On the minimum of $1 + x + \cdots + x^{2n}$

Aaron Hendrickson ahendr16@jh.edu

Claude Leibovici cfl-consultant@club-internet.fr

October 18, 2021

Abstract

The minimum of the polynomial $f_{2n}(x) = 1 + x + \cdots + x^{2n}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is studied. Results show that for all *n* the minimum is unique, resides on the interval [-1, -1/2], and corresponds to $\partial_x f_{2n}(x) = 0$. Perturbation theory is applied to generate rapidly converging and asymptotically exact approximations to $x_{2n} = \arg \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_{2n}(x)$. A closed-form expression for x_{2n} is conjectured, which is shown to yield the correct result for the case n = 1. Numerical studies are carried out to show how many terms of the perturbation expansion of x_{2n} are needed to obtain suitably precise approximations.

1 Introduction

The inspiration for this work came from a question asked on the Mathematics Stack Exchange on March 13, 2021, which sought a solution to the minimum of the polynomial $1 + x + \cdots + x^{2n}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ [2]. The original poster (OP) of the question noted that the minimum appeared to correspond to a vanishing derivative and thus could be found by solving for the roots of $\partial_x(1+x+\cdots x^{2n})$. For n = 1, 2 these roots are explicitly solved using the standard formulae for linear and cubic equations. However for $n \geq 3$, no explicit formula exists; hence, motivating the need for more powerful methods. Given the broad and pervasive applications of geometric sums in the literature, further study of this polynomial and its minimum is a worthwhile venture.

Keywords: perturbation theory, root finding, hypergeometric function, k-gamma function 2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 65H04, Secondary 65Q30.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this work we define $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, ...\}$, $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, and $\mathbb{E} = \{2, 4, ...\}$ to be the sets of positive integers, nonnegative integers, and positive even integers, respectively. For the sake of brevity we shall denote m = 2n so that the polynomial of interest and its minimizer becomes

$$f_m(x) \coloneqq 1 + x + \dots + x^m, \quad m \in \mathbb{E}$$

and

$$x_m \coloneqq \operatorname*{arg \, inf}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_m(x),$$

respectively. With these definitions at hand we are ready to begin studying properties of f_m and x_m for use in § 4.

3 Properties of f_m and x_m

Our first goal is to establish that x_m exists and is unique for all $m \in \mathbb{E}$. To accomplish this it will be helpful to use the known closed-form for geometric sums and write f_m in the form

$$f_m(x) = \frac{1 - x^{m+1}}{1 - x}.$$
(1)

Lemma 1. For all $m \in \mathbb{E}$, $f_m(x)$ is strictly convex on $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. To establish strict convexity it is sufficient to show $f''_m(x) > 0$ everywhere on $x \in \mathbb{R}$. It is trivial to show that $f''_m(x) > 0$ holds for $x \ge 0$ so all that is left is to consider the complementary case x < 0. Equating the second derivative of f_m with zero we find $f''_m(x) = 0 \iff h_m(x) = 0$, where

$$h_m(x) = (m-1)mx^{m+1} - 2(m^2 - 1)x^m + m(m+1)x^{m-1} - 2.$$

The signs of the coefficients for $h_m(-x)$ in order of descending variable exponent gives the sequence (-1, -1, -1, -1), which are all negative. It follows from Descartes' rule of signs that $f''_m(x)$ has zero roots on the interval $x \in (-\infty, 0)$. But, $f''_m(-1) = \frac{1}{2}m^2 > 0$; thus, we conclude $f''_m(x) > 0$ also holds for all x < 0. The proof is now complete.

Theorem 1. For all $m \in \mathbb{E}$, x_m exists, is unique, and resides on the interval [-1, -1/2].

