Pacific Journal of Mathematics

ON INTERPOLATION OF $L_p[a, b]$ AND WEIGHTED SOBOLEV SPACES

Zeev Ditzian

Vol. 90, No. 2 October 1980

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 90, No. 2, 1980

ON INTERPOLATION OF $L_p[a, b]$ AND WEIGHTED SOBOLEV SPACES

Z. DITZIAN

The goal of this paper is to characterize the interpolation spaces between $L_p[a, b]$ or $C[a, b]$ and the space of functions for which $W(x)f^{(r)}(x)$ belongs to $L_p[a, b]$ or $C[a, b]$. In order to achieve this, for a class of weights $W(x)$ the Peetre K functional is characterized.

We recall that the Peetre K functional on $f \in B_1 + B_2$ where B_i are Banach spaces, both of which are contained in a linear Hausdorff space, is given by

$$K(\tau, f) \equiv \inf_{f=f_1+f_2} (\|f_1\|_{B_1} + \tau\|f_2\|_{B_2}) \, . \tag{1.1}$$

The Peetre interpolation spaces $(B_1, B_2)_{\theta,q;K}$ for $0 \leqq \theta \leqq 1$ and $1 \leqq q \leqq \infty$ are given by their norms

$$\|f\|_{\theta;K} \equiv \|f\|_{\theta,\infty;K} = \sup_{\tau>0} \tau^{-\theta}K(\tau, f) \tag{1.2}$$

and

$$\|f\|_{\theta,q;K} = \left\{\int_0^\infty (\tau^{-\theta}K(\tau, f))^q \frac{d\tau}{\tau}\right\}^{1/q} \text{ for } 1 \leqq q < \infty \, . \tag{1.3}$$

It is therefore obvious that to find a characterization of the space $(B_1, B_2)_{\theta,q;K}$ it is enough to characterize the functional $K(\tau, f)$ in terms of $f(x)$. It can be noted that sometimes a natural condition can be given for a function to belong to a specific $(B_1, B_2)_{\theta,q;K}$ without going through the function (see [4]), but it is preferable to attain a description of $K(\tau, f)$, since that will yield results for all $1 \leqq q \leqq \infty$ simultaneously. In this paper $f \in B_1$, and therefore $K(\tau, f) = \inf_g (\|f - g\|_{B_1} + \|g\|_{B_2})$. Moreover, for the sake of convenience, we shall substitute $\tau = t^r$.

The functionals in which we are interested, $K_*(t^r, f)$ and $K(t^r, f)$ are given by:

$$K_*(t^r, f) = \inf_g (\|f - g\|_B + t^r(\|g\|_B + \|W(\cdot)^r g^{(r)}(\cdot)\|_B) \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$K(t^r, f) = \inf_g (\|f - g\|_B + t^r(\|W(\cdot)^r g^{(r)}(\cdot)\|_B) \tag{1.5}$$

where B is $L_p[a, b]$ or $C[a, b]$ and where $g^{(r)}$ exists except perhaps at zeros of $W(x)$, and $g^{(r-1)}$ is locally absolutely continuous for $x \in$

$[a, b]\backslash\{x_0; w(x_0) = 0\}$. Using the K_* and K functionals of (1.4) and (1.5), in (1.2) and (1.3), we have the norm $\|f\|_{\theta,q;K_*}$ and seminorm $\|f\|_{\theta,q;K}$ respectively. For $\theta > 0$, $\|f\|_{\theta,q;K_*}$ is bounded, that is, f belongs to the interpolation space, if and only if $\|f\|_{\theta,q;K}$ is bounded. This follows the simple observations that: (a) $K(\tau, f) \leqq \|f\|$ and $K_*(\tau, f) \leqq \|f\|$; and, since g in both (1.4) and (1.5) can be chosen among $\|g\| \leqq 2\|f\|$ (otherwise $g = 0$ would yield a smaller number), then (b) $K_*(\tau, f) \geqq K(\tau, f) \geqq K_*(\tau, f) - 2\|f\|\tau$. For $\theta > 0$, in (1.2) when the supremum is taken on $\tau > \delta$ and in (1.3) when the integral is $\int_\delta^\infty$, the estimate (a) would imply boundedness. For $\theta > 0$ (b) would imply, for $\tau \leqq \delta$, that the difference between the expressions with K and K_* is bounded.

We shall solve the problem for $W(x)$ having finitely many zeros x_i for which $A_1|x - x_i|^{\alpha_{ij}} \leqq W(x) \leqq A_2|x - x_i|^{\alpha_{ij}}$ for $x < x_i$ or $x > x_i$ when $j = 1$ or 2 respectively. Actually in § 2 we shall show how to reduce the question to that of characterization of $K(t^r, f)$ when the function is defined on [0, 1] and its support is in [0, 3/4] and where the weight function is $W(x) = x^\alpha$. We shall solve this main problem in § 3 for continuous functions and in § 4 for L_p functions. We shall later, in § 5, fully state the general result for the characterization of K. We shall also state the actual interpolation results as a corollary.

For $C[0, 1]$, $W(x) = x^\alpha$ and $\omega_r^*(f, h)$ given by

$$\omega_r^*(f, h) = \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta \leqq h} \operatorname*{Sup}_{(r/2)\eta < x^{1-\alpha}} |\Delta_{\eta x^\alpha}^r f(x)| \tag{1.6}$$

where $\Delta_t^r f(x) = \Delta_t(\Delta_t^{r-1} f(x))$ and $\Delta_t f(x) = f(x + t/2) - f(x - t/2)$ we will have the relation

$$C_1\omega_r^*(f, t) \leqq K(t^r, f) \leqq C_2\omega_r^*(f, t) \text{ for } 0 < t < \delta . \tag{1.7}$$

It is clear that away from the singularity 0 $\omega_r^*(f, t)$ behaves like a modulus of continuity while near 0 much smaller differences are taken, in other words, for $\omega_r^*(f, h)$ to be small the function has to be much less smooth near 0 than away from 0. For example, $f(x) = x^{1/3}$ and $\alpha = 1/2$ will yield $\omega_1^*(f, t) \sim ct^{2/3}$. The result in (1.7), which will be proved in § 3, can be stated also as the following interpolation theorem.

THEOREM. *Let* $f(x) \in C[0, 1]$, Supp $f \subset [0, 3/4]$ *and* A_r *be given by* $A_r = \{f \in C[0, 1]; x^{r\alpha} f^{(r)}(x) \in C[0, 1], f^{(r-1)}$ *is locally absolutely continuous*$\}$ *then* $f \in (C, A_r)_{\theta,K_*}$ *for* $0 \leqq \theta \leqq 1$ *or* $f \in (C, A_r)_{\theta,q,K_*}$ *for* $0 < \theta \leqq 1$ *and* $1 \leqq q < \infty$ *if and only if* $t^{-r\theta}\omega_r^*(f, t)$ *is bounded for* $t<\delta$ *or* $\int_0^\delta (t^{-r\theta}\omega_r^*(f, t))^q dt/t$ *is bounded, respectively where* $\omega_r^*(f, t)$ *is given* *by* (1.6).

