x) = 0$. Therefore, we denote $\mathbf{C}_\varphi^0 := \mathbf{C}[-1, 1]$ and, for $r \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{C}_\varphi^r := \left\{ f \in \mathbf{C}^r(-1, 1) \cap \mathbf{C}[-1, 1] \mid \lim_{x \rightarrow \pm 1} \varphi^r(x)f^{(r)}(x) = 0 \right\}.$$

Clearly

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \subset \mathbf{B}^r,$$

while if $f \in \mathbf{B}^r$, then $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^l$ for all $0 \leq l < r$, and

$$(1.7) \quad \omega_{r-l,l}^\varphi(f^{(l)}, t) \leq ct^{r-l} \|\varphi^r f^{(r)}\|, \quad t > 0.$$

Note that for $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r$, and any $0 \leq l \leq r$ and $k \geq 1$, the following inequalities hold (see [12]):

$$(1.8) \quad \omega_{k+r-l,l}^\varphi(f^{(l)}, t) \leq ct^{r-l} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, t), \quad t > 0,$$

in particular, if $l = 0$, then

$$(1.9) \quad \omega_{k+r}^\varphi(f, t) \leq ct^r \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, t), \quad t > 0.$$

Finally for $0 \leq l < r/2$,

$$(1.10) \quad \mathbf{B}^r \subset \mathbf{C}^l[-1, 1].$$

In this paper, we are interested in determining for which values of the parameters k , r , and s , the statement: if $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, then

$$(1.11) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) \leq Cn^{-r} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n), \quad n \geq N,$$

where $C = \text{const} > 0$ and $N = \text{const} > 0$, is valid, and for which it is invalid. Here and later in this paper, for clarity of exposition, we denote $\omega_{0,r}(f, t) := \|\varphi^r f\|$. Hence, in the case $k = 0$, (1.11) becomes:

$$E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) \leq Cn^{-r} \|\varphi^r f^{(r)}\|, \quad n \geq N,$$

for $f \in \mathbf{B}^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$.

The structure of our paper is as follows. In Section 2, our main results are stated. After collecting some auxiliary results in Section 3, we prove the positive results in Section 4 and the negative results in Section 5.

2. Main results

In this section we state our main results devoted to investigating for which values of the parameters k , r and s , the estimate (1.11) is valid, and for which it is invalid.

In particular, we wish to know the range of parameters k , r and s , for which (1.11) holds and, if it does hold, whether or not it is necessary for the constants C and N to essentially depend on Y_s (or even f), or whether it is true with C and N dependent only on the parameters k , r , and s .

For reader's convenience we describe our results using arrays in Figs. 1 and 2 below. There, the symbols “−”, “⊖”, “⊕”, and “+”, have the following meaning:

• The symbol “−” in the position (k, r) means that, for each $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$ there is a function $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^r E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s)}{\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n)} = \infty.$$

This means that the estimate (1.11) is invalid even if we allow both constants C and N to depend on the function f .

• The symbol “ \ominus ” in the position (k, r) means that (1.11) is valid with an absolute constant C , and N depending on the function f and, for any $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, there are no constants C and N , both of which are independent of f , such that (1.11) holds for every function $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$.

• The symbol “ \oplus ” in the position (k, r) means that (1.11) is valid with C depending only on k, r , and s , and N depending only k, r , and the set Y_s and, there are no constants C and N , both of which are independent of Y_s , such that (1.11) holds for all $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$ and $f \in \Delta^2(Y_s) \cap \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r$.

• The symbol “+” in the position (k, r) means that (1.11) is valid with C depending only on k, r , and s , and $N = k + r$.

REMARK. Evidently, in the “cases \ominus ”, we also have (1.11) with $C(f)$ and $N = 1$. Taking into account the estimates by Pleshakov and Shatalina [11] for $n = k + r$, in the “cases \oplus ”, our results imply that (1.11) is valid also for $C = C(k, r, Y_s)$ and $N = k + r$.




Fig. 1: $s = 1$




Fig. 2: $s \geq 2$

REMARK. It follows from the inequalities (1.3), (1.4), and (1.8) that a positive result for a specific pair (k_0, r_0) implies positive results of the same

type for all (k, r) with $r_0 \leq r \leq k_0 + r_0 - k$. Similarly, a negative result for (k_0, r_0) , $k_0 > 0$, implies negative results of the same type for all (k, r) with $k_0 + r_0 - k \leq r \leq r_0$, and a negative result for $(0, r_0)$, implies negative results of the same type for all (k, r) with $r_0 - k \leq r < r_0$.

This, in particular, implies the following:

(i) If the symbol “ $-$ ” appears in the position (k_0, r_0) , then “ $-$ ” should appear in all positions (k, r) with $k_0 + r_0 - k \leq r \leq r_0$.

(ii) If the symbol “ \ominus ” appears in the position (k_0, r_0) , then in all positions (k, r) with $r_0 \leq r \leq k_0 + r_0 - k$, we can have anything but “ $-$ ” and, in all positions (k, r) with $k_0 + r_0 - k \leq r \leq r_0$ we can have only “ \ominus ” or “ $-$ ”.

(iii) If the symbol “ \oplus ” appears in the position (k_0, r_0) , then in all positions (k, r) with $r_0 \leq r \leq k_0 + r_0 - k$, we can have only “ $+$ ” or “ \oplus ” and, if $k_0 = 0$, then in all positions (k, r) with $r_0 - k \leq r < r_0$, we can have anything but “ $+$ ”.

(iv) If the symbol “ $+$ ” appears in the position (k_0, r_0) , then “ $+$ ” should appear in all positions (k, r) with $r_0 \leq r \leq k_0 + r_0 - k$.

The results described by Figs. 1 and 2 are obtained in or can be derived from our theorems and the papers listed in the table on the next page.

We now give precise statements of the theorems yielding results summarized in the above arrays.

We begin with estimates for functions $f \in \mathbf{B}^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$. Recall that we denote by c positive constants that may depend only on all or some of the parameters k , r , and s . We first have

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $r \geq 1$, $s \geq 1$, and $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, be given. If $f \in \mathbf{B}^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, then*

$$(2.1) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) \leq cn^{-r} \|\varphi^r f^{(r)}\|, \quad n \geq N(r, Y_s),$$

where $N(r, Y_s)$ is a constant which may depend only on r and Y_s .

For $r \leq 3$, Theorem 2.1 follows from [5], thus we only have to prove it for $r \geq 4$.

REMARK. It is interesting to note that, in the case $s = 0$, the following result holds (see [7, 4, 10]): For any $f \in \Delta^2$ and $r \neq 4$,

$$(2.2) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f) \leq cn^{-r} \|\varphi^r f^{(r)}\|, \quad n \geq r.$$

Moreover, the above statement is invalid for $r = 4$, however, it is valid, if the inequality $n \geq 4$ is replaced by $n \geq N(f)$.

Unlike in the situation with (2.2), inequality (2.1) holds for all $r \geq 1$, that is, including the case $r = 4$.

Positive results: “+” in position (k, r)		
2002 —	$(2, 0)$ for $s = 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid k + r \leq 2\}$ for $s = 1$ $\{(k, 7) \mid k \geq 0\}$ for $s = 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid k \geq 0, r \geq 7\}$ for $s = 1$	Leviatan and Shevchuk [9] Theorem 2.3 ($k = 0$) and Theorem 2.11 ($k \geq 1$)
Positive results: “ \oplus ” in position (k, r)		
1999 — — —	$(3, 0)$ for $s \geq 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid k + r \leq 3\}$ for $s \geq 2$, and $\{(k, r) \mid k + r = 3\}$ for $s = 1$ $\{(k, 5) \mid k \geq 0\}$ for $s \geq 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid k \geq 0, r \geq 5\}$ for $s \geq 2$, and $\{(k, r) \mid k \geq 0, 5 \leq r \leq 6\}$ for $s = 1$ $(3, 2)$ for $s \geq 2$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid 2 \leq r \leq 5 - k\}$ for $s \geq 2$ $(2, 2)$ for $s = 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid 3 \leq k + r \leq 4, r \geq 2\}$ for $s = 1$	Kopotun, Leviatan and Shevchuk [5] Theorem 2.1 ($k = 0$) and Theorem 2.5 ($k \geq 1$) Theorem 2.7 Theorem 2.8
Positive results: “ \ominus ” in position (k, r)		
—	$(3, 2)$ for $s = 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid k = 5 - r, 2 \leq r \leq 4\}$ for $s = 1$	Theorem 2.8
Negative results: “-” in position (k, r)		
1993 2003 —	$(3, 1)$ for $s \geq 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid 4 - k \leq r \leq 1\}$ for $s \geq 1$ $(4, 2)$ for $s \geq 1$; $\therefore \{(k, 2) \mid 6 - k \leq r \leq 2\}$ for $s \geq 1$ $(2, 4)$ for $s \geq 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid 6 - k \leq r \leq 4\}$ for $s \geq 1$	Zhou [13] Gilewicz and Yushchenko [3] Theorem 2.13
Negative results: “ \ominus ” in position (k, r)		
—	$(1, 4)$ for $s = 1$; $\therefore (2, 3)$ and $(3, 2)$ for $s = 1$	Theorem 2.15
Negative results: “+” CANNOT be in position (k, r)		
2000 2002 — —	$(2, 1)$ for $s \geq 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid 3 - k \leq r \leq 1\}$ for $s \geq 1$ $\{(0, r) \mid 1 \leq r \leq 3\}$ for $s \geq 2$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid k \geq 0, 1 - k \leq r \leq 2\}$ for $s \geq 2$ $\{(0, r) \mid r \geq 1\}$ for $s \geq 2$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid k + r \geq 1\}$ for $s \geq 2$ $\{(0, r) \mid 3 \leq r \leq 6\}$ for $s = 1$; $\therefore \{(k, r) \mid 3 - k \leq r \leq 6\}$ for $s = 1$	Pleshakov and Shatalina [11] Leviatan and Shevchuk [9] Theorem 2.2 Theorem 2.4

Next, we show that for $s \geq 2$, the constant $N(r, Y_s)$ in (2.1) cannot be replaced by a constant independent of Y_s . Namely,

THEOREM 2.2. *Let $s \geq 2$ and $r \geq 1$ be given. Then for each $n \geq 1$, there are a collection $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$ and an $f := f_n \in \mathbf{C}^r[-1, 1] \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, such that*

$$(2.3) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) > cn(n^{-r} \|f^{(r)}\|).$$

For $s = 1$, we face a different situation. Depending on the value of r , it is sometimes possible to replace $N(r, Y_1)$ by $N(r)$, while for other r 's it is impossible.

