

Algorithms of constrained uniform approximation

Vladimir Yu. Protasov ^{*}, Rinat Kamalov [†]

Abstract

We address the problem of the best uniform approximation of a continuous function on a convex domain. The approximation is by linear combinations of a finite system of functions (not necessarily Chebyshev) under arbitrary linear constraints. By modifying the concept of alternance and of the Remez iterative procedure we present a method, which demonstrates its efficiency in numerical problems. The linear rate of convergence is proved under some favourable assumptions. A special attention is paid to systems of complex exponents, Gaussian functions, lacunar algebraic and trigonometric polynomials. Applications to signal processing, linear ODE, switching dynamical systems, and to Markov-Bernstein type inequalities are considered.

Key words: *uniform approximation, polynomial of the best approximation, non-Chebyshev system, linear constraints, Remez algorithm, regularization, exponential polynomials, recovery of signals*

AMS 2010 subject classification *41A29, 41A50, 93D20*

1. Introduction

The uniform approximation of functions on compact domains is well-understood in case of approximations by Chebyshev systems on a segment. In this case for every $f \in C[a, b]$, the closest to f polynomial is always unique and is characterised by the alternance criterion (the Chebyshev - Vallée-Poussin theorem). The numerical computation of the polynomial of best approximation is realized by the Remez algorithm [41]. A system of n functions on a set K is *Chebyshev* (also called *Haar*) if every nontrivial polynomial by this systems, i.e., a linear combination of its functions, has at most $n - 1$ zeros on K . They are, for example, algebraic polynomials on a segment and trigonometric polynomials on the period. See [10, 21, 23] for the general theory of Chebyshev approximations.

^{*}Moscow State University, Russia; e-mail: v-protasov@yandex.ru

[†]Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Russia e-mail: rinat020398god@yandex.ru

For non-Chebyshev systems, the situation is different. Neither the alternance criterion nor the Remez algorithm works. In general, little is known on the uniform polynomial approximation in this case, especially in the numerical aspect. Many important problems in signal processing, numerical ODE, etc. deal with non-Chebyshev systems such as quasipolynomials, band-limited functions, lacunary algebraic polynomials (polynomials spanned by some integer powers t^{m_k} , $k = 1, \dots, n$), Müntz polynomials (spanned by arbitrary nonnegative powers), etc. All multivariate systems are, as a rule, non-Chebyshev. Another class of problems which is not covered by the Chebyshev analysis is the constrained uniform approximation. For example, an algebraic polynomial of the best approximation with a prescribed value of the derivative at some point may not possess an alternance and may not be unique. Actually, imposing linear constraints can destroy all properties of the Chebyshev approximation.

In this paper we begin with a criterion for the best approximation by polynomials spanned by an arbitrary system of continuous functions on a compact domain. It is formulated with the concept of “generalized alternance”. This result is actually not new and appeared in the literature in different forms (we give references in the next section). Then we prove the classification theorem that characterizes the whole set of polynomials of best approximations, in the case of non-uniqueness. Then we address the constrained approximation: formulate and prove the criterion and the classification for uniform approximation under linear constraints. Using those results we derive a “Remez-like” method for numerical computation of the best approximating polynomials. The main difficulty is that on some steps the algorithm may arrive at degenerate configurations, in which case it slows down or even sticks. Besides, the generalized alternance can be degenerate, which leads to non-uniqueness of the solution and to suffering of the algorithm (linear systems solved in each iteration become ill-conditioned, etc.) We present a method of regularization that overcomes both those problems. The efficiency of the new approach is approved by numerical experiments. In the vast majority of examples, including degenerate ones, the polynomial of best approximation is found within a few iterations. This is also demonstrated in applications to the signal processing and to the stability of dynamical systems.

2. The roadmap of the main results

We consider an arbitrary metric compact set K and a finite system of continuous linearly independent real-valued functions $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ on it. A linear combination $p = \sum_{k=1}^n p^k \varphi_k$, $p^k \in \mathbb{R}$, will be referred to as a *polynomial by the system* Φ . All polynomials form a linear space \mathcal{P} , which is naturally identified with \mathbb{R}^n . The vector of coefficients of the polynomial p will be denoted by the bold letter: $\mathbf{p} = (p^1, \dots, p^n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. All the results are also valid for unbounded domains provided that all $\varphi_k(t)$ tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

By $C(K)$ we denote the space of continuous functions on a metric compact set K with a standard uniform norm. For a function $f \in C(K)$, the problem of the *best uniform polynomial approximation* is

$$\begin{cases} \|p - f\|_{C(K)} \rightarrow \min \\ p \in \mathcal{P}. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Note that the objective function is continuous and coercive on \mathcal{P} , hence, the optimal polynomial \hat{p} always exists, although may not be unique. The problem (1) is convex, however,

the standard tools of convex optimisation are usually less efficient for it than special approximating algorithms. We will discuss this issue in Section 10. If Φ is a Chebyshev system on a segment $[a, b]$, then \hat{p} is unique and can be found by the Remez algorithm, which has a linear convergence and normally computes the solution fast with a high precision. It is based on the classical Chebyshev criterion: \hat{p} is a polynomial of the best approximation precisely when there exists a sequence of $n + 1$ points $\tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{n+1}$ called *alternance* such that the difference $\hat{p}(t) - f(t)$ reaches the maximal absolute value at the points $t = \tau_j$ and its sign alternates in j , i.e., $\hat{p}(\tau_j) - f(\tau_j) = (-1)^{j+\delta} \|\hat{p} - f\|$, where δ is either zero or one. Let us briefly describe the Remez algorithm. By the k th iteration it produces points $\{t_i^{(k)}\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ and a polynomial p_k such that the values $p_k(t_i^{(k)}) - f(t_i^{(k)})$ are equal by modulus (not necessary equal to $\|p_k - f\|$) and their signs alternate in i . We take the point of maximum of $|p_k - f|$, denote it by $t_0^{(k)}$, and replace some point $t_s^{(k)}$ by $t_0^{(k)}$. Then we construct the next polynomial p_{k+1} which possesses the alternating property on the new system of points. The point $t_s^{(k)}$ is chosen to be the neighbouring node to $t_0^{(k)}$ with the same sign of the difference $p - f$.

The Chebyshev property holds for several important functional systems such as algebraic and trigonometric polynomials, real exponents, etc. However, in general, Chebyshev systems are rather exceptional. For arbitrary systems, neither of the aforementioned facts take place. The optimal polynomial \hat{p} is not necessarily unique and may not possess an alternance. The ‘‘Refinement theorem’’ (Theorem B in Section 3) implies the existence of a set of points $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $N \leq n + 1$, such that no polynomial from \mathcal{P} has all values $|p(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)|$ smaller than $\|\hat{p} - f\|$. This set can be considered as a weakened version of alternance, however, it may be degenerate (when $N < n + 1$) and the signs of $p(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$, may not alternate. Therefore, this ‘‘weakened alternance’’ is not sufficient to characterise the best approximation. Moreover, the routine of Remez’ algorithm becomes inapplicable, because rule for the choice of the point $t_s^{(k)}$ to be replaced by $t_0^{(k)}$ is not valid without the sign alternating.

Theorem 1 proved in Section 3 formulates the criterion of the best approximation by a non-Chebyshev system. The signs alternating property is replaced by the following geometric condition: the simplex formed by the oriented moment vectors in \mathbb{R}^n contains the origin. Here we need some further notation. For an arbitrary point $t \in K$, we consider the *moment vector* $\mathbf{u}(t) = (\varphi_1(t), \dots, \varphi_n(t))^T$. If, in addition, we are given a function $f \in C(K)$ and a polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$, then we define the *oriented moment vector* $\mathbf{a}(t) = \sigma(t) \mathbf{u}(t)$, where $\sigma(t) = \text{sign}(p(t) - f(t))$. For a given polynomial $\hat{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, the *generalized alternance* is a set $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^m \subset K$, $m \leq n + 1$, such that $\hat{p}(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i) = \sigma_i \|\hat{p} - f\|$, $\sigma_i \in \{-1, 1\}$, for all i , and the $(m - 1)$ -dimensional simplex Δ with vertices $\{\sigma_i \mathbf{u}(\tau_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ contains the origin in \mathbb{R}^n . In other words, some convex combination of the vectors $\mathbf{a}(\tau_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, is equal to zero.