For L_p the expression of $\omega_r^*(f, t)$ is somewhat more complicated and the exact characterization of $K(t^r, f)$ will be given in § 4 for the above $W(x)$.

The problem of interpolation between $\|f\|_{B[a,b]}$ and $\|f^{(r)}\|_{B[a,b]}$ where $B = L_p$ (or C) i.e., the case $W(x) = 1$ was solved and treated extensively. (See for instance [3] and [5].)

The problem of interpolation between $L_p(\nu)$ and $L_p(\mu)$ was solved by Stein and Weiss [6] which covers in general the case where no derivatives are involved.

For $C[a, b] = C[0, 1]$ and $W(x) = (x(1-x))^{1/2}$ a characterization of the class $\{f; K(t^{2r}, f)/t^{\beta} = 0(1),\ t \to 0\}$ was given by the author [4] in order to characterize the class of functions for which Bernstein polynomials of $f(x)$ and their combinations converge to $f(x)$ at a certain rate.

For this particular case the present paper yields a different (but equivalent) result and in addition here the K functional is characterized and not only the class $\{f\colon K(t^{2r}, f)/t^{\beta} = 0(1)\}$. It is clear that the difference between K_* and K is bounded by $2\|f\|t^r$ and the cases of interest would occur when $t^r = o(K(t^r, f)),\ t \to 0+$.

2. Some simplifications.

We first observe that if $0 < A_1 \leqq W(x) \leqq A_2$

$$K_{W^*}(t^r, f) = \inf_g (\|f - g\|_B + t^r(\|g\|_B + \|W^r g^{(r)}\|)_B) \tag{2.1}$$

where B is $L_p[a, b]$ or $C[a, b]$ and

$$K_{1^*}(t^r, f) = \inf_g (\|f - g\| + t^r(\|g\|_B + \|g^{(r)}\|_B))$$

are equivalent norms independent of t and therefore the situation in which a continuous $W(x)$ has no zero does not interest us in this paper since it has already been solved and discussed elsewhere.

One can mention here that if $W(x)$ is equal to zero on a subinterval of $[a, b]$ the values of f in that subinterval will not affect $K_W(t^r, f)$. In any case the treatment in this paper is for $W(x)$ having only isolated zeros x_i satisfying $A_1|x - x_i|^{\alpha} \leqq W(x) \leqq A_2|x - x_i|^{\alpha}$ for x either only on one side of x_i for that or on both sides.

We can define

$$K_i(t^r, f) = \inf_g [\|f - g\|_{B[x_i, x_{i+1}]} + t^r(\|g(x)\|_{B[x_i, x_{i+1}]} + \|W(x)^r g^{(r)}(x)\|_{B[x_i, x_{i+1}]})]$$

where x_i, x_{i+1} are consecutive zeros of $W(x)$ or one of them may be an edge of $[a, b]$ even in case a or b are not zeros of $W(x)$. We observe

$$K_*(t^r, f) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} K_i(t^r, f) .$$

That $K_*(t^r, f) \leqq \sum \cdots$ is clear from the definition of the K functionals being infimums, and the inequality in the other direction follows, since when g, chosen for $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ it does not affect its choice elsewhere. In fact there is no relation between $K_i(t^r, f)$ and $K_j(t^r, f)(i \neq j)$ and all the information of $f(x)$ can be derived separately.

Moreover, if (a, b) is infinite, that is $a = -\infty$ or $b = \infty$ or both, and x_i are infinitely many zeros of $W(x)$ that do not have an accumulation point, we still have $K_*(t^r, f) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} K_i(t^r, f)$.

For a single K_i a linear transformation can bring $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ to $[0, 1]$.

To simplify even further we would like to separate the problem into two symmetric problems near 0 and near 1.

For that we shall define the C^∞ function $\psi_1(x)$ $0 \leqq \psi_1(x) \leqq 1$, $\psi_1(x) = 1$ on $[0, 1/4]$ and $\psi_1(x) = 0$ on $[3/4, 1]$. Recalling

$$K_*(t^r, f) = \inf_g (\|f - g\| + t^r(\|g\| + \|W^r g^{(r)}(\cdot)\|))$$

we have

$$K_*(t^r, f) \leqq K_*(t^r, f\psi_1) + K_*(t^r, f(1 - \psi_1)) .$$

We shall show

$$(2.2) \quad K_*(t^r, f\cdot\psi_1) \leqq MK_*(t^r, f),\ K_*(t^r, f(1 - \psi_1)) \leqq MK_*(t^r, f) .$$

Therefore characterization of $K_*(t^r, f\psi_1)$ and $K_*(t^r, f(1 - \psi_1))$ separately will suffice. This is the only point where K_* (rather than K) is used since when $f = g$ and $g^{(r)} = 0$ $(g\psi_1)^{(r)}$ is not necessarily equal to zero.

To prove (2.3) we shall need the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.1. *If $f, f^{(r)} \in L_p[a, b]$ $1 \leqq p < \infty$ or $C[a, b]$, ($f^{(r-1)}$ is locally absolutely continuous), then for $0 < k < r$*

$$(2.4) \qquad \|f^{(k)}\|_p \leqq M\left(\frac{\|f\|_p}{(b - a)^k}\right) + (b - a)^{r-k}\|f^{(r)}\|_p\Big)$$

where M does not depend on p nor on $[a, b]$.

The lemma is well-known (see Adams [2, p. 81]) if M can depend on p and $[a, b]$, which would suffice for this section but not for the following sections. With M not depending on p or $[a, b]$ I was not able to find a reference, so a simple proof is enclosed. For the space $C[a, b]$ the validity of Lemma 2.1 was mentioned to me by S. Riemenschneider who has a different proof (just for $C[a, b]$) using B-splines.

Using Lemma 2.1 we now prove (2.3). There exists g_t satisfying $\|f - g_t\| + t^r(\|g_t\| + \|W^r g_t^{(r)}\|) \leqq 2K_*(t^r, f)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} K_*(t^r, f\psi_1) &\leqq \|f\psi_1 - g_t\psi_1\| + t^r(\|g_t\psi_1\| + \|W^r(g_t\psi_1)^{(r)}\|) \leqq \|f - g_t\| \\ &+ t^r\|W^r g_t^{(r)}\|_{B[0,1/4]} + t^r\|g_t\|_{B[0,1]} + t^r\|W^r(g_t\psi_1)^{(r)}\|_{B[1/4,3/4]} \leqq 2K_*(t^r, f) \\ &+ t^r \max_{1/4 \leqq x \leqq 3/4} W(x)^r \cdot \sum \binom{r}{k} \|g_t^{(k)}\|_{B[1/4,3/4]} \|\psi_1^{(r-k)}\|_\infty \leqq 2K_*(t^r, f) \\ &+ t^r M(\|g_t^{(r)}\|_{B[1/4,3/4]} + \|g_t\|_{B[1/4,3/4]}) \leqq 2K_*(t^r, f) \\ &+ t^r M_1 \|W(x)^r g_t^{(r)}\|_{B[1/4,3/4]} + t^r M\|g_t\|_{B[0,1]} \leqq M_2 K_*(t^r, f) . \end{aligned}$$

In fact we have shown a little more, that is

$$K_*(t^r, f_1) \leqq M_2 \inf_g (\|f - g\|_{B[0,3/4]} + t^r(\|g\|_{B[0,3/4]} + \|W(x)^r g^{(r)}(\cdot)\|_{B[0,3/4]}))$$

and a similar estimate for $K_*(t^r, f(1 - \psi_1))$ and the interval $[1/4, 1]$.

