

Minakshi Gaur, S. K. Sharma, G. Prasad

## INVERSE THEOREM FOR SZÁSZ-BETA OPERATORS

In the present paper, we prove an inverse theorem for the recently introduced Szász-Beta operators, using the technique of Peetre's  $K$ -functional.

### 1. Introduction

Durrmeyer [3] introduced the integral modification of Bernstein polynomials to approximate Lebesgue integrable functions on  $[0,1]$ . Several researches introduced and studied Durrmeyer type summation-integral operators (see e.g. [1], [7], [8], [9] and [10] etc.). Recently Gupta et al. [5] defined a new sequence  $B_n(f, x)$  of linear positive operators by combining Szász and Beta operators by setting

$$(1.1) \quad B_n(f, x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} b_{n,k}(t) f(t) dt, \quad x \in R^+,$$

where  $P_{n,k}(x) = e^{-nx} \frac{(nx)^k}{k!}$  and  $b_{n,k}(t) = \frac{1}{B(k+1, n)} \frac{t^k}{(1+t)^{n+k+1}}$  with  $B(k+1, n) = k!(n-1)!/(n+k)!$  the usual Beta function.

They use them to approximate Lebesgue integrable functions  $f$  on  $R^+ = [0, \infty)$  and sharpened the previous direct theorems on simultaneous approximation. The paper [5] motivated us to state and prove an inverse theorem for the operators (1.1). The main tool in our considerations plays Peetre's  $K$ -functional.

We denote by  $C_{\beta}[0, \infty)$ ,  $(\beta > 0)$  the class of continuous function on  $R^+$  satisfying  $|f(t)| \leq Mt^{\beta}$ ,  $M > 0$ . Note that for  $f \in C_{\beta}[0, \infty)$  the operators (1.1) are well-defined for  $n > \beta$ , only.

Further by  $C_0$  we mean the set of continuous function on  $(0, \infty)$  having a compact support and by  $C_0^m$  — the subset of  $C_0$  of  $m$ -times continuously differentiable functions.

For given  $0 < a < a' < b < +\infty$  we define Peetre's  $K$ -functional by

$$K(\xi, f) = \inf \{ \|f - g\|_{C[a,b]} + \xi \|g''\|_{C[a,b]} : g \in G\},$$

where  $0 < \xi \leq 1$  and

$$G = \{g \in C_0^2, \text{ supp } g \subset [a', b']\}.$$

The modulus of smoothness of  $f$  is defined by

$$\omega_k(f, h, a, b) = \sup \{ |\Delta_t^k f(x)| : |t| \leq h, x + kt \in [a, b] \},$$

where

$$\Delta_t^k f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} f(x + jt).$$

## 2. Auxiliary results

In this section, we first mention some results which are necessary to prove the main theorem.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let*

$$U_{n,m}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right)^m, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

*Then  $U_{n,0}(x) = 1$ ,  $U_{n,1}(x) = 0$  and  $U_{n,2}(x) = \frac{x}{n}$  and the recurrence relation*

$$nU_{n,m+1}(x) = x[U_{n,m}^{(1)}(x) + mU_{n,m-1}(x)]$$

*holds.*

Consequently

- (i)  $U_{n,m}(x)$  is a polynomial in  $x$  of degree  $\leq m$ ;
- (ii)  $U_{n,m}(x) = o_x(n^{-[(m+1)/2]})$ ,

where  $[\alpha]$  stands for the integer part of  $\alpha$ .