Theorem 1 asserts that \hat{p} is a polynomial of the best approximation if and only if it possesses the generalized alternance. The results similar to Theorem 1 appeared in the literature in various forms, see [7, p.12], [9, theorem 5.2], [45, theorem 4.2], [47]. Its proof follows in a rather straightforward manner by applying the Refinement theorem and the Farkas lemma (see Section 1). Another possible proof involves subdifferentials (Remark 1).

If the system is non-Chebyshev, then the best approximation may not be unique as the following simple example demonstrates:

Example 1 Let $K = [-1, 1]$, $\Phi = \{t, t^2, \dots, t^n\}$. For the function $f = 1$, each of the

functions t^k is a polynomial of the best approximation. Indeed, $p(0) = 0$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$, hence, the distance from f to \mathcal{P} is at least one. On the other hand, it is equal to one for every $p_k(t) = t^k$. It is interesting that for each p_k , the generalized alternance is a singleton $\{0\}$. On the other hand, if n is even and $T_n = \cos(n \operatorname{acos} t)$ is the Chebyshev polynomial, then $p(t) = 1 - (-1)^{n/2} T_n$ is also a polynomial of the best approximation, and its alternance $\tau_k = \cos \frac{\pi k}{n}$, $k = 0, \dots, n$, is the same as for the Chebyshev polynomial (Example 3 in Section 3).

If, for a given function f , the polynomial of the best approximation is not unique, how to find them all? A complete classification is given in Theorem 2. The classification is surprisingly simple: all polynomials of the best approximation must have the same generalized alternance with the same values on it. Note that each polynomial may also have other alternances.

Theorems 1 and 2 make it possible to generalize Remez' algorithm for an arbitrary system of functions Φ on a compact set. In each iteration we take the point of maximum t_0 of the modulus $|p_k(t) - f(t)|$ and replace one of the vertices of the simplex Δ_k with $\sigma_0 \mathbf{u}(t_0)$, $\sigma_0 = \operatorname{sign}(p_k(t_0) - f(t_0))$, so that the new simplex Δ_{k+1} still contains the origin. The algorithm halts when we localize the distance from f to \mathcal{P} to a segment of a given length ε . This algorithm has a linear rate of convergence in the nondegenerate case. The latter condition is significant: in many situations the simplex Δ_k that appears on k th iterations may be close to degenerate, after which the algorithm slows down or stacks. In this case algorithm also faces technical problems because the linear systems solved in each iteration become ill-conditioned. Moreover, if $m < n + 1$, then this simplex always degenerates for large k since the limit simplex is $(m - 1)$ -dimensional. To resolve those problems we present the method of regularization and modify the algorithm. The key novelty is the choice of the new point $t_0^{(k)}$, see Section 5. The efficiency of the new method is confirmed numerically (Section 9).

In Section 6 we address the constrained approximation. For given linear functionals $\ell_j : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and numbers b_j , $j = 1, \dots, r$, we consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} \|p - f\|_{C(K)} \rightarrow \min \\ \ell_j(p) = b_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \\ p \in \mathcal{P}. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Even if the system $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is Chebyshev, problem (2) cannot be solved by the standard approach: the optimal polynomial may not have an alternance (even generalized one) and the Remez algorithm may not be applicable.

Example 2 Let \mathcal{P} be the space of algebraic polynomials of degree n on the segment $[-1, 1]$. The problem of approximating the identical zero $f \equiv 0$ under the constraint $\ell(p) = p_0 = -1$ (the free coefficient of p is equal to -1) is equivalent to the problem from Example 1. Hence, each of the functions t^k , $k \geq 1$, is a polynomial of the best approximation with the one-point alternance $\{0\}$. We see that the Chebyshev system $\{t^k\}_{k=0}^n$ loses its properties after imposing a linear constraint.

Nevertheless, it turns out that the generalized alternance approach and the regularization technique can be adopted to constrained problems and can efficiently solve them. Theorems 6

and 7 characterize polynomial of the best approximation. Then we present the computation algorithm.

Section 8 deals with several applications. The main attention is paid to the signal processing, where signals often have the form of quasipolynomials (real parts of of complex exponents). If the signal is given by observation, with possible errors and noise, the problem is to recover it in an optimal (in some sense) way. Our method restores it with the minimal uniform distance from the observed function. If, in addition, the signal is given by means of a linear sampling, then the optimal recovery is done by solving constrained problem (2). The same technique works for other types of signals, for instance, the ones spanned by shifts and contractions of the Gaussian function or of the Cauchy function.

Other applications are on the stability of linear dynamical systems and analysing the growth of their trajectories.

3. The generalised alternance

We begin with a criterion of the best uniform approximation. Let K be a metric compact space, $f \in C(K)$, $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a system of linearly independent functions from $C(K)$ and \mathcal{P} be the space of polynomials by the system Φ . Then by $\text{co}(X)$ we denote the convex hull of a set X .

Definition 1 For given $p \in \mathcal{P}$, a set of points $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m\}$, $m \leq n + 1$, is called generalized alternance if

- 1) $p(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i) = \sigma_i \|p - f\|$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\sigma_i \in \{-1, 1\}$, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$;
- 2) the convex hull of the vectors $\{\sigma_i \mathbf{u}(\tau_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ in \mathbb{R}^n contains the origin.

Using the notation $\mathbf{a}_i = \sigma_i \mathbf{u}(\tau_i)$, we have $\mathbf{O} \in \Delta = \text{co}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$. In what follows we deal with generalized alternance only and drop the word ‘‘generalized’’.

Theorem 1 A polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is of the best approximation for a function $f \in C(K)$ if and only if it has an alternance.

As we know, for a Chebyshev system on a segment the alternance possesses the sign alternating property. For general systems this property is replaced by that $\mathbf{O} \in \Delta$. In fact, already for two-element systems Φ on $[-1, 1]$, there are examples of polynomials of the best approximation with non-alternating signs of $p(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)$. Example 4 at the end of this section demonstrates this situation for the system $\Phi = \{t, t^2\}$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on two results of convex analysis formulated below. The first one is the well-known Farkas lemma, see, for instance [42].

Lemma A (Farkas’ lemma) For an arbitrary set of vectors $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_N$ in \mathbb{R}^N the following are equivalent:

- 1) their convex hull contains the origin;
- 2) the system of linear inequalities $(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{x}) < 0$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, does not have a solution

The second auxiliary result is the Refinement theorem; its proof can be found in [28].

Theorem B (*Refinement theorem*) Let K be a compact subset of a metric space, a function $F : K \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that for each $t \in K$, the function $F(t, \cdot)$ is convex and for each $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the function $F(\cdot, \mathbf{p})$ is continuous. Then there exist $N \leq n + 1$ and points $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N \in K$ such that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\max_{t \in K} F(t, \mathbf{p}) \right) = \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\max_{i=1, \dots, N} F(\tau_i, \mathbf{p}) \right).$$

Applying Theorem B to the function $F(t, \mathbf{p}) = |p(t) - f(t)|$, where p is the polynomial from \mathcal{P} with the vector of coefficients \mathbf{p} , we see that finding the polynomial of the best approximation on K can always be reduced to that on some finite subset $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^m \subset K$. Therefore, some kind of “weakened alternance” always exists. The problem is that Theorem B asserts only the existence and do not give any recipe how to find those points. Nevertheless, it gives a bridge to Theorem 1 for charactering polynomials of the best approximation.

Proof of Theorem 1. Sufficiency. If a polynomial p possesses an alternance $\{\tau_j\}_{j=1}^m$ but does not provide the best approximation, then there exists $h \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\|p + h - f\| < \|p - f\|$. Therefore, at each point τ_i , we have

$$|p(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i) + h(\tau_i)| < \|p - f\| = |p(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)|.$$

This implies that the value $h(\tau_i)$ has an opposite sign to $(p - f)(\tau_i) = \sigma_i \|p - f\|$. Hence, $\text{sign } h(\tau_i) = -\sigma_i$ and consequently, $\sigma_i h(\tau_i) < 0$. If \mathbf{h} denotes the vector of coefficients of the polynomial h , then $h(\tau_i) = (\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{u}(\tau_i))$ and $\sigma_i h(\tau_i) = (\sigma_i \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{u}(\tau_i)) = (\mathbf{h}, \sigma_i \mathbf{u}(\tau_i)) = (\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}_i)$. We see that $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}_i) < 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, which contradicts to Farkas’ lemma.