THEOREM 2.3. *Suppose $s = 1$. If either $r \leq 2$ or $r \geq 7$, then (2.1) is valid with $N = r$.*

For $r \leq 2$, Theorem 2.3 follows from [9], thus we will prove it only for $r \geq 7$.

On the other hand, we show

THEOREM 2.4. *Let $s = 1$ and $3 \leq r \leq 6$. Then for each $n \geq 1$ and every $A > 0$, there exist $Y_1 := \{y_1\}$ and a function $f := f_{n,A} \in \mathbf{B}^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_1)$, such that*

$$(2.4) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) > A \|\varphi^r f^{(r)}\|.$$

Moreover, for $r = 6$ the function $f_{n,A}$ satisfying (2.4), may be taken in $\mathbf{C}_\varphi^6 \cap \Delta^2(Y_1)$.

Note that the latter part of Theorem 2.4 provides the needed counterexample that implies that the symbol \oplus in entries $(k, 6)$, $k \geq 1$, in Fig. 1, may not be replaced by $+$.

We now consider analogous estimates for $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$. First, we have

THEOREM 2.5. *Let $k \geq 1$, $r = 5$, $s \geq 1$, and $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, be given. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^5 \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, then*

$$(2.5) \quad E_n(f, Y_s) \leq cn^{-5} \omega_{k,5}^\varphi(f^{(5)}, 1/n), \quad n \geq N(k, Y_s),$$

where $N(k, Y_s) = \text{const}$, depends on k and Y_s .

An immediate consequence of Theorem 2.5 and (1.8) is

COROLLARY 2.6. *Let $k \geq 1$, $r \geq 5$, $s \geq 1$, and $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, be given. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, then*

$$E_n(f, Y_s) \leq cn^{-r} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n), \quad n \geq N(k, r, Y_s),$$

where $N(k, r, Y_s) = \text{const}$, depends on k , r and Y_s .

We also prove the following.

THEOREM 2.7 ($s \geq 2$). *Let $s \geq 2$, and let $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$ be given. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2 \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, then*

$$(2.6) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) \leq cn^{-2} \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n), \quad n \geq N(Y_s),$$

where $N(Y_s) = \text{const}$, depends on Y_s .

THEOREM 2.8 ($s = 1$). Let $Y_1 \in \mathbf{Y}_1$ be given. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2 \cap \Delta^2(Y_1)$, then

$$(2.7) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + cn^{-4}\omega_{2,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n), \quad n \geq N(Y_1),$$

where $N(Y_1) = \text{const}$, depends on Y_1 . Hence

$$(2.8) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{2,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n), \quad n \geq N(Y_1).$$

Moreover,

$$(2.9) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + cn^{-6}\|f''\|_{[-1/2, 1/2]}, \quad n \geq N(Y_1),$$

and therefore

$$(2.10) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n), \quad n \geq N(f).$$

By virtue of (1.8), immediate consequences of Theorems 2.7 and 2.8 are the following results.

COROLLARY 2.9 ($s \geq 2$). Let $s \geq 2$, $2 \leq r \leq 4$, $1 \leq k \leq 5 - r$, and $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, be given. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, then

$$(2.11) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) \leq cn^{-r}\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n), \quad n \geq N(Y_s).$$

COROLLARY 2.10 ($s = 1$). Let $s = 1$, $2 \leq r \leq 4$, and $Y_1 \in \mathbf{Y}_1$, be given. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_1)$, then

$$E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) \leq cn^{-r}\omega_{5-r,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n), \quad n \geq N(f),$$

and for $1 \leq k \leq 4 - r$,

$$E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) \leq cn^{-r}\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n), \quad n \geq N(Y_1).$$

REMARK. In view of (1.7), it readily follows from Theorem 2.2 that, in the case $s \geq 2$, the condition that N in the above statements, depends on Y_s , is essential and cannot be removed. Thus, there cannot be the symbol “+” in any positions (k, r) in Fig. 2. This is in contrast to the case $s = 1$ where in Fig. 1 we do have positions with “+” symbol (see Theorem 2.11 below).

THEOREM 2.11. Let $k \geq 1$ and $Y_1 \in \mathbf{Y}_1$ be given. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^7 \cap \Delta^2(Y_1)$, then

$$(2.12) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) \leq cn^{-7}\omega_{k,7}^\varphi(f^{(7)}, 1/n), \quad n \geq k + 7.$$

Again, by virtue of (1.8), an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.11 is

COROLLARY 2.12. *Let $k \geq 1$, $r \geq 7$, and $Y_1 \in \mathbf{Y}_1$, be given. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_1)$, then*

$$E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) \leq cn^{-r} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n), \quad n \geq k+r.$$

At the same time, we have the following negative result.

THEOREM 2.13. *Let $s \geq 1$. For each $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$ there is a function $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^4 \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, such that*

$$(2.13) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^4 E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s)}{\omega_{2,4}^\varphi(f^{(4)}, 1/n)} = \infty.$$

Therefore, (1.8) implies

COROLLARY 2.14. *For every $0 \leq r \leq 4$, $k \geq 6-r$, and for each $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, there is a function $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^r E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s)}{\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n)} = \infty.$$

Furthermore, in the special case $s = 1$ and $r = 4$, we have

THEOREM 2.15. *For every $Y_1 \in \mathbf{Y}_1$ and every $n \geq 1$, there is a function $f := f_n \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^4 \cap \Delta^2(Y_1)$, such that*

$$E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_1) > C \frac{\ln n}{n^4} \omega_{1,4}^\varphi(f^{(4)}, 1),$$

where $C = C(Y_1)$.

This shows that the symbols “ \ominus ” in Fig. 1 cannot be replaced by “ \oplus ”.

3. Auxiliary results

The following results were proved in [10] (see Corollaries 2.4 and 2.6 there).

LEMMA 3.1. *Let $k \geq 1$, and let $f \in \mathbf{C}^2[a, a+h]$, $h > 0$, be convex. Then there exists a convex polynomial P of degree $\leq k+1$ satisfying $P(a) = f(a)$, $P(a+h) = f(a+h)$, $P'(a) \geq f'(a)$, and $P'(a+h) \leq f'(a+h)$, and such that*

$$\|f - P\|_{[a, a+h]} \leq ch^2 \omega_k(f'', h, [a, a+h]).$$

LEMMA 3.2. *Let $k > 1$, and let $a < \beta < a + h$ be fixed, and assume that $f \in \mathbf{C}^2[a, a + h]$ is such that*

$$f''(x)(x - \beta) \geq 0, \quad a \leq x \leq a + h.$$

If a polynomial $p \in \mathbf{P}_{k-1}$ satisfies

$$p(x)(x - \beta) \geq 0, \quad a \leq x \leq a + h,$$

then there exists a polynomial $P \in \mathbf{P}_{k+1}$ such that $P'' = p$,

$$P(a) = f(a), \quad P'(a) \leq f'(a), \quad P'(a + h) \leq f'(a + h),$$

and

$$\|f - P\|_{[a, a+h]} \leq \frac{3}{2}h^2\|f'' - p\|_{[a, a+h]}.$$

Let $x_j := \cos(j\pi/n)$, $0 \leq j \leq n$, be the Chebyshev knots, and denote $I_j := [x_j, x_{j-1}]$, and $|I_j| := x_{j-1} - x_j$, $1 \leq j \leq n$. Denote by $\Sigma_{k,n}$ the collection of all continuous piecewise polynomials of degree $k - 1$, on the Chebyshev partition $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^n$.

Given $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, let

$$O_i := O_{i,n}(Y_s) := (x_{j+1}, x_{j-2}), \quad \text{if } y_i \in [x_j, x_{j-1}),$$

where $x_{n+1} := -1$, $x_{-1} := 1$, and denote

$$O = O(n, Y_s) := \bigcup_{i=1}^s O_i.$$

Finally, we write $j \in H = H(n, Y_s)$, if $I_j \cap O = \emptyset$, and denote by $\Sigma_{k,n}(Y_s)$ the subset of $\Sigma_{k,n}$ consisting of those continuous piecewise polynomials S for which

$$p_j \equiv p_{j+1} \quad \text{whenever } j, j + 1 \notin H,$$

where $p_j := S_{I_j}$. In other words, piecewise polynomials from $\Sigma_{k,n}(Y_s)$ do not have any knots “too close” to the points $y_i \in Y_s$ of convexity change.