LEMMA 2.2 [5]. *Let*

$$V_{n,m}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} b_{n,k}(t)(t - x)^m dt.$$

*Then*

$$V_{n,0}(x) = 1, V_{n,1}(x) = \frac{1+x}{n-1}$$

*and we have the following recurrence relation*

$$(n - m - 1)V_{n,m+1}(x) = xV_{n,m}^{(1)}(x) + [(m + 1)(1 + 2x) - x]V_{n,m}(x) + mx(2 + x)V_{n,m-1}(x), \quad n > m - 1.$$

Consequently, for all  $x \in R^+$

$$V_{n,m}(x) = o_x(n^{-[(m+1)/2]}).$$

LEMMA 2.3. *Let*

$$\varphi_{n,m}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} b_{n,k}(t) t^m dt.$$

*Then each of  $\varphi_{n,m}(x)$  is a polynomial (in  $x$ ) of degree  $m$  and a rational function in  $n$ . Moreover for each  $x \in R^+$ ,  $\varphi_{n,m}(x) = o_x(1)$ .*

Proof. Using Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\varphi_{n,0}(x) = 1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{n,1}(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} b_{n,k}(t)(t-x) dt + x \\ &= \frac{1+x}{n-1} + x = \frac{1+nx}{n-1}, \quad n > 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$xp_{n,k}^{(1)}(x) = (k-nx)p_{n,k}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad t(1+t)b_{n,k}^{(1)}(t) = [k-(n+1)t]b_{n,k}(t),$$

then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x\varphi_{n,m}^{(1)}(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k-nx)p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} b_{n,k}(t)t^m dt \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} [\{k-(n+1)t\} + (n+1)t - nx]b_{n,k}(t)t^m dt \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} t(1+t)b_{n,k}^{(1)}(t)t^m dt + (n+1)\varphi_{n,m+1}(x) - nx\varphi_{n,m}(x) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore for  $n > m + 1$  we have

$$(n-m-1)\varphi_{n,m+1}(x) = x\varphi_{n,m}^{(1)}(x) + (nx+m+1)\varphi_{n,m}(x).$$

From the latter recurrence relation one can easily prove the required result.

COROLLARY 2.4. *Let  $\beta$  and  $\delta$  be two positive numbers. Then for any  $m > 2\beta$ , there exists a constant  $K_m$  such that*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{I_x(\delta)} b_{n,k}(t) t^{\beta} dt \right\|_{C[a,b]} \leq K_m n^{-m},$$

where  $I_x(\delta) = (0, \infty) \setminus [x - \delta, x + \delta]$ .

Proof. Using Lemma 2.2 we have the estimations

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{|t-x| \geq \delta} b_{n,k}(t) t^{\beta} dt &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{|t-x| \geq \delta} b_{n,k}(t) \frac{(t-x)^{2m}}{\delta^{2m}} t^{\beta} dt \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{\delta^{2m}} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{|t-x| \geq \delta} b_{n,k}(t) (t-x)^{4m} dt \right)^{1/2} \\
 &\quad \times \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{|t-x| \geq \delta} b_{n,k}(t) t^{2\beta} dt \right)^{1/2} \\
 &\leq \frac{K_1}{\delta^{2m}} n^{-m} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{|t-x| \geq \delta} b_{n,k}(t) t^{2\beta} dt \right)^{1/2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since (in view of Lemma 2.3) for  $m > 2\beta$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{|t-x| \geq \delta} b_{n,k}(t) t^{2\beta} dt \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{t \leq x-\delta} b_{n,k}(t) t^{2\beta} dt + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_{t \geq x+\delta} b_{n,k}(t) t^{2\beta} dt \\
 &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} b_{n,k}(t) (x-\delta)^{2\beta} dt + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} b_{n,k}(t) \frac{t^m}{(x+\delta)^{m-2\beta}} dt \\
 &= (x-\delta)^{2\beta} + \frac{\varphi_{n,m}(x)}{(x+\delta)^{m-2\beta}} \leq K_2 \quad \text{for all } x \in [a, b]
 \end{aligned}$$

and then the required inequality holds.

### 3. Main theorem

In this section we shall prove the following inverse theorem:

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $0 < a_1 < a_2 < b_2 < b_1 < \infty$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 2$  and suppose that for  $f \in C_{\beta}[0, \infty)$  we have*

(i)  $\|B_n(f, \cdot) - f(\cdot)\|_{C[a_1, b_1]} = o(n^{-\alpha/2})$ .

