

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Lagrange interpolation at Pollaczek--Laguerre zeros on the real semiaxis

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1724928> since 2020-04-07T09:32:15Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.jat.2019.04.004

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the author's final version of the contribution published as:

Giuseppe Mastroianni and Incoronata Notarangelo Lagrange interpolation at Pollaczek–Laguerre zeros on the real semiaxis. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 245 (2019), pp. 83–100. DOI: 10.1016/j.jat.2019.04.004

The publisher's version is available at:

[<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0021904519300425>]

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Link to this full text:

[<http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1724928>]

This full text was downloaded from iris-AperTO: <https://iris.unito.it/>

LAGRANGE INTERPOLATION AT POLLACZEK-LAGUERRE ZEROS ON THE REAL SEMIAXIS

G. MASTROIANNI AND I. NOTARANGELO

ABSTRACT. In order to approximate functions defined on the real semiaxis, which can grow exponentially both at 0 and at $+\infty$, we introduce a suitable Lagrange operator based on the zeros of orthogonal polynomials with respect to the weight $w(x) = x^\gamma e^{-x^{-\alpha}-x^\beta}$. We prove that this interpolation process has Lebesgue constant with order $\log m$ in weighted uniform metric and converges with the order of the best approximation in a large subset of weighted L^p -spaces, $1 < p < \infty$, with proper assumptions.

Keywords: Lagrange interpolation, weighted polynomial approximation, orthogonal polynomials, Pollaczek-Laguerre exponential weights, real semiaxis.

AMS subject classification: 41A05, 41A10.

1. INTRODUCTION

The polynomial approximation of functions defined on the real semiaxis, which can grow exponentially both at 0 and at $+\infty$, has received attention in the literature only recently (see [3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]). In these papers, with the contribution of further authors, we have introduced a weight of the form $w(x) = x^\gamma e^{-x^{-\alpha}-x^\beta}$, with $x > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 1$ and $\gamma \geq 0$, and developed the related theory of polynomial approximation in proper function spaces. The properties of the orthonormal system $\{p_m(w)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ have been studied in [9] also from the computational point of view. To this aim the results proved by Levin and Lubinsky in their book [4] are crucial.

In the present paper, using the zeros of $p_m(w)$, we introduce a new interpolation process, which will be denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w)$, in order to approximate the above mentioned class of functions. As main results, we are going to prove that, under suitable necessary and sufficient conditions, this interpolation process has Lebesgue constant with order $\log m$ in weighted uniform metric (cfr. [13]) and behaves like the best approximation in a wide subspace of weighted L^p -spaces, $1 < p < \infty$.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

In the sequel c, \mathcal{C} will stand for positive constants which can assume different values in each formula. We shall write $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{C}(a, b, \dots)$ when \mathcal{C} is independent of a, b, \dots , and, on the other hand, we will write \mathcal{C}_a or $\mathcal{C}(a)$ when \mathcal{C} depends on a . Furthermore $A \sim B$ will mean that if A and B are positive quantities depending on some parameters, then there exists a positive constant \mathcal{C} independent of these parameters such that $(A/B)^{\pm 1} \leq \mathcal{C}$. Finally, we

The first author was partially supported by University of Basilicata (local funds). The second author was partially supported by University of Basilicata (local funds) and by INdAM-GNCS..

will denote by \mathbb{P}_m the set of all algebraic polynomials of degree at most m . As usual \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{R} , will stand for the sets of all natural, integer, real numbers, while \mathbb{Z}^+ and \mathbb{R}^+ denote the sets of positive integers and positive real numbers, respectively.

For the sake of completeness and for the reader's convenience, we recall some basic facts, recently proved in [8].

2.1. Classes of functions. Letting

$$(2.1) \quad u(x) = x^\delta \sqrt{\sigma(x)}, \quad \sigma(x) = e^{-x^{-\alpha} - x^\beta}$$

with $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 1$, $\delta \geq 0$, $x > 0$, we introduce the following spaces of functions.

If $1 \leq p < \infty$ we will write $f \in L_u^p$ if and only if

$$\|f\|_{L_u^p} := \|fu\|_p = \left(\int_0^{+\infty} |fu|^p(x) dx \right)^{1/p} < \infty.$$

For $p = \infty$, by a slight abuse of notation, we set

$$L_u^\infty = C_u = \left\{ f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^+) : \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f(x)u(x) = 0 = \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x)u(x) \right\}$$

and

$$\|f\|_{L_u^\infty} := \|fu\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in (0, +\infty)} |f(x)u(x)|,$$

where $C^0(\mathbb{R}^+)$ is the collection of all continuous functions on $(0, +\infty)$.

For smoother functions we introduce the Sobolev-type spaces

$$W_r^p(u) = \{ f \in L_u^p : f^{(r-1)} \in AC(0, +\infty), \|f^{(r)}\varphi^r u\|_p < \infty \},$$

with

$$\|f\|_{W_r^p(u)} = \|fu\|_p + \|f^{(r)}\varphi^r u\|_p,$$

where $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $1 \leq r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\varphi(x) := \sqrt{x}$ and $AC(0, +\infty)$ denotes the set of all absolutely continuous functions on $(0, +\infty)$.

To characterize further subspaces of L_u^p , we introduce the following moduli of smoothness. Let us consider the intervals

$$\mathcal{I}_h(c) = \left[h^{1/(\alpha+1/2)}, \frac{c}{h^{1/(\beta-1/2)}} \right],$$

with α and β in (2.1), $h > 0$ sufficiently small, and $c > 1$ an arbitrary but fixed constant. For any $f \in L_u^p$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $r \geq 1$ and $t > 0$ sufficiently small (say $t < t_0$), we set

$$\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p} = \sup_{0 < h \leq t} \left\| \Delta_{h\varphi}^r(f) u \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{I}_h(c))},$$

where

$$\Delta_{h\varphi}^r f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^r (-1)^i \binom{r}{i} f(x + (r-i)h\varphi(x)), \quad \varphi(x) = \sqrt{x}.$$