THEOREM 3.3 ([9, Theorem 3]). *For every $k \geq 1$ and $s \geq 1$ there are constants c and $c_* = c_*(k, s)$, such that if $n \geq 1$, $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, and $S \in \Sigma_{k,n}(Y_s) \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, then there is a polynomial $P_n \in \Delta^2(Y_s)$ of degree $\leq c_*n$, satisfying*

$$(3.1) \quad \|S - P_n\| \leq c\omega_k^\varphi(S, 1/n).$$

Let $[z_0, \dots, z_m; g]$ stand for the m -th divided difference of a function g at the knots z_0, \dots, z_m .

LEMMA 3.4. Let $f \in \mathbf{C}(-1, 1)$, let $k \geq 1$ and $r \geq 0$ be such that $k + r \geq 3$, and let $1 \leq \mu \leq n - k$ be fixed. Then, for all $1 \leq j \leq \mu$,

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & |[x_\mu, \dots, x_{\mu+k-1}; f] - [x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+k-1}; f]| \\ & \leq cn^{2k+r-2} \left(\frac{1}{\min\{j, n-\mu\}} \right)^{k+r-2} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $k + r \geq 5$, then for all ν and j such that $1 \leq j \leq \nu \leq \mu$, we also have

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \varepsilon([x_\nu, \dots, x_{\nu+k-2}; f] - [x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+k-2}; f]) \\ & \leq cn^{2k+r-4} \left(1 + \frac{n^2}{(n-\mu)^{k+r-2}} \right) \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon := \operatorname{sgn}([x_\mu, \dots, x_{\mu+k-1}; f])$.

Note that the right hand sides of both inequalities (3.2) and (3.3) are finite if $\|\varphi^r f\| < \infty$. Otherwise both are infinite, while the left hand sides are always finite, hence, the lemma is trivially valid in this case.

PROOF. For convenience, everywhere in the proof below, we write $[x_j, \dots, x_{j+l}]$ instead of $[x_j, \dots, x_{j+l}; f]$, and we put $\mathbf{w} := \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n)$. Also, note that, for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\varphi(x_i) \sim \min\{i, n-i\}/n$, and $|I_i| \sim \min\{i, n-i\}/n^2$, where, as usual, $\alpha_i \sim \beta_i$ means that $\frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i}$ is bounded away from 0 and ∞ .

The following inequality is contained in the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [6]:

$$(3.4) \quad |[x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+k}]| \leq cn^k \left(\frac{n}{\min\{j, n-j\}} \right)^{k+r} \mathbf{w},$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq n - k - 1$.

Now, for any $m \geq 0$ and $1 \leq j \leq \sigma < n - m$, we have

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & [x_\sigma, \dots, x_{\sigma+m}] - [x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+m}] \\ & = \sum_{i=j}^{\sigma-1} (x_{i+m+1} - x_i)[x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+m+1}]. \end{aligned}$$

This, with $m = k - 1$, $\sigma = \mu$, together with the inequality (3.4) for $1 \leq j < \mu \leq n - k$, implies

$$|[x_\mu, \dots, x_{\mu+k-1}] - [x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+k-1}]|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \sum_{i=j}^{\mu-1} (x_{i+k} - x_i) [x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+k}] \right| \\
&\leq c \sum_{i=j}^{\mu-1} |I_i| n^k \left(\frac{n}{\min \{i, n-i\}} \right)^{k+r} \mathbf{w} \\
&\leq cn^{2k+r-2} \mathbf{w} \sum_{i=j}^{\mu-1} \left(\frac{1}{\min \{i, n-i\}} \right)^{k+r-1} \\
&\leq cn^{2k+r-2} \mathbf{w} \sum_{i=\min \{j, n-\mu\}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{k+r-1}} \leq cn^{2k+r-2} \left(\frac{1}{\min \{j, n-\mu\}} \right)^{k+r-2} \mathbf{w},
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality we used $k+r \geq 3$. Thus, (3.2) is proved.

Now, suppose that $k+r \geq 5$. Applying (3.5) with $m = k-2$ and $\sigma = \nu$ and (3.2), for all $1 \leq j \leq \nu \leq \mu$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon ([x_\nu, \dots, x_{\nu+k-2}] - [x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+k-2}]) \\
&= \varepsilon \sum_{i=j}^{\nu-1} (x_{i+k-1} - x_i) [x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+k-1}] \\
&= \varepsilon \sum_{i=j}^{\nu-1} (x_i - x_{i+k-1}) ([x_\mu, \dots, x_{\mu+k-1}] - [x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+k-1}]) \\
&\quad - \varepsilon [x_\mu, \dots, x_{\mu+k-1}] \sum_{i=j}^{\nu-1} (x_i - x_{i+k-1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=j}^{\nu-1} (x_i - x_{i+k-1}) |[x_\mu, \dots, x_{\mu+k-1}] - [x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+k-1}]| \\
&\leq cn^{2k+r-2} \mathbf{w} \sum_{i=j}^{\nu-1} |I_i| \left(\frac{1}{\min \{i, n-\mu\}} \right)^{k+r-2} \\
&\leq cn^{2k+r-4} \mathbf{w} \sum_{i=j}^{\nu-1} \frac{\min \{i, n-i\}}{(\min \{i, n-\mu\})^{k+r-2}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq cn^{2k+r-4} \mathbf{w} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu-1} \frac{\min\{i, n-i\}}{(\min\{i, n-\mu\})^{k+r-2}} =: \mathcal{S}.$$

Now, since $k+r \geq 5$, if $\mu \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, then

$$\mathcal{S} \leq cn^{2k+r-4} \mathbf{w} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{k+r-3}} \leq cn^{2k+r-4} \mathbf{w},$$

and if $\mu > \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &\leq cn^{2k+r-4} \mathbf{w} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-\mu} \frac{1}{i^{k+r-3}} + \sum_{i=n-\mu+1}^{\mu-1} \frac{\min\{i, n-i\}}{(n-\mu)^{k+r-2}} \right) \\ &\leq cn^{2k+r-4} \mathbf{w} \left(1 + \frac{1}{(n-\mu)^{k+r-2}} \sum_{i=1}^n i \right) \leq cn^{2k+r-4} \mathbf{w} \left(1 + \frac{n^2}{(n-\mu)^{k+r-2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

REMARK. Taking into account the inequality

$$|[x_\mu, \dots, x_{\mu+k-1}; f]| \leq cn^{k-1} \left(\frac{n}{\min\{\mu, n-\mu\}} \right)^{k+r-1} \omega_{k-1,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n),$$

(see (3.4)), it follows from (3.2) that for any $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and $r \in \mathbf{N}_0$ such that $k+r \geq 3$, all $f \in \mathbf{C}(-1, 1)$, and every $1 \leq j \leq n-k$, the following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} |[x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+k-1}; f]| &\leq cn^{2k+r-2} \left(\frac{1}{\min\{j, n-\mu\}} \right)^{k+r-2} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n) \\ &\quad + cn^{k-1} \left(\frac{n}{\min\{\mu, n-\mu\}} \right)^{k+r-1} \omega_{k-1,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, taking $j=1$ and $\mu = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad |[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k; f]| \leq cn^{2k+r-2} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n) + cn^{k-1} \omega_{k-1,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n).$$

Also, the same sequence of inequalities that was used to prove (3.3), in fact implies,

$$|[x_\nu, \dots, x_{\nu+k-2}; f] - [x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+k-2}; f]|$$

$$\leq c|[x_\mu, \dots, x_{\mu+k-1}; f]| + cn^{2k+r-4} \left(1 + \frac{n^2}{(n-\mu)^{k+r-2}} \right) \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n),$$

if $k+r \geq 5$, and in particular,

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & |[x_\nu, \dots, x_{\nu+k-2}; f] - [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}; f]| \\ & \leq cn^{2k+r-4} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n) + cn^{k-1} \omega_{k-1,r}^\varphi(f, 1/n). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_{n-j} = -x_j$ for all $0 \leq j \leq n$, we may apply Lemma 3.4 to the function $f_1(x) := f(-x)$, observing that

$$[x_i, \dots, x_\sigma; f_1] = (-1)^{\sigma-i} [x_{n-i}, \dots, x_{n-\sigma}; f],$$

and $\omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f, \delta) = \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f_1, \delta)$. Hence we get the following corollary (note that while it is valid for general k, r and j we only give its statement for $k=3, r=2, j=1$ and $j=n-1$ which is what we need in this paper).

COROLLARY 3.5. *Let $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2$. Then*

(a) *For any index $1 \leq \mu \leq n-3$, if $\operatorname{sgn} \{ [x_\mu, x_{\mu+1}, x_{\mu+2}; f''] \} = \varepsilon$, then*

$$(3.8) \quad -\varepsilon [x_1, x_2, x_3; f''] \leq cn^6 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

Moreover, if an index $1 \leq \nu \leq \mu$ is such that $\operatorname{sgn} \{ [x_\nu, x_{\nu+1}; f''] \} = \varepsilon$, then we also have

$$(3.9) \quad -\varepsilon [x_1, x_2; f''] \leq cn^4 \left(1 + \frac{n^2}{(n-\mu)^3} \right) \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

(b) *For any index $1 \leq \mu \leq n-3$, if $\operatorname{sgn} \{ [x_{n-\mu}, x_{n-\mu-1}, x_{n-\mu-2}; f''] \} = \varepsilon$, then*

$$(3.10) \quad -\varepsilon [x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f''] \leq cn^6 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

Moreover, if an index $1 \leq \nu \leq \mu$ is such that $\operatorname{sgn} \{ [x_{n-\nu}, x_{n-\nu-1}; f''] \} = -\varepsilon$, then we also have

$$(3.11) \quad \varepsilon [x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f''] \leq cn^4 \left(1 + \frac{n^2}{(n-\mu)^3} \right) \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

We note that, for a set $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, $s \geq 1$, if

$$n \geq 4 \left(\min_{1 \leq j \leq s+1} \{ y_{j-1} - y_j \} \right)^{-1} =: \mathcal{N}(Y_s),$$

then there is at least one knot x_i between y_{j-1} and y_j , for all $1 \leq j \leq s+1$.