Proof. We begin by establishing that $f'_m(x)$ has exactly one real root. It is immediately obvious that $f'_m(x) > 0$ for all $x \ge 0$. Now assuming x < 0, we deduce $f'_m(x) = 0 \iff g_m(x) = 0$, where $g_m(x) = mx^{m+1} - (m+1)x^m + 1$. The signs of the coefficients for $g_m(-x)$ in order of descending variable exponent gives the sequence (-1, -1, +1); showing a single variation in sign. Again appealing to Descartes' rule of signs we conclude $f'_m(x)$ must have exactly one real root on the interval $x \in (-\infty, 0)$. However, $f'_m(-1) = -\frac{1}{2}m$ and $f'_m(-1/2) = \frac{1}{9}2^{1-m}(2^{m+1}-3m-2) \ge 0$ with the latter inequality following from induction on $m \in \mathbb{E}$. Consequently, $f'_m(x)$ has a single root on the real line contained in the interval [-1, -1/2] for all $m \in \mathbb{E}$. Furthermore, the strict convexity of f_m proven in Lemma 1 implies that the root of $f'_m(x) = 0$ also corresponds to the unique global minimum of f_m , which completes the proof. \Box

With the existence and uniqueness of x_m proven, we turn to finding a simple formula for the minimum of f_m as a function of x_m .

Lemma 2. Let $x_m \in [-1, -1/2]$ denote the unique minimizer of f_m such that $f_m(x_m) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_m(x)$. Then,

$$f_m(x_m) = \frac{1+m}{1+m(1-x_m)}$$

Proof. From Theorem 1 we know that x_m satisfies $mx_m^{m+1} - (m+1)x_m^m + 1 = 0$. Solving this equality for x_m^{m+1} we have $x_m^{m+1} = x_m/(1 + m(1 - x_m))$, which upon substituting into (1) yields the desired result.

4 Perturbation series expansion of x_m

In the previous section we showed that the minimizer x_m exists, is unique, and resides in the interval [-1, -1/2] for all $m \in \mathbb{E}$. Furthermore, we were able to establish a very simple expression for $\inf f_m$ as a function of this minimizer so that the problem of evaluating $\inf f_m$ is equivalent to finding x_m . For m = 2, 4we may apply the standard equations for roots of linear and cubic equations to derive exact expressions for x_m . Furthermore, as $m \to \infty$ we find $f_m(x) \to \infty$ at x = -1 and $f_m(x) \to (1-x)^{-1}$ for all other $x \in (-1, -1/2]$. Bringing these observations together we have

$$x_{2} = -\frac{1}{2}$$

$$x_{4} = -\frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \sqrt[3]{5/9} \left(\sqrt[3]{9 + 4\sqrt{6}} - \sqrt[3]{4\sqrt{6} - 9} \right) \right)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$x_{\infty} = -1.$$

For all remaining $m \ge 6$, no explicit formula for x_m exists and so we must turn to alternative methods.

From Theorem 1 we know that x_m satisfies

$$g_m(x_m) = 0$$
, with $g_m(x) = x^m \left(1 - x + \frac{1}{m}\right) - \frac{1}{m}$

and $x_m \to -1$ as $m \to \infty$. The fact that $x_m + 1$ vanishes as m becomes large suggests we apply the methods of perturbation theory to the problem

$$g_{m,\epsilon}(x_{m,\epsilon}) = 0$$
, with $g_{m,\epsilon}(x) = x^m \left(2 - (1+x)\epsilon + \frac{1}{m}\right) - \frac{1}{m}$,

where

$$x_{m,\epsilon} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \epsilon^k.$$
⁽²⁾

Upon inspection we observe $g_{m,1}(x) = g_m(x)$ and so it follows that x_m can be recovered by evaluating the perturbation series (2) at $\epsilon = 1$. To determine the coefficients of the perturbation series $x_{m,\epsilon}$ we first consider the following well known result for integer powers of power series:

$$x_m^p = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_{k,p} \epsilon^k, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}$$

with $c_{0,p} = a_0^p$ and

$$c_{k,p} = \frac{1}{a_0 k} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} ((p+1)\ell - k) a_\ell c_{k-\ell,p}.$$