Moreover, we introduce the following K -functional

$$K(f, t^r)_{u,p} = \inf_{g \in W_r^p(u)} \left\{ \|(f - g)u\|_p + t^r \|g^{(r)} \varphi^r u\|_p \right\}$$

and its main part

$$\tilde{K}(f, t^r)_{u,p} = \sup_{0 < h \leq t} \inf_{g \in W_r^p(u)} \left\{ \|(f - g)u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{I}_h(c))} + h^r \|g^{(r)} \varphi^r u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{I}_h(c))} \right\}.$$

Then we define the complete r th modulus of smoothness by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p} &= \Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p} + \inf_{q \in \mathbb{P}_{r-1}} \|(f - q)u\|_{L^p(0, t^{1/(\alpha + \frac{1}{2})})} \\ &\quad + \inf_{q \in \mathbb{P}_{r-1}} \|(f - q)u\|_{L^p[ct^{-1/(\beta - \frac{1}{2})}, +\infty)} \end{aligned}$$

with $c > 1$ a fixed constant. We emphasize that the behaviour of $\omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}$ is independent of the constant c . Moreover, this modulus of smoothness is equivalent to the K -functional. To be more precise (see [8, pp. 171–172, Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4])

$$\omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p} \sim K(f, t^r)_{u,p}$$

and

$$\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p} \sim \tilde{K}(f, t^r)_{u,p},$$

where the constants in “ \sim ” are independent of f and t , in both cases.

By means of the main part of the modulus of smoothness, for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, we can define the Zygmund-type spaces

$$Z_s^p(u) = \left\{ f \in L_u^p : \sup_{t>0} \frac{\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^s} < \infty, \ r > s \right\},$$

$s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, with the norm

$$\|f\|_{Z_s^p(u)} = \|f\|_{L_u^p} + \sup_{t>0} \frac{\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^s}.$$

In the sequel, we will use the notation $\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p} = \Omega_\varphi^1(f, t)_{u,p}$. We remark that, in the definition of $Z_s^p(u)$, the main part of the r th modulus of smoothness $\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}$ can be replaced by the complete modulus $\omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}$ (see [8, p. 171]).

2.2. Best weighted approximation. Let us denote by

$$E_m(f)_{u,p} = \inf_{P \in \mathbb{P}_m} \|(f - P)u\|_p$$

the error of best polynomial approximation of a function $f \in L_u^p$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

Then, for any $f \in L_u^p$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, the following Jackson, Stechkin and weak Jackson inequalities hold (see [8, p. 173, Theorems 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4])

$$E_m(f)_{u,p} \leq C \omega_\varphi^r \left(f, \frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)_{u,p},$$

$$\omega_{\varphi}^r \left(f, \frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)_{u,p} \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^r \sum_{i=0}^m \left(\frac{i}{\sqrt{a_i}} \right)^r \frac{E_i(f)_{u,p}}{i}$$

and, assuming $\Omega_{\varphi}^r(f, t)_{u,p} t^{-1} \in L^1[0, 1]$,

$$(2.2) \quad E_m(f)_{u,p} \leq \mathcal{C} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_{\varphi}^r(f, t)_{u,p}}{t} dt,$$

where $m > r \geq 1$, $a_m = a_m(u) \sim m^{1/\beta}$ is the Mhaskar–Rahmanov–Saff number related to u and \mathcal{C} is independent of m and f .

In particular, for any $f \in W_r^p(u)$, $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, we obtain

$$(2.3) \quad E_m(f)_{u,p} \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^r \|f^{(r)} \varphi^r u\|_p, \quad \mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{C}(m, f).$$

Whereas, for any $f \in Z_s^p(u)$, $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, we get

$$E_m(f)_{u,p} \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^s \sup_{t>0} \frac{\Omega_{\varphi}^r(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^s}, \quad r > s, \quad \mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{C}(m, f).$$

2.3. The interpolation process. Let us now consider the weight

$$w(x) = x^{\gamma} \sigma(x) = x^{\gamma} e^{-x^{-\alpha} - x^{\beta}},$$

with $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 1$, $\gamma \geq 0$ and $x \in (0, +\infty)$, and denote by $\{p_m(w)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ the sequence of orthonormal polynomials with positive leading coefficients.

The zeros of $p_m(w)$ lie in the MRS interval associated with \sqrt{w} (see [4, p. 361] and [11, p. 38, Proposition 2.3], taking into account that w belongs to the Levin–Lubinsky class $\mathcal{F}(C^2+)$), namely

$$\varepsilon_m < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_m < a_m,$$

with m sufficiently large and

$$(2.4) \quad \varepsilon_{\tau} = \varepsilon_{\tau}(\sqrt{w}) \sim \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_{\tau}}}{\tau} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad a_{\tau} = a_{\tau}(\sqrt{w}) \sim \tau^{1/\beta}, \quad \tau > 0.$$

Since $\varepsilon_{\tau}(\sqrt{w}) \sim \varepsilon_{\tau}(u)$ and $a_{\tau}(\sqrt{w}) \sim a_{\tau}(u)$, where the constants in “ \sim ” depend only on γ and δ , in the sequel with a slight abuse of notation we will simply write ε_{τ} and a_{τ} for both weights.

Then, setting $x_0 = \varepsilon_m$ and $x_{m+1} = a_m$, for any function $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^+)$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}(w, f)$ the Lagrange polynomial, interpolating the function f at the points x_k , $k = 0, 1, \dots, m+1$, namely

$$\mathcal{L}_{m+2}(w, f) = \sum_{k=0}^{m+1} \ell_k(x) f(x_k),$$

where

$$\ell_k(x) = \frac{v(x) p_m(w, x)}{v(x_k) p'_m(w, x_k) (x - x_k)}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m,$$

$$v(x) = (x - \varepsilon_m)(a_m - x),$$

$$\ell_0(x) = \frac{a_m - x}{a_m - \varepsilon_m} \frac{p_m(w, x)}{p_m(w, \varepsilon_m)},$$

and

$$\ell_{m+1}(x) = \frac{x - \varepsilon_m}{a_m - \varepsilon_m} \frac{p_m(w, x)}{p_m(w, a_m)}.$$

Let us now fix $\theta \in (0, 1)$. With that we introduce a new interpolation process $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w)$, defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f, x) = \sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \ell_k(x) f(x_k).$$

So, the operator $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w)$ has the advantage of requiring a smaller number of evaluations of the function. To ensure that this definition is not an unmotivated (though fortunate) “truncation”, we need some further observation. To this aim we recall the following inequalities (see [4, p. 97] and [12, 11], taking into account that u belongs to the Levin–Lubinsky class $\mathcal{F}(C^2+)$). For any $P_m \in \mathbb{P}_m$ and $s > 1$, with u given by (2.1) and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, we have

$$(2.5) \quad \|P_m u\|_p \leq \mathcal{C} \|P_m u\|_{L^p[\varepsilon_m, a_m]}$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad \|P_m u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^+ \setminus [\varepsilon_{sm}, a_{sm}])} \leq \mathcal{C} e^{-cm^\nu} \|P_m u\|_p,$$

where \mathcal{C} and c are independent of m and P_m and

$$\nu = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\beta}\right) \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha + 1} \in (0, 1),$$

and ε_m, a_m are the Mhaskar–Rahmanov–Saff numbers related to u .

