Cuenya *et al. Journal of Inequalities and Applications* 2012, **2012**:26
http://www.journalofinequalitiesandapplications.com/content/2012/1/26

Journal of Inequalities and Applications
a SpringerOpen Journal

RESEARCH Open Access

Pólya-type polynomial inequalities in Orlicz spaces and best local approximation

Héctor H Cuenya[1], Fabián E Levis[1] and Claudia V Ridolfi[2*]

* Correspondence: ridolfi@unsl.edu.ar
[2]Department of Mathematics, UNSL, 5700, San Luis, Argentina
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

Abstract

We obtain an extension of Pólya-type inequalities for univariate real polynomials in Orlicz spaces. We also give an application to a best local approximation problem.

MSC 2010: 41A10; 41A17.

Keywords: algebraic polynomials, p?ó?lya-type inequalities, best local approximation, balanced integers

1 Introduction

Let X be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Consider the measure space $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, where μ is the Lebesgue measure, and denote $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(X)$ the system of all equivalence classes of Lebesgue measurable real valued functions on X. Let Φ be the set of convex functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$, with $\varphi(x) > 0$ for $x > 0$, and $\varphi(0) = 0$.

Given $\varphi \in \Phi$, we define

$$L^{\phi} = L^{\phi}(X) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{M} : \int_X \phi\left(\alpha \left|f(x)\right|\right) dx < \infty, \quad \text{for some } \alpha > 0 \right\}.$$

The space L^{φ} is called the Orlicz space determined by φ. This space is endowed with the Luxemburg norm,

$$\|f\|_{\phi,X} = \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_X \phi\left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda}\right) \frac{dx}{\mu(X)} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

The space L^{φ} with this norm is a Banach space (see [1]). If $E \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\mu(E) > 0$, then $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi,E}$ is a seminorm on $L^{\varphi}(X)$. In the particular case, $\varphi(t) = t^p$, we will use the notation $\|\cdot\|_{p,E}$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi,E}$.

Let $\Pi^N \subset \mathcal{M}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be the class of all algebraic polynomials of degree at most N, with real coefficients.

Given $E \in \mathcal{B}$, we recall that a polynomial $g_E \in \Pi^N$ is a best approximation of $f \in L^{\varphi}(X)$ from Π^N respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi,E}$, if

$$\|f - g_E\|_{\phi,E} = \inf\left\{ \|f - P\|_{\phi,E} : \quad P \in \prod^N \right\}.$$

Springer

© 2012 Cuenya et al.; licensee Springer. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Let x_k, $1 \le k \le n$, be n points in X. We consider a net of measurable sets $\{E\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ such that $E = \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} E_k$, with $\mu(E_k) > 0$ and

$$\sup_{1\le k\le n} \sup_{y\in E_k} |x_k - y| \to 0, \quad \text{as } \mu(E) \to 0.$$

Given $f \in L^{\varphi}(X)$ and Π^N, we consider a net of best approximation functions $\{g_E\}$. If it has a limit in Π^N as $\mu(E) \to 0$, this limit is called the *best local approximation of f from* Π^N on $\{x_1,..., x_n\}$. If the points in our approximation problem have not the same importance the neighborhoods E_k can be adjusted to reflect it. In [2], Chui et al. introduced the balanced neighborhood concept and they studied existence and characterization of best local approximation in L^p-spaces for several points with different size neighborhoods. In [3,4], the last problem was considered for φ-approximation and $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi}$-approximation, respectively, in Orlicz spaces. Other results in these spaces about best local approximation with non balanced neighborhoods were considered in [5].

Polynomial inequalities on measurable sets have been studied extensively in the literature (see [6-8]). In [9], the authors proved the following extension of the Pólya inequality in L^p-spaces, $0 < p \le \infty$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $0 < p \le \infty$ *and* $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$. *Let* i_k, $1 \le k \le n$, *be n positive integers such that* $\sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k = N + 1$. *Let* B_k, $1 \le k \le n$, *be disjoint pairwise compact intervals in* $\mathbb{R}$ *with* $0 < \mu(B_k) \le 1$. *Then there exists a constant K depending on p,* i_k *and* B_k, *for* $1 \le k \le n$, *such that*

$$|c_j| \le \frac{K}{\min_{1\le k\le n} \mu(E\cap B_k)^{i_k-1+1/p}} \|P\|_{p,E}, \quad 0 \le j \le N,$$

for all $P(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} c_j x^j$, $E \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} B_k$, $\mu(E\cap B_k) > 0$, $1 \le k \le n$..