Using Faá di Bruno's formula we may also obtain a closed-form for the coefficients $c_{k,p}$ as

$$c_{k,p} = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} (p)^{(\ell)} a_0^{p-\ell} B_{k,\ell}(1! a_1, \dots, (k-\ell+1)! a_{k-\ell+1}),$$

where $(s)^{(n)} = \Gamma(s+1)/\Gamma(s-n+1)$ is the falling factorial and $B_{n,k}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-k+1})$ is the partial Bell-polynomial. Using these results we substitute $x_{m,\epsilon}$ into $g_{m,\epsilon}$ and collect terms by powers of ϵ yielding

$$g_{m,\epsilon}(x_m) = \left(2 + \frac{1}{m}\right)a_0^m - \frac{1}{m} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[\left(2 + \frac{1}{m}\right)c_{k,m} - c_{k-1,m} - c_{k-1,m+1}\right]\epsilon^k.$$

Since $g_{m,\epsilon}(x_{m,\epsilon}) = 0$ we may equate the coefficients of ϵ^k with zero to yield an infinite system of equations that allow us to solve for the perturbation series coefficients a_k . Setting the constant term equal to zero gives $a_0^m = (1+2m)^{-1}$. Knowing that $x_m \in [-1, -1/2]$ and $m \in \mathbb{E}$ we take the negative solution to this equation and then set the higher-order coefficients of ϵ^k equal with zero to get

$$a_0 = -(1+2m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}, \quad (1+2m)c_{k,m} - m(c_{k-1,m} + c_{k-1,m+1}) = 0.$$
 (3)

To this point, a method for solving the recursion given in (3) has proven to be elusive. Perhaps the biggest challenge in finding the solution is the presence of the $c_{k-1,m+1}$ term, which can be expressed in terms of $c_{*,m}$ by writing $c_{k-1,m+1} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} a_{\ell}c_{k-\ell-1,m}$. Given no clear path to a solution we evaluated the first several coefficients and observed a pattern of the form

$$a_k = \frac{a_0}{(1+2m)^k k!} \sum_{\ell=0}^k \binom{k}{\ell} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} (\ell+1+mj) \right] a_0^{\ell}.$$

Using symbolic calculations in MATHEMATICA this pattern was confirmed to satisfy the recurrence relation (3) for at least k = 0, ..., 15. With a few algebraic manipulations and the following definition we are able to conjecture a closed-form for a_k .

Definition 1 (k-gamma function and Pochhammer k-symbol). The k-gamma and k-Pochhammer functions are given by

$$\Gamma_k(x) \coloneqq k^{\frac{x}{k}-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{x}{k}\right)$$

and

$$(x)_{n,k} \coloneqq \frac{\Gamma_k(x+nk)}{\Gamma_k(x)},$$

respectively, where $\Gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt$ denotes the ordinary gamma function [1].

Relation 1 ([3, Prop. 3.1]). If $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ then $(\alpha)_{n,k} = k^n (\alpha/k)_n$, where $(s)_n = \Gamma(s+n)/\Gamma(n)$ denotes the ordinary Pochhammer symbol.

Conjecture 1. The sequence of coefficients $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ with $a_0 = -(1+2m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}$ and

$$a_k = \sum_{\ell=0}^k \frac{(\ell+m+1)_{k-1,m}}{\ell!(k-\ell)!} a_0^{mk+\ell+1}$$

satisfies (3) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Assuming Conjecture 1 holds we are able to derive some useful properties of x_m including a closed-form expression in terms of generalized hypergeometric functions of unity argument.

Corollary 1. Let

$$\tilde{x}_{m,n} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k.$$

If Conjecture 1 holds then $x_m \sim \tilde{x}_{m,n}$ as $m \to \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. Using the expression for a_k given in Conjecture 1 we have $\lim_{m\to\infty} a_0 = -1$ and $\lim_{m\to\infty} a_k = 0$ for all $k \ge 1$; thus, $\lim_{m\to\infty} \tilde{x}_{m,n} = -1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since $\lim_{m\to\infty} x_m = -1$ the result follows.