In this section we show the equivalence treating different $K_*(t^r, f)$. In what follows $K(t^r, f)$ will be used rather than K_*, but the difference is at most $O(t^r)$ so that our result will relate to K_* only if $t^r = O(K(t^r, f))$ (in which case $t^r = O(K_*(t^r, f))$ too).

Proof of Lemma 2.1. We first observe that instead of proving for $0 < k < n$

$$\|f^{(k)}\|_B \leqq M(n, k)\{(b - a)^{-k}\|f\|_B + (b - a)^{n-k}\|f^{(n)}\|_B\} , \tag{2.5}$$

it is enough to show

$$\|f^{(k)}\|_B \leqq M(k)\{(b - a)^{-k}\|f\|_B + (b - a)\|f^{(k+1)}\|_B\} , \tag{2.6}$$

that is (2.5) with $n = k + 1$ since (2.5) follows (2.6) by induction. For $a \leqq x \leqq (a + b)/2$ and $h = (b - a)/2k$ we use the Taylor formula with integral remainder that for locally integrable $f^{(k+1)}$ with $f^{(k)}$ locally absolutely continuous is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f(x + jh) &= f(x) + \frac{jh}{1!}f'(x) + \cdots + \frac{(jh)^k}{k!}f^{(k)}(x) \\ &+ \frac{1}{k!}\int_0^{jh} (jh - u)^k f^{(k+1)}(x + u)\,du \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

to obtain

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}(-1)^{k-j}f(x+jh)=h^k f^{(k)}(x) + \frac{1}{k!}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\binom{k}{j}(-1)^{k-j}\int_0^{jh}(jh-u)^k f^{(k+1)}(x+u)\,\mathrm{du}\,. \tag{2.8}$$

Therefore $f, f^{(k+1)} \in L_p[a, b]$ (or $C[a, b]$) implies $f^{(k)} \in L_p[a, (a+b)/2]$ (or $C[a, (a+b)/2]$) and

$$\begin{aligned} h^k\|f^{(k)}\|_{L_p[a,a+b/2]} &\leqq 2^k\|f\|_{L_p[a,b]} \\ &+\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\binom{k}{j}\left\{\int_a^{(a+b)/2}\left|\int_0^{jh}(jh-u)^k f^{(k+1)}(x+u)du\right|^p dx\right\}^{1/p} \\ &\leqq 2^k\|f\|_{L_p[a,b]}+\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\binom{k}{j}\frac{(jh)^{k+1}}{k+1}\|f^{(k+1)}\|_{L_p[a,b]}\,. \end{aligned}$$

This can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^{(k)}\|_{L_p[a,(a+b)/2]} &\leqq 2^k(2k)^k\cdot(b-a)^{-k}\|f\|_{L_p[a,b]} \\ &+\frac{1}{(k+1)!}\,\frac{2^k k^{k+1}}{2k}(b-a)\|f^{(k+1)}\|_{L_p[a,b]}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Using $h=-(b-a)/2k$ we obtain a similar estimate for $\|f^{(k)}\|_{L_p[a+b/2,b]}$ or $\|f^{(k)}\|_{C[a+b/2,b]}$, and combining both we obtain (2.6) with the constants in (2.9) for $C[a, b]$ and with twice those constants for L_p. (The exact constants which we arrived at are not important since they are not the best possible.)

3. The $C[0, 1]$ case. In this section functions $f \in C[0, 1]$ for which $\operatorname{Supp} f \in [0, 3/4]$ are investigated but, as discussed in § 2, it is clear that $f \in C[0, 1]$ in general is actually being treated and the condition $\operatorname{Supp} f \subset [0, 3/4]$ is just for convenience.

THEOREM 3.1. *Suppose* $f(x) \in C[0, 1]$, $\operatorname{Supp} f \subset [0, 3/4]$ *and let*

$$K(t^r, f) \equiv \inf_g (\|f-g\|_{C[0,1]} + t^r\|x^{r\alpha}g^{(r)}(\cdot)\|_{C[0,1]}) \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\omega_r^*(f, h) \equiv \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta<h}\ \operatorname*{Sup}_{r/2\eta<x^{1-\alpha}} |\Delta_{\eta x^\alpha}^r f(x)|,\quad \Delta_\zeta f(x) \equiv f\left(x+\frac{\zeta}{2}\right) - f\left(x-\frac{\zeta}{2}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

then for $\alpha > 0$

$$M_1\omega_r^*(f, t) \leqq K(t^r, f) \leqq M_2\omega_r^*(f, t) \tag{3.3}$$

where M_1 *and* M_2 *depend on* r *and* α *but not on* f *and* t.

Proof. First we will show $M_1\omega_r^*(f, t) \leqq K(t^r, f)$. There exists g_t satisfying $\|f - g_t\| + t^r\|x^{r\alpha}g_t^{(r)}(x)\| \leqq 2K(t^r, f)$. We have

$$\omega_r^*(f, h) \leqq \omega_r^*(f - g_t, h) + \omega_r^*(g_t, h)$$

and clearly $\omega_r^*(f - g_t, h) \leqq 2^r\|f - g_t\| \leqq 2^{r+1}K(t^r, f)$. To estimate $\omega_r^*(g_t, h)$ we note that $r\eta/2 < x^{1-\alpha}$ always and therefore we can estimate $\Delta_{\eta x^\alpha}^r f$ for $r\eta \leqq x^{1-\alpha}$ and for $r\eta/2 < x^{1-\alpha} \leqq r\eta$ separately. We observe also that for $\alpha \geqq 1$ h can be chosen so small that the first case ($r\eta \leqq x^{1-\alpha}$) always applies.

For $x^{1-\alpha} \geqq r\eta$ and $\eta \leqq h = t$ we write

$$|\Delta_{\eta x^\alpha}^r f(x)| = |\eta^r x^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(\xi)| \leqq t^r \left|\frac{x}{\xi}\right|^{r\alpha} |\xi^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(\xi)| \leqq 2^{r\alpha}\cdot 2K(t^r, f)$$

since $x - (r/2)\eta < \xi < x + (r/2)\eta$ and $|x/\xi| < 2$.