They gave an application of this theorem to the existence of the best multipoint local approximation in L^p spaces, with balanced neighborhoods.

In this article, we generalize Theorem 1.1 and the balanced neighborhood concept to L^{φ}. As a consequence of this extension we prove the existence of the best local approximation of a function from Π^N on $\{x_1,..., x_n\}$, with balanced neighborhoods, following the pattern used in [9]. Moreover, we prove that the best local approximation polynomial is the Hermite interpolating polynomial.

We say that a function $\varphi \in \Phi$ satisfies the Δ_2-condition if there exists a constant $k > 0$ such that $\varphi(2x) \le k\varphi(x)$, for $x \ge 0$, and we say that φ satisfies the Δ'-condition if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\varphi(xy) \le c\varphi(x)\varphi(y)$ for $x, y \ge 0$. We point out that the Δ'-condition implies the Δ_2-condition. A detailed treatment about these subjects may be found in [1].

If φ satisfies the Δ'-condition, it is easy to see that there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\phi^{-1}(x)\phi^{-1}(y) \le K\phi^{-1}(xy), \quad \text{for all } x, y \ge 0. \tag{1}$$

We assume in this article that $\varphi \in \Phi$ and it satisfies the Δ'-condition.

2 Preliminary results

Let $\mathcal{X}_A$ denotes the characteristic function on the measurable set $A \subset X$.

Proposition 2.1. *The family of all seminorms* $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi.E}$ *with* $\mu(E) > 0$, *has the following properties:*

(a) $\|\mathcal{X}_E\|_{\phi,E} = \dfrac{1}{\phi^{-1}(1)}$.

(b) if $f, g \in L^{\varphi}(X)$ *satisfy* $|f| \le |g|$ *on E, then* $\|f\|_{\varphi,E} \le \|g\|_{\varphi,E}$. *The inequality is strict if* $|f| < |g|$ *on some subset of E with positive measure.*

(c) There exists a constant $M > 0$ *such that*

$$\|f\|_{\phi,G} \le \frac{M}{\phi^{-1}\left(\dfrac{\mu(G)}{\mu(D)}\right)} \|f\|_{\phi,D}, \quad f \in L^{\phi}(X), \tag{2}$$

for all pair of measurable sets G, D, with $G \subset D$ *and* $\mu(G) > 0$.

Proof (a) For $\lambda := 1/\varphi^{-1}(1)$ we have

$$\int_E \phi\left(\frac{|\mathcal{X}_E|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(E)} = \int_E \frac{dx}{\mu(E)} = 1.$$

Now, the Δ_2- condition implies $\|\mathcal{X}_E\|_{\phi,E} = 1/\phi^{-1}(1)$.

(b) If $|f| \le |g|$ on E, then

$$\int_E \phi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(E)} \le \int_E \phi\left(\frac{|g|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(E)}, \quad \lambda > 0,$$

and so $\|f\|_{\varphi,E} \le \|g\|_{\varphi,E}$. In addition, if $|f| < |g|$ on some subset of E with positive measure, the above inequality is strict. So, the Δ_2-condition implies the assertion.

(c) Given $G \subset D$, $\mu(G) > 0$, and $f \in L^{\varphi}(X)$, for each $\lambda > 0$, we denote

$$\mathfrak{A}(\lambda) := \int_G \phi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(G)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{B}(\lambda) := \int_D \phi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(D)}.$$

We consider $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{B}(\lambda) \le 1$. By the Δ'-condition we obtain

$$\mathfrak{A}\left(\frac{\lambda}{\phi^{-1}\left(\dfrac{\mu(G)}{c\,\mu(D)}\right)}\right) \le \int_D c\frac{\mu(G)}{c\,\mu(D)}\phi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(G)} = \mathfrak{B}(\lambda) \le 1.$$

Then $\|f\|_{\phi,G} \le \dfrac{\lambda}{\phi^{-1}\left(\dfrac{\mu(G)}{c\,\mu(D)|}\right)}$, for all $\lambda > 0$ with $\mathfrak{B}(\lambda) \le 1$. So, the definition of $\|f\|_{\varphi,D}$ and (1) imply $\|f\|_{\phi,G} \le \dfrac{M}{\phi^{-1}\left(\dfrac{\mu(G)}{\mu(D)}\right)}\|f\|_{\phi,D}$ with $M = \dfrac{K}{\phi^{-1}(c^{-1})}$.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a constant* $M > 0$ *such that*

$$\left|P^{(j)}(a)\right| \le \frac{M}{\varepsilon^j}\|P\|_{\phi,[a-\varepsilon,\, a+\varepsilon]},$$

for all $P \in \Pi^N$, $[a - \epsilon, a + \epsilon] \subset X$, *and* $0 \le j \le N$.

