Pacific Journal of Mathematics

ON THE VARIATION OF THE BERNSTEIN POLYNOMIALS OF A FUNCTION OF UNBOUNDED VARIATION

MARTIN EDWARD PRICE

Vol. 27, No. 1 January 1968

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 27, No. 1, 1968

ON THE VARIATION OF THE BERNSTEIN POLYNOMIALS OF A FUNCTION OF UNBOUNDED VARIATION

MARTIN PRICE

The behavior of the ordinary Bernstein polynomials, B_nf, for discontinuous functions f can be quite erratic. The purpose of this note is to give an example of a function f which is quite irregular on the rationals but such that the total variation, VB_nf of B_nf tends to zero with n.

It is known that if f is of bounded variation, then VB_nf tends to the variation of f taken over its points of continuity, [2 p. 25]. In [3] we consider arbitrary f, and give sufficient conditions for VB_nf to tend to zero in terms of the sums $\sum_{r=0}^{n} |f(r/n)|$. It is shown in [2 p. 28] that B_nf, for unbounded f, can behave unusually in terms of pointwise convergence to f. Here we construct a function, unbounded on the rationals in every subinterval of $[0, 1]$, and which has the property that B_nf converges in variation (and uniformly) to zero.

2. **Preliminaries.** The n-th Bernstein polynomial of the real function f on $[0, 1]$ is

$$B_nf \equiv \sum_{r=0}^{n} f\left(\frac{r}{n}\right)p_{nr}(x) , \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$p_{nr}(x) \equiv \binom{n}{r} x^r(1-x)^{n-r} , \qquad x \in [0, 1] .$$

Since B_nf depends only on rational values of f, we restrict ourselves to "skeletons," i.e., functions defined only on the rationals in $[0, 1]$, in the manner of [1]. We need the following facts:

(A) If $r = 1, \cdots, n-1$, then for all n,

$$P(n, r) \equiv \operatorname*{Max}_{[0,1]} p_{nr}(x) < Cn^{\frac{1}{2}}[r(n-r)]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.2}$$

where C is an absolute constant [1].

(B) If a is a positive integer, then

$$P(an, ar) < 2a^{-\frac{1}{2}}P(n, r) \tag{2.3}$$

for each $n \geqq 2$ and $r = 1, \cdots, n-1$. ((A) and (B) are applications of Stirling's formula.)

(C) For all n and f

$$VB_nf \leqq 2\sum_{r=0}^{n}\left|f\left(\frac{r}{n}\right)\right|P(n, r)\ . \tag{2.4}$$

(D) If $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i$ is a pointwise convergent series of functions (skeletons) on $[0, 1]$ then,

$$VB_n\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i\right) \leqq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} VB_nf_i$$

where the right side may be $+\infty$.

3. Construction. We define a sequence of skeletons f_i such that each skeleton tends to $+\infty$ on a set of rationals tending to a limit rational r_i. The r_i will be dense in $[0, 1]$. It is shown that the skeleton $f \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i$ has the following properties:

(1) f is unbounded on the rationals in every subinterval of $[0, 1]$;

(2) $VB_nf \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

(Since f will satisfy $f(0) = f(1) = 0$, and since $B_nf(0) = f(0)$ and $B_nf(1) = f(1)$ for all f and n, (2) implies $B_nf \to 0$ uniformly on $[0, 1]$.)

For all $i = 1, 2, \cdots$, pick $r_i \equiv p_i/q_i$ such that q_i is prime, $0 < p_i < q_i$, $q_i < q_{i+1}$, and $r_i \in I_i$, where $I_1 = [0, 1/2]$, $I_2 = [1/2, 1]$, $I_3 = [0, 1/4]$, $\cdots$ $I_6 = [3/4, 1]$, $I_7 = [0, 1/8]$, $\cdots$. Thus the r_i are dense in $[0, 1]$. Define

$$f_i\left(\frac{p_i}{q_i} + \frac{1}{q_i^{\alpha(i,l)}}\right) \equiv l \tag{3.1}$$

where for each i, $\alpha(i, l)$ is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers to be determined later. For all other rationals in $[0, 1]$, put $f_i \equiv 0$, and then set $f \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i$. Since the supports of the f_i are disjoint, f is well defined at all rationals, and satisfies (1) by construction. We have

$$VB_nf \leqq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} VB_nf_i \leqq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} H(i, n) \tag{3.2}$$

by 2 (C) and (D), where we have put

$$H(i, n) \equiv 2\sum_{r=0}^{n}\left|f_i\left(\frac{r}{n}\right)\right| P(n, r)\ . \tag{3.3}$$

LEMMA (3.1). *For fixed i, it is possible to choose $\alpha(i, l)$, $l = 1, 2, \cdots$ such that*

$$H(i, q_i^{\alpha(i,l)}) < \frac{1}{q_i^2 l}\ . \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. To simplify matters, let $p_i \equiv p$, $q_i \equiv q$ and $\alpha(i, l) \equiv \alpha_l$. When $n = q_i^{\alpha(i,k)} \equiv q^{\alpha_k}$, there are only k, nonzero terms on the right in (3.3), and these correspond to the points

$$\frac{r}{n} = \frac{p}{q} + \frac{1}{q^{\alpha_j}} = \frac{pq^{\alpha_k - 1} + q^{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}}{q^{\alpha_k}} \qquad (j = 1 \cdots k) .$$

Since the value of f_i at the j-th point is j, (3.3) becomes

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} 2jP(q^{\alpha_k}, pq^{\alpha_k - 1} + q^{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}) . \tag{3.5}$$

