

APPROXIMATION OF NON-NEGATIVE CONVEX  
FUNCTIONS BY POLYNOMIALS WITH POSITIVE  
COEFFICIENTS IN THE HAUSDORFF METRIC

by

V. AT. KOSTOVA

(Russe)

In the paper an estimate is obtained for the approximation of the non-negative convex function by polynomials with positive coefficients in the Hausdorff metric. It is proved that the estimate is exact with respect to the order  $(1/\sqrt{n})$ .

We shall use the following notations:

$R_\Delta$  — the set of real functions defined on the interval  $\Delta$ ;  $R_\Delta^M$  — the set of functions  $f \in R_\Delta$ ,  $\max |f(x)| \leq M$ ,  $x \in \Delta$ ,  $M > 0$ ;  $K_\Delta^M$  — the set of convex functions  $f \in R_\Delta^M$ , i.e.  $K_\Delta^M = \{f; f \in R_\Delta^M, f(\alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2) \leq \alpha f(x_1) + (1 - \alpha)f(x_2), x_1, x_2 \in \Delta, \alpha \in [0, 1]\}$ ;  $C_\Delta$  — the set of continuous functions  $f \in R_\Delta^M$ ;  $H_n$  — the set of polynomials  $P_n$  of degree  $\leq n$ ;  $H_n^*$  — the set of  $P_n \in H_n$  of the type:

$$P_n(x) = \sum_{i+j \leq n} a_{ij} x^i (1-x)^j, a_{ij} \geq 0;$$

$\tau(\Delta; f, P_n)$  — the Hausdorff distance between  $f \in R_\Delta^M$  and  $P_n \in H_n$  [7];  $E_{n,\tau}(f) = \inf \{\tau(\Delta; f, P_n); P_n \in H_n\}$  — the best approximation of  $f \in R_\Delta^M$  with  $P_n \in H_n$  in the Hausdorff metric;  $E_{n,\tau}^*(f) = \inf \{\tau(\Delta; f, P_n); P_n \in H_n^*\}$  — the best approximation of  $f \in R_\Delta^M$  with  $P_n \in H_n^*$  in the Hausdorff metric.

It is known [8], that for every function  $f \in R_\Delta^M$

$$(1) \quad E_{n,\tau}(f) = O(\ln n/n)$$

is valid, where  $O(1)$  is a constant depending only on the interval  $\Delta$  and  $M$ . V. Popov [6] proved that for  $f \in K_{\Delta}^M$

$$(2) \quad E_{n,\tau}(f) \leq C \ln(e + M)n^{-1}$$

is valid, where  $C$  is an absolute constant.

The aim of our examination is to find the best Hausdorff approximation of non-negative functions  $f \in K_{\Delta}^M$  with polynomials  $P_n \in H_n^*$ . In [1] V. Veselinov proved

THEOREM 1. Let  $f \in R_{[0,1]}^M$ ,  $f(x) \geq 0$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Then

$$(3) \quad E_{n,\tau}^* = O(\sqrt{\ln n/n})$$

holds, where the constant  $O(1)$  depends only on  $M$ .

We prove

THEOREM 2. Let  $f \in K_{[0,1]}^M$ ,  $f(x) \geq 0$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Then

$$(4) \quad E_{n,\tau}^*(f) = O(1/\sqrt{n})$$

is valid, where the constant  $O(1)$  depends only on  $M$ .

In order to prove Theorem 2 we need some definitions and lemmas. In accordance with [6] we define the one sided Hausdorff distance from the function  $f$  to the continuous function  $g$ :

$$h(\Delta; f, g) = \max_{x \in \Delta} \min_{\xi \in \Delta} \max \{ |x - \xi|, |f(x) - g(\xi)| \}.$$

From the definition of Hausdorff distance [7] we have

$$\tau(\Delta; f, g) = \max \{ h(\Delta; f, g), h(\Delta; g, f) \}$$

The following two lemmas are proved in [6].