For any fixed $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and for every $f \in L_u^p$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, we get, by using (2.6) and denoting by P_M , $M = \lfloor (\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}) m \rfloor$, the polynomial of best approximation of f in L_u^p ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|fu\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^+ \setminus [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}])} &\leq \|(f - P_M)u\|_p + \|P_M u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^+ \setminus [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}])} \\ &\leq E_M(f)_{u,p} + \mathcal{C} e^{-cM^\nu} \|P_M u\|_p \\ &\leq E_M(f)_{u,p} + 2\mathcal{C} e^{-cM^\nu} \|fu\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for a sufficiently large M (say $M > M_0$), $2\mathcal{C} e^{-cM^\nu} < 1$ and we get, using

$$\|fu\|_p \leq \|fu\|_{L^p[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]} + \|fu\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^+ \setminus [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}])},$$

the estimate

$$\|fu\|_p \leq \mathcal{C} [\|fu\|_{L^p[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]} + E_M(f)_{u,p}]$$

for all sufficiently large $M = \lfloor \frac{\theta m}{\theta+1} \rfloor$ and with $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_\theta \neq \mathcal{C}(m, f)$. Hence the dominant part of $\|fu\|_p$ is the norm of a finite section of f , namely $\chi_\theta f$, where χ_θ is the characteristic function of $[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]$. For this reason we apply the operator $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w)$ to this finite section.

Now, by definition, it follows that

$$\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f, x_k) = f(x_k), \quad x_k \in [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}],$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f, x_k) = 0, \quad x_k \notin [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}].$$

So, $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w)$ does not preserve all polynomials of degree at most $m+1$. Nevertheless, if we denote by \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^* the set of the polynomials of degree at most $m+1$ vanishing at $x_k \notin [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}_{m+1}^* = \{Q \in \mathbb{P}_{m+1} : Q(x_k) = 0, \quad x_k \notin [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}], \quad 0 \leq k \leq m+1\}$$

then $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f) \in \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^*$ and, for any $Q \in \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^*$, $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, Q) = Q$. Finally, if we denote by

$$E_{m+1}^*(f)_{u,p} = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^*} \|(f - Q)u\|_p$$

the error of best weighted approximation by polynomials of \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^* , we can show that (see [9, p. 1664, Lemma 4.1] or [5, 6] for different weight functions)

$$(2.7) \quad E_{m+1}^*(f)_{u,p} \leq \mathcal{C} [E_M(f)_{u,p} + e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_p]$$

with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $M = \lfloor \frac{\theta m}{\theta+1} \rfloor$, $\nu = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\beta}\right) \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha+1}$, \mathcal{C} and c independent of m and f . So, $\bigcup_m \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^*$ is dense in L_u^p , $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

3. MAIN RESULTS

Let us now state some convergence results for the operator $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w)$. To this aim we recall that $w(x) = x^\gamma \sigma(x)$ is the weight of the orthonormal system $\{p_m(w)\}_m$ and $u(x) = x^\delta \sqrt{\sigma(x)}$ is the weight of the previously introduced function classes.

Theorem 3.1. *For any $f \in C_u$ we have*

$$(3.1) \quad \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)u\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{C}(\log m) \|fu\|_\infty$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad \|[f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)]u\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{C} [(\log m) E_M(f)_{u,\infty} + e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_\infty]$$

with $M = \lfloor \frac{\theta m}{\theta+1} \rfloor$, $\nu = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\beta}\right) \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha+1}$, \mathcal{C} and c independent of m and f , if and only if

$$(3.3) \quad -\frac{3}{4} \leq \delta - \frac{\gamma}{2} \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Before stating an analogous theorem in L_u^p -norm, we recall that (see [7, p. 160 Corollary 3.3]) if $f \in L_u^p$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $\frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} \in L^1[0, 1]$, then f is continuous on $(0, +\infty)$. So, $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)$ is well defined for this kind of functions.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $f \in L_u^p$ satisfies*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt < \infty.$$

Then we have

$$(3.4) \quad \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f) u\|_p \leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k |f u|^p(x_k) \right)^{1/p}$$

with \mathcal{C}_θ independent of m and f , if and only if

$$(3.5) \quad -\frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{p} < \delta - \frac{\gamma}{2} < \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{p}.$$

We remark that the constant \mathcal{C}_θ in (3.4) depends on the parameter θ . To be more precise

$$\mathcal{C}_\theta = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\theta(1-\theta)} \right),$$

hence the “truncation” does play a crucial role in this case and Lemma 3.2 does not hold if we replace $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, x)$ by $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}(w, x)$.

Remark 3.3. We observe that, as a consequence of Lemma 3.2 and Remark 4.2, for any $Q \in \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^*$, with $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $0 < \theta < 1$, if conditions (3.5) hold, then we obtain

$$\|Qu\|_p \sim \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k |Q(x_k)u(x_k)|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

where the constants in “ \sim ” are independent of m and Q .

We note that this Marcinkiewicz-type equivalence is true only for polynomials of the subspace \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^* and not for ordinary polynomials of \mathbb{P}_{m+1} .

Theorem 3.4. Let $1 < p < \infty$. Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.2, if (3.5) holds, we get

$$(3.6) \quad \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f) u\|_p \leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \left[\|fu\|_p + \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^{1/p} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt \right]$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad \| [f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)] u \|_p \leq \mathcal{C} \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^{1/p} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} + e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_p \right]$$

with $\nu = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\beta}\right) \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha+1}$, \mathcal{C} and c independent of m and f .