Proof. Given $P \in \Pi^N$ and $[a - \epsilon, a + \epsilon] \subset X$, we divide that interval in $2(N + 1)$ close subintervals with the same size. Let J_ϵ be one of them. From Proposition 2.1 (c), we get $\|P\|_{\phi,J_\varepsilon} \le M\|P\|_{\phi,[a-\varepsilon,\ a+\varepsilon]}$, where M is independent on P, a, and ϵ. In addition, there exists $y_\epsilon \in J_\epsilon$ such that $|P(y_\varepsilon)| \le \phi^{-1}(1)\|P\|_{\phi,J_\varepsilon}$. In fact, if $\phi^{-1}(1)\|P\|_{\phi,J_\varepsilon} < |P(y)|$, for all $y \in J_\epsilon$, then Proposition 2.1 (a) and (b) yield $\|P\|_{\phi,J_\varepsilon} > \|P\|_{\phi,J_\varepsilon}$. A contradiction.

From the family of intervals J_ϵ, we choose pairwise disjoint $(N + 1)$ intervals, and we denote them with $J_{i,\epsilon}$, $1 \le i \le N + 1$. Let $y_{i,\epsilon} \in J_{i,\epsilon}$ be such that

$$|P(y_{i,\varepsilon})| \le M\phi^{-1}(1)\|P\|_{\phi,[a-\varepsilon,\ a+\varepsilon]}, \quad 1 \le i \le N+1. \tag{3}$$

If $t_{i,\varepsilon} := \dfrac{y_{i,\varepsilon} - a}{\varepsilon} \in [-1, 1]$, we have

$$P(y_{i,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \frac{P^{(j)}(a)}{j!}(y_{i,\varepsilon} - a)^j = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \frac{P^{(j)}(a)}{j!}\varepsilon^j t_{i,\varepsilon}^j, \quad 1 \le i \le N+1. \tag{4}$$

The matrix of the linear system (4), $\left(t_{i,\varepsilon}^j\right)$, is a Vandermonde matrix whose determinant has a positive lower bound, because $t_{i,\epsilon} - t_{i',\epsilon} \ge 1/N + 1$ for $i > i'$. Using Cramer's rule and (3), there is a constant which we again denote by M such that

$$\left|P^{(j)}(a)\varepsilon^j\right| \le M\|P\|_{\phi,[a,\varepsilon,\ a+\varepsilon]} \quad 0 \le j \le N.$$

The proof of the following lemma is analogous to the one of Lemma 2.3 in [9], however we give it for sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.3. *Let* $C \subset X$ *be an interval,* $E \subset C$, $\mu(E) > 0$. *For all* $P \in \Pi^N$, *there exists an interval* $F := F(E,P) \subset C$ *such that*

a) $\mu(F) \ge \dfrac{\mu(E)}{2N}$,

b) $\|P\|_{\varphi,F} \le 2N\|P\|_{\varphi,E}$.

Proof. Let $P \in \Pi^N$, $S = 2N$, and let $D_a := \{x \in C : |P(x)| < a\}$. It easy to see that the function $G(a) := \mu(D_a)$ is continuous, $G(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{a\to\infty} G(a) = \mu(C)$. Therefore, there exists a constant $a_* \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\mu(D_{a_*}) = \mu(E)/2$. Since $\{x \in C : |P(x)| = a_*\}$ has at most $2N$ elements, there exists k, $1 \le k \le N$, and pairwise disjoint intervals E_j, $1 \le j \le k$, such that $D_{a_*} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k E_j$.

We denote $\overline{A} = C\backslash A$, for any set A. Then

$$\mu(E \cap \overline{D}_{a_*}) = \mu(E) - \mu(E \cap D_{a_*}) \ge \mu(E) - \mu(D_{a_*}) = \frac{\mu(E)}{2}. \tag{5}$$

There exists j, $1 \le j \le k$, such that $\mu(E_j) \ge \mu(E)/S$. In fact, if $\mu(E_j) < \mu(E)/S$ for all j, $1 \le j \le k$, we obtain $\mu(D_{a_*}) < k/S\mu(E) \le \mu(E)/2$, which is a contradiction. So, we have proved a) with $F := E_j$.