LEMMA 1. [6] Let  $f, g \in C_{\Delta}$ ,  $\Delta = [a, b]$ ,  $g$  be monotone in  $[a, b]$ . Then

$$h(\Delta; g, f) \leq \max \{ h(\Delta; f, g), p, q \},$$

where

$$p = v(g, f; a), \quad q = v(g, f; b);$$

$$v(g, f; x) = \min_{\xi \in \Delta} \max \{ |x - \xi|, |g(x) - f(\xi)| \}.$$

We'll need its modification, i.e.

COROLLARY 1. Let  $f, g \in C_{[0,1]}$ ,  $f, g$  be monotone and  $f(0) = g(0)$ ,  $f(1) = g(1)$ . Then the following equality is true

$$\tau(\Delta; f, g) = h(\Delta; g, f) = h(\Delta; f, g).$$

LEMMA 2. [6] Let  $g_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  be monotone increasing continuous functions in the interval  $[a, b]$  and  $f_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  are functions such that  $h(\Delta; f_i, g_i) \leq \delta_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . If  $\mu_i \geq 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  then

$$h\left(\Delta; \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i f_i, \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i g_i\right) \leq \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \delta_i, \max_i \delta_i \right\}.$$

We'll need its modification, i.e.

COROLLARY 2. Let  $f_i, g_i \in C_{[0,1]}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  be monotone increasing functions such that  $f_i(0) = g_i(0)$ ,  $f_i(1) = g_i(1)$ ,  $\tau(\Delta; f_i, g_i) \leq \delta_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . Then if  $\mu_i \geq 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  it follows that

$$\tau\left(\Delta; \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i f_i; \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i g_i\right) \leq \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \delta_i, \max_i \delta_i \right\}.$$

Now we'll prove the following three lemmas:

LEMMA 3. Let  $g(\lambda; x)$  be a monotone increasing function defined on  $[0, 1]$

$$g(\lambda; x) = \max \{0, \mu(x - \lambda)/(1 - \lambda)\},$$

where  $M > 0$ ,  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . Then there exists an absolute constant  $C_0^*$ , such that

$$\tau([0, 1]; B_n(g(\lambda)), g(\lambda)) \leq C_0^* M/\sqrt{n},$$

where

$$B_n(f; x) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n f\left(\frac{\nu}{n}\right) p_{n,\nu}(x), \quad p_{n,\nu}(x) = \binom{n}{\nu} x^{\nu}(1-x)^{n-\nu}$$

is the Bernstein polynomial for  $f \in C_{[0,1]}$ .

Proof. The function  $g(\lambda) \in K_{\Delta}^M$ . Therefore following [4] we have

$$(5) \quad g(\lambda; x) \leq B_n(g(\lambda); x).$$

From the definition of the Bernstein polynomial it follows (See [9])

$$(6) \quad B_{k-1}(f; x) - B_k(f; x) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{k-1} S(f; k, \nu) p_{k,\nu}(x),$$

where

$$S(f; k, \nu) = \frac{k-\nu}{k} f\left(\frac{\nu}{k-1}\right) - f\left(\frac{\nu}{k}\right) + \frac{\nu}{k} f\left(\frac{\nu-1}{k-1}\right), \quad 1 \leq \nu \leq k-1.$$

We express

$$B_{k-1}(f; x) - B_k(f; x) = S_1(f; x) + S_2(f; x),$$

where 
$$S_1(f; x) = \sum_{|v/k-x| \leq 2\sqrt{x(1-x)} \ln k/k} S(f; k, v) p_{k,v}(x);$$

$$S_2(f; x) = \sum_{|v/k-x| > 2\sqrt{x(1-x)} \ln k/k} S(f; k, v) p_{k,v}(x).$$

First we estimate  $S_2(f; x)$ . From the definition of  $S(f; k, v)$  it follows that  $S(g(\lambda); k, v) \neq 0$  only for  $\lambda - \frac{\lambda}{k} < \frac{v}{k} < \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{k}$ . Then the following relations hold:

$$(7) \quad \left\{ S(g(\lambda); k, v); 0 < \frac{v}{k} < 1 \right\} \leq$$

$$\leq \max \left\{ S(g(\lambda); k, v); \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{k} < \frac{v}{k} < \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{k} \right\}$$