The following are consequences of Corollary 3.5 for $f \in \Delta(Y_s)$, $s \geq 2$.

COROLLARY 3.6 ($s \geq 3$). Let $s \geq 3$, $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2 \cap \Delta(Y_s)$, and

$$n \geq \max \left\{ \mathcal{N}(Y_s), \left(\min \{ \varphi(y_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq s \} \right)^{-3} \right\}.$$

Then

$$(3.12) \quad \max \left\{ |[x_1, x_2, x_3; f'']|, |[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f'']| \right\} \leq cn^6 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and

$$(3.13) \quad \max \left\{ |[x_1, x_2; f'']|, |[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f'']| \right\} \leq cn^4 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

COROLLARY 3.7 ($s = 2$). Let $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2 \cap \Delta(Y_2)$, and

$$n \geq \max \left\{ \mathcal{N}(Y_2), \left(\min \{ \varphi(y_1), \varphi(y_2) \} \right)^{-3} \right\}.$$

Then

$$(3.14) \quad \max \left\{ -[x_1, x_2, x_3; f''], -[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f''] \right\} \leq cn^6 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and

$$(3.15) \quad \max \left\{ -[x_1, x_2; f''], [x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f''] \right\} \leq cn^4 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

PROOF OF COROLLARIES 3.6 AND 3.7. For the sake of convenience denote $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}(Y_s) := \min \{ \varphi(y_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq s \}$. Let $s \geq 2$ and $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2 \cap \Delta(Y_s)$, be given. Observe that if an index i is such that $y_s \leq x_i \leq y_1$, then

$$4 \min \{ i, n - i \} \geq n \sin(i\pi/n) = n\varphi(x_i) \geq n \min \{ \varphi(y_s), \varphi(y_1) \} \geq \mathcal{A}n.$$

Now, let the indices μ_1 , ν_1 , ν_2 , and μ_2 (if $s \geq 3$) be such that $f''(x_{\mu_1+1}) = \min \{ f''(x_i) \mid y_2 \leq x_i \leq y_1 \}$, $x_{\nu_1+1} \leq y_1 < x_{\nu_1}$, $x_{\nu_2+1} \leq y_2 < x_{\nu_2}$, and

$$f''(x_{\mu_2+1}) = \max \{ f''(x_i) \mid y_3 \leq x_i \leq y_2 \}.$$

Then, using $f''(x)(x - y_1)(x - y_2) \geq 0$ for all $x \geq y_3$ (or $x > -1$ if $s = 2$), we conclude that the following inequalities hold:

$$1 \leq \nu_1 \leq \mu_1 < \nu_2 \leq n - 2, \quad \nu_2 \leq \mu_2 \leq n - 3 \text{ (if } s \geq 3),$$

$$[x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_1+1}, x_{\mu_1+2}; f''] \geq 0, \quad [x_{\nu_1}, x_{\nu_1+1}; f''] \geq 0,$$

$$[x_{\mu_2}, x_{\mu_2+1}, x_{\mu_2+2}; f''] \leq 0, \quad [x_{\nu_2}, x_{\nu_2+1}; f''] \leq 0.$$

Now by Corollary 3.5(a) with $\mu = \mu_1$ and $\nu = \nu_1$, taking into account that $n - \mu_1 + 1 \geq \mathcal{A}n/4$, it follows that

$$(3.16) \quad -[x_1, x_2, x_3; f''] \leq cn^6 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and

$$(3.17) \quad -[x_1, x_2; f''] \leq cn^4 \left(1 + \frac{n^2}{(n - \mu_1)^3}\right) \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) \leq cn^4 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

Further, if $s \geq 3$, then Corollary 3.5(a) with $\mu = \mu_2$ and $\nu = \nu_2$, and the observation that $n - \mu_2 \geq \mathcal{A}n/4$, imply

$$(3.18) \quad [x_1, x_2, x_3; f''] \leq cn^6 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and

$$(3.19) \quad [x_1, x_2; f''] \leq cn^4 \left(1 + \frac{n^2}{(n - \mu_2)^3}\right) \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) \leq cn^4 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

This in turn implies that

$$|[x_1, x_2, x_3; f'']| \leq cn^6 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) \quad \text{and} \quad |[x_1, x_2; f'']| \leq cn^4 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and the analogous inequalities for

$$|[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f'']| \quad \text{and} \quad |[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f'']|,$$

follow by symmetry. This completes the proof of Corollary 3.6.

In order to complete the proof of Corollary 3.7 it suffices to use Corollary 3.5(b) with $\mu = n - \mu_1 - 2$ and $\nu = n - \nu_2 - 1$, and the estimate $\mu_1 + 1 \geq \mathcal{A}n/4$, and to combine the resulting inequalities with (3.16) and (3.17). \square

In the case $s = 1$, let $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2 \cap \Delta(Y_1)$. Then, just as in the proof above, for the index ν_1 such that $x_{\nu_1+1} \leq y_1 < x_{\nu_1}$, we have $[x_{\nu_1}, x_{\nu_1+1}; f'''] \geq 0$. Hence, by virtue of (3.6) and (3.7) with $k = 3$, $r = 2$, and $\nu = \nu_1$, we obtain the following result (the estimates for $[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f''']$ and $[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f''']$ follow by symmetry), that will be used in the proof of (2.7) and (2.8).

COROLLARY 3.8 ($s = 1$). Let $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2 \cap \Delta(Y_1)$, and $n \geq 7(\varphi(y_1))^{-3}$.

Then

$$(3.20) \quad \max \left\{ |[x_1, x_2, x_3; f'']|, |[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f'']| \right\} \\ \leq cn^6 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + cn^2 \omega_{2,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and

$$(3.21) \quad \max \left\{ -[x_1, x_2; f''], -[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f''] \right\} \\ \leq cn^4 \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + cn^2 \omega_{2,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of [6, Corollary 3.5] and will be used in the proof of estimates (2.9) and (2.10).

LEMMA 3.9. Let $n \geq 9$, $m = 1$ or $m = 2$, and $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2$. Then,

$$(3.22) \quad \max \left\{ |[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m+1}; f'']|, |[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, \dots, x_{n-m-1}; f'']| \right\} \\ \leq cn^{2m+2} \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + c \|f''\|_{[-1/2, 1/2]}.$$

Let

$$l_1(x) := f''(x_1) + (x - x_1)[x_1, x_2; f''] + (x - x_1)(x - x_2)[x_1, x_2, x_3; f''],$$

be the quadratic polynomial function which interpolates f'' at x_1 , x_2 and x_3 ; and symmetrically, let

$$l_n(x) := f''(x_{n-1}) + (x - x_{n-1})[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f''] \\ + (x - x_{n-1})(x - x_{n-2})[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f'']$$

be the quadratic polynomial which interpolates f'' at x_{n-1} , x_{n-2} and x_{n-3} .

The following lemma is a consequence of [6, Lemma 3.1].

LEMMA 3.10. Let $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^2$, $n \geq 4$, and let the polynomials \mathfrak{p}_1 and \mathfrak{p}_n of degree ≤ 4 be such that $\mathfrak{p}_1^{(i)}(x_1) = f^{(i)}(x_1)$ and $\mathfrak{p}_n^{(i)}(x_{n-1}) = f^{(i)}(x_{n-1})$, for $i = 0, 1$, and $\mathfrak{p}_1''(x) = l_1(x)$, $\mathfrak{p}_n''(x) = l_n(x)$. Then,

$$(3.23) \quad \|f - \mathfrak{p}_1\|_{I_1} \leq cn^{-2} \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and

$$(3.24) \quad \|f - \mathfrak{p}_n\|_{I_n} \leq cn^{-2} \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

We end this section by recalling that for $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r$, it was shown in [6] (see inequalities (3.4) and (3.5) there), that

$$(3.25) \quad |I_j|^l \omega_{k+r-l}^\varphi(f^{(l)}, |I_j|, I_j) \leq cn^{-r} \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, n^{-1}),$$

where either $1 < j < n$ and $0 \leq l \leq r$, or $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $0 \leq l < r/2$.

4. Proofs of the positive results

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5. In view of Theorem 3.3 and the estimate

$$\omega_{k+5}^\varphi(s_n, 1/n) \leq c\|f - s_n\| + c\omega_{k+5}^\varphi(f, 1/n) \leq c\|f - s_n\| + cn^{-5}\omega_{k,5}^\varphi(f^{(5)}, 1/n)$$

(see (1.9)), we only need to construct a spline $s_n \in \Sigma_{k+5,n}(Y_s) \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, such that

$$(4.1) \quad \|f - s_n\| \leq cn^{-5}\omega_{k,5}^\varphi(f^{(5)}, 1/n).$$

Inequality (3.25) with $l = 3$ and $r = 5$ implies

$$(4.2) \quad |I_j|^3 \omega_{k+2}(f^{(3)}, |I_j|, I_j) \leq cn^{-5}\omega_{k,5}^\varphi(f^{(5)}, 1/n)$$

for $1 < j < n$, while, with $l = 2$ and $r = 5$, it implies

$$(4.3) \quad |I_j|^2 \omega_{k+3}(f'', |I_j|, I_j) \leq cn^{-5}\omega_{k,5}^\varphi(f^{(5)}, 1/n)$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Taking these estimates into account, the same construction as in [10, Proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2] yields a spline $s_n \in \Sigma_{k+5,n}(Y_s)$ which is coconvex with f on $[-1, 1]$ and such that (4.1) holds. For the sake of completeness, we briefly describe this construction.