Necessity. Let \hat{p} be the polynomial of the best approximation. Applying the Refinement theorem to the function $F(t, \mathbf{p}) = |p(t) - f(t)|$, we obtain a set of points $\tau_i \in K$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, where $N \leq n + 1$, such that \hat{p} gives the best approximation of the function f on this set. After renumbering it can be assumed that $|\hat{p}(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)| = \|\hat{p} - f\|$ for $i \leq m$ and $|\hat{p}(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)| < \|\hat{p} - f\|$ for $i > m$, where $0 \leq m \leq N$. If $m = 0$, then $\max_{i=1}^N |\hat{p}(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)| < \|\hat{p} - f\|$, which is impossible, hence $m \geq 1$. If there exists a polynomial $h \in \mathcal{P}$ such that for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, the value $h(\tau_i)$ has the sign $-\sigma_i$, then for sufficiently small $\lambda > 0$, we have $|\hat{p}(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i) + \lambda h(\tau_i)| < |\hat{p}(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)|$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, which contradicts to the best approximation property of \hat{p} on the set $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^N$. Thus, there is no polynomial $h \in \mathcal{P}$ for which $\sigma_i h(\tau_i) < 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. In terms of the corresponding vectors of coefficients \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{p} , we have $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}_i) = (\mathbf{h}, \sigma_i \mathbf{u}(\tau_i)) = \sigma_i h(\tau_i) < 0$. Hence, the system of linear inequalities $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}_i) < 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, has no solution. By the Farkas lemma, $\mathbf{0} \in \text{co}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$. □

Remark 1 Another proof of Theorem 1 can be done by involving subdifferentials. Let us describe the idea. The point $\hat{p} \in \mathcal{P}$ gives an absolute minimum of the function $F(p) = \|p - f\|$ if and only if $\mathbf{0} \in \partial F(\hat{p})$, where ∂F denotes the subdifferential. Since $F(\hat{p}) = \max_{t \in K} |\hat{p}(t) - f(t)|$, it follows that the subdifferential $\partial F(p)$ can be computed by the Dobovitsky-Milyutin theorem on the subdifferential of maximum. Denote

$$\Gamma = \left\{ \sigma(t) \mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n : t \in K, |\hat{p}(t) - f(t)| = \|\hat{p} - f\| \right\}.$$

We obtain $\partial F(\hat{p}) = \text{co}\Gamma$. Thus, $\mathbf{O} \in \text{co}\Gamma$. Now we invoke the Caratheodory theorem and conclude that there exist $m \leq n + 1$ points from Γ , whose convex hull contains \mathbf{O} .

Clearly, for every $f \in C(K)$, the set of polynomials of the best approximation is a convex compact subset of \mathcal{P} . Due to Theorem 1, each element p of this subset possesses an alternance, which is not necessarily unique and depends on p . It turns out, however, that all those alternances have a nonempty intersection, which is a common alternance for all polynomials of the best approximation.

Theorem 2 *Let \mathcal{P} be the space of polynomials by a system Φ . For every $f \in C(K)$, all polynomials of the best approximation have the same alternance with the same values on it.*

This means that for every function f , there exists a set of points $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^m$ such that all polynomials of the best approximation have this set as an alternance and for every i , the value of all those polynomials at the point τ_i is the same.

Proof. Let $\{p_v \in \mathcal{P} : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ be the set of all polynomials of the best approximation, \mathcal{V} is some index set. Without loss of generality it can be assumed that $\|p_v - f\| = 1$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Every point of absolute maximum of $|p_v - f|$ will be called *extreme point* of p_v . Thus, at every extreme point τ , we have $p_v(\tau) - f(\tau) = \sigma_v(\tau) \in \{-1, 1\}$. Denote by \mathcal{T}_v the set of pairs $\{(\tau, \sigma_v(\tau)) : \tau \text{ is an extreme point of } p_v\}$. By Theorem 1, for every $v \in \mathcal{V}$, the set of extreme points of p_v contains an alternance of p_v , therefore, the set $C_v = \text{co}\{\mathbf{a}(\tau) : \tau \text{ is an extreme point of } p_v\}$ contains the origin. Since all polynomials of the best approximation form a convex compact subset in \mathcal{P} , for every $v_1, \dots, v_N \in \mathcal{V}$, the polynomial $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N p_{v_j}$ belongs to this set. Denote it by p_a , $a \in \mathcal{V}$ and use the short notation $v_j = j$. The convexity implies that for every extreme point τ of p_a , all the values $p_j(\tau) - f(\tau)$, $j = 1, \dots, j$ are equal (either to 1 or to -1), hence, τ is an extreme point for all p_j with the same sign $\sigma_j(\tau) = \sigma_a(\tau)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{T}_v \in \bigcap_{j=1}^N \mathcal{T}_j$. We see that the family of compact sets $M = \{\mathcal{T}_v : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ possesses the following property: the intersection of an arbitrary finite subfamily of M contains the set from M . Then all $\mathcal{T}_v \in M$ have a nonempty intersection, which is also a set from M . Let it be \mathcal{T}_b , $b \in \mathcal{V}$. The set C_v contains the origin, therefore, by Carateodiry's theorem [28], there are extreme points τ_1, \dots, τ_m of p_b , $m \neq n+1$ such that $\mathbf{O} \in \text{co}\{\sigma(\tau_i)\mathbf{u}(\tau_i)\}_{i=1}^m$. Since they are extreme points for every p_v with the same signs $\sigma_v(\tau_i)$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we see that they form an alternance for p_v .

□

Example 3 (*A one-point alternance*). In Example 1, all polynomials $p(t) = \sum_{k=1}^n p^k t^k$ of the best approximation for $f \equiv 1$ on the segment $[-1, 1]$ have the same alternance $\{0\}$. On the other hand, some of them have other alternances. For instance, the polynomial $p(t) = 2t^2$ also gives the best approximation and it has an alternance $\{-1, 0, 1\}$; the polynomial $p(t) = 1 - (-1)^{n/2} T_n$, where n is an even number and T_n is the Chebyshev polynomial, have the alternance $\cos \frac{\pi k}{n}$, $k = 0, \dots, n$ (the same as T_n has).


Example 4 (*An alternance with non-alternating signs*). Consider the space of quadratic polynomials without the free term: $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\} = \{t^2, t\}$ and approximate the function $f(t) = t^4 + t^3 - \frac{1}{4}$ on the segment $[-1, 1]$. Let us show that $p(t) = \frac{3}{4}t^2 + \frac{1}{2}t$ is a unique

polynomial of the best approximation. We have

$$p(t) - f(t) = \frac{1}{2} - \left(t + 1\right)^2 \left(t - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2.$$

The modulus of this function reaches its maximum on $[-1, 1]$ at three points: $\tau_1 = -1, \tau_2 = \frac{1}{2}$ (at those points $p - f = \frac{1}{2}$), and $\tau_3 = 1$, where $p - f = -\frac{1}{2}$, see Fig. 1.

Figure 1



This is an alternance because $\mathbf{a}_1 = (-1, 1)^T$; $\mathbf{a}_2 = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})^T$, $\mathbf{a}_3 = -(1, 1)^T$ and $\mathbf{O} \in \text{co}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3\}$. Thus, p is a polynomial of the best approximation. It is unique by Theorem 2. Indeed, p has a unique alternance, since τ_i are the only points of maximum of the function $|p - f|$ and there is no subset of those points for which the convex hull if the corresponding vectors \mathbf{a}_i contains the origin. Consequently, another polynomial of the best approximation, if it exists, has the same alternance and the same values on it, which is impossible since there is only one quadratic function passing through three fixed points.

Note that the difference $f - p$ have the same sign at τ_1 and τ_2 , so the signs of $p(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i)$ are not alternating.

Remark 2 Theorem 2 gives an idea of possible efficient methods of computing the best approximating polynomials in the non-Chebyshev case. There may be many optimal polynomials, but all of them have the same alternance. Therefore, an algorithm should search the alternance rather than the polynomial. In the next sections we will see how this idea works.

4. Algorithm of the best approximation. The regular case

We derive Algorithm 1 that follows the Remez scheme, but with another rule of choosing the next point of alternance in k th iteration. The sign alternating property is replaced by the requirement that $\mathbf{O} \in \Delta_k$, where the simplex Δ_k have vertices at the oriented moment

vectors $\mathbf{a}_i = \sigma(\tau_i)\mathbf{u}(\tau_i)$. We show that in the regular case, i.e., when all the simplices Δ_k are nondegenerate and the barycentric coordinates of \mathbf{O} in Δ_k are bounded away from zero independently of k , Algorithm 1 converges with a linear rate. Otherwise, if Δ_k is closed to degenerate in some iterations, we apply a regularization procedure given in the next section (Algorithm 2). We begin Algorithm 1 with several auxiliary results.