We remark that, under the assumption (3.5), if f fulfills only $\frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} \in L^1[0, 1]$, then

$$\| [f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)] u \|_p = o \left(\left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^{1/p} \right),$$

while if $f \in W_r^p(u)$ then

$$\| [f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)] u \|_p \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^r \|f\|_{W_r^p(u)}$$

and, by (2.3) this order of convergence is the same of the best weighted polynomial approximation.

Now it is easy to prove that the operator $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w)$ is uniformly bounded in Sobolev-type spaces. Here we prove a more general theorem. To this aim we denote by $D^p(u)$, $1 < p < \infty$, the following wide class of functions

$$(3.8) \quad D^p(u) = \{f \in L_u^p : \Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p} t^{-1-1/p} \in L^1[0, 1]\},$$

with the norm

$$\|f\|_{D^p(u)} = \|fu\|_p + \int_0^1 \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt.$$

We observe that the Besov-type space $D^p(u)$ contains the continuous functions, the functions of $Z_s^p(u)$, $s > 1/p$, and those belonging to $W_r^p(u)$, $r \geq 1$.

Theorem 3.5. *For any $f \in D^p(u)$, $1 < p < \infty$, if*

$$-\frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{p} < \delta - \frac{\gamma}{2} < \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{p}$$

then

$$\sup_m \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)\|_{D^p(u)} \leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \|f\|_{D^p(u)}$$

with $\mathcal{C}_\theta = \mathcal{C}(\theta) \neq \mathcal{C}(f)$.

Therefore the polynomial $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)$ behaves essentially as the best approximation in the space $D^p(u)$.

4. PROOFS

First of all we recall the following inequalities (see [4, pp. 1–34, 325 and 360] and also [11, pp.39–40]). With $w(x) = x^\gamma e^{-x^{-\alpha} - x^\beta}$ and $v(x) = (a_m - x)(x - \varepsilon_m)$, we have

$$(4.1) \quad |p_m(w, x)| \sqrt{w(x) \sqrt{|v(x)|}} \leq \mathcal{C} \quad \forall x \in (0, +\infty),$$

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{1}{|p'_m(w, x_k)| \sqrt{w(x_k)}} \sim \Delta x_k \sqrt[4]{v(x_k)}$$

$$(4.3) \quad \Delta x_k \sim \frac{a_m x_k}{m \sqrt{v(x_k)}}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad \Delta x_k \sim \frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \sqrt{x_k}, \quad x_k \in [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}],$$

where \mathcal{C} and the constants in “ \sim ” are independent of m and k .

Proof Theorem 3.1: (3.3) \Rightarrow (3.1) and (3.2). By (2.5) we have

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)u\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{C} \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)u\|_{L^\infty(I_m)},$$

where $I_m = [\varepsilon_{m+1}, a_{m+1}]$. Hence, for $x \in I_m$, x_d a zero closest to x , $x_k \in [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]$ and $k \neq d, d \pm 1$, using (4.1) and (4.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\ell_k(x)| \frac{u(x)}{u(x_k)} &= \left| \frac{v(x)p_m(w, x)u(x)}{v(x_k)p'_m(w, x_k)(x - x_k)u(x_k)} \right| \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{x}{x_k} \right)^{\delta - \gamma/2} \left(\frac{v(x)}{v(x_k)} \right)^{3/4} \frac{\Delta x_k}{|x - x_k|}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by (2.4), taking into account that $x_k \in [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]$, we have

$$\frac{v(x)}{v(x_k)} \leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \frac{x}{x_k},$$

whence

$$|\ell_k(x)| \frac{u(x)}{u(x_k)} \leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \left(\frac{x}{x_k} \right)^{\delta - \gamma/2 + 3/4} \frac{\Delta x_k}{|x - x_k|}, \quad k \neq d, d \pm 1.$$

Since [4, p. 361]

$$|\ell_k(x)| \frac{u(x)}{u(x_k)} \sim 1, \quad k = d, d \pm 1,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)u\|_\infty \leq \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \|fu\|_{L^\infty[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]} \max_{x \in I_m} \left[1 + \sum_{\substack{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m} \\ k \neq d, d \pm 1}} \left(\frac{x}{x_k} \right)^{\delta - \gamma/2 + 3/4} \frac{\Delta x_k}{|x - x_k|} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis $0 \leq \delta - \gamma/2 + 3/4 \leq 1$ and so the sum at the right-hand side is dominated by $\mathcal{C} \log m$. In fact, for $x \in (\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m})$, this sum is dominated by

$$\mathcal{C} \left\{ \int_{\varepsilon_{\theta m}}^{x_{d-1}} + \int_{x_{d+1}}^{a_{\theta m}} \right\} \left(\frac{x}{t} \right)^{\delta - \gamma/2 + 3/4} \frac{dt}{|x - t|} = I_1 + I_2$$

For the term I_2 , since $x < t$, we have

$$I_2 \leq \mathcal{C} \int_{x_{d+1}}^{a_{\theta m}} \frac{dt}{t - x} \sim \log m.$$

While, for the term I_1 , setting $y = \frac{x}{t}$ and $\lambda = -\delta + \gamma/2 - 3/4$, by (3.3) we have $-1 \leq \lambda \leq 0$ and then

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq \int_0^{1-\frac{\Delta x_d}{x}} \frac{y^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4}}{1-y} dy \\
&\leq \int_0^{1-\frac{\Delta x_d}{x}} \frac{y^\lambda(1-y^{-\lambda})}{1-y} dy + \int_0^{1-\frac{\Delta x_d}{x}} \frac{dy}{1-y} \\
&\leq \int_0^{1-\frac{\Delta x_d}{x}} y^\lambda(1-y)^{-\lambda-1} dy + \int_0^{1-\frac{\Delta x_d}{x}} \frac{dy}{1-y} \\
&\leq \mathcal{C} + \mathcal{C} \log m,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof, since the other cases are simpler. In the sequel we are going to show that inequality (3.1) implies the assumptions (3.3).