Theorem 2. If Conjecture 1 holds then

$$x_m = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{(-m)^{k-2}}{(1+m)^{\frac{(m+1)k}{m}-1}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{(m+1)k}{m}-1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m+k}{m}\right)\Gamma(k)} {}_{m+2}F_{m+1}\left(\begin{array}{c} 1, \{\frac{k}{m}+\frac{\ell-1}{m+1}\}_{\ell=0}^m \\ \frac{m+k}{m}, \{\frac{k+\ell}{m}\}_{\ell=0}^{m-1}; 1\right).$$

Proof. We begin by considering the closed-form for x_m claimed in the statement of the theorem, which consists of a sum of m hypergeometric functions. Denoting $\{a_{j,k}\}_{j=1}^{m+2}$ as the top parameters and $\{b_{j,k}\}_{j=1}^{m+1}$ as the bottom parameters of

the hypergeometric function in the kth term we find $\gamma_k = (b_1 + \cdots + b_{m+1}) - (a_1 + \cdots + a_{m+2}) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$. Since $\gamma_k > 0$, each of the *m*-terms of x_m can be written as absolutely convergent series; hence, this expression must also be absolutely convergent. Now calling on Conjecture 1 we write

$$x_m = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \frac{m^{k-1}}{\ell!(k-\ell)!} \frac{\Gamma(k+\frac{\ell+1}{m})}{\Gamma(1+\frac{\ell+1}{m})} a_0^{mk+\ell+1}.$$

If this expression is equal to that given in the statement of the theorem, then it is also absolutely convergent and permits rearrangement of its term. Interchanging the order of summation we find after some simplification

$$x_m = \frac{a_0}{m} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{(m+1)\ell+1}{m}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{\ell+1}{m}\right)} \frac{(ma_0^{m+1})^\ell}{\ell!} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(m+1)\ell+1}{m}\right)_k \frac{(ma_0^m)^k}{k!}.$$

The interior sum over k can now be evaluated in terms of ${}_{1}F_{0}(\alpha; -; z) = (1 - z)^{-\alpha}$, which after reintroducing a_{0} yields

$$x_m = -\frac{(1+m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}}{m} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{(m+1)\ell+1}{m})}{\Gamma(\frac{m+\ell+1}{m})} \frac{\left(-m(1+m)^{-\frac{m+1}{m}}\right)^{\ell}}{\ell!}$$

To evaluate the remaining series we write $x_m = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} c_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty c_{m\ell+i-1}$, which results in m new series containing Pochhammer symbols of the form $(\cdot)_{(m+1)\ell}$ and $(\cdot)_{m\ell}$. Using the identity [3, Eq. 2.13]

$$(\alpha)_{rn} = r^{rn} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \left(\frac{\alpha+j}{r}\right)_n, \quad r \in \mathbb{N}$$

we arrive at

$$x_m = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{(-m)^{k-2}}{(1+m)^{\frac{(m+1)k}{m}-1}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{(m+1)k}{m}-1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m+k}{m}\right)\Gamma(k)} \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty \frac{(1)_\ell \prod_{j=0}^m \left(\frac{i}{m}+\frac{j-1}{m+1}\right)_\ell}{\left(\frac{m+i}{m}\right)_\ell \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{i+j}{m}\right)_\ell} \frac{1}{\ell!},$$

which is the desired result.

Corollary 2. The conjectured form of x_m in Theorem 2 holds for m = 2. *Proof.* Substituting m = 2 into the conjectured expression for x_m we have

$$x_2 = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} {}_2F_1\left(\frac{\frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{6}}{\frac{3}{2}}; 1\right) - \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}} {}_3F_2\left(\frac{\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{3}, \frac{4}{3}}{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{2}}; 1\right).$$

The $_2F_1(\cdot)$ term is simplified using Gauss's hypergeometric summation theorem

$${}_{2}F_{1}\left(\begin{matrix} \alpha,\beta\\ \gamma \end{matrix};1 \right) = \frac{\Gamma(\gamma)\Gamma(\gamma-\alpha-\beta)}{\Gamma(\gamma-\alpha)\Gamma(\gamma-\beta)}, \quad \Re(\gamma-\alpha-\beta) > 0.$$

Likewise, the ${}_{3}F_{2}(\cdot)$ term is reduced by [4, Eq. 07.27.03.0120.01]

$${}_{3}F_{2}\left(\frac{1,\beta,\gamma}{2,\epsilon};z\right) = \frac{\epsilon-1}{(\beta-1)(\gamma-1)z}\left({}_{2}F_{1}\left(\frac{\beta-1,\gamma-1}{\epsilon-1};z\right) - 1\right)$$

and then applying Gauss's summation theorem to the remaining $_2F_1(\cdot)$ term. After some simplification we have

$$x_2 = -\frac{1}{2},$$

which is the exact value of x_2 .