We take $N(Y_s)$ to be so large that, for $n \geq N$, the sets O_i , $1 \leq i \leq s$, are all disjoint and do not contain the endpoints of the interval $[-1, 1]$. Now, if $I_j \cap O = \emptyset$, then f does not change its convexity on I_j , and Lemma 3.1 implies that there exists a polynomial $p_j \in \mathbf{P}_{k+5}$ which is coconvex with f , interpolates it at the endpoints of I_j , and such that $p'_j(x_j) \geq f'(x_j)$ and $p'_j(x_{j-1}) \leq f'(x_{j-1})$ (if f is convex on I_j), or $p'_j(x_j) \leq f'(x_j)$ and $p'_j(x_{j-1}) \geq f'(x_{j-1})$ (if f is concave on I_j), and satisfies

$$\|f - p_j\|_{I_j} \leq c|I_j|^2 \omega_{k+3}(f'', |I_j|, I_j) \leq cn^{-5}\omega_{k,5}^\varphi(f^{(5)}, 1/n).$$

Now, it is convenient to denote the endpoints of O_i by a_i and b_i , i.e., $O_i = (a_i, b_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq s$. For each $1 \leq i \leq s$, there exists a polynomial $\tilde{p}_i \in \mathbf{P}_{k+3}$ which is copositive with f'' on O_i (i.e., $\tilde{p}_i(x)f''(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in O_i$) and such that (see [2, Corollary 3.1])

$$\|f'' - \tilde{p}_i\|_{O_i} \leq c|O_i| \omega_{k+2}(f^{(3)}, |O_i|, O_i).$$

Lemma 3.2 implies that there exists a polynomial $\bar{p}_i \in \mathbf{P}_{k+5}$ such that $\bar{p}'_i(a_i) \leq f'(a_i)$ and $\bar{p}'_i(b_i) \leq f'(b_i)$ (if f is such that $f''(x)(x - y_i) \geq 0$ for $x \in O_i$), or $\bar{p}'_i(a_i) \geq f'(a_i)$ and $\bar{p}'_i(b_i) \geq f'(b_i)$ (if f is such that $f''(x)(x - y_i) \leq 0$ for $x \in O_i$), and satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \bar{p}_i\|_{O_i} &\leq c|O_i|^2 \|f'' - \tilde{p}_i\|_{O_i} \leq c|O_i|^3 \omega_{k+2}(f^{(3)}, |O_i|, O_i) \\ &\leq cn^{-5} \omega_{k,5}^\varphi(f^{(5)}, 1/n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (4.2), the observation that $|O_i| \sim |I_j|$ where j is such that $y_i \in I_j$, and the fact that O_i is “far” from ± 1 .

Now, the piecewise polynomial continuous approximant $s_n \in \Sigma_{k+5,n}(Y_s) \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$ is constructed from the polynomial pieces p_j and \bar{p}_i in such a way that, if s_n is constructed for all $x \leq x_\nu$, then, on $[x_\nu, x_{\nu-1}]$ (or $[x_\nu, x_{\nu-3}] = O_\mu$ if x_ν happens to be the left endpoint of some interval O_μ) it is defined to be p_ν (or $\bar{p}_\mu + \alpha$, where the constant α is chosen in such a way as to make s_n continuous). It is not difficult to see now that s_n is coconvex with f and (4.1) holds. \square

PROOF OF THEOREMS 2.7 AND 2.8. Suppose that n is such that

$$n \geq \max \left\{ 4 \left(\min_{1 \leq j \leq s+1} \{y_{j-1} - y_j\} \right)^{-1}, \left(\min_{1 \leq j \leq s} \{\varphi(y_j)\} \right)^{-3} \right\}.$$

Then, in particular, f is of fixed convexity in $[x_2, 1]$ and in $[-1, x_{n-2}]$.

Again, we use the same construction as in [10, Proof of Theorem 4.1] which we described in the proof of Theorem 2.5 above. The only difference now is that, on each interval O_i , $1 \leq i \leq s$, the polynomial \tilde{p}_i is defined to be the quadratic polynomial interpolating f'' at a_i , y_i and b_i , whence, by Whitney’s inequality,

$$\|f'' - \tilde{p}_i\|_{O_i} \leq c\omega_3(f'', |O_i|, O_i).$$

Hence, using the inequality

$$|I_j|^2 \omega_3(f'', |I_j|, I_j) \leq cn^{-2} \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n), \quad 1 < j < n,$$

which follows from (3.25), we conclude that there exists a spline $s_n \in \Sigma_{5,n}(Y_s)$ which is coconvex with f on $[x_1, x_{n-1}]$, satisfies the inequality

$$(4.4) \quad \|f - s_n\|_{[x_{n-1}, x_1]} \leq cn^{-2} \omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and is such that

$$s_n(x_{n-1}+) = f(x_{n-1}), \quad (-1)^{s+1} s'_n(x_{n-1}+) \leq (-1)^{s+1} f'(x_{n-1}),$$

and $s'_n(x_1-) \leq f'(x_1)$.

We now extend the construction of s_n to the intervals I_1 and I_n preserving its coconvexity with the original function f , as well as keeping it close to f .

To this end, on I_1 and I_n , s_n is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} s_n(x_1+) &= s_n(x_1-), \quad s'_n(x_1+) = f'(x_1), \\ s_n^{(i)}(x_{n-1}-) &= f^{(i)}(x_{n-1}), \quad i = 0, 1, \\ s''_n(x) &:= f''(x_1) + (x - x_1) \max\{0, [x_1, x_2, f'']\} \\ &+ (x - x_1)(x - x_2) \max\{0, [x_1, x_2, x_3, f'']\}, \quad x \in I_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} s''_n(x) &:= f''(x_{n-1}) + (x - x_{n-1})(-1)^{s+1} \max\{0, (-1)^{s+1}[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f'']\} \\ &+ (x - x_{n-1})(x - x_{n-2})(-1)^s \max\{0, (-1)^s[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f'']\}, \quad x \in I_n. \end{aligned}$$

(We wish to emphasize that in the case $s \geq 3$, we could alternatively define $s''_n(x) := f''(x_1)$, $x \in I_1$, and $s''_n(x) := f''(x_{n-1})$, $x \in I_n$, which is somewhat simpler than the current construction, but would force us to consider the case $s \leq 2$ separately.)

Evidently, s_n is continuous on $[-1, 1]$ and is in $\Delta^2(Y_s)$ (since s'_n and $(-1)^s s'_n$ are non-decreasing on I_1 and I_n , respectively, we have that

$$(-1)^s s'_n(x_{n-1}-) \leq (-1)^s s'_n(x_{n-1}+),$$

and $s'_n(x_1-) \leq s'_n(x_1+)$).

Hence, it remains to estimate $\|f - s_n\|_{I_1}$ and $\|f - s_n\|_{I_n}$. First, we note that (4.4) implies that $\alpha := f(x_1) - s_n(x_1-)$ satisfies $|\alpha| \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n)$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.10 we have for every $x \in I_1$

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - s_n(x)| &\leq \|f - \mathbf{p}_1\|_{I_1} + |\mathbf{p}_1(x) - s_n(x)| \\ &\leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + \left| f(x_1) - s_n(x_1+) + \int_{x_1}^x (x-u)(\mathbf{l}_1(u) - s''_n(u)) du \right| \\ &\leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + |\alpha| + \left| \int_{x_1}^x (x-u)(\mathbf{l}_1(u) - s''_n(u)) du \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n) + cn^{-4}\|l_1 - s_n''\|_{I_1}.$$

Similarly (except that $s_n(x_{n-1}-) = f(x_{n-1}) = \mathfrak{p}_n(x_{n-1})$), for every $x \in I_n$, we have

$$|f(x) - s_n(x)| \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n) + cn^{-4}\|l_n - s_n''\|_{I_n}.$$

Now, for $x \in I_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (4.5) \quad 0 \leq s_n''(x) - l_1(x) &= (x - x_1)(\max\{0, [x_1, x_2, f'']\} - [x_1, x_2, f'']) \\ &+ (x - x_1)(x - x_2)(\max\{0, [x_1, x_2, x_3, f'']\} - [x_1, x_2, x_3, f'']) \\ &= (x - x_1)\max\{0, -[x_1, x_2, f'']\} \\ &+ (x - x_1)(x - x_2)\max\{0, -[x_1, x_2, x_3, f'']\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $s \geq 2$, we conclude by Corollaries 3.6 and 3.7, that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq s_n''(x) - l_1(x) &\leq (x - x_1)cn^4\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n) \\ &+ (x - x_1)(x - x_2)cn^6\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n) \leq cn^2\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n), \quad x \in I_1. \end{aligned}$$

For $s = 1$, we apply Corollary 3.8 and similarly conclude that

$$0 \leq s_n''(x) - l_1(x) \leq cn^2\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n) + c\omega_{2,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n), \quad x \in I_1.$$