Estimating $\omega_r^*(g_t, h)$ for $r\eta/2 < x^{1-\alpha} < r\eta$ (in which case only $\alpha < 1$ has to be considered), we have using Taylor's formula

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta_{\eta x^\alpha}^r g_t(x)| &\leqq \sum_{l=0}^{r}\binom{r}{l}\frac{1}{(r-1)!}\left|\int_x^{x+(l-r/2)\eta x^\alpha}\left(x+\left(l-\frac{r}{2}\right)\eta x^\alpha - u\right)^{r-1} g_t^{(r)}(u)\,\mathrm{du}\right| \\ &\leqq \|u^{r\alpha}g_t^{(r)}(u)\|\frac{2^r}{(r-1)!}\max_{0\leqq l\leqq r}\left|\int_x^{x+(l-r/2)\eta x^\alpha}\frac{(x+(l-r/2)\eta x^\alpha - u)^{r-1}}{u^{r\alpha}}\mathrm{du}\right| .\end{aligned}$$

For $l > r/2$

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_x^{x+(l-r/2)\eta x^\alpha}\frac{(x+(l-r/2)\eta x^\alpha - u)^{r-1}}{u^{r\alpha}}\mathrm{du}\right| \\ &\qquad \leqq \frac{[(l-r/2)\eta x^\alpha]^r}{x^{r\alpha}} = \left(l - \frac{r}{2}\right)^r \eta^r .\end{aligned}$$

For $l = r/2$ the above is zero. For $l < r/2$, we have, since $x+(l-r/2)\eta x^\alpha > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_x^{x+(l-r/2)\eta x^\alpha}\frac{(x + (l - r/2)\eta x^\alpha - u)^{r-1}}{u^{r\alpha}}\right|\mathrm{du} \\ &\qquad \leqq \int_0^x u^{r-r\alpha-1}\mathrm{du} = \frac{1}{r(1-\alpha)}x^{r(1-\alpha)} < \frac{1}{r(1-\alpha)}r^r\eta^r .\end{aligned}$$

Therefore using $\eta \leqq t$

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta_{\eta x^\alpha}^r g_t(x)| &\leqq K(t^r, f)\frac{\eta^r}{t^r}\cdot\frac{2^r}{(r-1)!}\max\left(\left(r - \frac{r}{2}\right)^r, \frac{1}{r(1-\alpha)}r^r\right) \\ &\leqq MK(t^r, f) .\end{aligned}$$

To prove now $K(t^r, f) \leqq M_2\omega_2^*(f, t)$ we construct $g_t(x)$ such that

$$\|f - g_t\|_{C[0,1]} + t^r\|x^{\alpha r}g_t^{(r)}\| \leqq M_2\omega_r^*(f, t) .$$

To accomplish the construction of g_t we have to define the functions $\psi_l(x) \equiv \psi(4^l x)$ where $\psi(x) \in C^\infty$, $0 \leqq \psi(x) \leqq 1$, $\psi(x)$ is decreasing, $\psi(x) = 1$ $x \leqq 1$ and $\psi(x) = 0$ $x \geqq 3$.

We also construct

$$f_h(x)=\left(\frac{r}{h}\right)^r \int_0^{h/r} \cdots \int_0^{h/r} \sum_{k=1}^{r} (-1)^{k+1} \binom{r}{k} f(x+k(u_1 \cdots + u_r))du_1 \cdots du_r \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_h^*(x) &= \left(\frac{r}{h}\right)^r \left[1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^r\right]^{-1} \\ &\times \int_{h/2r}^{h/r} \cdots \int_{h/2r}^{h/r} \sum_{k=1}^{r} (-1)^{k+1} \binom{r}{k} f(x+k(u_1 + \cdots + u_r))du_1 \cdots du_r \,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

For $\alpha < 1$ and t satisfying $4^{-(l+1)(1-\alpha)} < t \leqq 4^{-l(1-\alpha)}$ we write

$$g_t(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{l} f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}} \psi_{k-1}(x)(1 - \psi_k(x)) + f^*_{t\cdot 4^{-l\alpha}M} \psi_l(x) \tag{3.6}$$

where M will be chosen later and for $\alpha \geqq 1$ we write

$$g_t(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{t,4^{-k\alpha}} \psi_{k-1}(x)(1 - \psi_k(x)) \,. \tag{3.7}$$

We now have to show

$$\| f - g_t \|_{C[0,1]} \leqq K_1 \omega_r^*(f, t) \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$t^r \| x^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)} \|_{C[0,1]} \leqq K_2 \omega_r^*(f, t) \,. \tag{3.9}$$

We recall that

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{l} f(x)\psi_{k-1}(x)(1 - \psi_k(x)) + f(x)\psi_l(x)$$

or

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f(x)\psi_{k-1}(x)(1 - \psi_k(x)) \,.$$

(Both expressions are correct independently of α but will be used respectively for $\alpha < 1$ and $\alpha \geqq 1$.)

Since in (3.6) and (3.7) at most two terms of the sum differ from zero for any x we will prove (3.8) when we show for $4^{-k} < x < 3\cdot 4^{-k+1}$

$$| f(x) - f_{t4^{-k\alpha}}(x) | \leqq \omega_r^*(f, t) \tag{3.10}$$

for all k when $\alpha \geqq 1$ and for $k \leqq l$, l given by $4^{-(l+1)(1-\alpha)}<t\leqq 4^{-l(1-\alpha)}$ only for $\alpha < 1$; but in the latter case for $x < 3\cdot 4^{-l}$ we have to show also

$$(3.11)\qquad |f(x) - f^*_{t4^{-l\alpha}}| \leqq \omega^*_r(f, t) .$$

To prove (3.10) we have

$$|f(x) - f_{t4^{-k\alpha}}(x)| \leqq \sup_{\substack{\eta\leqq t\\ 4^{-k}<x<3\cdot 4^{-k+1}}} \left|\Delta^r_{\eta 4^{-k\alpha}} f\left(x + \frac{r}{2}\eta 4^{-k\alpha}\right)\right|$$
$$\leqq \sup_{\substack{x-(r/2)\eta x^{\alpha}>4^{-k}\\ \eta\leqq t}} |\Delta^r_{\eta x^\alpha} f(x)| \leqq \omega^*_r(f, t) .$$

We derive (3.11) as follows

$$|f - f^*_{t4^{-l\alpha}}| \leqq \sup_{t/2\leqq\eta\leqq t} \left|\Delta^r_{\eta 4^{-l\alpha}M} f\left(x + \eta\cdot\frac{r}{2}4^{-l\alpha}\right)\right|$$
$$\leqq \sup_{\substack{t/2\leqq\eta\leqq t\\ \zeta>(r/2)\eta 4^{-l\alpha}M}} |\Delta^r_{\eta 4^{-l\alpha}M} f(\zeta)| = \sup_{\substack{\eta\leqq t\\ \zeta\geqq(r/2)\eta\zeta^\alpha}} |\Delta^r_{\eta\zeta^\alpha} f(\zeta)| \leqq \omega^*_r(f, t)$$

for $M=\min(1, (r/8)^{\alpha/1-\alpha})$, since for such M, $\eta(r/2)4^{-l\alpha}M \geqq (r/2)4^{-l\alpha}(t/2)M \geqq (r/4)4^{-l\alpha}4^{-l(1-\alpha)}4^{-(1-\alpha)} \geqq 4^{-l}r/8\cdot M \geqq 4^{-l}(r/8)^{1/1-\alpha}$, (or $\geqq 4^{-l}$ if $M = 1$).