$$\leq \max \left\{ \left[ \frac{M(k-v)}{(1-\lambda)k} \left( \frac{v}{k-1} - \lambda \right); \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{k} < \frac{v}{k} \leq \lambda \right], \left[ \frac{M(k-v)}{(1-\lambda)k} \left( \frac{v}{k-1} - \lambda \right) - \frac{M}{1-\lambda} \left( \frac{v}{k} - \lambda \right); \lambda \leq \frac{v}{k} < \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{k} \right] \right\} \leq$$

$$\leq \max \left\{ \left[ \frac{M}{1-\lambda} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k} - \lambda \right) \left( \frac{v}{k} + \frac{v}{k(k-1)} - \lambda \right); \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{k} < \frac{v}{k} \leq \lambda \right], \left[ \frac{M}{1-\lambda} \left( \frac{v}{k-1} - \frac{v^2}{k(k-1)} + \lambda \frac{v}{k} - \frac{v}{k} \right); \lambda \leq \frac{v}{k} < \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{k} \right] \right\} \leq$$

$$\leq \max \left\{ \left[ \frac{2Mv}{k(k-1)}, \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{k} < \frac{v}{k} \leq \lambda \right], \left[ \frac{Mv(1-\lambda-v+\lambda k)}{(1-\lambda)(k-1)k}; \lambda \leq \frac{v}{k} < \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{k} \right] \right\} \leq$$

$$\leq \max \left\{ \left[ \frac{2M\lambda}{k-1}; \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{k} < \frac{v}{k} \leq \lambda \right], \left[ \frac{Mv}{k(k-1)}; \lambda \leq \frac{v}{k} < \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{k} \right] \right\}$$

$$\leq \left\{ \frac{2M\lambda}{k-1}; \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{k} < \frac{v}{k} < \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{k} \right\}.$$

According to [4] we have

$$(8) \quad \sum_{|v/k-x| > 2\sqrt{x(1-x)} \ln n/n} p_{k,v}(x) \leq 2n^{-1}.$$

In view of (7) and (8) we get

$$S_2(g(\lambda); x) \leq 4M\lambda[(k-1)k]^{-1}.$$

Futher we find an estimate for  $S_1(g(\lambda); x)$ . From the definition of  $S(f; k, v)$  and (7) it follows that

$$S_1(g(\lambda); x) \leq \sum_{|v/k-\lambda| \leq 2\sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)} \ln k/k} S(g(\lambda); k, v) p_{k,v}(\lambda) =$$

$$= \sum_{|v/k-\lambda| \leq 1/k} S(g(\lambda); k, v) p_{k,v}(\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda-\lambda/k < v/k < \lambda+(1-\lambda)/k} S(g(\lambda); k, v) p_{k,v}(\lambda) \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{2M\lambda}{k-1} \sum_{|v/k-\lambda| \leq 1/k} p_{k,v}(\lambda).$$

It is known [3], that for  $n^{-4/5} < x < 1 - n^{-4/5}$  and  $|v/n - x| \leq 2[x(1-x) \ln n/n]^{1/2}$  the following is valid:

$$p_{n,v}(x) = \frac{1 + \theta_1(n, v, x)}{\sqrt{2\pi n^{1/2} [x(1-x)]^{1/2}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{n(v/n-x)^2}{2x(1-x)} \right\},$$

where  $|\theta_1(n, v, x)| \leq \theta_2(n)$ ,  $\theta_2(n) > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_2(n) = 0$ . Therefore a constant  $C_3$  exists such that

$$(9) \quad P_{k,v}(x) \leq C_3 [kx(1-x)]^{-1/2}.$$

Now we can estimate:

$$B_{k-1}(g(\lambda); x) - B_k(g(\lambda); x) \leq \frac{2C_3 M \lambda}{(k-1)[k\lambda(1-\lambda)]^{1/2}} + \frac{4M\lambda}{(k-1)k} \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{C_2 M [\lambda(1-\lambda)]^{1/2}}{(1-\lambda)(k-1)\sqrt{k}} + \frac{4M\lambda(1-\lambda)}{(1-\lambda)(k-1)k} \leq \frac{C_1 M [\lambda(1-\lambda)]^{1/2}}{(1-\lambda)(k-1)\sqrt{k}}.$$