Analogously, for $x \in I_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq (-1)^s(s_n''(x) - l_n(x)) &= (x_{n-1} - x)\max\{0, (-1)^s[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}; f'']\} \\ &+ (x - x_{n-1})(x - x_{n-2})\max\{0, (-1)^{s+1}[x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, x_{n-3}; f'']\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $s \geq 2$, by Corollaries 3.6 and 3.7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq (-1)^s(s_n''(x) - l_n(x)) &\leq (x_{n-1} - x)cn^4\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n) \\ &+ (x - x_{n-1})(x - x_{n-2})cn^6\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n) \leq cn^2\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n), \quad x \in I_n, \end{aligned}$$

and for $s = 1$, by Corollary 3.8 we get

$$0 \leq -(s_n''(x) - l_n(x)) \leq cn^2\omega_{3,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n) + c\omega_{2,2}^{\varphi}(f'', 1/n), \quad x \in I_n.$$

Also, in the case $s = 1$, applying Lemma 3.9 instead of Corollary 3.8 we have for $x \in I_1$

$$\begin{aligned} |s_n''(x) - \mathfrak{l}_1(x)| &\leq (x - x_1)|[x_1, x_2, f'']| + (x - x_1)(x - x_2)|[x_1, x_2, x_3, f'']| \\ &\leq n^{-2}|[x_1, x_2, f'']| + n^{-4}|[x_1, x_2, x_3, f'']| \\ &\leq cn^2\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + cn^{-2}\|f''\|_{[-1/2, 1/2]}, \end{aligned}$$

and the estimate for $\|s_n'' - \mathfrak{l}_n\|_{I_n}$ is derived analogously.

To summarize, in the case $s \geq 2$ we have

$$(4.6) \quad \|f - s_n\| \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n),$$

and in the case $s = 1$ we have

$$(4.7) \quad \|f - s_n\| \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + cn^{-6}\|f''\|_{[-1/2, 1/2]},$$

and

$$(4.8) \quad \|f - s_n\| \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) + cn^{-4}\omega_{2,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

By virtue of Lemma 3.3 and the estimate

$$\omega_5^\varphi(s_n, 1/n) \leq c\|f - s_n\| + c\omega_5^\varphi(f, 1/n) \leq c\|f - s_n\| + cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n)$$

(see (1.9)), we conclude that there exists a polynomial $P_n \in \Delta^2(Y_s)$ of degree $\leq cn$ such that

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f - P_n\| &\leq \|f - s_n\| + \|s_n - P_n\| \leq \|f - s_n\| + c\omega_5^\varphi(s_n, 1/n) \\ &\leq c\|f - s_n\| + cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the inequalities (4.6)–(4.8) we get (2.6), (2.7) and (2.9).

Finally, in order to prove (2.10), note that (1.5) implies that

$$n^3\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n) \geq C(f), \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Hence, for $n \geq \|f''\|_{[-1/2, 1/2]}/C(f) =: N(f)$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\|f''\|_{[-1/2, 1/2]} \leq C(f) \leq n^3\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n).$$

Therefore, it follows from (4.7) and (4.9) that

$$\|f - P_n\| \leq cn^{-2}\omega_{3,2}^\varphi(f'', 1/n), \quad n \geq N(f),$$

and (2.10) is proved. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1. As was mentioned above, Theorem 2.1 for $r \leq 3$ is due to [5]. For $r = 4$, it follows from (1.7) and Theorems 2.7 and 2.8, and for $r \geq 6$, Theorem 2.1 follows from (1.7) and Theorem 2.5. Finally, if $r = 5$, then, for $s \geq 2$, it follows from (1.7) and Theorem 2.7, and, for $s = 1$, we repeat the arguments of the proof of Theorem 2.5, replacing $\omega_{k,5}^\varphi(f^{(5)}, 1/n)$ by $\|\varphi^5 f^{(5)}\|$. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.11. We follow the proof of Theorem 2.5, where we observe that since $s = 1$, there is no need to separate the points of inflection. This time we construct an $S \in \Sigma_{k+7,n}(Y_s) \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$. Also, it follows by virtue of (1.10) that $f \in \mathbf{C}^3[-1, 1]$, and by (3.25) with $l = 3$ and $r = 7$, we have

$$|I_j|^3 \omega_{k+4}(f^{(3)}, |I_j|, I_j) \leq cn^{-7} \omega_{k,7}(f^{(7)}, 1/n), \quad 1 \leq j \leq n,$$

which we use instead of (4.2). Hence, even if $I_1 \cap O_1 \neq \emptyset$ or $I_n \cap O_1 \neq \emptyset$, we are on safe grounds and we do not need to make sure that O_1 is “far” from ± 1 . We omit the details. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3. As mentioned above, Theorem 2.3 for $r \leq 2$ was proved in [9]. For $r > 7$, Theorem 2.3 readily follows from Corollary 2.12 and (1.7). The case $r = 7$, is proved by applying the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.11, replacing $\omega_{k,7}(f^{(7)}, 1/n)$ by $\|\varphi^7 f^{(7)}\|$. \square

In order to prove Theorem 1.2, we need the following corollary which readily follows from the positive results described in Section 2 (see Figs. 1 and 2).

COROLLARY 4.1. *Let $r \geq 0$ and let $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$. If $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, then*

$$(4.10) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) = O(n^{-r} \omega_{1,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n)), \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and if, in addition, $r \neq 4$, then

$$(4.11) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) = O(n^{-r} \omega_{2,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, 1/n)), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2. Let $\alpha > 0$, $Y_s \in \mathbf{Y}_s$, and let $f \in \Delta^2(Y_s)$ be such that

$$E_n(f) = O(n^{-\alpha}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then the well known inverse theorem [1] (see also [12]) implies that for each pair (k, r) such that $r < \alpha < k + r$, we have that $f \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^r$, and

$$(4.12) \quad \omega_{k,r}^\varphi(f^{(r)}, t) = O(t^{\alpha-r}), \quad t \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, if $\alpha \notin \mathbf{N}$, then we put $r := [\alpha]$, and (4.10) yields

$$(4.13) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) = O(n^{-\alpha}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

If $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}$, then we put $r := \alpha - 1$. Then for $\alpha \neq 5$, (4.13) follows from (4.11) and (4.12). The proof for $\alpha = 5$ needs some modification of the proof of Theorem 2.5, we will not elaborate here. \square

5. Proofs of the negative results

We begin with two lemmas which we need for the proof of Theorem 2.2. It is possible that the following lemma is known but we have failed to find any similar result in the literature.

LEMMA 5.1. *Given a monotone odd function $g \in \mathbf{L}_1[-1, 1]$. Then, for every polynomial $P_{n-1} \in \mathbf{P}_{n-1}$, the following inequality holds*

$$(5.1) \quad \|g(\cdot/n)\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]} \|P_{n-1}\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]} \leq 2 \|gP_{n-1}\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]},$$

where, as usual, $\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]} := \int_{-1}^1 |f(x)| dx$.

Note that inequality (5.1) is sharp in that the constant 2 is exact since, for the function $g(x) = \operatorname{sgn}(x)$, (5.1) becomes an equality.

PROOF. Without loss of generality assume that $\|P_{n-1}\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]} = 1$ and $g(x) = 1$ for $1/n \leq x \leq 1$. We may further assume that g is absolutely continuous on $[-1, 1]$. Integration by parts, together with the observation that g' is an even function on $[-1, 1]$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| g\left(\frac{\cdot}{n}\right) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]} &= \int_{-1}^1 \left| g\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \right| dx \\ &= n \int_{-1/n}^{1/n} |g(x)| dx = 2 - 2n \int_0^{1/n} xg'(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|gP_{n-1}\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]} &= \int_{-1}^1 |P_{n-1}(x)| dx - \int_{-1}^1 (1 - |g(x)|) |P_{n-1}(x)| dx \\ &= 1 - \int_{-1/n}^{1/n} (1 - |g(x)|) |P_{n-1}(x)| dx \end{aligned}$$

$$= 1 - \int_0^{1/n} g'(x) \int_{-x}^x |P_{n-1}(u)| du dx.$$

Therefore, (5.1) is equivalent to

$$(5.2) \quad \int_0^{1/n} g'(x) \int_{-x}^x |P_{n-1}(u)| du dx \leq n \int_0^{1/n} xg'(x) dx.$$

Since g' is nonnegative, the proof will be complete if we show that, for any $0 \leq x \leq 1/n$,

$$\int_{-x}^x |P_{n-1}(u)| du \leq nx = \frac{n}{2} \int_{-x}^x du,$$

which, in turn, will be proved if we verify that

$$(5.3) \quad |P_{n-1}(x)| \leq \frac{n}{2} \quad \text{for all } -1/n \leq x \leq 1/n.$$

Now, let $-1 < \alpha < 1$ be such that $\int_{-1}^{\alpha} |P_{n-1}(x)| dx = \int_{\alpha}^1 |P_{n-1}(x)| dx = 1/2$, and define $Q_n(x) := \int_{\alpha}^x P_{n-1}(u) du$. Then, $Q_n \in \mathbf{P}_n$ and $\|Q_n\| \leq 1/2$. Therefore, by the Bernstein inequality, for all $-1/n \leq x \leq 1/n$,

$$|P_{n-1}(x)| = |Q_n'(x)| \leq \frac{n-1}{\sqrt{1-n^{-2}}} \|Q_n\| \leq \frac{n-1}{2\sqrt{1-n^{-2}}} \leq \frac{n}{2},$$

and the proof of the lemma is complete. \square

Taking $g(x) = x|x|$ in the statement of Lemma 5.1 we get the following corollary.