We shall prove (3.9) now. First let us observe

$$(3.14)\qquad |f_h^{(r)}(x)| = \left|\left(\frac{r}{h}\right)^r \sum_{j=1}^r \binom{r}{j}(-1)^{k+1}\Delta^r_{jh/r} f(x + jh/2)\right|$$

which can be proved following Achieser [1, p. 174] where the case in which f_h is translated to be centered at zero and $r = 2$ is treated. Therefore, for $4^{-k} \leqq x \leqq 3\cdot 4^{-k+1}$ (and $k < l$ for $\alpha < 1$)

$$|t^r x^{r\alpha} f^{(r)}_{4^{-k\alpha}}(x)| \leqq t^r 3^{r\alpha}|4^{-kr\alpha} f^{(r)}_{t4^{-k\alpha}}(x)| \leqq 3^{r\alpha}r^r \sum_{j=1}^r \binom{r}{j} |\Delta^r_{t4^{-k\alpha}(j/r)} f(x + jt4^{-k\alpha/2})$$
$$\leqq 3^{r\alpha}r^r\cdot 2^r \max_j |\Delta^r_{t4^{-k\alpha}(j/r)} f\left(x + jt4^{-k\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right)\Big| \leqq M \sup_{\substack{\eta\leqq t\\ x-(r/2)\eta x^{\alpha}>4^{-k}}} |\Delta^r_{\eta x^\alpha} f(x)|$$
$$\leqq M\omega^*_2(f, t) .$$

For $f^*_k(x)$ we have

$$(3.15)\qquad \begin{aligned}|f^*_k(x)| = \left(\frac{r}{h}\right)^r\left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^r\right)^{-1} \Big| \sum_{j=1}^r \binom{r}{j}(-1)^{k+1}\\ \times \left\{\Delta^r_{jh/r} f\left(x + jh\frac{1}{2}\right) - \Delta^r_{jh/2r} f(x + jh/4)\right\}\Big| .\end{aligned}$$

For $h=t\cdot 4^{-l\alpha}M$, $t \geqq 4^{-(l+1)\alpha}$ and $x<3\cdot 4^{-l}$ we derive $t^r\|x^{r\alpha}f^{*(r)}_{t,4^{-l\alpha}M}(x)\| \leqq M_1\omega^*_r(f, t)$ similar to our earlier calculation. To complete the proof one has to check $g_t^{(r)}(x)$ at points x for which $g_t(x)$ is equal to the sum of two terms or in other words, $\{x: 4^{-k}<x<3\cdot 4^{-k+1}\}\cap\{x: 4^{-k+1}< x < 3\cdot 4^{-k+2}\} = \{x: 4^{-k+1} < x < 3\cdot 4^{-k+1}\}$ on which $g_t(x)=\psi_{k-1}(x)f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}(x)+(1-\psi_{k-1}(x)f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}(x) = f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}(x)+\psi_{k-1}(x)[f_{t\cdot^{-k\alpha}}(x)-f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}(x)]$. Since $|\psi^{(j)}_{k-1}(x)| \leqq M4^{kj}$ we have to estimate only $f^{(r-j)}_{t4^{-k\alpha}}(x) - f^{(r-j)}_{t4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}(x)$ and we will use on this function Lemma 2.1 where $b - a = 2\cdot 4^{-k+1}$. Using (3.14) (for $r = n$ in the lemma) and using (3.10) for k and $k-1$, we obtain in $4^{-k+1} < x < 3\cdot 4^{-k+1}$

$$t^r x^{r\alpha}\psi^{(j)}_{k-1}(x)\,|f^{(r-j)}_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}(x) - f^{(r-j)}_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}(x)| \leqq M_* t^r x^{r\alpha}4^{kj}(4^k)^{r-j}\omega^*_r(f, t) + M_* 4^{kj}\cdot 4^{-kj}\omega^*_r(f, t)\,.$$

Recalling $t^r x^{r\alpha}4^{kr} \leqq 12^{r\alpha}t^r 4^{kr(1-\alpha)}$ which is bounded for $\alpha \geqq 1$ or otherwise $k < l$ and $t \leqq 4^{-l(1-\alpha)}$ which still implies that $t^r x^{r\alpha}4^{kr}$ is bounded, we have $t^r x^{r\alpha}|\psi^{(j)}_{k-1}(x)(f^{(r-j)}_{t4^{-k\alpha}}(x) - f^{(r-j)}_{t4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}(x))| \leqq M\omega^*_r(f, t)$. Similarly we can treat $g_t(x)$ in $4^{-l} < x < 3\cdot 4^{-l}(\alpha < 1)$, (using (3.15) instead of (3.14)).

4. The L_p case. The expression for ω^*_r for the L_p case is more complicated. Possible different expressions for ω^*_r will be discussed in § 5 but a complete result will be obtained here with ω^*_r given by

$$\omega^*_r(f, t) = \sup_{\eta\leqq t}\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)}\int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}}|\Delta^r_{\eta 4^{-k\alpha}}f(x)|^p dx\right\}^{1/p} + \sup_{\eta\leqq t^{1/1-\alpha}}\left\{\int_0 |\Delta^r_\eta f(x)|^p dx\right\}^{1/p}\delta(\alpha) \tag{4.1}$$

where $\Delta_\mu f$ in this section is a forward difference given by $\Delta f(x) = f(x+\mu) - f(x)$, $\delta(\alpha) = 1$ for $\alpha < 1$ $\delta(\alpha) = 0$ for $\alpha \geqq 1$ and $k_0(t)$ given by $k_0(t) = \text{Max}\,\{k: 4^{-4} + \text{tr}\,4^{-k\alpha} \leqq 4^{-k+1}\}$. One can observe that for $\text{tr} < 1/4$ and $\alpha \geqq 1$ there is no bound on k and we replace $k_0(t)$ by ∞. In accordance with the discussion in § 2 we have $\text{Supp}\, f \subset [0, 3/4]$ with no loss of generality.

The functional $\omega^*_r(f, t)$ represents the L_p smoothness of f in exactly the same way as the r modulus of continuity does when away from the singular point, in this case 0. Near the singular point the function need not be as smooth. The expression (4.1) is a quantitative measure of smoothness needed near 0 (the singular point) as well as elsewhere that expresses the above qualitative description. For $K(t^r, f)$ given by

$$K(t^r, f) = \inf_g (\|f - g\|_p + t^r\|x^{r\alpha}g^{(r)}\|_p) \tag{4.2}$$

we can derive the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.1. *For $f(x)\in L_p$ and* $\text{Supp}\, f\subset[0, 3/4]$ *we have*

$$(4.3) \qquad A\omega_r^*(f, t) \leqq K(t^r, f) \leqq B\omega_r^*(f, t)$$

where $K(t^r, f)$ *and* $\omega_r^*(f, t)$ *are given by* (4.2) *and* (4.1) *respectively.*

Proof. We first show $\omega_r^*(f, t) \leqq A^{-1}K(t^r, f)$ for some $A > 0$. By definition of $K(t^r, f)$ there exists g_t such that $||f-g_t||\leqq 2K(t^r, f)$ and $t^r||x^{r\alpha}g_t^{(r)}(x)|| \leqq 2K(t^r, f)$. Obviously $\omega_r^*(f, t) \leqq \omega_r^*(f - g_t t) + \omega_r^*(g_t, t)$.