Using (5), we obtain

$$\mu(E\cap\overline{D}_{a_*})\geq\frac{\mu(E)}{2}=\mu(D_{a_*})\geq\mu(F)\mu(F\cap\overline{E}).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\int_F\phi\left(\frac{|P|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(F)}&\leq\int_{F\cap E}\phi\left(\frac{|P|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(F)}+\phi\left(\frac{a_*}{\lambda}\right)\frac{\mu(E\cap\overline{D}_{a_*})}{\mu(F)}\\&\leq\int_{E\cap D_{a_*}}\phi\left(\frac{|P|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(F)}+\int_{E\cap\overline{D}_{a_*}}\phi\left(\frac{|P|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(F)}\\&=\int_E\phi\left(\frac{|P|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(F)}.\end{aligned}$$

So, (a) implies

$$\mathcal{A}_F(\lambda):=\int_F\phi\left(\frac{|P|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(F)}\leq S\int_E\phi\left(\frac{|P|}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dx}{\mu(E)}=:S\mathcal{A}_E(\lambda).$$

Let λ be such that $\mathcal{A}_E(\lambda)=1$. The convexity of φ implies $\mathcal{A}_F(S\lambda)\leq 1$. So, $\|P\|_{\varphi,F}\leq S\|P\|_{\varphi,E}$.

3 Pólya inequality

Now, we present the main result concerning to Pólya inequality in L^{φ}.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\varphi\in\Phi$, and n, $N\in\mathbb{N}$. Let i_k, $1\leq k\leq n$, be n positive integers such that $\sum_{k=1}^{n}i_k=N+1$. Let B_k, $1\leq k\leq n$, be disjoint pairwise compact intervals in $\mathbb{R}$, with $0<\mu(B_k)\leq 1$. Then there exists a positive constant M depending on φ, i_k, and B_k, $1\leq k\leq n$, such that*

$$|c_j|\leq\frac{M}{\min_{1\leq k\leq n}\left\{\mu(E\cap B_k)^{i_k-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E\cap B_k)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right\}}\|P\|_{\phi,E},\quad 0\leq j\leq N,\tag{6}$$

for all $P(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{N}c_jx^j$, $E\subset\bigcup_{k=1}^{n}B_k$ with $\mu(E\cap B_k)>0$, $1\leq k\leq n$.

Proof. In the following proof, the constant M can be different in each occurrence. Let $P(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{N}c_jx^j\in\Pi^N$, and let $E\subset\bigcup_{k=1}^{n}B_k$ be a measurable set with $\mu(E\cap B_k)>0$, $1\leq k\leq n$. By Lemma 2.3 for $C=B_k$, there exist n intervals $F_k=[a_k-r_k,a_k+r_k]\subset B_k$, $1\leq k\leq n$, such that $\mu(F_k)\geq\mu(E\cap B_k)/2N$ and $\|P\|_{\phi,F_k}\leq 2N\|P\|_{\phi,E\cap B_k}$. From Lemma 2.2, there exists a positive constant M depending on p, i_k, and B_k, $1\leq k\leq n$, such that for all j, $0\leq j\leq i_k-1$, $1\leq k\leq n$, it verifies

$$\left|P^{(j)}(a_k)\right|\leq\frac{M}{\mu(F_k)^j}\|P\|_{\phi,F_k}\leq\frac{M}{\mu(F_k)^{i_k-1}}\|P\|_{\phi,F_k}\leq\frac{M}{\mu(E\cap B_k)^{i_k-1}}\|P\|_{\phi,E\cap B_k}.\tag{7}$$

From (7) and (2), there is a constant M such that

$$\left|P^{(j)}(a_k)\right|\leq\frac{M}{\mu(E\cap B_k)^{i_k-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E\cap B_k)}{\mu(E)}\right)}\|P\|_{\phi,E}$$

for $0 \le j \le i_k - 1$, $1 \le k \le n$. So

$$\left|P^{(j)}(a_k)\right| \le \frac{M}{\min_{1\le s\le n}\left\{\mu(E\cap B_s)^{i_s-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E\cap B_s)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right\}}\|P\|_{\phi,E},$$

for $0 \le j \le i_k - 1$, $1 \le k \le n$. From the equivalence of the norms $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ on Π^N,

$$\|P\|_1 = \max_{1\le k\le n}\sup_{a_k\in B_k}\max_{0\le j\le i_k-1}\left|P^{(j)}(a_k)\right| \quad\text{and}\quad \|P\|_2 = \max_{0\le j\le N}\left|c_j\right|,$$

we obtain (6).