COROLLARY 5.2. *For every polynomial $P_{n-1} \in \mathbf{P}_{n-1}$, we have*

$$(5.4) \quad \|P_{n-1}\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]} \leq 3n^2 \|x^2 P_{n-1}\|_{\mathbf{L}_1[-1,1]}.$$

LEMMA 5.3. *Let $h \leq \frac{1}{3n}$, and let $P \in \mathbf{P}_{n+1}$ be such that*

$$(5.5) \quad (x^2 - h^2)P''(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in [-1, 1].$$

Then

$$(5.6) \quad P(-1) - 2P(0) + P(1) \geq 0.$$

PROOF. First of all, note that (5.5) implies that $P''(\pm h) = 0$ and, therefore, $P''(x) = (x^2 - h^2)Q(x)$, where $Q \in \mathbf{P}_{n-3}$ is nonnegative on I . Now, taking into account that

$$(1 - |x|)(x^2 - h^2) \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - x^2)(x^2 - 2h^2), \quad x \in [-1, 1],$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(-1) - 2P(0) + P(1) &= \int_{-1}^1 (1 - |x|)P''(x) dx \\ &= \int_{-1}^1 (1 - |x|)(x^2 - h^2)Q(x) dx \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 (1 - x^2)(x^2 - 2h^2)Q(x) dx \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Corollary 5.2 taking into account that the polynomial $R(x) := (1 - x^2)Q(x)$ of degree $\leq n - 2$ is nonnegative on $[-1, 1]$ and $2h^2 \leq \frac{1}{3n^2}$. \square

Using linear transformation of the interval $[-1, 1]$ to $[-1/2, 1/2]$ and change of variables, we immediately get the following consequence.

COROLLARY 5.4. *Let $h \leq \frac{1}{6n}$, and let $Q \in \mathbf{P}_n$ be such that*

$$(x^2 - h^2)Q''(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in [-1/2, 1/2].$$

Then

$$Q(-1/2) - 2Q(0) + Q(1/2) \geq 0.$$

We are ready with

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2. Suppose that $s \geq 2$ and $r \geq 1$ are given. Let $Y_s = \{y_i\}_{i=1}^s$ be such that $-1 < y_s < \dots < y_{s-2} \leq -1/2$, $y_2 = -h$ and $y_1 = h$, where $h = \frac{1}{6n}$. Now, let f be such that

$$f(x) = \int_0^x (x - t)f''(t) dt,$$

where

$$f''(t) := \begin{cases} -(h^2 - t^2)^r, & |t| \leq h, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $f \in \mathbf{C}^r[-1, 1] \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, and

$$(5.7) \quad \|f^{(r)}\| \leq ch^{r+2}.$$

Also, $f(0) = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} -f(1/2) - f(-1/2) &= -\int_0^{1/2} (1/2 - t)f''(t) dt - \int_0^{-1/2} (-1/2 - t)f''(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^h (1 - 2t)(h^2 - t^2)^r dt \geq \frac{1}{3h} \int_0^h (h^2 - t^2)^r 2t dt = \frac{h^{2r+1}}{3(r+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

If $Q_n \in \mathbf{P}_n$ is in $\Delta^2(Y_s)$ (whence, in particular, $(x^2 - h^2)Q''(x) \geq 0$ on $[-1/2, 1/2]$), then applying Corollary 5.4, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h^{2r+1}}{3(r+1)} &\leq -f(1/2) - f(-1/2) \leq Q_n(-1/2) - f(-1/2) - 2(Q_n(0) - f(0)) \\ &\quad + Q_n(1/2) - f(1/2) \leq |Q_n(-1/2) - f(-1/2)| + 2|Q_n(0) - f(0)| \\ &\quad + |Q_n(1/2) - f(1/2)| \leq 4\|Q_n - f\|, \end{aligned}$$

implying that

$$(5.8) \quad E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s) \geq \frac{h^{2r+1}}{12(r+1)}.$$

Now, by (5.7) and (5.8) and recalling that $h = 1/(6n)$, we have

$$\frac{n^r E_n^{(2)}(f, Y_s)}{\|f^{(r)}\|} \geq \frac{n^r h^{2r+1}}{12(r+1)ch^{r+2}} = cn.$$

This completes our proof. \square

We now construct counterexamples which prove our claims in Theorem 2.4.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4. Given $A > 0$, let

$$g_r(x) := \begin{cases} (-1)^{(r-1)/2} c_r (1+x)^{r/2}, & r = 3, 5, \\ c_4 (1+x)^2 \ln(1+x), & r = 4, \\ c_6 (1+x)^3 (3 - \ln(1+x)), & r = 6, \end{cases}$$

where the normalizing constants c_r are so chosen that

$$(5.9) \quad \|g_r^{(r)} \varphi^r\| = 1, \quad 3 \leq r \leq 6.$$

Thus, in particular, $g_r \in \mathbf{B}^r$.

First observe that

$$(5.10) \quad g_r^{(3)}(x) > 0, \quad 3 \leq r \leq 6, \quad \text{and} \quad g_r^{(5)}(x) > 0, \quad r = 5, 6, \quad x \in (-1, 1].$$

Denote $M_r := \|g_r\|$, $3 \leq r \leq 6$, let $m := \max\{4, n-1\}$, and take $b \in (-1, 0)$ to be such that

$$(5.11) \quad |g_r''(b)| > m^4(A + M_r), \quad r = 3, 4, \quad \text{and} \quad g_r^{(3)}(b) > m^6(A + M_r), \quad r = 5, 6.$$

Finally, let

$$f_b(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2!} \int_b^x g_r^{(3)}(t)(x-t)^2 dt, & r = 3, 4, \\ \frac{1}{4!} \int_b^x g_r^{(5)}(t)(x-t)^4 dt, & r = 5, 6, \end{cases}$$

that is, $f_b(x) = g_r(x) - T_r(x)$ where T_r is the Taylor polynomial about $x = b$, of degree 2, for $r = 3, 4$, and of degree 4, for $r = 5, 6$, respectively. Then in view of (5.10), it readily follows that f_b changes its convexity once in $(-1, 1)$, at $y_1 := b$. Now assume that some $p_n \in \mathbf{P}_n$ satisfying

$$(5.12) \quad p_n''(x)(x-b) \geq 0, \quad -1 \leq x \leq 1,$$

is such that

$$(5.13) \quad \|f_b - p_n\| \leq A \|g_r^{(r)} \varphi^r\| = A.$$

Then $\|T_r + p_n\| \leq A + M_r$, which by Markov's inequality implies,

$$(5.14) \quad \|T_r'' + p_n''\| \leq m^4(A + M_r),$$

and

$$(5.15) \quad \|T_r^{(3)} + p_n^{(3)}\| \leq m^6(A + M_r).$$

On the other hand, if $r = 3$ or $r = 4$, then by (5.11),

$$\|T_r'' + p_n''\| \geq |T_r''(b) + p_n''(b)| = |T_r''(b)| = |g_r''(b)| > m^4(A + M_r),$$

a contradiction to (5.14). If $r = 5$ or $r = 6$, then by (5.11),

$$\|T_r^{(3)} + p_n^{(3)}\| \geq T_r^{(3)}(b) + p_n^{(3)}(b) \geq T_r^{(3)}(b) = g_r^{(3)}(b) > m^6(A + M_r),$$

contradicting (5.15). Note that in the second inequality we used the fact that p_n'' passes from negative to positive at b , and therefore $p_n^{(3)}(b) \geq 0$.

We conclude that no polynomial satisfying (5.12), also verifies (5.13). This completes the first part of the proof.

What is left is to modify g_6 so that it will be in \mathbf{C}_φ^6 , and still preserve (2.4). To this end, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, set $g_\varepsilon := g_6(x + \varepsilon)$. Then $g_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{C}_\varphi^6$, $\|g_\varepsilon^{(6)}\varphi^6\| < 1$, $g_\varepsilon^{(3)}(x) > 0$, and $g_\varepsilon^{(5)}(x) > 0$, $x \in [-1, 1]$, and finally $M_\varepsilon := \|g_\varepsilon\| \leq 2M_6$. Now we take ε so small that

$$g_\varepsilon^{(3)}(-1) > m^6(A + 2M_6),$$

where we recall that $m := \max\{4, n - 1\}$, and we proceed with the above arguments to obtain a contradiction. \square

In order to prove Theorem 2.13, we let $b \in (0, 1)$, and set

$$g_b(x) := \Pi(x) \ln \frac{b}{1 + x + b}, \quad x \in [-1, 1],$$

where we recall that $\Pi(x) := \prod_{i=1}^s (x - y_i)$. Finally, we denote

$$G_b(x) := \int_{-1}^x (x - u)g_b(u) du, \quad x \in [-1, 1],$$

so that clearly, $G_b \in \mathbf{C}^\infty[-1, 1]$.

First, we prove

LEMMA 5.5. *The following estimates hold:*

$$(5.16) \quad \omega_{2,4}^\varphi(G_b^{(4)}, t) \leq c \left(1 + t^2 \ln \frac{1}{b} \right),$$

and

$$(5.17) \quad |g_b(x)| b \ln \frac{1}{b} \leq |\Pi(x)| (1 + x) \ln \frac{3e^2}{1 + x}, \quad x \in (-1, 1].$$

PROOF. First, since $G_b''(x) = g_1(x) + g_2(x)$, where $g_1(x) := \Pi(x) \ln b$ and $g_2(x) := -\Pi(x) \ln(1 + x + b)$, we have

$$\omega_{2,4}^\varphi(G_b^{(4)}, t) \leq \omega_{2,4}^\varphi(g_1'', t) + \omega_{2,4}^\varphi(g_2'', t) \leq \omega_2(g_1'', t) + c\|\varphi^4 g_2''\|,$$

where we used the inequalities (1.3) and (1.4).