Now, let us prove the error estimate (3.2). Since $\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w)$ preserves the polynomials of \mathcal{P}_{m+1}^* , using (3.1) and (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\| [f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)] u \|_\infty &\leq \mathcal{C}_\theta (\log m) E_{m+1}^*(f)_{u, \infty} \\
&\leq \mathcal{C}_\theta [(\log m) E_M(f)_{u, \infty} + e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_\infty]
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition will be useful in order to prove Theorem 3.4.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$, $\eta \geq 0$ and $0 < \theta < \bar{\theta} < 1$. Then, for any polynomial $P_{lm} \in \mathbb{P}_{lm}$, with l a fixed integer, we have*

$$\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k |x_k^\eta P_{lm}(x_k)|^p \leq \mathcal{C} \int_{\varepsilon_{\bar{\theta} m}}^{a_{\bar{\theta} m}} |x^\eta P_{lm}(x)|^p dx,$$

where x_k are the zeros of $p_m(w)$ and \mathcal{C} is independent of m and P_{lm} .

Proof. From inequality

$$(b-a) |f(a)|^p \leq 2^p \left[\int_a^b |f(x)|^p dx + (b-a)^p \int_a^b |f'(x)|^p dx \right],$$

setting $a = x_k$, $b = x_{k+1}$ and $f = P_{lm}$, we deduce

$$\Delta x_k |P_{lm}(x_k)|^p \leq 2^p \left[\int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} |P_{lm}(x)|^p dx + (\Delta x_k)^p \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} |P'_{lm}(x)|^p dx \right].$$

Using (4.4) and $x_k \sim x$ for $x \in [x_k, x_{k+1}]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta x_k |x_k^\eta P_{lm}(x_k)|^p \leq \\
&\leq \mathcal{C} \left[\int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} |x^\eta P_{lm}(x)|^p dx + \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^p \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} |x^\eta P'_{lm}(x) \sqrt{x}|^p dx \right].
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k |x_k^\eta P_{lm}(x_k)|^p \leq \\ & \leq \mathcal{C} \left[\int_{\varepsilon_{\theta m}}^{a_{\theta m}} |x^\eta P_{lm}(x)|^p dx + \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^p \int_{\varepsilon_{\theta m}}^{a_{\theta m}} |x^\eta P'_{lm}(x) \sqrt{x}|^p dx \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the second integral at the right-hand side, taking into account that

$$\sqrt{\frac{x}{x - \varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m}}} \sqrt{\frac{a_m}{a_{\bar{\theta}m} - x}} \leq C_{\bar{\theta}}$$

for

$$\varepsilon_m < \varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m} < \varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x \leq a_{\theta m} < a_{\bar{\theta}m} < a_m,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^p \int_{\varepsilon_{\theta m}}^{a_{\theta m}} |x^\eta P'_{lm}(x) \sqrt{x}|^p dx \\ & = \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^p \int_{\varepsilon_{\theta m}}^{a_{\theta m}} \left| \frac{x^\eta P'_{lm}(x) \sqrt{x} \sqrt{(x - \varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m})(a_{\bar{\theta}m} - x)}}{\sqrt{(x - \varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m})(a_{\bar{\theta}m} - x)}} \right|^p dx \\ & \leq \frac{\mathcal{C}}{m^p} \int_{\varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m}}^{a_{\bar{\theta}m}} |x^\eta P'_{lm}(x) \sqrt{(x - \varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m})(a_{\bar{\theta}m} - x)}|^p dx \\ & \leq \mathcal{C} \int_{\varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m}}^{a_{\bar{\theta}m}} |x^\eta P_{lm}(x)|^p dx, \end{aligned}$$

having used the Bernstein inequality related to the interval $[\varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m}, a_{\bar{\theta}m}]$ in weighted L^p -norm. The proposition easily follows. \square

Remark 4.2. We note that, proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 and taking into account that $u(x) \sim u(x_k)$ for $x \in [x_k, x_{k+1}]$ (see [8, p. 170, Proposition 2.1]), for any $P_{lm} \in \mathbb{P}_{lm}$, with l a fixed integer, with $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $0 < \theta < \bar{\theta} < 1$, we obtain

$$\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k |P_{lm}(x_k) u(x_k)|^p \leq \mathcal{C} \int_{\varepsilon_{\bar{\theta}m}}^{a_{\bar{\theta}m}} |P_{lm}(x) u(x)|^p dx,$$

where x_k are the zeros of $p_m(w)$ and \mathcal{C} is independent of m and P_{lm} .

Proposition 4.3. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$, $a > 0$ fixed and $g \in L^p$. Then, for $t_m(x) = p_m(w, x) \sqrt{w(x) \sqrt{|(a_m - x)(x - \varepsilon_m)|}}$, the inequality

$$\int_0^a |g(x) t_m(x)|^p dx \geq \mathcal{C} \int_0^a |g(x)|^p dx$$

holds with $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{C}(m, p_m(w))$.

Proof. Letting x_k be the zeros of $p_m(w)$, we set

$$J_m = \cup_{x_k \leq a} \left(x_k - \frac{\mu}{8} \Delta x_k, x_k + \frac{\mu}{8} \Delta x_k \right),$$

with $\mu > 0$ small. Taking into account (4.2) and (4.3), since

$$\left| \frac{p_m(w, x)}{p'_m(w, x_d)(x - x_d)} \right| \sim 1,$$

where x_d is a zero closest to $x \in (\varepsilon_m, a_m)$, we have

$$(4.5) \quad |t_m(x)| = \left| p_m(w, x) \sqrt{w(x)} \sqrt{|(a_m - x)(x - \varepsilon_m)|} \right| \sim \frac{|x - x_{d\pm 1}|}{\Delta x_{d\pm 1}}$$

and then

$$|t_m(x)| \geq C_\mu, \quad x \in [0, a] \setminus J_m.$$

So we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^a |g(x)t(x)|^p dx &\geq C_\mu \int_{[0, a] \setminus J_m} |g(x)|^p dx \\ &= C_\mu \int_0^a |g(x)|^p dx - C_\mu \int_{J_m} |g(x)|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since the measure of J_m fulfills $|J_m| \leq \frac{a\mu}{4}$, using the absolute continuity of the integral, for any fixed g we can choose μ such that the second integral at the right-hand side is a half of the first one and the proof is complete. \square