4 Best local approximation

In this section, we introduce a concept of balanced neighborhood in L^φ and we prove the existence of the best local approximation using the neighborhoods E_k, $1 \le k \le n$, mentioned in the Section 1.

It is easy to see that $E_k = x_k + \mu(E_k)A_k$, where A_k is a measurable set with measure 1. Henceforward, we assume the sets A_k are uniformly bounded.

For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and k, $1 \le k \le n$, we denote

$$\mathcal{A}_k(\alpha) := \frac{\mu(E_k)^\alpha}{\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E)}{\mu(E_k)}\right)}.$$

We assume the following condition, which allows us that $\mathcal{A}_k(\alpha)$ can be compared with each other as functions of α when $\mu(E) \to 0$.

For any nonnegative integers α and β, and any pair j, k, $1 \le j, k \le n$,

$$\text{either } \mathcal{A}_k(\alpha) = O(\mathcal{A}_j(\beta)) \text{ or } \mathcal{A}_j(\beta) = o(\mathcal{A}_k(\alpha)), \quad \text{as } \mu(E) \to 0. \tag{8}$$

Let $<i_k>$ be an ordered n-tuple of nonnegative integers. We say that $\mathcal{A}_j(i_j)$ is a *maximal* element of $<\mathcal{A}_k(i_k)>$ if $\mathcal{A}_k(i_k) = O(\mathcal{A}_j(i_j))$ for all $1 \le k \le n$. We denote it by

$$\mathcal{A}_j(i_j) = \max\left\{\mathcal{A}_k(i_k)\right\}.$$

Observe that $\sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{A}_k(i_k) = O(\max\{\mathcal{A}_k(i_k)\})$..

Definition 4.1. *An n-tuple $<i_k>$ of nonnegative integers is balanced if*

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{A}_k(i_k) = o\left(\min_{1\le k\le n}\left\{\mu(E_k)^{i_k-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_k)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right\}\right).$$

In this case, we say that $\sum_{k=1}^n i_k$ is a balanced integer, and $<E_k>$ are balanced neighborhoods.

Lemma 4.2. *To each balanced integer there corresponds exactly one balanced n-tuple.*

Proof. Let $<i_k>$ be a balanced n-tuple. If $<i'_k>$ is distinct from $<i_k>$ and $\sum_{k=1}^n i_k = \sum_{k=1}^n i'_k$, there exist indices j and s such that $i_j \ge i'_j + 1$ and $i'_s \ge i_s + 1$. From definition of balanced neighborhood, we have

$$\mathcal{A} := \sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{A}_k(i_k) = o\left(\mu(E_j)^{i_j-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_j)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right).$$

In addition, by (1) we get $\mu(E_j)^{i_j-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_j)}{\mu(E)}\right) \le \mu(E_j)^{i'_j}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_j)}{\mu(E)}\right) \le K\phi^{-1}(1)\mathcal{A}_j(i'_j)$.
So, $\mathcal{A} = o\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathcal{A}_k(i'_k)\right)$. Again, by (1) we get

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathcal{A}_k(i'_k)}{\mu(E_s)^{i'_s-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_s)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \ge \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathcal{A}_k(i'_k)}{\mu(E_s)^{i_s}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_s)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \ge \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathcal{A}_k(i'_k)}{K\phi^{-1}(1)\mathcal{A}_s(i_s)} \to \infty.$$

Then $< i'_k >$ cannot be balanced.

The following lemma allows us to state an algorithm to compute all the balanced integers greater than a given balanced integer.

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $<i_k>$ *and* $< i'_k >$ *be two balanced n-tuples with* $\sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k < \sum_{k=1}^{n} i'_k$. *Let* $A = A(< i_k >) := \{j : \mathcal{A}_j(i_j) = \max\{\mathcal{A}_k(i_k)\}\}$ *and* $B = B(<i_k>) := \{1,2,\ldots,n\} \setminus A$. *Then*

(a) for $j \in A\ i'_j \ge i_j + 1$.
(b) for $j \in A\ \ i'_j \ge i_j$.