4.1. Preliminary facts

For an arbitrary vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, its *negative extension* is $\{\lambda \mathbf{b} : \lambda \leq 0\}$. Thus, the negative extension of a nonzero vector is a ray directed opposite to \mathbf{b} ; for a zero vector, it is zero.

A system of N vectors $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_N \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $N \geq n$, is said to be *nondegenerate* if every n of its vectors are linearly independent. Clearly, an independent system cannot contain zero vectors or a subset of $m \leq n - 1$ dependent vectors.

Lemma 1 *Suppose the convex hull of vectors $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ contains the origin; then for an arbitrary vector $\mathbf{b}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $s \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$, such that after the replacement of \mathbf{b}_s by \mathbf{b}_0 , the convex hull still contains the origin. Moreover, if the enlarged system $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i=0}^{n+1}$ is nondegenerate, then such s is unique.*

Proof. First consider the case when $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i=0}^{n+1}$ is nondegenerate. Then the simplex $\Delta = \text{co}\{\mathbf{b}_s\}_{s=1}^{n+1}$ contains \mathbf{O} in its interior. Hence, the negative extension of \mathbf{b}_0 intersects a unique facet of Δ . Let \mathbf{b}_s be the vertex opposite to that facet; then s is the desired index. Consider now a general system $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i=0}^{n+1}$, which is admissible, i.e., satisfies the assumptions of the lemma. It can be slightly perturbed to become nondegenerate and still be admissible. Hence, there exists a sequence of nondegenerate admissible systems $\{\mathbf{b}_i^{(k)}\}_{i=0}^{n+1}$ that converges pointwise to $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i=0}^{n+1}$. By what we have proved above, for every k , there exist a unique index $s = s(k)$ such that the simplex with vertices $\{\mathbf{b}_i^{(k)}\}_{i \neq s}$ contains the origin. Passing to a subsequence, it can be assumed that $s(k)$ is the same for all k . Now by limit passage we conclude that the simplex with vertices $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i \neq s}$ contains the origin. \square

4.2. The scheme of Algorithm 1

Here we give a brief description of the algorithm and the details will follow in subsection 4.4. We assume that there are points $t_i \in K$ such that the system of moment vectors $\{\mathbf{u}(t_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ is nondegenerate. This is a part of the regularity assumption formulated in the next subsection.

Input. A system $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$, a function $f \in C(K)$, and $\varepsilon > 0$.

Output. Numbers b, B and a polynomial $\hat{p} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $B - b < \varepsilon$, $b \leq \text{dist}(f, \mathcal{P}) \leq B$ and $b \leq \|\hat{p} - f\| \leq B$.

Initialization. We start with arbitrary points t_1, \dots, t_{n+1} for which the set of vectors $\{\mathbf{u}(t_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ is nondegenerate and choose the signs σ_i so that the convex hull of the set $\{\sigma_i \mathbf{u}(t_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ contains the origin. Denote $\mathbf{a}_i = \sigma_i \mathbf{u}(t_i)$ and find $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the vector $(p^1, \dots, p^n, d)^T$, where $\mathbf{p} = (p^1, \dots, p^n)^T$ are coefficients of p , is a unique solution of the linear system

$$(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{u}(t_i)) = f(t_i) + \sigma_i d. \quad (3)$$

If $d < 0$, then change all the signs σ_i . Thus, $d \geq 0$. Set $b_1 = d$, $B_1 = \|p - f\|_{C(K)}$.

Main loop. After $k - 1$ iterations we have $n + 1$ points (for the sake of simplicity, denote them as above t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}) and the corresponding vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n+1}$, whose convex hull contains the origin as an interior point. Then we take a point t_0 of maximum of the function $|p(t) - f(t)|$ on K and replace one of the vectors \mathbf{a}_s with $\mathbf{a}_0 = \sigma_0 \mathbf{u}(t_0)$ so that the new system still contains the origin inside its convex hull. This means that the negative extension of \mathbf{a}_0 intersects the facet of the simplex $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ opposite to the vertex \mathbf{a}_s . If the extended system $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=0}^{n+1}$ is nondegenerate, then the index s is uniquely defined. Then we solve system (3) and set $b_{k+1} = d$, $B_{k+1} = \min\{B_k, \|p_k - f\|\}$.

Termination. The algorithm halts when $B_N - b_N < \varepsilon$. Then we set $b = b_N$, $B = B_N$ and $\hat{p} = p_k$, where $k \leq N$ is the number of iteration, for which $\|p_k - f\| = B$.

4.3. The regularity assumption

We say that the *regular case* takes place for Algorithm 1 if in each iteration, the system $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=0}^{n+1}$ is nondegenerate and the coefficient α_0 in the convex combination $\mathbf{O} = \sum_i \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i$ (the summation is over all $i = 0, \dots, n + 1$ except for s) is not less than a prescribed number $\mu > 0$. This number will be referred to as a *parameter of regularity*.

4.4. The routine of Algorithm 1

Here we give a detailed description of all steps.

Algorithm 1.

Input. A system Φ a function $f \in C(K)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.

Output. Numbers b, B and a polynomial $\hat{p} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $B - b < \varepsilon$, $b \leq \text{dist}(f, \mathcal{P}) \leq B$ and $b \leq \|\hat{p} - f\| \leq B$.

Initialisation. Take an arbitrary set $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ of $n + 1$ different points on K such that the system of moment vectors $\{\mathbf{u}(t_i)\}_{t_i \in \mathcal{T}_1}$ is nondegenerate. Then the system of $n + 1$ linear equations $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i \mathbf{u}(t_i) = 0$ possesses a unique solution $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$. If σ_i is a sign of x_i , $\alpha_i = |x_i|$ and $\mathbf{a}_i = \sigma_i \mathbf{u}(t_i)$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i \mathbf{u}(t_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |x_i| \sigma_i \mathbf{u}(t_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |x_i| \mathbf{a}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i.$$

Now find a vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and a number d from the linear system (3). The corresponding polynomial p possesses the property $p(t_i) = f(t_i) + \sigma_i d$, $i = 1, \dots, n+1$. If $d < 0$, then change all signs σ_i . Thus, $b_1 \geq 0$. Set $p_1 = p$, $b_1 = d$, $B_1 = \|p_1 - f\|$.

Main loop. The k th iteration. We have a polynomial $p_k \in \mathcal{P}$, a set of $n+1$ points $\mathcal{T}_k = \{t_i^{(k)}\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ (for the sake of simplicity we denote $t_i^{(k)} = t_i$) and two numbers $B_k > b_k \geq 0$ such that:

- 1) $p_k(t_i) = f(t_k) + \sigma_i b_k$, where $\sigma_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ for all i ;
- 2) the simplex $\Delta_k = \text{co}\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$, where $\mathbf{a}_i = \sigma_i \mathbf{u}(t_i)$ contains the origin inside: $\mathbf{O} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \alpha_i^{(k)} \mathbf{a}_i$ with all $\alpha_i^{(k)}$ positive and $\sum_i \alpha_i^{(k)} = 1$.

Denote $r_k = \|p_k - f\|$, $\alpha_i = \alpha_i^{(k)}$, and find a point t_0 for which $|p_k(t_0) - f(t_0)| = r_k$. Clearly, $r_k \geq b_k$. Denote by σ_0 the sign of $p_k(t_0) - f(t_0)$ and $\mathbf{a}_0 = \sigma_0 \mathbf{u}(t_0)$.

Now find the facet Δ_k^s of Δ_k intersected by the negative extension of \mathbf{a}_0 . To this end, we solve the linear system $\mathbf{a}_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} x_i \mathbf{a}_i$ and denote by $\tau = \frac{x_s}{\alpha_s}$, the maximal ratio $\frac{x_i}{\alpha_i}$. Then $\mathbf{a}_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} (x_i - \tau \alpha_i) \mathbf{a}_i$. The coefficient $x_s - \tau \alpha_s$ vanish and all other coefficients $x_i - \tau \alpha_i$ are negative. Hence, the negative extension of \mathbf{a}_0 intersects the facet Δ_k^s opposite to \mathbf{a}_s .