To estimate $\omega_r^*(f - g_t, t)$ we write $f - g_t = F_t$ and

$$\omega_r^*(F_t, t) \leqq r \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta \leqq t} \operatorname*{Sup}_{j} \binom{r}{j} \times \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} |F_t(x + \eta j 4^{-k\alpha})|^p dx \right\}^{1/p} + 2^r ||F_t|| \,.$$

Since $4^{-k} + \mathrm{tr}\, 4^{-k\alpha} < 4^{-k+1}$ (also $4^{-k+1} + \mathrm{tr}\, 4^{-k\alpha} < 4^{-k+2}$), each point $\zeta = x + \eta j 4^{-k\alpha}$ $x \in [4^{-k}, 4^{-k+1}]$ appears for fixed η and j at most twice and therefore $\omega_r^*(F_t, t) \leqq r \sup_j \binom{r}{j} 4K(t^r, f) + 2^r 2K(t^r, f)$.

Somewhat more complicated is the estimate of $\omega_r^*(g_t, t)$. Using Taylor's formula (and forward differences), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\equiv \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta \leqq t} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} |\Delta_{\eta 4^{-k\alpha}}^r g_t(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leqq \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta \leqq t} \Bigg(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} \Bigg| \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{r}{j} \frac{1}{(r-1)!} \\
&\qquad \times \int_x^{x+j\eta 4^{-k\alpha}} (x + j\eta 4^{-k\alpha} - u)^{r-1} g_t^{(r)}(u) du \Bigg|^p dx \Bigg)^{1/p} \\
&\leqq M_1(r) \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta \leqq t} \operatorname*{Sup}_{j \leqq r} \\
&\qquad \times \left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} \left| \int_x^{x+j\eta 4^{-k\alpha}} [(x + j\eta 4^{-k\alpha} - u)^{r-1}/u^{r\alpha}] u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(u) du \right|^p dx \right)^{1/p} .
\end{aligned}$$

Observing that

$$\frac{(x + j\eta u^{-k\alpha} - u)^{r-1}}{u^{r\alpha}} \leqq \frac{(j\eta 4^{-k\alpha})^{r-1}}{(4^{-k\alpha})^r} \leqq j\eta^{r-1} \frac{4^{k\alpha}}{4^\alpha}$$

and writing $M[u^{r\alpha}g_t^{(r)}](x) = \operatorname{Sup}_h 1/h \int_x^{x+h} |u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(u)| du$, the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of $u^{r\alpha}g_t^{(r)}(u)$, we have for $1 < p < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leqq M_1(r) \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta \leqq t} \operatorname*{Sup}_{j \leqq r} \eta^r \left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} |M[u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}](x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leqq M_1(r) t^r 2K(t^r, f) \,.
\end{aligned}$$

For $p = 1$ we estimate I_1 by Fubini's theorem (using $k_0(t)$)

$$I_1 \leqq M_r(r)t^{r-1} \operatorname*{Sup}_{j\leqq r} j \sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} 4^{k\alpha} \int_x^{x+j\eta 4^{-k\alpha}} |u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(u)| du dx$$
$$< M_1(r)t^r r^2 \sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+2}} |u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(u)| du \leqq t^r M_2(r) K(t^r, f) .$$

For $\alpha < 1$ we have to estimate one more term i.e.,

$$I_2 = \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta \leqq t^{1/1-\alpha}} \left\{ \int_0 | \Delta_\eta^r g_t |^p dx \right\}^{1/p} .$$

Following the above and using Taylor's formula around $x + (r/2)\eta$,

$$I_2 \leqq M \operatorname*{Sup}_{\substack{\eta \leqq t^{1/1-\alpha} \\ j \leqq r}} \left[\left\{ \int_0^\eta + \int_\eta \right\} \left| \int_{x+(r/2)\eta}^{x+r\eta-j\eta} (x + (r - j)\eta - u)^{r-1} g_1^{(r)}(u) | du \right|^p dx \right]^{1/p}$$
$$\equiv J_1 + J_2 .$$

For $x > \eta$ or $j < r$

$$\left| \frac{(x + r\eta - j\eta - u)^{r-1}}{u^{r\alpha}} \right| \leqq \frac{(|j - r/2|\eta)^{r-1}}{(\eta)^{r\alpha}} \leqq c\eta^{r-r\alpha-1}$$

and the estimate of J_2 proceeds as that of I_1 since $\eta^{r(1-\alpha)} \leqq t^r$. For $x < \eta$ and $j = r(u > x)$

$$\frac{(x + r\eta - r\eta - u)^{r-1}}{u^{r\alpha}} \leqq u^{r-r\alpha-1}$$

and

$$\int_{x+(r/2)\eta}^{x} u^{r-r\alpha-1} du \sim \eta^{r(1-\alpha)} .$$

Therefore we have

$$J_1 \leqq C \left\{ \int_0^\eta \eta^{r(1-\alpha)p/q} \int_x^{x+(r/2)\eta} | u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(u) |^p u^{r(1-\alpha)-1} du dx \right\}^{1/p}$$
$$\leqq C \left\{ \eta^{r(1-\alpha)p/q} \eta^{r(1-\alpha)} \cdot \int_0^{\eta+(r/2)\eta} | u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(u) | du \right\}^{1/p}$$
$$\leqq C\eta^{r(1-\alpha)} || u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(u) || \leqq Ct^r || u^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}(u) || \leqq 2CK(t^r, f) .$$

To prove $K(t^r, f) \leqq B\omega_r^*(f, t)$ we define g_t which will satisfy $|| f - g_t ||_p \leqq B_1 \omega_r^*(f, t)$ and $t^r || x^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)} ||_p \leqq B_2 \omega_r^*(f, t)$. Define f_h, f_h^* and g_t the same as in § 3 by (3.4), (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7) with possibly different M in (3.6).

To show $|| f - g_t || \leqq B\omega_r^*(f, t)$ we write

$$|| f - g_t ||^p \leqq C \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{l} \int | f(x) - f_{t \cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}(x) |^p | \psi_{k-1}(x)(1 - \psi_k(x)) |^p dx \right.$$
$$\left. + \int | f(x) - f_{t \cdot 4^{-l\alpha_M}} |^p | \psi_l(x) |^p dx \right\}$$

which follows since the sum is finite for every x.