Now,

$$\omega_2(g_1'', t) \leq t^2 \ln \frac{1}{b} \|\Pi''\| = ct^2 \ln \frac{1}{b},$$

and since $|(1+x) \ln(1+x+b)| \leq 3$, and $(1+x)/(1+x+b) \leq 1$, we conclude that

$$\|\varphi^4 g_2''\| \leq c(\|\Pi\| + \|\Pi'\| + \|\Pi''\|) \leq c.$$

This completes the proof of (5.16). Inequality (5.17) is proved in Lemma 5.1 in [6]. \square

Denote by \mathbf{P}_n^* the subset of polynomials $p_n \in \mathbf{P}_n$, such that $\Pi(-1)p_n''(-1) \geq 0$. Clearly, every polynomial p_n from $\mathbf{P}_n \cap \Delta^2(Y_s)$, is also in \mathbf{P}_n^* .

LEMMA 5.6. *For each $b \in (0, n^{-2})$ and every polynomial $p_n \in \mathbf{P}_n^*$, we have*

$$\|G_b - p_n\| \geq \frac{C}{n^4} \ln \frac{1}{n^2 b} - \frac{1}{n^4},$$

where $C = C(Y_s)$.

PROOF. Put

$$g_b^*(x) := -\Pi(x) \ln(n^2(1+x+b)), \quad l(x) := g_b(x) - g_b^*(x) = \Pi(x) \ln n^2 b,$$

so that l is a polynomial of degree s . Let

$$G_b^*(x) := \int_{-1}^x (x-u)g_b^*(u) du \quad \text{and} \quad L(x) := \int_{-1}^x (x-u)l(u) du.$$

Then we have $G_b^*(x) + L(x) = G_b(x)$. Also, for every $p_n \in \mathbf{P}_n^*$,

$$(5.18) \quad \Pi(-1)p_n''(-1) - \Pi(-1)L''(-1) \geq -\Pi(-1)l(-1) = \Pi^2(-1) \ln 1/n^2 b.$$

Straightforward computations yield

$$\int_{-1}^x |g_b^*(u)| du \leq c/n^2 + cn^2(1+x)^2, \quad -1 \leq x \leq 1,$$

whence

$$|G_b^*(x)| \leq \frac{c}{n^4} (1 + n^2(1+x))^3.$$

Hence,

$$|p_n(x) - L(x)| \leq \|p_n - G_b\| + \|G_b^*\|$$

$$\leq cn^6 \left(\|p_n - G_b\| + \frac{1}{n^4} \right) (1/n^2 + (1+x))^3.$$

We may apply now the Dzjadyk-type inequality used in [6], to obtain

$$|p_n''(-1) - L''(-1)| \leq cn^4 \left(\|p_n - G_b\| + \frac{1}{n^4} \right).$$

This combined with (5.18), in turn completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.13 by constructing a counterexample.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.13. The proof follows along the lines of the proof of Theorem 2.3 in [6], and we will only sketch it.

We begin with $b_n \in (0, 1/e)$, $n \geq 2$, such that $b_n \ln \frac{1}{b_n} = \frac{1}{n^2}$, and set

$$f_n(x) := c \frac{1}{n^2} G_{b_n}(x),$$

where $c < 1$ (which is independent of n) is taken so small that (5.21) and (5.22) below are fulfilled. We summarize the properties of f_n as follows from Lemma 5.5. Namely, for every $n \geq 2$, $f_n \in \mathbf{C}^\infty[-1, 1]$,

$$(5.19) \quad |f_n''(x)| \leq |\Pi(x)| (1+x) \ln \frac{3e^2}{1+x},$$

$$(5.20) \quad f_n(-1) = f_n'(-1) = f_n''(-1) = 0,$$

$$(5.21) \quad \|f_n^{(j)}\| < 1, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\varphi^{2j-4} f_n^{(j)}\| < 1, \quad j = 3, 4,$$

and

$$(5.22) \quad \omega_{2,4}^\varphi(f_n^{(4)}, 1/n) \leq n^{-2}.$$

The proof proceeds with no change constructing a subsequence f_{n_j} and an infinite sum which we continue to denote $f_1(x)$, and which differs from the one in [6] in that we multiply the second derivative of the latter by $\Pi(x)$. Therefore we have

$$|f_1''(x)| \leq 2|\Pi(x)| (1+x) \ln \frac{3e^2}{1+x},$$

so that if we put

$$f_2''(x) := 2\Pi(x)(1+x) \ln \frac{3e^2}{1+x},$$

and

$$f_2(x) := \int_{-1}^x (x-u)f_2''(u) du,$$

and if we denote $f(x) := f_1(x) + f_2(x)$, then $f \in \Delta^2(Y_s)$. The rest of the proof follows exactly as the proof of Theorem 2.3 in [6]. \square

Finally, we have

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.15. For $s = 1$, $Y_1 := \{y_1\}$, and $\Pi(x) = (x - y_1)$ is a polynomial of degree 1. We observe that Lemma 5.5 may be strengthened to yield $\omega_{1,4}(G_b^{(4)}, t) \leq c$. Let

$$F_b(x) := \frac{1}{b} \int_{-1}^x (x-u)\Pi(u)(u+1) du,$$

and set $f_b := G_b + F_b$. Since $F_b^{(4)}(x) = \text{const}$, its modulus of continuity vanishes, so that we have

$$\omega_{1,4}^\varphi(f_b^{(4)}, t) = \omega_{1,4}^\varphi(G_b^{(4)}, t) \leq c.$$

At the same time

$$\Pi(x)f_b''(x) = \Pi^2(x) \left(\frac{x+1}{b} + \ln \frac{b}{x+1+b} \right) \geq 0, \quad x \in [-1, 1],$$

so that $f_b \in \Delta^2(Y_1)$.

Since $F_b \in \mathbf{P}_n^*$ for $n \geq 5$, we may apply Lemma 5.6 and conclude that for every $p_n \in \mathbf{P}_n^*$,

$$\|f_b - p_n\| \geq \frac{C}{n^4} \ln \frac{1}{n^2 b} - \frac{1}{n^4}.$$

Hence, with $b = n^{-5/2}$ we obtain,

$$E_n^{(2)}(f_b, Y_1) \geq C \frac{\ln n}{n^4} \omega_{1,4}(f_b^{(4)}, 1). \quad \square$$

References

- [1] Z. Ditzian and V. Totik, *Moduli of Smoothness*, Springer Verlag (New York, 1987).
- [2] J. Gilewicz and I. A. Shevchuk, Comonotone approximation, *Fundam. Prikl. Mat.*, **2** (1996), 319–363 (in Russian).
- [3] J. Gilewicz and L. P. Yushchenko, A counterexample in coconvex and q -coconvex approximations, *East J. Approx.*, **8** (2002), 131–144.
- [4] K. A. Kopotun, Uniform estimates for coconvex approximation of functions by polynomials, *Mat. Zametki*, **51** (1992), 35–46. MR 93f:41014 (in Russian; translation in *Math. Notes*, **51** (1992), 245–254).
- [5] K. Kopotun, D. Leviatan and I. A. Shevchuk, The degree of coconvex polynomial approximation, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **127** (1999), 409–415. MR 99c:41010.
- [6] K. Kopotun, D. Leviatan and I. A. Shevchuk, Convex polynomial approximation in the uniform norm: conclusion, *Canadian Math. J.* (to appear), 23pp.
- [7] D. Leviatan, Pointwise estimates for convex polynomial approximation, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **98** (1986), 471–474. MR 88i:41010.
- [8] D. Leviatan and I. A. Shevchuk, Some positive results and counterexamples in comonotone approximation. II, *J. Approx. Theory*, **100** (1999), 113–143. MR 2000f:41026.
- [9] D. Leviatan and I. A. Shevchuk, Coconvex approximation, *J. Approx. Theory*, **118** (2002), 20–65. MR 2003f:41027.
- [10] D. Leviatan and I. A. Shevchuk, Coconvex polynomial approximation, *J. Approx. Theory*, **121** (2003), 100–118.
- [11] M. G. Pleshakov and A. V. Shatalina, Piecewise coapproximation and the Whitney inequality, *J. Approx. Theory*, **105** (2000), 189–210. MR 2002d:41014.
- [12] I. A. Shevchuk, *Approximation by Polynomials and Traces of the Functions Continuous on an Interval*, Naukova Dumka (Kyiv, 1992).
- [13] S. P. Zhou, On comonotone approximation by polynomials in L^p space, *Analysis*, **13** (1993), 363–376. MR 95d:41021.

(Received June 4, 2004; revised August 23, 2004)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, R3T 2N2
CANADA
E-MAIL: KOPOTUNK@CC.UMANITOBA.CA

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
RAYMOND AND BEVERLEY SACKLER FACULTY OF EXACT SCIENCES
TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY
TEL AVIV 69978
ISRAEL
E-MAIL: LEVIATAN@MATH.TAU.AC.IL

FACULTY OF MECHANICS AND MATHEMATICS
NATIONAL TARAS SHEVCHENKO UNIVERSITY OF KYIV
01033 KYIV, UKRAINE
E-MAIL: SHEVCHUK@UNIV.KIEV.UA