Thus, replacing \mathbf{a}_s by \mathbf{a}_0 we obtain a new simplex Δ_{k+1} containing the origin. Replacing t_s by t_0 we obtain a new system of points \mathcal{T}_{k+1} . Then we find a polynomial p_{k+1} and $b_{k+1} > 0$ from the linear system $p_{k+1}(t_i) = f(t_i) + \sigma_i b_{k+1}$, $i = 0, \dots, n+1$, $i \neq s$. Set $B_{k+1} = \min\{r_k, B_k\}$.

Finally, redenote the points of the set \mathcal{T}_{k+1} by $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ in an arbitrary order.

Termination. If $B_N - b_N < \varepsilon$, then STOP.

Set $b = b_N$, $B = B_N$ and $\hat{p} = p_k$, where $k \leq N$ is the number of iteration, for which $\|p_k - f\| = B$.

END

Remark 3 The procedure of the Algorithm 1 stays well-defined also without the regularity assumption. Lemma 1 provides the existence of the required point \mathbf{a}_s even if the simplex Δ_k is degenerate. However, in this case the distance between b_k and B_k may not decrease and the termination criterion $B_N - b_N < \varepsilon$ may not be reached within finite time. Another problem is that one needs to solve degenerate linear system in the k th iteration.

4.5. The rate of convergence

In the regular case Algorithm 1 converges with a linear rate, which follows from Theorem 3 below.

Theorem 3 *In the k th iteration of Algorithm 1, we have*

$$B_{k+1} - b_{k+1} \leq \left(1 - \alpha_0^{(k)}\right) \left(B_k - b_k\right), \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha_0^{(k)} > 0$ is the coefficient in the decomposition $\mathbf{O} = \sum_i \alpha_i^{(k)} \mathbf{a}_i$ in the k th iteration (the summation is over all $i = 0, \dots, n+1$ except for s).

Proof. Without loss of generality it can be assumed that $s = n+1$, i.e., the k th iteration replaces \mathbf{a}_{n+1} with \mathbf{a}_0 . Denote $\alpha_i = \alpha_i^{(k)}$. We have $(\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{a}_i) = |p_k(t_i)| = b_k$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $(\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{a}_0) = |\mathbf{p}_k(t_0)| = r_k$. On the other hand $(\mathbf{p}_{k+1}, \mathbf{a}_i) = |p_{k+1}(t_i)| = b_{k+1}$, $i = 0, \dots, n$. Taking the difference, we obtain $(\mathbf{p}_{k+1} - \mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{a}_i) = b_{k+1} - b_k$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $(\mathbf{p}_{k+1} - \mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{a}_0) = b_{k+1} - r_k$. Multiplying this equality by α_i , computing the sum over all $i \leq n$, we get

$$0 = \sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i (\mathbf{p}_k - \mathbf{p}_{k+1}, \mathbf{a}_i) = \alpha_0 (r_k - b_{k+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (b_k - b_{k+1}) = \alpha_0 r_k - b_{k+1} + (1 - \alpha_0) b_k.$$

Thus, $\alpha_0 r_k - b_{k+1} + (1 - \alpha_0) b_k = 0$. Adding and subtracting $(1 - \alpha_0) B_k$ we obtain after simple manipulations:

$$(1 - \alpha_0) B_k + \alpha_0 r_k - b_{k+1} = (1 - \alpha_0) (B_k - b_k) \quad (5)$$

Since $B_{k+1} = \min\{B_k, r_k\} \leq (1 - \alpha_0) B_k + \alpha_0 r_k$, we see that the left hand side of (5) is bigger than or equal to $B_{k+1} - b_{k+1}$, which concludes the proof. \square

Let us recall the regularity assumption: in all iterations we have $\alpha_0 \geq \mu$, where $\mu > 0$ is fixed.

Theorem 4 *In the regular case Algorithm 1 converges linearly with the regularity parameter μ :*

$$B_{k+1} - b_{k+1} \leq (1 - \mu)^k (B_1 - b_1), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Remark 4 Equation (5) shows that if α_0 is small, the k th iteration only slightly changes the difference $B_k - b_k$. In this case the algorithm slows down. This happens if the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ are almost linearly dependent. In this case the linear systems $\mathbf{a}_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} x_i \mathbf{a}_i$ solved in the k th iteration becomes ill-conditioned. If this degeneracy phenomenon occurs at k th iteration, one should perturb the point t_0 without significant descent of the value $|p_k(t_0) - f(t_0)|$. This is the regularization presented in the next section.

Remark 5 From the proof of Theorem 3 we see that it is not actually necessary to find the point of maximum t_0 at each iteration, it suffices to choose an arbitrary point where the value $|p_k(t_0) - f(t_0)|$ is significantly bigger than that at the points t_k . This may be done, for instance, by a random search. As a rule, this strategy slows down the rate of convergence, but it can be applied when finding the point of maximum of $|p_k(t) - f(t)|$ is difficult. For example, this situation occurs in the multivariate case.

5. Algorithm in the general case. Regularization

The regularisation procedure is needed when the simplex Δ_k becomes close to degenerate. In this case we apply an essentially different method of choosing the next point in each iteration. This can be realised under additional assumptions:

Assumptions. *The set K is a convex body in \mathbb{R}^N . All functions φ_i are analytic on K , f is Lipschits.*

We begin with auxiliary results. In this section all lengths and distances in \mathbb{R}^d are measured in the Euclidean norm, which is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_2$.

Lemma 2 *Let vectors $\mathbf{u}(t_1), \dots, \mathbf{u}(t_{n-1})$ span a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a unique, up to the sign, polynomial $q \in \mathcal{P}$ normalized by the condition $\|\mathbf{q}\|_2 = 1$ which vanishes at the points t_1, \dots, t_{n-1} . For every $t \in K$, the distance from $\mathbf{u}(t)$ to H is equal to $|q(t)|$.*

Proof. If \mathbf{q} is a unit normal vector to H , then for the corresponding polynomial q , we have $q(t_i) = (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}(t_i)) = 0$. If another polynomial $y(\cdot)$ vanish at the points t_i , then its vector \mathbf{y} is orthogonal to all $\mathbf{u}(t_i)$ and hence, is orthogonal to H , i.e., collinear to \mathbf{q} . Thus, the polynomial q is unique up to the sign. The distance from $\mathbf{u}(t)$ to H is equal to $|(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}(t))| = |q(t)|$. □

Lemma 2 expresses the distance from a moment vector to a hyperplane in terms of a special polynomial q . This trick will be applied in the regularization method.

Let a set of points $\mathcal{T} = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ be such that the system of vectors $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ is non-degenerate, $p(t_i) - f(t_i) = \sigma_i d$ for all i , where $d \geq 0$, and $r = \|p - f\|_{C(K)}$. For each pair i_1, i_2 such that $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n$, let $q_{i_1 i_2} \in \mathcal{P}$ be the polynomial such that $\|\mathbf{q}_{i_1 i_2}\|_2 = 1$ and $q_{i_1 i_2}(t_s) = 0$ for every $s \notin \{i_1, i_2\}$. This polynomial is unique up to the sign. For a given $\nu \in [0, 1)$, we denote by t_ν the solution of the following optimisation problem

$$\begin{cases} g(t) = \sum_{i_1 < i_2} \frac{1}{|q_{i_1 i_2}(t)|^2} \rightarrow \min, \\ |p(t) - f(t)| \geq (1 - \nu)r + \nu d, \quad t \in K. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Theorem 5 *For $\nu \in [0, 1)$, let $\rho(\nu)$ be the maximal number such that there exists $t \in K$ for which $|p(t) - f(t)| \geq (1 - \nu)r + \nu d$ and the point $\mathbf{u}(t)$ is bounded away by the distance at least $\rho(\nu)$ from each of $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ hyperplanes spanned by $n - 1$ vectors from $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{g(t_\nu)}} < \rho(\nu) \leq \sqrt{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g(t_\nu)}} \quad (7)$$

and the system $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n+1}, \mathbf{u}(t_\nu)\}$ is nondegenerate.