*Then*

(ii)  $f \in \text{Lip}^*(\alpha, C[a_2, b_2])$ ,

*where  $\text{Lip}^*(\alpha, C[a, b])$  denotes the Zygmund class of functions for which  $\omega_2(f, h, a, b) \leq M h^{\alpha}$ .*

There are two essential steps to prove the above theorem.

(I) We first reduce the above problem to the following lemmas as a special case when  $f$  has a compact support inside some interior interval  $[a', b']$  of  $(a_1, b_1)$ .

LEMMA 3.2. Let  $f \in C_0$  with  $\text{supp } f \subset [a'', b'']$ ,  $0 < a < a' < a'' < b'' < b' < b < \infty$ , and suppose that

$$\|B_n(f, \cdot) - f(\cdot)\|_{C[a, b]} = o(n^{-\alpha/2}).$$

Then

$$(3.1) \quad K(\xi, f) \leq K_0[n^{-\alpha/2} + n\xi K(n^{-1}, f)].$$

Consequently  $K(\xi, f) \leq K_1 \xi^{\alpha/2}$  for some constant  $K_1$ .

Proof. Since  $\text{supp } f \subset [a'', b'']$  then following May [6] there exists  $h \in G$  such that for  $i = 0$  and 2 we have

$$\|h^{(i)}(\cdot) - B_n^{(i)}(f, \cdot)\|_{C[a, b]} \leq K_2 n^{-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$K(\xi, f) \leq 2K_2 n^{-1} + \|f(\cdot) - B_n(f, \cdot)\|_{C[a, b]} + \xi \|B_n^{(2)}(f, \cdot)\|_{C[a, b]}$$

Hence, it is sufficient to show that there exists a constant  $K_3$  such that for each  $g \in G$  we have

$$(3.2) \quad \|B_n^{(2)}(f, \cdot)\|_{C[a', b']} \leq K_3 n \{ \|f - g\|_{C[a', b']} + n^{-1} \|g^{(2)}\|_{C[a', b']} \}.$$

In fact

$$(3.3) \quad \|B_n^{(2)}(f, \cdot)\|_{C[a', b']} \leq \|B_n^{(2)}(f - g, \cdot)\|_{C[a', b']} + \|B_n^{(2)}(g, \cdot)\|_{C[a', b']}.$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t) \right] = \frac{1}{x^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [(k - nx)^2 - k] p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t),$$

then by using Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\int_0^{\infty} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t) \right) \right| dt \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{|(k - nx)^2 - k|}{x^2} p_{n,k}(x) \int_0^{\infty} b_{n,k}(t) dt \leq \frac{2x}{n}.$$

Therefore we obtain

$$(3.4) \quad \|B_n^{(2)}(f - g, \cdot)\|_{C[a, b]} \leq \frac{2n}{a} \|f - g\|_{C[a, b]} = K_4 n \|f - g\|_{C[a, b]}.$$

Next, using Lemma 2.2, we see that for any  $m > i$

$$(3.5) \quad \int_0^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\partial^m}{\partial x^m} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t) \right) \right] (t - x)^i dt = 0.$$

Also, by Taylor's Expansion Theorem, there exists  $\xi$ , between  $t$  and  $x$ , such that

$$(3.6) \quad g(t) = g(x) + g^{(1)}(x)(t - x) + g^{(2)}(\xi)(t - x)^2.$$

Using (3.5) and (3.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_n^{(2)}(g, x) &= \int_0^\infty \left[ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \left( \sum_{k=0}^\infty p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t) \right) \right] g(t) dt \\
 &= \int_0^\infty [\dots] (g(x) + g^{(1)}(x)(t-x) + g^{(2)}(\xi)(t-x)^2) dt \\
 &= \int_0^\infty [\dots] g^{(2)}(\xi)(t-x)^2 dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

Making use of Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.7) \quad & \|B_n^{(2)}(g, \cdot)\|_{C[a,b]} \\
 & \leq \|g^{(2)}\|_{C[a,b]} \left\| \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \left( \sum_{k=0}^\infty p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t) \right) \right| (t-x)^2 dt \right\|_{C[a,b]} \\
 & \leq \|g^{(2)}\|_{C[a,b]} \left\| \left( \sum_{k=0}^\infty [(k-nx)^2 + k] p_{n,k}(x) \right) \int_0^\infty b_{n,k}(t) (t-x)^2 dt \right\|_{C[a,b]} \\
 & \leq K_5 \|g^{(2)}\|_{C[a,b]}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence (3.2) follows, by combining (3.3), (3.4) and (3.7). This completes the proof of the lemma.