5 Numerical results

Even if Conjecture 1 holds, the closed-form for x_m given in Theorem 2 is not amenable to numerical implementation and so we instead wish to approximate x_m with

$$\tilde{x}_{m,n} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k.$$

From Corollary 1 we know that $x_m \sim \tilde{x}_{m,n}$ for at least $n = 0, \ldots, 15$ and so we expect the number n needed to guarantee $|x_m - \tilde{x}_{m,n}| < \epsilon$ should decrease as $m \to \infty$. Since we have a closed-form for x_4 , which can be computed to arbitrary precision, our first task will be to study the convergence of $\tilde{x}_{4,n} \to x_4$ by counting the number of correct digits given by $\tilde{x}_{4,n}$ as a function of n. Given that we expect less terms will be needed for larger values of m, the results of this exercise should give us a worst case scenario for how large n must be to obtain a desired precision in our approximation.

Using MATHEMATICA software, the first one-hundred fifty digits of x_4 were computed and compared to those of $\tilde{x}_{4,n}$. For each n, the number of uninterrupted correct digits after the decimal point were counted with the results given in Figure 1. From the figure, we observe that the number n grows approximately linearly with the number of correct digits¹. Fitting a line to this data we find

 $n \approx 1.311 \times (\# \text{ of correct digits in } \tilde{x}_{4,n}) - 3.007,$

which shows that we obtain a correct digit for every ≈ 1.3 additional terms added to our approximation. Since the actual value of n fluctuates about this line we will ignore the intercept term and conclude n = 13 should give approximately ten correct digits for the case m = 4. Indeed, since $x_m \sim \tilde{x}_{m,13}$ we expect n = 13 to give approximately ten or more correct digits of x_m for m > 4. To verify this observation, the value of x_m was numerically approximated using a bisection method. For each m, x_m was successively approximated until the

¹The fact that $\tilde{x}_{4,n}$ is able to reproduce x_4 to hundreds of decimal places further points to the veracity of Conjecture 1.

interval width was small enough to guarantee $|x_m - \tilde{x}_{m,13}| \leq 5 \times 10^{-12}$. Comparing the numerical approximations of x_m from the bisection routine to $\tilde{x}_{m,13}$ showed agreement to ten decimal places for all $m = 2, 4, \ldots, 100$. Finally, Table 1 presents numerical values for x_m and $f_m(x_m)$ based on the formula in Lemma 2 and $\tilde{x}_{m,15}$.



Figure 1: Plot of the number n versus the number correct digits after the decimal place given by $\tilde{x}_{4,n}$.

6 Conclusions

In this note, we were able to establish many useful facts about the polynomial $f_m(x) = 1+x+\cdots+x^m$ and its minimum value on the real line. In particular, we were able to show that this minimum always occurs on the interval [-1, -1/2] as well as provide a very simple formula for the minimum as a function of the minimizer x_m . Perturbation theory was applied to derive a series expansion for x_m and a closed-form for the coefficients of this series was conjectured and confirmed for $k = 0, \ldots 15$. We were able to show that the conjectured closed-form for the sequence of coefficients $\{a_k\}$ leads to a closed-form expression for x_m , which yields the correct value for the special case of m = 2. Furthermore, numerical studies were conducted which gave a rule of thumb for how large n must be to achieve a desired precision in approximating x_m with $\tilde{x}_{m,n}$. Further improvements to this work include more efficient code to compute the coefficients a_k past k = 15 as well as a proof to Conjecture 1.