Proof. By Lemma 2 the distance from $\mathbf{u}(t)$ to the hyperplane spanned by all vectors $\mathbf{u}(t_i)$ except for $\mathbf{u}(i_1), \mathbf{u}(i_2)$ is equal to $|q_{i_1 i_2}(t)|$. If we replace all $\mathbf{u}(t_i)$ by $\mathbf{a}(t_i)$, nothing changes since those vectors span the same hyperplane. If there exists an admissible $t \in K$ for which $\mathbf{u}(t)$ is bounded away from all those hyperplanes by the distance at least ρ , then $g(t) \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2\rho^2}$. Hence, $\rho \leq \sqrt{\frac{n(n+1)}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g(t)}}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{n(n+1)}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g(t_\nu)}}}$, which proves the upper bound in (7). Furthermore, $g(t_\nu) > \max_{i_1 < i_2} \frac{1}{|q_{i_1 i_2}(t_\nu)|^2}$, hence the minimal number $|q_{i_1 i_2}(t_\nu)|$ over all i_1, i_2 is greater than $\frac{1}{\sqrt{g(t_\nu)}}$. In view of Lemma 2, this means that the minimal distance from $\mathbf{u}(t_\nu)$ to those hyperplanes is greater than $\frac{1}{\sqrt{g(t_\nu)}}$, which completes the proof of (7).

If the system $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n+1}, \mathbf{u}(t_\nu)\}$ is degenerate, then it contains a subset of n linearly dependent vectors, one of which must be $\mathbf{u}(t)$, because the system $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ is nondegenerate. Hence, $\mathbf{u}(t_\nu)$ must belong to the linear span of other $n - 1$ vectors of this subset, in which case $g(t_\nu) = +\infty$. □

Now we can present Algorithm 2 based on the regularisation.

Algorithm 2 coincides with Algorithm 1 with one crucial modification: we fix $\nu \in [0, 1)$, in each iteration solve problem (6) for the set of points $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_k$ and take the optimal point t_ν instead of t_0 (the point of maximum of $|p(t) - f(t)|$). Respectively, r_k is replaced by $(1 - \nu)r_k + \nu b_k$

The regular case is defined for Algorithm 2 in the same way as for Algorithm 1: in all iterations $\alpha_0 \geq \mu$. The rate of convergence in the regular case stays linear but slows down since the value r_k is replaced by a smaller value $(1 - \nu)r_k + \nu b_k$. Therefore, inequality (4) is replaced by

$$B_{k+1} - b_{k+1} \leq \left(1 - (1 - \nu)\alpha_0\right) (B_k - b_k). \quad (8)$$

Consequently, the rate of linear convergence becomes

$$B_{k+1} - b_{k+1} \leq \left(1 - (1 - \nu)\mu\right)^k (B_1 - b_1), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We see that in the regular case Algorithm 2 converges slower than Algorithm 1. Thus, in the regular case one should apply Algorithm 1, which is faster and less expensive. If it stacks at degenerate simplices on several successive iterations, one should switch to Algorithm 2.

Remark 6 The key difference between Algorithms 1 and 2 is the choice of the new point on each iteration. Algorithm 1 takes the point t_0 of the maximal distance $r_k = |p_k(t_0) - f(t_0)|$. Algorithm 2 instead considers all points t , where this distance is not necessarily maximal but big enough, i.e., $|p_k(t) - f(t)| \geq (1 - \nu)r_k + d_k$. On this set of points we minimize the function $g(t)$ and take the point of minimum t_ν as a new point. In other words, Algorithm 2 aims to guarantee the nongeneracy of the newly constructed simplex Δ_{k+1} provided that the value $|p_k(t_\nu) - f(t_\nu)|$ was significantly larger than b_k , but non necessarily maximal over all $t \in K$. The nondegeneracy, in turn, will guarantee a sufficient descent of the value $B_k - b_k$ on the next iterations.

The value $g(t_\nu)$ can be estimated from above. Under our assumptions (all φ_i are analytic and independent, K is a convex body, f is Lipschitz), it has the power growth in $1/|r_k - d_k|$.

Proposition 1 *We have $g(t_\nu) = O(|r_k - d_k|^{-2m})$, where m is the maximal multiplicity of zeros of polynomials from \mathcal{P}*

Proof. Suppose $M = \max_{p \in \mathcal{P}, \|p-f\| \leq r_k} \|p'\|_{C(K)}$ and L is the Lipschitz constant of f , then the inequality $|p(t) - f(t)| \geq \frac{1}{2}(r_k + d_k)$ is valid for all t from the ball $B(t_0, R)$ of radius $R = \frac{1}{2(M+L)}(r_k - d_k)$ centered at t_0 . On the other hand, there are constants $C, R_0 > 0$ such $|q_{i_1 i_2}(t)| > C\|t - t_0\|^m$, whenever $\|t - t_0\| < R_0$. Then for every $t \in K$ such that $\|t - t_0\| < \min\{R, R_0\}$, we have $g(t) = O(|r_k - d_k|^{-2m})$, which is required. \square

Practical issue. In all numerical results we set $\nu = 0.5$. Thus, $t_{0.5}$ is the point of minimum of $g(t)$ on the set $\{t \in K : |p_k(t) - f(t)| \geq \frac{1}{2}(r_k + d_k)\}$. In practice it often suffices to apply a simple procedure, without solving any optimisation problem. We fix small $\delta > 0$ and every iteration compute n values: $|q_{s,j}(t_0)|$, $j \neq s$, where t_0 is the point of maximum of $|p_k(t) - f(t)|$ on K and s is the index of the point t_s replaced by t_0 in the k th iteration, $j = 1, \dots, n+1$, $j \neq s$. Let us recall that $q_{s,j}$ is the polynomial with zeros at the points t_i , $i \notin \{s, j\}$. If $|q_{s,j}(t_0)| < \delta$ for some j , we find a point \bar{t} for which $|p_k(\bar{t}) - f(\bar{t})| \geq \frac{1}{2}(r_k + d_k)$ and $|q_{s,j}(t_0)| > \delta$. This point can be found, for example, by the penalty function method.

Remark 7 The regularization moves the point \mathbf{a}_0 away from all hyperplanes spanned by the other $(n+1)$ vectors \mathbf{a}_i . Hence, it always keeps the simplices Δ_k nondegenerate. This, however, does not imply that they are degenerate uniformly for all k and that the parameter $\alpha_0^{(k)}$ can be bounded away from zero by some positive constants. Although, a vast majority of the numerical experiments demonstrate the uniform nondegeneracy of those simplexes, and, respectively, linear convergence of Algorithm 2. Nevertheless, we do not have a proof of its convergence for any initial data and can only formulate the corresponding conjecture. According to numerical experiments, Algorithm 1 handles from 20% to 80% (depending on the problem) cases without suffering by degeneracy. The remaining cases need the regularization and are always handled by Algorithm 2. In both cases the solution with the precision $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ takes a few iterations, very seldom the number of iterations may grow to 30 – 40. We report the numerical results in Section 9, including those with randomly generated smooth functions (in the form of splines, see subsection 9.5).

6. Approximation under linear constraints

Unlike the classical Remez algorithm, the method introduced in Sections 3 and 4 is easily extended to a constrained approximation. For given linear functionals ℓ_j and numbers b_j , we consider the problem (2). As before, f is continuous on a compact set K , $\mathcal{P} = \text{span}\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$. Clearly, it can be assumed that all ℓ_j are independent and therefore, $r \leq n - 1$.

Even a Chebyshev system may lose its properties after imposing a linear constraint (Example 2). However, the concept of generalized alternance works for the constrained problems as well. We are going to establish a criterion of the best approximation, classify all optimal polynomials and derive algorithms for their computation.

We denote $L = \{\ell_j\}_{j=1}^r$, $L^\perp = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \ell_1(p) = \dots = \ell_r(p) = 0\}$ and as usual identify \mathcal{P} with \mathbb{R}^n . Every functional ℓ_j is associated to the vector $\boldsymbol{\ell}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\ell_j(p) = (\boldsymbol{\ell}_j, \mathbf{p})$. The orthogonal complement to the vectors $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\ell}_r$ will be denoted by the same symbol L^\perp . Since ℓ_j are linearly independent, it follows that $\dim L^\perp = n - r$. By projection we always mean an orthogonal projection. We assume that the projections of φ_i to L^\perp are independent, otherwise, we can remove redundant functions from Φ .

Definition 2 Let \mathcal{P} be the space of polynomials by a system $\Phi = \{\varphi\}_{i=1}^n$, $L = \{\ell_j\}_{j=1}^r$, $r < n$, be a set of independent linear functionals on \mathcal{P} . For a given polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$, a set of points $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m\} \subset K$, $m \leq n - r + 1$, is called L -alternance if

1) for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, we have $p(\tau_i) - f(\tau_i) = \sigma_i \|p - f\|$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $\sigma_i \in \{-1, 1\}$.