In order to prove Lemma 3.2, we recall some properties of the Hilbert transform \mathcal{H} extended to an interval (a, b) , defined by

$$\mathcal{H}(f, y) = \int_a^b \frac{f(x)}{x - y} dx, \quad y \in (a, b),$$

where the integral is understood in the Cauchy principal value sense. The commutation formula

$$\int_a^b \mathcal{H}(f)g = - \int_a^b \mathcal{H}(g)f$$

holds for any $f \in L^p$ and $g \in L^q$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1/p + 1/q = 1$. We recall that, for any measurable function f such that $fv \in L^p$, $1 < p < \infty$, the inequality

$$\|\mathcal{H}(f)v\|_p \leq C \|fv\|_p, \quad C \neq C(f),$$

holds if and only (see [2]) the weight v belongs to the A_p class, $1 < p < \infty$, i.e.,

$$\left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I v^p(x) dx \right)^{1/p} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I v^{-q}(x) dx \right)^{1/q} \leq C \quad I \subset (a, b),$$

where $|I|$ denotes the measure of I and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. By (2.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)u\|_p &\leq \mathcal{C} \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)u\|_{L^p(I_m)} \\ &= \mathcal{C} \sup_{\|g\|_{L^q(I_m)}=1} \int_{I_m} \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f, x) u(x) g(x) dx \\ &=: \mathcal{C} \sup_{\|g\|_{L^q(I_m)}=1} A(g) \end{aligned}$$

where $I_m := [\varepsilon_{m+1}, a_{m+1}]$ and $q = p/(p-1)$. By using (4.2) and since $v(x_k) \geq \mathcal{C}_\theta a_m x_k$ for $x_k \in [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A(g) &\leq \frac{\mathcal{C}_\theta}{a_m^{3/4}} \sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \frac{\Delta x_k |fu|(x_k)}{x_k^{\delta-\gamma/2+3/4}} \left| \int_{I_m} \frac{v(x) p_m(w, x) u(x) g(x)}{x - x_k} dx \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\mathcal{C}_\theta}{a_m^{3/4}} \sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \frac{\Delta x_k |fu|(x_k)}{x_k^{\delta-\gamma/2+3/4}} |\Pi(x_k)|, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(y) &= \int_{I_m} \frac{v(x) p_m(w, x) Q(x) - v(y) p_m(w, y) Q(y)}{x - y} \frac{u(x) g(x)}{Q(x)} dx \\ &= \mathcal{H}(v p_m(w) u g, y) - v(y) p_m(w, y) Q(y) \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{u g}{Q}, y\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $Q > 0$ is a polynomial of degree lm that will be chosen in the sequel and \mathcal{H} is the Hilbert transform related to the interval I_m . Then, using the Hölder inequality, we get

$$A(g) \leq \frac{\mathcal{C}_\theta}{a_m^{3/4}} \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k |fu|^p(x_k) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k \left| x_k^{\gamma/2-\delta-3/4} \Pi(x_k) \right|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

By Proposition 4.1, the second sum at the right-hand side is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{C} \left(\int_{I_m} |y^{\gamma/2-\delta-3/4} \Pi(y)|^q dy \right)^{1/q} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} \left[\left(\int_{I_m} |y^{\gamma/2-\delta-3/4} \mathcal{H}(v p_m(w) u g, y)|^q dy \right)^{1/q} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\int_{I_m} \left| y^{\gamma/2-\delta-3/4} v(y) p_m(w, y) Q(y) \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{u g}{Q}, y\right) \right|^q dy \right)^{1/q} \right] \\ &=: \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |v(y) p_m(w, y) u(y)| &\leq \mathcal{C} y^{\delta-\gamma/2} (a_m - y)^{3/4} (y - \varepsilon_m)^{3/4} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} y^{\delta-\gamma/2+3/4} a_m^{3/4}. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of (3.5), $y^{\gamma/2-\delta-3/4}$ is an A_q weight on I_m and we can use the boundedness of the Hilbert transform, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &\leq \mathcal{C} \left(\int_{I_m} |y^{\gamma/2-\delta-3/4} v(y) p_m(w, y) u(y) g(y)|^q dy \right)^{1/q} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} a_m^{3/4} \|g\|_{L^q(I_m)} = \mathcal{C} a_m^{3/4}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate \mathcal{I}_2 we can choose Q such that $Q \sim u$ in I_m (see [12, p. 809, Lemma 3.1]) and, by (4.1), we get

$$|y^{\gamma/2-\delta-3/4} v(y) p_m(w, y) Q(y)| \leq \mathcal{C} a_m^{3/4},$$

whence, using the boundedness of the Hilbert transform $\mathcal{H} : L^q(I_m) \rightarrow L^q(I_m)$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2 &\leq \mathcal{C} a_m^{3/4} \left\| \mathcal{H} \left(\frac{ug}{Q} \right) \right\|_{L^q(I_m)} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} a_m^{3/4} \|g\|_{L^q(I_m)} = \mathcal{C} a_m^{3/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the previous inequalities we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f) u\|_p \leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k |f u|^p(x_k) \right)^{1/p}.$$

Now, let us prove that inequality (3.4) implies conditions (3.5). To this aim, letting m fixed and sufficiently large, we consider a piecewise linear function F_0 such that

$$F_0(x) = 0 \quad x \notin [2, 3]$$

and

$$F_0(x_k) = \text{sgn}(p'_m(w, x_k)) \quad x_k \in [2, 3],$$

joining two consecutive points with a segment. Since F_0 is continuous on $(0, +\infty)$, we can write

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, F_0) u\|_{L^p[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1]} < \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, F_0) u\|_p \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k |F_0 u|^p(x_k) \right)^{1/p}$$

and, using (4.2) and $\frac{v(x)}{v(x_k)} \geq \mathcal{C}_\theta \frac{x}{x_k}$ for $x > \varepsilon_{\theta m}$ and $x_k \geq 2$, we get

$$|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, F_0, x) u(x)| \geq \mathcal{C} |p_m(w, x) v^{1/4}(x) u(x) x^{3/4}| \sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} u(x_k)$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, F_0) u\|_{L^p[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1]} \geq \mathcal{C} \|p_m(w) v^{1/4} u x^{3/4}\|_{L^p[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1]} \sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} u(x_k).$$