Since $f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}(x)$ can be written as

$$f_{t,4^{-k\alpha}}(x) = \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^r \int_0^{t/r} \cdots \int_0^{t/r} \sum_{k=1}^{r} (-1)^{k+1} \times \binom{r}{k} f(x + k(u_1 + \cdots + u_r)4^{-k\alpha}) du_1 \cdots du_r$$

and since $0 \leqq \psi_k \leqq 1$ and $\psi_{k-1}(1 - \psi_k) \neq 0$ in $[4^{-k}, 3\cdot 4^{-k+1}]$, the kth term

$$\int_{4^{-k}}^{3\cdot 4^{-k+1}} |f - f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}|^p dx \leqq \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^r \int_0^{t/r} \cdots \int_0^{t/r} \times \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} |\Delta^r_{(u_1+\cdots+u_r)4^{-k\alpha}} f|^p dx du_1 \cdots du_r + \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^r \int_0^{t/r} \cdots \int_0^{t/r} \int_{4^{-k+1}}^{4^{-k+2}} |\Delta^r_{(u_1\cdots u_r)4^{-(k-1)\alpha}/4^\alpha} f(x)|^p dx du_1 \cdots du_r .$$

We observe now that with $\eta = u_1 + \cdots + u_r$ or $\eta = 4^{-\alpha}(u_1 + \cdots + u_r)$ and since the integral is the same for all terms, we have on $L_p[4^{-l+1}, 1]$

$$\|f - g_t\| \leqq C\left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^r \int_0^{t/r} \cdots \int_0^{t/r} [\omega^*_r(f, t) + \omega^*_r(f, t/4^\alpha)] du_1 \cdots du_r \leqq C_1 \omega^*_r(f, t) .$$

Similarly we can treat the remaining integral remembering that $4^{-(l+1)(1-\alpha)} < t \leqq 4^{-l(1-\alpha)}$ and $t\cdot 4^{-l\alpha} \leqq 4^{-l}$ and $4^{-l}M < t^{1/1-\alpha}$ for appropriate M. To estimate $\|x^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}\|$ we shall observe first that (3.14) and (3.15) are still valid for $f \in L_p$ except that the result is valid almost everywhere rather than everywhere.

Rewritten to take into account forward difference, we have for (3.14) and (3.15)

$$(4.4) \qquad f^{(r)}_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}(x) = \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^r 4^{k\alpha} \sum_{j=1}^{r} (-1)^{j+1} \binom{r}{j} \Delta^r_{j(t/r)4^{-k\alpha}} f(x) \quad \text{a.e.}$$

and

$$(4.5) \qquad f^{*(r)}_{t\cdot 4^{-l\alpha_M}}(x) = \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^r \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^r\right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{r}{j} (-1)^{j+1} \times \{\Delta^r_{j(t/r)4^{-l\alpha_M}} f(x) - \Delta^r_{j(t/2r)4^{-l\alpha_M}} f(x)\} \quad \text{a.e.}$$

Using (4.4) and (4.5), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
t^{rp}\int_{4^{-k}}^{3\cdot 4^{-k+1}} & |x^{r\alpha} f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}^{(r)}(x)|^p dx \\
& \leqq M(r) \max_{1\leqq j\leqq r} \int_{4^{-k}}^{3\cdot 4^{-k+1}} |\Delta^r_{j(t/r)4^{-k\alpha}} f(x)|^p dx \\
& \leqq M(r) \left\{ \max_{1\leqq j\leqq r} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} |\Delta^r_{j(t/r)4^{-k\alpha}} f(x)|^p dx \right. \\
& \left. + \max_{1\leqq j\leqq r} \int_{4^{-k+1}}^{4^{-k+2}} |\Delta^r_{j(t/r)\cdot 4^{-\alpha}\cdot 4^{-\alpha(k-1)}} f(x)|^p dx \right\} .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}
$$

We notice that it is a maximum or a finite number of terms and $j(t/r)$ and $j(t/r)4^{-\alpha}$ are smaller than t and moreover it is a maximum on the same terms for all k. Similarly one can estimate

$$
t^{rp}\int_0^{4^{-l+1}} |x^{r\alpha} f_{t\cdot 4^{-l\alpha_M}}^{(r)}|^p dx .
$$

To conclude the proof let us follow Lemma 2.1 in much the same way as was done in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

To calculate the L_p norm of $g_t^{(r)}(x)$ we recall that in

$$
\begin{aligned}
\{x;\, 4^{-k+1} < x < 3\cdot 4^{-k+1}\} \quad g_t(x) &= f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}(x) \\
&+ \psi_{k-1}(x)[f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}(x) - f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}(x)] ,
\end{aligned}
$$

and since $|\psi_{k-1}^{(j)}| \leqq M4^{kj}$, we have to estimate in $L_p[4^{-k+1}, 3\cdot 4^{-k+1}]$ $f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha}}^{(r-j)}(x) - f_{t\cdot 4^{-k\alpha+\alpha}}^{(r-j)}(x)$ and for this we use (4.4) and earlier estimates in this section together with Lemma 2.1 where $b - a = 2\cdot 4^{-k+1}$.

It can be seen that the estimate for L_p norm in $[4^{-k+1}, 3\cdot 4^{-k+1}]$ is given by a maximum of a finite number of terms that depend on j and r but not on k. Using this and the fact that in the sums (3.6) or (3.7) we have for any x only two nonzero terms, we can conclude the proof i.e., $t^r \|x^{r\alpha} g_t^{(r)}\| \leqq B\omega_r^*(f, t)$.

If r is even, we can write $\omega_{2r}(f, p, t)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\omega_{2r}(f, p, t) &= \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta\leqq t} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{k_0(t)} \int_{4^{-k}}^{4^{-k+1}} |\Delta^{2r}_{\eta 4^{-k\alpha}} f(x)|^p dx \right\}^{1/p} \\
&+ \operatorname*{Sup}_{\eta\leqq t^{1/1-\alpha}} \left\{ \int_{r\eta}^{1-r\eta} |\Delta^{2r}_\eta f(x)|^p \right\}^{1/p} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}
$$

where the differences are symmetric ($\Delta_\eta f(x) = f(x+\eta/2) - f(x-\eta/2)$) and $k_0(t) = \operatorname{Max}(k\colon 4^{-k} - \operatorname{tr} 4^{-k\alpha} > 4^{-k-1})$. In this case one can prove similarly:

THEOREM 4.2. *For* $f(x) \in L_p$ $\operatorname{Supp} f \subset [0, 3/4]$, *we have for* $t < t_0$

$$
A\omega_{2r}(f, p, t) \leqq K(t^{2r}, f) \leqq B\omega_{2r}(f, p, t) . \tag{4.8}
$$

Actually Theorem 4.2 does not yield a new result, just a similar characterization which is proved following the same method, but I believe that (4.7) and $\omega_{2r}(f, p, t)$ will be convenient using symmetric rather than forward differences.

5. Conclusions. In this section we will use the two main results for §§ 3 and 4 as well as considerations of § 2 to obtain a global description of the K functional (which is a sum of translates of the local case) and also the interpolation theorem involved.

DEFINITION 5.1. A weight function $W(x)$ on $[a, b]$ is of class A if it is a continuous nonnegative function with finitely many zeros at $a \leqq x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_n \leqq b$ such that $0 < A_{ij}|x - x_i|^{\alpha_{ij}} \leqq W(x) \leqq B_{ij}|x - x_i|^{\alpha_{ij}}$ in $0 < (x - x_i)(-1)^j < \delta$ where $\alpha_{ij} > 0$ $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $j = 0, 1$ and where, in case $x_1 = a$ or $x_n = b$, the above condition for $i = 1, j = 1$ or $i = n, j = 0$ is void. (a and b might be $-\infty$ or ∞ respectively.)