The sequence of Bernstein polynomials for a function  $f \in C_{[0,1]}$  converges to  $f$  [4]. Hence it is true:

$$(10) \quad 0 \leq B_n(g(\lambda); x) - \max \{0, M(x-\lambda)/(1-\lambda)\} =$$

$$= \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} [B_{k-1}(g(\lambda); x) - B_k(g(\lambda); x)] \leq \frac{C_1 M [\lambda(1-\lambda)]^{1/2}}{1-\lambda} \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k-1)\sqrt{k}} =$$

$$\leq \frac{2C_0 M [\lambda(1-\lambda)]^{1/2}}{(1-\lambda)\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{C_0 M}{(1-\lambda)\sqrt{n}}.$$

In case of  $x \in [\lambda - C_0/\sqrt{n}, 1]$  we obtain from (5) and (10)

$$(11) \quad \max \left[ 0, \frac{M}{1-\lambda} (x-\lambda) \right] \leq B_n(g(\lambda); x) \leq \frac{M}{1-\lambda} \left( x - \lambda + \frac{C_0}{\sqrt{n}} \right).$$

For  $x \in [0, \lambda - C_0/\sqrt{n}]$  we have:

$$0 \leq B_n(g(\lambda); x) = \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} [B_{k-1}(g(\lambda); x) - B_k(g(\lambda); x)] \leq$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{4M\lambda}{(k-1)k} + \frac{4M\lambda}{(k-1)\sqrt{k}} \frac{\exp[-C_0^2 [2x(1-x)]^{-1}]}{[x(1-x)]^{1/2}} \right\} \leq \frac{MC}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Applying the definition of the Hausdorff distance and (1.1) we get

$$\tau([0, 1]; B_n(g(\lambda)), g(\lambda)) \leq C_0^* M n^{-1/2}.$$

LEMMA 4. Let  $f \in K_{[0,1]}^M$ ,  $f$  be a monotone increasing function,  $0 \leq f(x) \leq M$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a function

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n(\epsilon)-1} \mu_i g(\lambda_i; x)$$

with

$$g(\lambda_i; x) = \max \{0, M(x - \lambda_i)/(1 - \lambda_i)\},$$

$$\lambda_i \in (0, 1), M_i \geq 0, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu_i = 1,$$

such that

$$\tau([0, 1]; f, g) < \varepsilon$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $n$  is sufficiently large and  $1/n < \varepsilon$ . We split the interval in  $n$  uniform parts and define the functions:

$$g_1(x) = nf(1/n)x, \quad x \leq 1/n;$$

$$g_2(x) = \begin{cases} n\left[f\left(\frac{2}{n}\right) - 2f\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right]\left(x - \frac{1}{n}\right) & , \quad x > 1/n; \\ 0 & , \quad x \leq 1/n; \end{cases}$$

$$g_i(x) = \begin{cases} n\left[f\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - 2f\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) + f\left(\frac{i-2}{n}\right)\right]\left(x - \frac{i-1}{n}\right) & , \quad x > \frac{i-1}{n}; \\ 0 & , \quad x \leq \frac{i-1}{n}. \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 3, 4, \dots, n$ .

One can verify that for the function  $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x)$  the following is valid;

$$(12) \quad g(i/n) \leq f(i/n), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

According to the definition of the Hausdorff distance and (12) we have

$$\tau([0, 1]; f, g) < \varepsilon.$$

The function  $f$  is convex and has the property

$$f(x) \leq g(x) \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1].$$

After some transformations it is easy to see that for  $g$  one has

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{i-1} g\left(\frac{i-1}{n}; x\right)$$

where

$$g\left(\frac{i-1}{n}; x\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{nM}{n-i+1} \left(x - \frac{i-1}{n}\right), & x > \frac{i-1}{n}; \\ 0 & x \leq \frac{i-1}{n}, \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

$$\mu_0 = nf(1/n)/M$$

$$\mu_{i-1} = (n-i+1)[f(i/n) - 2f((i-1)/n) + f((i-2)/n)]/M, \\ i = 2, 3, \dots, n.$$

The restriction  $\mu_i \geq 0, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1$  holds because the function  $f$  is convex.