LEMMA 3.3. *Relation (3.1) implies*

$$f \in \text{Lip}^*(\alpha, C[a, b]).$$

Proof. Proceeding along the lines of the proof from [2], we have

$$(3.8) \quad K(\xi, f) \leq K_6 \xi^{\alpha/2}, \text{ for some constant } K_6 > 0.$$

Now, let  $0 < |\delta| < h$ . Then for any  $g \in G$  we have

$$|\Delta_\delta^2 f(x)| \leq |\Delta_\delta^2(f(x) - g(x))| + |\Delta_\delta^2 g(x)| \leq 4\|f - g\|_{C[a,b]} + \delta^2 \|g^{(2)}\|_{C[a,b]}.$$

Therefore, using (3.8), we get

$$\omega_2(f, h, a, b) \leq 4K(h^2, f) \leq 4K_6 h^\alpha$$

i.e.  $f \in \text{Lip}^*(\alpha, C[a, b])$ .

(II) In this step we shall show that, using Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, the required result follows.

Let us choose  $a', a'', b', b''$  in such a way that  $a_1 < a' < a'' < a_2$  and  $b_2 < b'' < b' < b_1$ . Take any  $g \in C_0^\infty$  such that  $\text{supp } g \subset [a'', b'']$  and  $g(x) = 1$  on  $[a_2, b_2]$ .

First assume that  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ . For  $x \in [a', b']$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_n(fg, x) - f(x)g(x) &= g(x)[B_n(f, x) - f(x)] \\
 &+ \int_{a_1}^{b_1} \left( \sum_{k=0}^\infty p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t) \right) f(t)[g(t) - g(x)] dt + o(n^{-1}) = I_1 + I_2 + o(n^{-1})
 \end{aligned}$$

say, where  $o(n^{-1})$  term is, by Corollary 2.4, uniform for  $x \in [a', b']$ .

Next, making use of the assumption  $\|B_n(f, \cdot) - f(\cdot)\|_{C[a', b']} = o(n^{-\alpha/2})$ , we get

$$(3.10) \quad \|I_1\|_{C[a', b']} \leq \|g\|_\infty \|B_n(f, \cdot) - f(\cdot)\|_{C[a', b']} \leq K_7 n^{-\alpha/2},$$

where  $\|g\|_\infty = \inf\{M : |f(x)| \leq M \text{ a.e. on } [a', b']\}$ ,  $M$  is a constant.

Also, by Mean Value Theorem, we get

$$I_2 = \int_{a_1}^{b_1} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t) \right) f(t) [g^{(1)}(\xi)(t-x)] dt.$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.2 and Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we see that

$$(3.11) \quad \|I_2\|_{C[a', b']} = o(n^{-1/2}) \leq o(n^{-\alpha/2}).$$

Combining the estimates in (3.9), (3.10) and (3.11) we obtain

$$\|B_n(fg, \cdot) - fg(\cdot)\|_{C[a', b']} = o(n^{-\alpha/2}).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, we have  $fg \in \text{Lip}^*(\alpha, C[a', b'])$ . Since  $g(x) = 1$  on  $[a_2, b_2]$  it follows that  $f \in \text{Lip}^*(\alpha, C[a_2, b_2])$ . This proves the implication (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii), when  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ .

Now assume that  $1 < \alpha < 2$ . We also choose two points  $a_1^*$  and  $b_1^*$  satisfying  $a_1 < a_1^* < a'$  and  $b' < b_1^* < b_1$ . It is sufficient to prove our assertion for  $1 < \alpha < 2 - \delta$ , where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is arbitrary.