Using Proposition 4.3 we obtain

$$\sup_m \left(\int_{\varepsilon_{\theta m}}^1 x^{(\delta-\gamma/2+3/4)p} dx \right)^{1/p} \sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} u(x_k) \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k u^p(x_k) \right)^{1/p}$$

Therefore

$$(4.6) \quad \left(\int_0^1 x^{(\delta-\gamma/2+3/4)p} dx \right)^{1/p} \sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} u(x_k) \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k u^p(x_k) \right)^{1/p}.$$

Now, let $A = \{A_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $A_k = (\Delta x_k)^{1/p} u(x_k)$ and $\|A\|_{l^p} = (\sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} A_k^p)^{1/p}$, the last inequality (4.6) can be rewritten as

$$\left(\int_0^1 x^{(\delta-\gamma/2+3/4)p} dx \right)^{1/p} \sup_A \sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \frac{A_k}{\|A\|_{l^p}} (\Delta x_k)^{1/q} x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} \leq \mathcal{C},$$

with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, since

$$\sup_A \sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \frac{A_k}{\|A\|_{l^p}} (\Delta x_k)^{1/q} x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} = \sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k x_k^{(-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4)q} \sim 1.$$

It follows that (3.4) implies $\delta - \gamma/2 > -3/4 - 1/p$, $1 < p < \infty$.

Let us now show that (3.4) implies $\delta - \gamma/2 < 1/4 - 1/p$. To this aim we consider a piecewise linear function F_1 such that

$$F_1(x) = 0 \quad x \notin [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1]$$

and

$$F_1(x_k) = \text{sgn}(p'_m(w, x_k)) \quad x_k \in [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1].$$

Hence we get

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, F_1) u\|_{L^p[2,3]} < \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, F_1) u\|_p \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq 1} \Delta x_k |F_1 u|^p(x_k) \right)^{1/p}$$

and, proceeding as before, inequality (4.6) is replaced by

$$\left(\int_2^3 x^{(\delta-\gamma/2+3/4)p} dx \right)^{1/p} \sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq 1} \Delta x_k x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq 1} \Delta x_k u^p(x_k) \right)^{1/p}.$$

Now, with $B = \{B_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $B_k = (\Delta x_k)^{1/p} u(x_k)$ and $\|B\|_{l^p} = (\sum_{0 \leq x_k \leq 1} B_k^p)^{1/p}$, the integral at the left-hand side is bounded, while

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_B \sum_{0 \leq x_k \leq 1} \frac{B_k}{\|B\|_{l^p}} (\Delta x_k)^{1/q} x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} &= \left(\sum_{0 \leq x_k \leq 1} \Delta x_k x_k^{(-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4)q} \right)^{1/q} \\ &\sim \left(\int_0^1 x^{(-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4)q} dx \right)^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

From

$$\left(\int_0^1 x^{(-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4)q} dx \right)^{1/q} \leq \mathcal{C}$$

condition $\delta - \gamma/2 < 1/4 - \frac{1}{p}$ follows. So the proof is complete. \square

Proof that inequality (3.1) of Theorem 3.1 implies conditions (3.3). Let us first prove that (3.1) implies $\delta - \gamma/2 - 3/4 \geq 0$. To this aim, using the same arguments of the previous proof (inequality (3.4) implies $\delta - \gamma/2 > -3/4 - 1/p$), but replacing p with ∞ and q with 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1]} |p_m(w, x) v^{1/4} x^{3/4} u(x)| &\sum_{2 \leq x_k \leq 3} \Delta x_k u(x_k) x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, F_0) u\|_{L^\infty[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1]} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} \|F_0 u\|_{L^\infty[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1]} \log m \\ (4.7) \quad &\leq \mathcal{C} \log m, \end{aligned}$$

where F_0 is the above defined function. The sum at the left hand side is bounded from below and using (4.5), it follows that

$$\max_{x \in [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, 1]} x^{\delta-\gamma/2+3/4} \leq \mathcal{C} \log m,$$

i.e. $\delta - \gamma/2 + 3/4 \geq 0$.

Let us now prove that (3.1) implies $\delta - \gamma/2 - 3/4 \leq 1$. As before, we will use a procedure similar to that of previous proof (inequality (3.4) implies $\delta - \gamma/2 < 1/4 - 1/p$), with $p = \infty$ and $q = 1$ and F_1 in place of F_0 . In this case (4.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in [2, 3]} |p_m(w, x) v^{1/4} x^{3/4} u(x)| &\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq 1} \Delta x_k u(x_k) x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, F_1) u\|_{L^\infty[2, 3]} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} \|F_1 u\|_{L^\infty[2, 3]} \log m \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} \|u\|_{L^\infty[2, 3]} \log m. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|p_m(w, x)v^{1/4}x^{3/4}u(x)|$ is bounded from below in $[2, 3]$, we get

$$\sup_u \sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq 1} \Delta x_k \frac{u(x_k)}{\|u\|_{L^\infty[2,3]}} x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} \leq \mathcal{C} \log m$$

and

$$\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq 1} \Delta x_k x_k^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} \leq \mathcal{C} \log m,$$

whence

$$\int_{\varepsilon_{\theta m}}^1 t^{-\delta+\gamma/2-3/4} dt \leq \mathcal{C} \log m,$$

i.e. $\delta - \gamma/2 + 3/4 \leq 1$. So, (3.1) implies conditions (3.3). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.4. First of all, inequality (3.6) can be obtained proceeding like in [15, pp. 232–234]), since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)u\|_p &\leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{\theta m} \leq x_k \leq a_{\theta m}} \Delta x_k |fu|^p(x_k) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \left[\|fu\|_p + \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^{1/p} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Then, for any $P \in P_{m+1}^*$ of quasi best approximation, we can write

$$f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f) = (f - P) - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f - P).$$

By (2.7) and (2.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(f - P)u\|_p &\leq \mathcal{C} [E_M(f)_{u,p} + e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_p] \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^{1/p} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt + e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_p \right] \end{aligned}$$

and, using (4.8) and arguments similar to those in [14, Prop. 4.2, pp.280–281],

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f - P)u\|_p &\leq \mathcal{C}_\theta \left[\|(f - P)u\|_p + \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^{1/p} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f - P, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} \left[e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_p + \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m} \right)^{1/p} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt \right] \end{aligned}$$

we obtain (3.7). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Let us consider the space $D^p(u)$, defined by (3.8). We have