Proof. (a) Suppose $i'_j \le i_j$ for some $j \in A$. For any $l \in B$, from (8) we get $\mathcal{A}_l(i_l) = o\left(\mathcal{A}_j(i_j)\right)$. Assume now $i'_l \ge i_l + 1$ for some $l \in B$. By (1), there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}_j(i'_j)}{\mu(E_l)^{i'_l-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_l)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \ge \frac{\mathcal{A}_j(i_j)}{\mu(E_l)^{i_l}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_l)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \ge \frac{\mathcal{A}_j(i_j)}{M\mathcal{A}_l(i_l)} \to \infty,$$

as $\mu(E) \to 0$. Thus $< i'_k >$ cannot be balanced, a contradiction. Therefore, either $B = \emptyset$ or $i'_l \le i_l$, for all $l \in B$. On the other hand, since $\sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k < \sum_{k=1}^{n} i'_k$, there is $s \in A$ such that $i'_s \ge i_s + 1$. According to (1) and the definition of A we obtain

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}_j(i'_j)}{\mu(E_s)^{i'_s-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_s)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \ge \frac{\mathcal{A}_j(i_j)}{\mu(E_s)^{i_s}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_s)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \ge \frac{\mathcal{A}_j(i_j)}{M\mathcal{A}_s(i_s)} \ge M',$$

as $\mu(E) \to 0$, for some constant $M' > 0$. Therefore, $< i'_k >$ cannot be balanced.

(b) Suppose $i'_j < i_j$ for some $j \in B$. From (a), (1) and the definition of balanced n-tuple, we obtain for each $l \in A$,

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}_j(i'_j)}{\mu(E_l)^{i'_l-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_l)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \ge \frac{\mathcal{A}_j(i_j-1)}{M\mathcal{A}_l(i_l)} \ge M'\frac{\mu(E_j)^{i_l-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_j)}{\mu(E)}\right)}{\mathcal{A}_l(i_l)} \to \infty,$$

as $\mu(E) \to 0$. Therefore $< i'_k >$ cannot be balanced.

Given a balanced integer, the above lemma gives us a necessary condition which must satisfy the next balanced integer. The following example shows that the conditions of Lemma 4.3 are not sufficient to get a balanced n-tuple.

Example 4.4. Define $\varphi(x) = x^3(1 + |\ln x|)$, $x > 0$, and $\varphi(0) = 0$. Consider two points x_1, x_2 with $\mu(E_1) = \delta^{4/3}$, $\mu(E_2) = \delta^{1/3}$, and $A_1 = A_2 = [0,1]$. The 2-tuple $< 0,1 >$ is balanced. Here, the set $A(< 0,1 >) = \{0\}$, however $< 1,1 >$ is not a balanced 2-tuple. In fact, if $<i_k> = < 0,1 >$ we obtain

$$\min_{1\le k\le 2}\left\{\mu(E_k)^{i_k-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_k)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right\} = \min\left\{\frac{\phi^{-1}(\delta)}{\delta^{4/3}},\phi^{-1}(1)\right\} + o(1) \to \phi^{-1}(1),$$

as $\delta \to 0$. Since $\mathcal{A}_2(i_2) = o(\mathcal{A}_1(i_1))$ and $\mathcal{A}_1(i_1) = o(1)$, as $\delta \to 0$, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathcal{A}_k(i_k)}{\min_{1\le k\le 2}\left\{\mu(E_k)^{i_k-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_k)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right\}} = o(1), \quad \text{as } \delta - 0.$$

So $< 0,1 >$ is a balanced 2-tuple, $A(< 0,1 >) = \{0\}$, and $< 1,1 >$ is the next 2-tuple generated by the algorithm. For $<i_k> = < 1,1 >$ we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}_2(i_2)}{\min_{1\le k\le 2}\left\{\mu(E_k)^{i_k-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_k)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right\}} \ge \frac{\mathcal{A}_2(i_2)}{\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_1)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \to \infty, \quad \text{as } \delta \to 0.$$

Thus $< 1,1 >$ is not a balanced 2-tuple.

Next, we establish an algorithm which gives all balanced n-tuples. First, we observe that $< 0 >$ is a balanced n-tuple. In fact, since φ^{-1} is a concave positive function on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with $\varphi^{-1}(0) = 0$, we have $\varphi^{-1}(x) \ge \varphi^{-1}(1)x$, for $x \le 1$. This yields

$$\frac{\mu(E_j)}{\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E)}{\mu(E_k)}\right)\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_j)}{\mu(E)}\right)} \le \frac{\mu(E)}{(\phi^{-1}(1))^2}, \quad 1 \le j,k \le n.$$

Algorithm. Let v_q be a balanced integer and let $< i_k^{(vq)} >$ be the corresponding balanced n-tuple. To build the next n-tuple, $< i_k^{(vq+1)} >$, put $i_k^{(vq+1)} = i_k^{(vq)} + 1$ for $k \in A\left(< i_k^{(vq)} >\right)$ and $i_k^{(v_q+1)} = i_k^{(v_q)}$ for $k \in B\left(< i_k^{(vq)} >\right)$.