References

- [1] Rafael Díaz and Eddy Pariguan. On hypergeometric functions and pochhammer k-symbol. *Divulgaciones Matemáticas*, 15(2), 2007.
- [2] SaltedFishKing (https://math.stackexchange.com/users/837297/saltedfishking). The minimum of $f(x) = 1 + x + \cdots + x^{2n}$. Mathematics Stack Exchange. URL:https://math.stackexchange.com/q/4060608 (version: 2021-03-14).
- [3] Shahid Mubeen and Abdur Rehman. A note on k-gamma function and pochhammer k-symbol. Journal of Informatics and Mathematical Sciences, 6(2), 2014.
- [4] Inc. Wolfram Research. The wolfram functions site. Visited on 2021-04-28.

m	x_m	$f_m(x_m)$	m	x_m	$f_m(x_m)$
2	-0.5000000000	0.7500000000	78	-0.9376111258	0.5192801905
4	-0.6058295862	0.6735532235	80	-0.9388198625	0.5188795643
6	-0.6703320476	0.6350938940	82	-0.9399784542	0.5184964771
8	-0.7145377272	0.6115666906	84	-0.9410900592	0.5181297723
10	-0.7470540749	0.5955429324	86	-0.9421575717	0.5177783938
12	-0.7721416355	0.5838576922	88	-0.9431836485	0.5174413759
14	-0.7921778546	0.5749221276	90	-0.9441707340	0.5171178332
16	-0.8086048979	0.5678463037	92	-0.9451210804	0.5168069528
18	-0.8223534102	0.5620909079	94	-0.9460367670	0.5165079864
20	-0.8340533676	0.5573090540	96	-0.9469197164	0.5162202447
22	-0.8441478047	0.5532669587	98	-0.9477717091	0.5159430910
24	-0.8529581644	0.5498010211	100	-0.9485943966	0.5156759367
26	-0.8607238146	0.5467931483	102	-0.9493893132	0.5154182363
28	-0.8676269763	0.5441558518	104	-0.9501578860	0.5151694840
30	-0.8738090154	0.5418228660	106	-0.9509014444	0.5149292100
32	-0.8793814184	0.5397430347	108	-0.9516212282	0.5146969770
34	-0.8844333818	0.5378762052	110	-0.9523183955	0.5144723780
36	-0.8890371830	0.5361903986	112	-0.9529940289	0.5142550329
38	-0.8932520563	0.5346598151	114	-0.9536491420	0.5140445872
40	-0.8971270425	0.5332633990	116	-0.9542846846	0.5138407092
42	-0.9007031162	0.5319837878	118	-0.9549015479	0.5136430885
44	-0.9040147981	0.5308065300	120	-0.9555005690	0.5134514340
46	-0.9070913919	0.5297194951	122	-0.9560825347	0.5132654729
48	-0.9099579456	0.5287124219	124	-0.9566481855	0.5130849489
50	-0.9126360054	0.5277765690	126	-0.9571982191	0.5129096209
52	-0.9151442141	0.5269044410	128	-0.9577332933	0.5127392623
54	-0.9174987898	0.5260895727	130	-0.9582540286	0.5125736594
56	-0.9197139122	0.5253263565	132	-0.9587610115	0.5124126108
58	-0.9218020367	0.5246099035	134	-0.9592547961	0.5122559267
60	-0.9237741513	0.5239359311	136	-0.9597359069	0.5121034274
62	-0.9256399895	0.5233006711	138	-0.9602048403	0.5119549436
64	-0.9274082062	0.5227007942	140	-0.9606620669	0.5118103146
66	-0.9290865244	0.5221333471	142	-0.9611080328	0.5116693885
68	-0.9306818591	0.5215957008	144	-0.9615431615	0.5115320215
70	-0.9322004214	0.5210855067	146	-0.9619678551	0.5113980772
72	-0.9336478067	0.5206006599	148	-0.9623824957	0.5112674259
74	-0.9350290699	0.5201392683	150	-0.9627874469	0.5111399447
76	-0.9363487901	0.5196996259	∞	-1.0000000000	0.5000000000

Table 1: Numerical values for x_m and $f_m(x_m)$.