2) the convex hull of the projections of the vectors $\{\sigma_i \mathbf{u}(\tau_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ onto L^\perp contains the origin.

The proofs of the following generalization of Theorem 1 is literally the same:

Theorem 6 A polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is of the best approximation for a function f under the constraints $\ell_j(p) = b_j$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, if and only if it has an L -alternance.

In case of non-uniqueness, all polynomials of the best approximation are characterised by a common L -alternance. The proof of the following theorem is the same as for the corresponding Theorem 2:

Theorem 7 For every f , all polynomials of the best approximation from \mathcal{P} under constraints $\ell_j(p) = b_j$, $\ell_j \in L$, have the same L -alternance and the same values on it.

Algorithms 1 and 2 are transferred to the constrained problem (2) merely by replacing all vectors \mathbf{a}_i by their projections to L^\perp . Respectively, the dimension n is replaced by $n - r$ and \mathbb{R}^n is replaced by L^\perp . In Algorithm 2, the polynomial $q_{i_1 i_2}$ is defined by the set of zeros t_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n - r + 1\} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}$ and by the conditions $\ell_j(q_{i_1 i_2}) = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, r$. We refer to those algorithms as Algorithms 1c and 2c respectively (“c” is from “constrained”).

Remark 8 It is possible to obtain some generalizations of Theorem 6 to nonlinear smooth constraints ℓ_j . In this case the subspace L will be spanned by the derivatives $\ell'_j(p)$. The analogue of Theorem 6 is valid in the direction “necessity”: every optimal polynomial do possess an L -alternance, but the converse is in general not true. It becomes true if all ℓ_j are convex and all equality constraints are replaced by inequalities $\ell_j(p) \leq b_j$. In this case we have a complete analogue of Theorem 6 with the subspace L spanned by the derivatives $\ell'_j(p)$ of active constraints (computed at the point p).

However, for Algorithms 1c and 2c, the linearity of functionals ℓ_j is significant. Those algorithms are not generalized (at least, straightforwardly) to the case of nonlinear constraints. The reason is that if some of the functionals $\ell_j(p)$ is nonlinear, then the subspace L depends

on p . Therefore, the subspaces $L(p_k)$ and $L(p_{k+1})$ in Algorithms 1c can be different. The key requirement of the algorithm that the projections of the simplex Δ_k to L^\perp contains the origin may not be preserved in k th iteration.

We are not aware of any algorithm for the problem (2) with nonlinear constraints that would have a linear rate of convergence.

7. Approximations on unbounded domains

All the results are valid for arbitrary closed sets K (and convex in Algorithms 2 and 2c), not necessarily bounded, provided that all φ_i and f tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, if the distance $r = \min_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \|p - f\|_{C(K)}$ is positive (otherwise the statement is trivial), then it is positive on some ball $B \subset K$. The set of polynomials p for which $\|p - f\|_{C(B)} \leq 2d$ is compact in \mathcal{P} . Hence, all polynomials p uniformly tend to zero on this set as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, there exists a ball $B_1 \subset B$ such that the polynomial of the best approximation on B_1 coincides with that on K . This reduces our problem to the compact set B_1 .

Thus, the criteria of the best approximation in terms of the generalized alternance and L-alternance, as well as all the algorithm are extended to unbounded domain and functions φ_i that decay at infinity without any change. This concerns, for example, systems of exponential polynomials on the half-line, systems of shifts and contractions of the Gaussian function and of the Cauchy function on the whole line.

8. Applications

8.1. Structural recovery of signals

The problem of decomposition a continuous time signal into the form $f(t) \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \varphi(t, z_i)$, where $\varphi(t, z_i)$ are functions from a certain class, arises in a number of applications such as sparse array of arrival estimation [22], system theory for parametrized model reduction [19], radar [34], ultrasound [43], etc. For the case when $\varphi(t, z_i) = e^{2\pi z_i t}$ and z_i, c_i are unknown complex and real parameters respectively, there are many methods such as . A popular approach is related to Prony's method [2, 3, 35]. If $\varphi(t, z_i) = \varphi(t - z_i)$, for example $\varphi(t, z_i) = e^{-\frac{(t-z_i)^2}{\sigma^2}}$ or $\varphi(t, z_i) = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{(t-z_i)^2}{\sigma^2}}$, where $\sigma > 0$, the matrix pencil method is efficient [48]. Most of those methods are unstable in the presence of deterministic or random noise. In this case the decomposition problem is replaced by that of approximation and sometimes requires different tools. Algorithms 1 and 2 find the best approximation of a signal in case when all the decomposition functions φ_{t, z_i} are known.

Consider a continuous time attenuating signal $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ on the positive half-line, which tends to zero as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. One needs to find its best approximation by a function

of the form $p(t) = \sum_m C_m(t) e^{z_m t}$ where $z_m = a_m + b_m i$, $b_m < 0$, are known complex frequencies and $C_m(t)$ are unknown algebraic polynomials of prescribed powers (they correspond to multiple frequencies). We specialize our investigation to real-valued signals, when p can be rewritten as a quasipolynomial $p(t) = \sum_k P_k(t) e^{a_k t} \cos b_k t + Q_k(t) e^{a_k t} \sin b_k t$. Here P_k, Q_k are real algebraic polynomials and $\sum_k \deg P_k(t) + \deg Q_k(t) = n$. In most of applications all the polynomials are constants and one has to realize an optimal recovery in the uniform metric in $C(\mathbb{R}_+)$ by finding coefficients c_m .

The optimal recovery problem is also considered with a sampling. For example, we know the values of $p(t)$ at some points or other linear parameters (derivatives, Fourier coefficients, etc.) In this case we have a problem with linear constraints which is solved with Algorithms 1c and 2c. Numerical examples are given in Section 9.

8.2. Markov-Bernstein type inequalities

The Markov-Bernstein constants are sharp upper bounds $C_j = C_j(\Phi)$ in the inequalities between the functions and their derivatives: $\|p^{(j)}\|_{C(K)} \leq C_j \|p\|_{C(K)}$, $p \in \mathcal{P}$. The classical Bernstein theorem asserts that for trigonometric polynomials $p = \sum_{k=0}^N (a_k \cos kt + b_k \sin kt)$ on the period $[-\pi, \pi]$, the sharp constant $C_1 = N$ (respectively, $C_j = N^j$) is attained on the functions $p(t) = \cos Nt$ and $p(t) = \sin Nt$. The Markov inequality establishes that for algebraic polynomials of degree N on $K = [-1, 1]$, the sharp constant is $C_1 = N^2$ and it is attained on the Chebyshev polynomial $T_N = \cos(N \arccos t)$. See [16] for a survey and extensions to entire functions. Many works are concerned with the generalization of the Markov-Bernstein type inequalities for polynomials over other functional systems. In [46, 29, 46] this was done for the system $\{t^{k-1}e^{-t}\}_{k=1}^n$ (algebraic polynomials with the Laguerre weight), in [14] it is done for algebraic polynomials with the Gaussian weight. Systems of real negative exponents $\{e^{a_k t}\}_{k=1}^n$, $a_k < 0$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, have been analysed in [5, 6, 32, 38, 40]. Both those systems are Chebyshev. Generalizations of Markov-Bernstein inequalities to non-Chebyshev systems, apart from the theoretical interest, is important in analytic geometry, ODE, and dynamical systems [12, 38]. The latter application deals with the systems of complex exponents in \mathbb{R}_+ [40].

We begin with lacunary polynomials (spanned by an arbitrary collection of integer non-negative powers $\varphi_k = t^{m_k}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$). Such systems can be non-Chebyshev (Example 1).

Proposition 2 *For lacunary algebraic polynomials $\mathcal{P} = \{p(t) = \sum_{k=1}^n p_k t^{m_k} : p_k \in \mathbb{R}\}$ on $K = [-1, 1]$, the constant C_j is the reciprocal to the value of the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \|p\|_{C[-1,1]} \rightarrow \min \\ p^{(j)}(-1) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Thus, the Markov-Bernstein constants for lacunary polynomials are obtained using problem (2) with $f \equiv 0$, $\ell(p) = p^{(j)}(-1)$.