The following lemma shows that all balanced n-tuples are contained in the set of n-tuples generated by the algorithm.

Lemma 4.5. *if* $<i_k>$ *is a balanced n-tuple with* $\sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k = q$, *then the algorithm generates all the balanced n-tuple* $< i_k^* >$ *with* $\sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k^* > q$.

Proof. Suppose $< i_k^* >$ is a balanced n-tuple with $\sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k^* = m > q$, and the n-tuple $< i_k^{(m)} >$ is not balanced. Since $\sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k^* = \sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k^{(m)}$, there exist r and s such that $i_r^{(m)} > i_r^*$ and $i_s^* > i_s^{(m)}$. By definition of balanced integer we have

$$\mathcal{A}_r\left(i_r^{(m)} - 1\right) = O\left(\mathcal{A}_r\left(i_r^*\right)\right) = o\left(\mu(E_s)^{i_s^*-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_s)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right), \tag{9}$$

and (1) implies $\mu(E_s)^{i_s^*-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_s)}{\mu(E)}\right) \le K\phi^{-1}(1)\mathcal{A}_s\left(i_s^*-1\right)$. So, $\mathcal{A}_r\left(i_r^{(m)}-1\right) = o\left(\mathcal{A}_s\left(i_s^{(m)}\right)\right)$.

On the other hand, since $m > q$, Lemma 4.3 implies $i_r^* \ge i_r$, so $i_r^{(m)} > i_r$. Therefore $\mathcal{A}_r\left(i_r^{(m)}-1\right)$ is maximal in a previous step of the algorithm, i.e., there exists m', $q \le m' < m$, such that $\mathcal{A}_r\left(i_r^{(m)}-1\right)$ is maximal of $<\mathcal{A}_k\left(i_k^{(m')}\right)>$. Since the exponents $i_k^{(m)}$ are nondecreasing,

$$\mathcal{A}_s\left(i_s^{(m)}\right) = O\left(\mathcal{A}_s\left(i_s^{(m')}\right)\right) = O\left(\mathcal{A}_r\left(i_r^{(m)}-1\right)\right),$$

which contradicts (9).

Remark 4.6. If we assume the additional condition $\varphi^{-1}(x)\varphi^{-1}(1/x) \ge c > 0$ for $x > 0$, given a balanced n-tuple $<i_k>$, it is easy to see that the n-tuple $<i'_k>$ defined by $i'_k = i_k + 1$ for $k \in A\left(<i_k^{(vq)}>\right)$, and $i'_k = i_k$ for $k \in B\left(<i_k^{(vq)}>\right)$, is balanced. It give us an algorithm that generates the infinite sequences of all balanced n-tuples.

Let $PC^m(X)$ be the class of functions with derivatives up to order m - 1 and with bounded piecewise continuous m^{th} derivative on X.

Next, we prove the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $<i_k>$ be an ordered n-tuple of nonnegative integers. Suppose $h \in PC^m(X)$, where $m = \max\{i_k\}$ and $h^{(j)}(x_k) = 0$, $0 \le j \le i_k - 1$, $1 \le k \le n$. Then*

$$\|h\|_{\phi,E} = O\left(\max\{\mathcal{A}_k(i_k)\}\right).$$

Proof. Expanding h by the Taylor polynomial at x_k up to the order n, we obtain

$$h(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} h^{(i_k)}(\xi_k)\frac{(x-x_k)^{i_k}}{i_k!}\chi_{E_k}(x), \quad x \in E,$$

where ξ_k is between x and x_k. The change of variable $x - x_k = \epsilon y$, $y \in A_k$, yields

$$\|h\|_{\phi,E} = \inf\left\{\lambda > 0 : \sum_{k=1}^{n}\int_{A_k}\mu(E_k)\phi\left(\frac{\left|h^{(i_k)}(\xi_k)\right|\frac{\mu(E_k)^{i_k}\left|y^{i_k}\right|}{i_k!}}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dy}{\mu(E)} \le 1\right\}.$$

For

$$\lambda := M\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\mu(E_j)^{i_j}}{\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E)}{n\,\mu(E_j)}\right)},$$

where $M = \max\limits_{1\le k\le n}\left\{\frac{1}{i_k!}\max\limits_{x\in X}\left\{\left|h^{(i_k)}(x)\right|\right\}\max\limits_{y\in A_k}\left\{|y|^{i_k}\right\}\right\}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\int_{A_k}\mu(E_k)\phi\left(\frac{\left|h^{(i_k)}(\xi_k)\right|\frac{\mu(E_k)^{i_k}\left|y^{i_k}\right|}{i_k!}}{\lambda}\right)\frac{dy}{\mu(E)} \le 1.$$