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)\|_{D^p(u)} \leq \|f\|_{D^p(u)} + \|f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)\|_{D^p(u)}$$

and

$$\|f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)\|_{D^p(u)} = \|[f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)]u\|_p + \int_0^1 \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f), t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt.$$

Let us estimate the second addend, decomposing it as

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f), t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt = \left\{ \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m}} + \int_{\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m}}^1 \right\} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f), t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt.$$

For the second integral we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m}}^1 \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f), t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt &\leq c \left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{am}} \right)^{1/p} \|[f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f)]u\|_p \\ &\leq c \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt + c e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate the first integral we can write

$$f - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f) = (f - P) - \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f - P) + \mathcal{L}_{m+2}(w, (1 - \chi_\theta)P)$$

where $P \in \mathbb{P}_M$, $M = \lfloor \frac{\theta m}{\theta+1} \rfloor$, is a polynomial of quasi best approximation for f , χ_θ is the characteristic function of $[\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]$. Since (using a procedure in [1, pp. 98–100], see also [8, p. 174, Theorem 3.5])

$$\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m} \|P'_m \varphi u\|_p \leq c \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t} dt$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f - P, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt &\leq c \left[\int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi^r(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt + \left(\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|P'_m \varphi u\|_p \right] \\ &\leq c \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{am}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f - P), t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt &\leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}\right)^{1-1/p} \left\| [\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f - P)]' \varphi u \right\|_p \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}\right)^{-1/p} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f - P) u \right\|_p \\ &\leq C \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(f, t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt, . \end{aligned}$$

In this last inequality we have used the estimate for $\left\| \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, f - P) u \right\|_p$ given in Theorem 3.4. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, (1 - \chi_\theta)P), t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt &\leq C \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}\right)^{1-1/p} \left\| [\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, (1 - \chi_\theta)P)]' \varphi u \right\|_p \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}\right)^{-1/p} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, (1 - \chi_\theta)P) u \right\|_p . \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left| \mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, (1 - \chi_\theta)P, x) u(x) \right| \leq \|Pu\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \setminus [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}])} \sum_{x_k \notin [\varepsilon_{\theta m}, a_{\theta m}]} \frac{|\ell_k(x)| u(x)}{u(x_k)}$$

where the sum is dominated by Cm^τ , for some $\tau > 0$, using (2.6) and the Nikolskii inequality (see [12, p. 810, Theorem 3.4])

$$\|Pu\|_\infty \leq C \left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_m a_m}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|Pu\|_p ,$$

we get

$$\int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{a_m}}{m}} \frac{\Omega_\varphi(\mathcal{L}_{m+2}^*(w, (1 - \chi_\theta)P), t)_{u,p}}{t^{1+1/p}} dt \leq C e^{-cm^\nu} \|fu\|_p$$

which completes the proof. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the referees for their relevant comments, which allowed to improve the previous version of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Ditzian and V. Totik, *Moduli of smoothness*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, Vol. 9, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.
- [2] R. Hunt, B. Muckenhoupt and R. Wheeden, *Weighted norm inequalities for the conjugate function and the Hilbert transform*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 176 (1973), 227–251.
- [3] P. Junghanns, G. Mastroianni and I. Notarangelo, *On Nyström and product integration methods for Fredholm integral equations*, In: Contemporary Computational Mathematics - a celebration of the 80th birthday of Ian Sloan (J. Dick, F.Y. Kuo, H. Woźniakowski, eds.), Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. 645–673. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72456-0_29

- [4] A.L. Levin and D. S. Lubinsky, *Orthogonal polynomials for exponential weights*, CSM Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC, 4. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [5] G. Mastroianni and I. Notarangelo, *A Lagrange-type projector on the real line*, Mathematics of Computation 79 (2010), no. 269, 327–352.
- [6] G. Mastroianni and I. Notarangelo, *Lagrange interpolation with exponential weights on $(-1, 1)$* , Journal of Approximation Theory 167 (2013), 65–93.
- [7] G. Mastroianni and I. Notarangelo, *Embedding theorems with an exponential weight on the real semiaxis*, Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics 43 (2013), 155–160.
- [8] G. Mastroianni and I. Notarangelo, *Polynomial approximation with an exponential weight on the real semiaxis*, Acta Mathematica Hungarica 142 (2014), no. 1, 167–198.
- [9] G. Mastroianni, G.V. Milovanović and I. Notarangelo, *Gaussian quadrature rules with an exponential weight on the real semiaxis*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis 34 (2014), no. 4, 1654–1685.
- [10] G. Mastroianni, G.V. Milovanović and I. Notarangelo, *A Nyström method for a class of Fredholm integral equations on the real semiaxis*, Calcolo 54 (2017), 567–585.
- [11] G. Mastroianni, G.V. Milovanović and I. Notarangelo, *Polynomial approximation with Pollaczek–Laguerre weights on the real semiaxis. A survey*, Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis 50 (2018), 36–51.
- [12] G. Mastroianni, I. Notarangelo and J. Szabados, *Polynomial inequalities with an exponential weight on $(0, +\infty)$* , Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics 10 (2) (2013), 807–821.
- [13] G. Mastroianni, I. Notarangelo, L. Szili and P. Vértesi, *Some new results on orthogonal polynomials for Laguerre type exponential weights*, Acta Math. Hungar. 155 (2) (2018), 466–478.
- [14] G. Mastroianni and M. G. Russo, *Lagrange interpolation in weighted Besov spaces*, Constr. Approx. 15 (1999), 257–289.
- [15] G. Mastroianni and P. Vértesi, *Fourier sums and Lagrange interpolation on $(0, +\infty)$ and $(-\infty, +\infty)$* , in: Frontiers in Interpolation and Approximation, Dedicated to the memory of A. Sharma, (N.K. Govil, H.N. Mhaskar, R.N. Mohapatra, Z. Nashed and J. Szabados, eds.) Boca Raton, Florida, Taylor & Francis Books, 2006, pp. 307–344.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COMPUTER SCIENCES AND ECONOMICS,, UNIVERSITY OF BASILICATA, VIALE DELL'ATENEO LUCANO 10, 85100 POTENZA, ITALY