LEMMA 5. Let  $f$  be a monotone convex function in the interval  $[0, 1]$ ,  $0 \leq f(x) \leq M$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,  $f(x) = 0$  for  $x \in [0, 2\delta_n]$ , where  $\delta_n = C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}$ ,  $C_0^*$  is the constant from Lemma 3. Then

$$E_{n,\tau}^*(f) \leq 2C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}$$

holds.

*Proof.* For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a linear combination

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu_i g(\lambda_i; x)$$

with the property

$$(13) \quad \tau([0, 1]; f, g) < \varepsilon,$$

where  $\mu_i \geq 0, i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu_i = 1; g(\lambda_i), i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$  are the convex functions from Lemma 3. Now we shall define a polynomial with positive coefficients of the type

$$P_n(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu_i B_n(g(\lambda_i); x).$$

Following (11) this polynomial has the following properties:

$$(14) \quad 1) P_n(x) \leq C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}, \quad x \in [0, \delta_n]; \quad P_n(0) = 0; \quad P_n(1) = M.$$

2)  $P_n$  is a convex function;

$$3) \quad 0 \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu_i [B_n(g(\lambda_i); x) - g(\lambda_i; x)] \leq P_n(x) - f(x), \quad x \in [0, 1].$$

Due to Corollary 2 and Lemma 3 we have

$$(15) \quad \tau([0, 1]; P_n, g) \leq C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}$$

From (13) and (15) it follows that

$$\tau([0, 1]; P_n, f) \leq \tau([0, 1]; P_n, g) + \tau([0, 1]; g, f) \leq 2C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}$$

Lemma 5 is proved. Now we can prove Theorem 2.

Let  $f \in K_{[0,1]}^M$ . We suppose that  $f \in C_{[0,1]}$  and  $\min \{f(x), x \in [0, 1]\} = f(\beta) = a$ , where  $a \geq 0, \beta \in [0, 1]$ . We denote  $\delta_n^* = C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}$ ,

where  $C_0^*$  is the constant from Lemma 3. We set  $f^*(x) = f(x) - a$ ,  $x \in [0, 1]$  and we define a continuous function  $f_n$  as follows:

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} f^*(x) & x \in [0, \beta]; \\ 0 & x \in [\beta, \beta + 2\delta_n]; \\ f^*(x - 2\delta_n) & x \in [\beta + 2\delta_n, 1 - n^{-1}], \end{cases}$$

$f_n(1) = M - a$ ,  $f_n(x)$  is linear for  $x \in [1 - n^{-1}, 1]$ . It is obvious that  $\tau([0, 1]; f^*, f_n) \leq 2\delta_n$ . Further we define  $f_n$  as a sum of two functions  $g_n$  and  $h_n$ , where

$$g_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, \beta + \delta_n]; \\ f_n(x) & x \in [\beta + \delta_n, 1], \end{cases}$$

$$h_n(x) = \begin{cases} f_n(x) & x \in [0, \beta + \delta_n]; \\ 0 & x \in [\beta + \delta_n, 1]. \end{cases}$$

The functions  $g_n$  and  $\bar{g}_n(x) = h_n(1 - x)$  satisfy the restrictions of Lemma 5. Therefore there exist polynomials  $P_{1n}$  and  $P_{2n}$  with positive coefficients such that

$$\tau([0, 1]; g_n, P_{1n}) \leq 2\delta_n; \quad \tau([0, 1]; \bar{g}_n, P_{2n}) \leq 2\delta_n.$$

From the definition of  $g_n$ ,  $\bar{g}_n$  and (14) it follows that

$$(16) \quad P_{1n}(x) \leq C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}, \quad x \in [0, \beta + \delta_n];$$

$$P_{2n}(1 - x) \leq C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}, \quad x \in [\beta + \delta_n, 1].$$

Then denoting  $P_n^*(x) = P_{1n}(x) + P_{2n}(1 - x)$ ,  $x \in [0, 1]$  we obtain from the definitions of  $g_n$ ,  $\bar{g}_n$  and (16) that

$$\tau([0, 1]; P_n^* f_n) \leq$$

$$\leq \max \{ \tau([0, \beta + \delta_n]; P_n^*, f_n), \tau([\beta + \delta_n, 1]; P_n^*, f_n) \} \leq$$

$$\leq \max \{ \tau([0, \beta + \delta_n]; P_{2n}, \bar{g}_n) + \delta_n, \tau([\beta + \delta_n, 1]; P_{1n}, g_n) + \delta_n \} = 3C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}.$$