Therefore $\|h\|_{\phi,E} = O\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\mu(E_k)^{i_k}}{\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E)}{n\,\mu(E_k)}\right)}\right)$. Using the convexity of φ, we have $\frac{\phi^{-1}(x)}{n} \leq \phi^{-1}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)$, $x \geq 0$. So, $\|h\|_{\phi,E} = O\left(\max\{\mathcal{A}_k(i_k)\}\right)$.

If a polynomial $P \in \Pi^N$, $N + 1 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k$, satisfies $P^{(j)}(x_k) = f^{(j)}(x_k)$, $1 \leq j \leq i_k - 1$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, we call it *the Hermite interpolating polynomial* of the function f on $\{x_1,...,x_n\}$.

Now, we are in condition to prove the main result in this Section.

Theorem 4.8. *Let* $<i_k>$ *be a balanced n-tuple and* $N + 1 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k$. *If* $m = \max\{i_k\}$ *and* $f \in PC^m(X)$, *then the best local approximation of f from* Π^N *on* $\{x_1,...,x_k\}$ *is the Hermite interpolating polynomial of f on* $\{x_1,...,x_n\}$.

Proof Let $H \in \Pi^N$ be the Hermite interpolating polynomial and let $\{g_E\}$ be a net of best approximations of f from Π^N respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi,E}$. From Lemma 4.7,

$$\left\|g_E - H\right\|_{\phi,E} = O\left(\max\{\mathcal{A}_k(i_k)\}\right).$$

Using Theorem 3.1 and the equivalence of the norms in Π^N, we get

$$\left\|g_E - H\right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{K}{\min\limits_{1\leq k\leq n}\left\{\mu(E_k)^{i_k-1}\phi^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(E_k)}{\mu(E)}\right)\right\}}\left\|g_E - H\right\|_{\phi,E.}$$

So, the definition of balanced n-tuple implies $g_E \to H$, as $\mu(E) \to 0$.

Acknowledgements
This work was supported by Universidad Nacional de Rio Cuarto, Universi-dad Nacional de San Luis and CONICET.

Author details
[1]Department of Mathematics, UNRC, 5800, Río Cuarto, Argentina [2]Department of Mathematics, UNSL, 5700, San Luis, Argentina

Authors' contributions
The three authors participated in the preparation of all work. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests
The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Received: 14 July 2011 Accepted: 10 February 2012 Published: 10 February 2012

References
1. Krasnosel'skii, M, Rutickii, Ya: Convex Function and Orlicz Spaces. Noordhoff Groningen. (1961)
2. Chui, C, Diamond, H, Raphael, R: On best data approximation. Approx Theory Appl. **1**, 37–56 (1984)
3. Cuenya, H, Favier, S, Levis, F, Ridolfi, C: Weighted best local | · |-approximation in Orlicz spaces. Jaen J Approx. **2**(1):113–127 (2010)
4. Favier, S, Ridolfi, C: Weighted best local approximation in Orlicz spaces. Anal Theory Appl. **24**(3):225–236 (2008). doi:10.1007/s10496-008-0225-y
5. Cuenya, H, Levis, F, Marano, M, Ridolfi, C: Best local approximation in Orlicz spaces. Numer Funct Anal Optim. **32**(11):1127–1145 (2011). doi:10.1080/01630563.2011.590264
6. Borwein, P, Erdelyi, T: Polynomials and Polynomial Inequalities. Springer, New York (1995)
7. Ganzburg, MI: Polynomial inequalities on measurable sets and their applications. Constr Approx. **17**, 275–306 (2001). doi:10.1007/s003650010020
8. Timan, FA: Theory of Approximation of Functions of a Real Variable. Pergamon Press, New York. (1963)
9. Cuenya, H, Levis, F: Pólya-type polinomial inequalities in L^p spaces and best local approximation. Numer Funct Anal Optim. **26**(7-8):813–827 (2005). doi:10.1080/01630560500431084

doi:10.1186/1029-242X-2012-26
Cite this article as: Cuenya *et al.*: **Pólya-type polynomial inequalities in Orlicz spaces and best local approximation.** *Journal of Inequalities and Applications* 2012 **2012**:26.