By applying (2.2), one gets each term in (3.5) less than

$$\begin{aligned} &2jC\left[\frac{q^{\alpha_k}}{[pq^{\alpha_k - 1} + q^{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}][q^{\alpha_k} - pq^{\alpha_k - 1} - q^{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}]}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= 2jC\left[q^{\alpha_k}\left(\frac{p}{q} - \frac{p^2}{q^2} - \frac{2p}{q^{\alpha_j + 1}} + \frac{1}{q^{\alpha_j}} - \frac{1}{q^{2\alpha_j}}\right)\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} . \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Thus, for $k = j = 1$, α_1 may be chosen so large that (3.6), hence (3.5), is less than $1/q^2$. (We pick $\alpha_1 \geqq 2$ so that $p/q + 1/q^{\alpha_1} < 1$.) Now suppose α_k, $k = 1, \cdots, l - 1$ have been chosen so that $\alpha_k > \alpha_{k-1}$, and so that (3.5) is less than $1/q^2 k$. When $k = l$, (3.6) shows that α_l can be chosen so that each term, $j = 1, \cdots l$ is less than $1/q^2 l^2$. Thus (3.5) is less than $l \cdot (ql)^{-2} = 1/q^2 l$.

We can factor every integer n uniquely as:

$$n \equiv d \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{T} n_j, \qquad n_j = q_{i_j}^{\alpha(i_j, L_j)} \quad q_{i_j} < q_{i_{j+1}} . \tag{3.7}$$

The q_{i_j} are those q_i which appear in n to a power greater than or equal $\alpha(i_j, 1)$, and L_j is the largest index l of the exponents $\alpha(i_j, l)$ such that $q_{i_j}^{\alpha(i_j, l)}$ divides n. For any n,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} H(i, n) = \sum_{j=1}^{T} H(i_j, n) \leqq \sum_{j=1}^{T} 2\left(\frac{n_j}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} H(i_j, n_j) \tag{3.8}$$

where the inequality follows from (2. B) with $a = n/n_j$. If we apply the lemma to each term, we get the last sum less than

$$\sum_{j=1}^{T} 2\left(\frac{n_j}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{q_{i_j}^2 L_j} \leqq \frac{2}{n_T^{1/2}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{q_{i_j}^2 L_j}\right) + \frac{1}{q_{i_T}^2 L_T} \tag{3.9}$$

where the decomposition applies if $T > 1$. In this case, the sum on the right is dominated by $\sum 1/m^2$ and is thus bounded. (If $T = 1$, the assertion is that (3.9) holds if the sum is regarded as vacuous, and a similar remark holds for (3.11) below.) Therefore if the largest of the q_{i_j}, q_{i_T} is as large as, let us say, q_{i_*}, n_T will also be large, and (3.9) can be made less than ε.

Now suppose n is such that every $q_{i_j} < q_{i_*}$. As before

$$\sum_{i=j}^{\infty} H(i, n) \leqq \sum_{j=1}^{T} 2\left(\frac{n_j}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{q_{i_j}^2 L_j} \qquad (q_{i_j} < q_{i_*}) \tag{3.10}$$

Let k be the first index where $\mathrm{Max}_{1 \leqq j \leqq T} L_j$ occurs. Then (3.10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j \neq k} \left[2\left(\frac{n_j}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{q_{i_j}^2 L_j}\right] + \frac{1}{q_{i_k}^2 L_k} \leqq \\ &\left[2(2)^{-\alpha(i_k, L_k)/2}\left(\sum_{j \neq k} \frac{1}{q_{i_j}^2 L_j}\right)\right] + \frac{1}{q_{i_k}^2 L_k} , \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

since $q_{i_k} \geqq 2$ and appears in every n^j/n for $j \neq k$. As in (3.9), the sum is bounded. Thus if L_k is large enough, say $L_k \geqq L, \alpha(i_k, L_k)$ is also large, and (3.10) is less than ε.
Now suppose every q_i in n is less than q_{i_*} and all the indices L_j are less than L. There are only a finite number of such combinations $\prod_{j=1}^{T} n_j$, and we denote them C_s, $s = 1 \cdots S$. If $n \equiv d \cdot C_s$, we get by (2.B)

$$\sum_{i-1}^{\infty} H(i, n) \leqq \frac{2}{d^{1/2}} \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} H(i, C_s) . \tag{3.12}$$

However only a finite number of q_i appear in any C_s so that the sum is bounded by, say $M_s > 0$. Therefore (3.12) is less $2M_s/d^{1/2}$, and we can pick d_s large enough so that $d \geqq d_s$ implies (3.12) is less than ε.

Thus if $n > \mathrm{Max}\,[q_{i_*}^{\alpha(i_*, 1)}, q_1^{\alpha(1, L)}, d_1 c_1 \cdots d_S c_S]$, $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} H(i, n) < \varepsilon$, implying $VB_n f < \varepsilon$ by (3.2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. F. Herzog and J.D. Hill, *The Bernstein polynomials for discontinuous functions*, Amer. J. Math. **68** (1946), 109-124.
2. G.G. Lorentz, *Bernstein Polonomials*, University of Toronto Press, 1953.
3. M. Price, *Variation convergence for Bernstein polynomials*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **19** (1968), 551-554.

Received May 22, 1967. This is based on part of the author's Ph. D. thesis at Purdue University, written under the direction of Professor C. Goffman. It was supported by NSF Grant GP-03515.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Printed in Japan by International Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 27, No. 1 January, 1968