For $W(x)$ of class A we may define the modified modulus of continuity as follows:

For $f \in C$ and $t \leqq t_0$

$$\omega_r^*(f, t; W, C) = \sum_{i,j} \operatorname{Sup}_{\eta < t} \operatorname{Sup}_{\substack{(r/2)\eta < x^{1-\alpha_{ij}} \\ x < d/2}} |\Delta^r_{\eta x^{\alpha_{ij}}} f(x_i + (-1)^j x)| + \operatorname{Sup}_{\eta < t} \left\{ |\Delta^r_\eta f(x)|; x \pm r\frac{\eta}{2} \in [a, b] \text{ and } |x - x_i| > \frac{d}{4} \right\}. \tag{5.1}$$

For $f \in L_p$ and $t \leqq t_0$ we have

$$\omega_r^*(f, t, w; L_p) = \sum_{ij} \omega^*_{r,i,j}(f, t) + \operatorname{Sup}_{\eta < t} \left\{ \int_{|x - x_i| > d/16} |\Delta^r_\eta f|^p \, dx \right\}^{1/p} \tag{5.2}$$

where $\omega^*_{r,i,j}$ are the expressions given by (4.1) with α_{ij} replacing α, $f(x_i + (-1)^j x)$ replacing $f(x)$ and k starting from k_1 rather than 1, (chosen so that $4^{-k_1+1} \leqq d/2$, and therefore the distance between x_i and $x_i + (-1)^j x$ is less than $d/2$). Both expressions are measurements of smoothness showing that near a zero of $W(x)$ less smoothness is needed and that the amount of relaxation in smoothness depends on the rate at which $W(x)$ tends to zero near x_i.

Now using the introduction, § 2 and the main result in §§ 3 and 4 we can conclude the following interpolation results:

THEOREM 5.1. *For $W(x)$ of class A, $f \in C[a, b]$ or $f \in L_p[a, b]$, and the expressions $K(t^r, f)$, $\omega_r^*(f, t; w; C)$ and $\omega_r^*(f, t; w; L_p)$ given by* (1.5), (5.1) *and* (5.2) respectively, *we have for $t \leqq t_0$(t_0 small enough)*

(5.3) $M_1\omega_r^*(f, t; w, B) \leqq K(t^r, f) \leqq M_2\omega_r^*(f, t, w, B),\ 0<M_1<M_2<\infty$

where B *is either* $C[a, b]$ *or* $L_p[a, b]$.

THEOREM 5.2. *Under the conditions of Theorem* 5.1 *and when the interpolation space* $(B, B(r, w))_{\theta,q;K_*}$ *is given by the norm in* (1.2) *and* (1.3) *using the functional* $K_*(f, t)$ *defined in* (1.4) *for* $B = C$ *or* $B = L_p$, *we have* $f \in (B, B(r, w))_{\theta,q;K_*}$ *if and only if*

$$\sup_{0<t\leqq t_0} t^{-r\theta}\omega_r^*(f, t, w, B)\leqq M(f) \text{ for } q=\infty \text{ and } B=C \text{ or } B=L_p \tag{5.4}$$

respectively and

$$\int_0^{t_0}(t^{-r\theta}\omega_r^*(f, t, w, B))^q\frac{dt}{t}\leqq M(f) \text{ for } 1\leqq q<\infty \text{ and } B=C \text{ or } B=L_p \tag{5.5}$$

respectively.

6. Remarks and generalizations.

1. In an earlier paper [4] the author proved for Bernstein polynomials, $B_n(f, x)$ for $\beta < 2$ $\|B_n(f) - f\|_{C[0,1]} = 0(1/n^{\beta/2})$ if and only if $|[x(1-x)]^{\beta/2}\Delta_h^2 f| \leqq Mh^\beta$, as a result of the equivalence of $K(t^2, f)/t^\beta \leqq M$ and $\mathrm{Sup}_{h<x<1-h}|[x(1-x)]^{\beta/2}\Delta_h^2 f| \leqq Mh^\beta$ where $K(t^2, f) = \inf_g(\|f-g\|_C + t^2\|x(1-x)g''(x)\|_C)$. This paper yields the new characterization of $\|B_nf - f\|_{C[0,1]} = 0(n^{-\beta/2})$, that is $\|B_nf - f\| = 0(n^{-\beta/2})$ if and only if $\|\Delta_{hX^{1/2}}^2 f\|_{C(h^2,\, 1-h^2)} \leqq Mh^\beta$ where α of our Theorem 3.1 is 1/2. Similarly with respect to other results of [4] one can deduce additional results from Theorem 3.1. (Results on conditions for rate of convergence of combinations of Bernstein polynomials.)

2. For the case $C[0, 1]$ given in § 3 the condition $K(t^r, f)/t^\beta \leqq M$ (which is an important case) is equivalent to

$$\sup_{(r/2)h<x<1-(r/2)h} |x^{r\alpha\beta}\Delta_h^r f| \leqq Mh^\beta .$$

We did not go that route in order to characterize the K functional completely and not just the case $K(t^r, f)/t^\beta \leqq M$.

3. An alternative for $\omega_{2r}^*(f, t)$ could be

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{2r}^{**}(f, t) &= \sup_{\eta\leqq t}\left(\int_{(r\eta)^{1/1-\alpha}}^{1-C}|\Delta_{\eta x^\alpha}^{2r}f(x)|^p dx\right)^{1/p} \\ &\quad + \sup_{\eta\leqq t^{1/1-\alpha}}\left(\int_{r\eta}|\Delta_\eta^{2r}f(x)|^p dx\right)^{1/p} \quad \text{for } \alpha<1\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

and

$$\omega_{2r}^{**}(f, t) = \sup_{\eta\leqq t}\left(\int_0^{1-C}|\Delta_{\eta x^\alpha}^{2r}f(x)|^p dx\right)^{1/p} \text{ for } \alpha \geqq 1 .$$

While in proving $\omega_{2r}^{**}(f, t) \leqq AK(t^{2r}, f)$ there was no problem, the author was not able to show $K(t^{2r}, f) \leqq A_1\omega_{2r}^{**}(f, t)$.

4. Various α were treated and while the case $\alpha = 1/2$ has already yielded a result about the rate of approximation of Bernstein polynomials, the rate of approximation of the Post-Widder inversion formula for Laplace transforms or the Gamma operators relate to $\alpha = 1$ and together with a much wider class of operators will be treated elsewhere.

References

1. N. I. Achieser, *Theory of Approximation,* English translation, F. Ungar Publ. Co., New York, 1956.
2. R. A. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, Academic Press, 1975.
3. R. A. DeVore, *Degree of Approximation,* Approximation Theory II, pp. 117-161, Edited by Lorentz, Chui and Schumaker, Academic Press, 1976.
4. Z. Ditzian, *Global inverse theorem for combinations of Bernstein polynomials,* J. Approximation, **26** (1979), 277-232.
5. H. Johnen and K. Scherer, *On the equivalence fo the K functional and the moduli of continuity and some applications,* Proceedings "Mehrdimensionale konstruktive Funktionen theorie", Oberwolfach, 1976.
6. E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, *Interpolation of operators with change of measure,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **87** (1958), 159-172.

Received June 8, 1979 and in revised form November 30, 1979.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA T60 2G1

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints to each author are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: $84.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rato: $42.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address shoud be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A Old back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.).
8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 90, No. 2 October, 1980