We may notice, from the previous result, that the condition

$$\|B_n(f, \cdot) - f(\cdot)\|_{C[a_1, b_1]} = o(n^{-\alpha/2}) \text{ implies } f \in \text{Lip}(1 - \delta, C[a_1^*, b_1^*]).$$

Now, for  $x \in [a', b']$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_n(fg, x) - f(x)g(x) &= g(x)[B_n(f, x) - f(x)] + f(x)[B_n(g, x) - g(x)] \\ &\quad + \int_{a_1^*}^{b_1^*} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_{n,k}(x) b_{n,k}(t) \right) [f(t) - f(x)][g(t) \\ &\quad - g(x)] dt + o(n^{-1}) = J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + o(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $o(n^{-1})$  term holds uniformly for  $x \in [a', b']$  (by Corollary 2.4).

In fact, the relation  $\|J_1\|_{C[a', b']} = o(n^{-\alpha/2})$  follows from the assumption, while  $\|J_2\|_{C[a', b']} = o(n^{-1}) \leq o(n^{-\alpha/2})$ , from Lemma 2.2.

Also, since  $|f(t) - f(x)| \leq K(t - x)^{1-\delta}$  and  $g(t) - g(x) = g^{(1)}(\xi)(t - x)$ , then, using Jensen's inequality and Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$\|J_3\|_{C[a', b']} = o(n^{-(2-\delta)/2}) \leq o(n^{-\alpha/2}).$$

Combining the above estimates of  $J_1, J_2$  and  $J_3$ , we get

$$\|B_n(fg, \cdot) - fg(\cdot)\|_{C[a', b']} = o(n^{-\alpha/2}).$$

Now the result follows, as in the first case, from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3. This completes the proof of inverse theorem.

**Acknowledgement.** We are extremely thankful to the referee for his valuable comments and suggestions which enabled us to improve the presentation of the paper.

### References

- [1] P. N. Agrawal and Vijay Gupta, *Simultaneous approximation by linear combination of modified Bernstein polynomials*, Bull. Greek Math. Soc. 30 (1989), 21–29.
- [2] H. Berens and G. G. Lorentz, *Inverse theorem for Bernstein polynomials*, Indian Univ. Math. J. 21 (1972), 693–708.
- [3] J. L. Durrmeyer, *Une Formule d'inversion de a Transforme de Laplace: Application a la Theory des Moments*, Thèse de 3e cycle, Faculte' des Sciences de Université' de Paris 1967.
- [4] Vijay Gupta and P. N. Agrawal, *An estimate of the rate of convergence for Modified Szász-Mirsky operators of functions of bounded variation*, Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) 49 (63) (1991), 97–103.
- [5] Vijay Gupta, G. S. Srivastava and A. Sahai, *On simultaneous approximation by Szász-Beta operators*, Soochow J. Math. 21 (1995). 1–11.
- [6] C. P. May, *Saturation and inverse theorems for combinations of a class of exponential type operators*, Canad. J. Math. 6, 28 (1976), 1224–1250.
- [7] S. M. Mazhar and V. Totik, *Approximation by modified Szász operator*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged), 49 (1985), 257–269.
- [8] A. Sahai and G. Prasad, *On approximation by modified Lupaş operators*, J. Approx. Theory 45 (1985), 122–128.
- [9] S. P. Singh, *On approximation by modified Szász operators*, Mathematical Chronicle 15 (1986), 39–48.
- [10] B. Wood, *Uniform approximation by linear combination of modified Bernstein polynomials*, J. Approx. Theory 41 (1984), 51–55.

Minakshi Gaur, S.K. Sharma

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

N.A.S. P.G. COLLEGE (MEERUT UNIVERSITY)

MEERUT 250-002 (U.P.) INDIA

G. Prasad

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

UNIVERSITY OF ROORKEE

ROORKEE - 247 667 (U.P.) INDIA

Received March 30, 1995.