For the function  $f^*$  we have

$$\tau([0, 1]; P_n^* f^*) \leq \tau([0, 1]; f^*, f_n) +$$

$$+ \tau([0, 1]; f_n, P_n^*) \leq 5C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}.$$

Substituting  $f(x) = f^*(x) + a$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$  and applying the definition of the Hausdorff distance we get:

$$\tau([0, 1]; P_n^*(x), f^*(x)) =$$

$$= \max \left\{ \max_{x \in [0, 1]} \min_{\xi \in [0, 1]} \max [ |x - \xi|, |f(x) - a - P_n^*(\xi)| ] \right\}$$

$$\max_{x \in [0, 1]} \min_{\xi \in [0, 1]} \max [ |x - \xi|, |f(\xi) - a - P_n^*(x)| ] = \tau([0, 1]; f(x), P_n^*(x) + a).$$

Therefore there exists a polynomial with positive coefficients  $P_n(x) = P_n^*(x) + a$  for which

$$\tau([0, 1]; P_n, f) \leq 5C_0^* Mn^{-1/2}.$$

holds.

The obtained estimate can not be improved for non-negative convex functions. This can be seen from the following

**THEOREM 3.** [5] Let  $f(x) = |x - a|^\alpha$ ,  $0 < a < 1$ ,  $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ . Then

$$\max_{x \in [0, 1]} ||x - a|^\alpha - Q_n^*(x)| \geq Mn^{-\alpha/2}$$

for sufficiently large  $n$  and more precisely  $Q_n^*(a) \geq Mn^{-\alpha/2}$ , where  $Q_n^*$  is the polynomial of the best uniform approximation. The constant  $M > 0$  depend only on  $a$ .

Really, let us examine the function  $\tilde{f}(x) = |x - 1/2|$ ,  $x \in [0, 1]$ . In view of Theorem 3 for the function  $\tilde{f}$  and its polynomial of the best uniform approximation  $Q_n^* \in H_n^*$  one gets:

$$h([0, 1]; \tilde{f}, Q_n^*) \geq Mn^{-1/2}.$$

Therefore the Hausdorff distance in the point  $x = 1/2$  can not be improved.

Theorem 2 is proved.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Veselinov, V. M., Best approximation of functions by polynomials with positive coefficients in the Hausdorff metric, C. R. Acad. Bulg. Sci., **27**, 599-602, (1974).
- [2] Veselinov, V. M., The exact constants in the theory of approximation by the Bernstein polynomials in the Hausdorff metric, C. R. Acad. Bulg. Sci., **27**, 1183-1186, (1974).
- [3] Esseen, G. G., Über die asymptotisch beste Approximation stetige Functionen mit Hilfe von Bernstein Polynomen, Numer. Math., **2**, 206, (1960).
- [4] Lorentz, G. G., Bernstein Polynomials, Toronto, 1953.
- [5] Lorentz, G. G., The Degree of Approximation by Polynomials with Positive Coefficients, Math. Annalen **151**, 239-251, 1963.
- [6] Попов, В. А., Approximation of convex functions by algebraic polynomials in Hausdorff's metric. Serdica, **1**, 386-398, 1975.
- [7] Сендов, Бл., Хаусдорфовы приближения, БАН, София, 1978.
- [8] Сендов Бл., Попов, В. А. Точная асимптотика наилучшего приближения алгебраическими и тригонометрическими многочленами в метрике Хаусдорфа. Мат. сб., **89**, 138-147, 1972.
- [9] Струков, Л. И. Тиман, А. Ф., Математическое ожидание непрерывных функций случайных величин гладкость и дисперсия., Сибирский мат. журнал. **18**, 3, 658-664, 1977.

Received 19.II.1983.

TU „Angel Kanchev“  
Center of Mathematics  
7004 Russe Bulgaria  
Violeta At. Kostova