Proof. The minimal norm $\|p\|$ under the assumption $\|p^{(j)}\| = 1$ is equal to $1/C_j$. Let it be attained on some polynomial p and $\|p^{(j)}\| = |p^{(j)}(a)|$ at some point $a \in [-1, 1]$, say,

$a < 0$. If $a > -1$, then the polynomial $\bar{p}(t) = a^j p(t/a)$ satisfies $\|\bar{p}\| \leq |a|^j \|p\|$, while $\|\bar{p}^{(j)}\| = |\bar{p}^{(j)}(-1)| = |a|^j |a^{-j} p^{(j)}(a)| = 1$, which contradicts to the optimality of p . Thus, $|p^{(j)}(-1)| = 1$, and hence, up to the sign, p coincides with the solution of the aforementioned extremal problem. \square

The second example is the space real-valued polynomials of complex exponents (quasipolynomials). For the sake of simplicity we assume that all frequencies z_k are of multiplicity one.

Proposition 3 *For systems of complex exponents $\varphi_k = e^{z_k t}$, $\operatorname{Re} z_k < 0$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, on the half-line \mathbb{R}_+ , the constant C_j is the reciprocal to the value of the problem $\|p\|_{C[0,+\infty]} \rightarrow \min$, $p^{(j)}(0) = 1$.*

Proof. If the minimal norm $\|p\|$ under the assumption $\|p^{(j)}\| = 1$ is attained on some polynomial p , for which $\|p^{(j)}\| = |p^{(j)}(a)|$, then for the polynomial $\bar{p}(\cdot) = p(\cdot + a)$, we have $\|\bar{p}\| \leq \|p\|$ and $\|\bar{p}^{(j)}\| = |p^{(j)}(0)|$. Hence, up to the sign, p coincides with the solution of that extremal problem. \square

8.3. Bounded trajectories of linear ODE

We consider a linear ODE of n th order: $x^{(n)} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_k x^{(k)}$ on $[0, +\infty)$ with constant coefficients c_k under the asymptotic stability assumption (every solution tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$). The problem is how large the derivative $\dot{x}(0)$ can be if $|x(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Since $x(\cdot)$ is a linear combination of n elementary solutions $t^s e^{zt}$, where z is a root of the characteristic polynomial $P(x) = z^n - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_k z^k$ and s does not exceed its multiplicity. Hence, the problem is equivalent to minimizing $\|p\|_{C(\mathbb{R}_+)}$ under the constraint $\dot{x}(0) = 1$. It is solved as in subsection 8.2 (the computing of the Markov-Bernstein constants).

8.4. Linear switching dynamical systems

Linear switching system is a linear ODE $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A(t)\mathbf{x}(t)$ on the vector-function $\mathbf{x} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with the initial condition $\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ such that the matrix function $A(t)$ takes values from a given compact set \mathcal{A} called a *control set*. The *switching law* is an piecewise-constant function $A : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. The *switching interval* is the interval between two consecutive switching points. This is the time of a continuous action of one matrix. The *dwell time assumption* means that each interval is not less than a fixed time m .

Linear switching systems have found many applications, mostly in electronic engineering, robotics, and planning [1, 15, 25]. One of the main issues is the stability of the system [4, 8, 30]. A system is called *asymptotically stable* if all its trajectories tend to zero. Deciding stability is usually hard [17]. One of the problems in this direction is to establish the minimal stability interval [20]. This is the smallest number M with the following property: if all trajectories with lengths of switching intervals at most M tend to zero, then the system

is stable. In other words, it is always sufficient to check the stability only for switching laws with short intervals. It is known [37] that $M = m + T$, where T is the minimal number such that for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the value $p(T)$ of the problem:

$$\begin{cases} \|\mathbf{p}\|_{C(\mathbb{R}_+)} \rightarrow \min, \\ p(T) = 1, \\ p \in \mathcal{P}_A \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

is bigger than 1. Here \mathcal{P}_A denotes the space of polynomials defined by the system $\Phi = \{t^k e^{zt} : z \in \text{sp}(A), k \leq d(z)\}$, where $\text{sp}(A)$ is the spectrum of A and $d(z)$ is the size of the largest Jordan block of the eigenvalue z .

Thus, to find M one needs to solve problem (10) for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then by bisection we find the minimal number T for which the value of all problems is bigger than one. In turn, problem (10) is solved as the approximation problem (2) with one constraint $\ell(p) = p(T) = 1$.

9. Examples and numerical results


9.1. Approximation by shifts of Gaussian functions

Unconstrained problems. We approximate the signal

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{10} (t - 5)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (t - 4) + \sin(0.4 \cdot t^2 \cos(0.5t)),$$

with polynomials by the system $\Phi = \{e^{-\frac{(t-1)^2}{9}}, e^{-\frac{(t-5)^2}{9}}, e^{-\frac{(t-7)^2}{9}}\}$ on the segment $K = [0, 8]$ with $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$. Eight iterations of the Algorithm 2 yields the required accuracy (Figure 2). The polynomial of the best approximation $p(t)$ has corresponding coefficients $\mathbf{p} = (1.902091, -2.453699, 3.842463)^T$ with the distance $\|f - p\| = 1.254985$. The generalized alternance consists of points $\tau_1 = 0.517919, \tau_2 = 4.430493, \tau_3 = 5.992115, \tau_4 = 7.942944$.

Figure 2




A problem with linear constraints. In the previous example, the value of the approximated function $f(t)$ at the point $t = 6.4$ is 1.999... while for the polynomial of the best

approximation, is $p(6.4) = 1.78\dots$ If we need to approximate f and keep its value at $t = 6.4$, which we for simplicity round to 2, we come to the constrained problem

$$\begin{cases} \|f - p\| \rightarrow \min \\ l(p) = p(6.4) = 2 \\ p \in \mathcal{P} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

The results of Algorithm 2c are shown in the Figure 3. The polynomial of the best approxima-

Figure 3



(a) $f(t)$ and $p(t)$; $p(6.4) = 2$

(b) $f(t) - p(t)$


(c) $\log_{10}(B_N - b_N)$

tion $p(t)$ has corresponding coefficients $p_1 = 2.078450$, $p_2 = -2.939696$, $p_3 = 4.457802$ with the minimal distance $\|f - p\| = 1.3807$. The L -alternance comprises $\tau_1 = 0.500162$, $\tau_2 = 4.427931$, $\tau_3 = 5.998317$.

Now add an extra condition: the value of the derivative of $p(t)$ at the same point $t = 6.4$ coincides with that of f , which is approximately 4.47. Thus, we add the constraint $l_2(p) = p'(6.4) = 4.47$.

The Algorithm 2c produces the following results (see Figure 4). The coefficients of the best polynomial are $p_1 = 7.407235$, $p_2 = -12.84065$, $p_3 = 12.52896$ with the minimal distance $\|f - p\| = 5.614225$. The L -alternance consists of two points $\tau_1 = 4.430836$, $\tau_2 = 0.386453$.

Figure 4



(a) $f(t)$ and $p(t)$;
 $p(6.4) = 2$, $p'(6.4) = 4.47$

(b) $f(t) - p(t)$

(c) $\log_{10}(B_N - b_N)$

9.2. Signal recovery by complex exponents

Unconstrained problems. We consider the space \mathcal{P} of exponential polynomials on $[0, +\infty)$:


$$p(t) = e^{-0.1t}(a_3 \cos(0.2t) + a_4 \sin(0.2t) + a_5 \cos(0.3t) + a_6 \sin(0.3t)) \\ + e^{-0.5t}(a_1 \cos(0.4t) + a_2 \sin(0.4t)) + e^{-0.9t}(a_7 \cos t + a_8 \sin t) + a_9 e^{-0.3t}$$

and a signal f , which is a sum of the polynomial with coefficients:

$$(a_k)_{k=1}^9 = (1, 1, 4, -7, -3, -2, 1, 5, 6)$$

and of the noise $8e^{-\frac{|t-7|}{2}}$. Algorithm 2 finds the best approximating polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$ with the precision $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ within $k = 31$ iterations, Fig. 5. The distance $\|p - f\|_{C(\mathbb{R}_+)} = 1.318352$ (we leave six digits after the decimal point). The algorithm converges slower than in the previous example (subsection 9.2) because of the infinite domain and a slow decrease of the functions $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_4$ (with the exponential part $e^{-0.1t}$).

Figure 5




Problems with linear constraints. The same problem under the constraint $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} p dt = 1$ gives the following results (Fig. 6). The distance to the best approximation $\|p - f\|$ increases in more than 1.5 times, from 1.318352 to 2.104564. The polynomial of the best approximation p now possess a degenerated L -alternance that it consists of 5 points instead of $n + 1 - r = 9$, Figure 6b)). Because of the degeneracy, Algorithm 1c stacks on this problem and we have to apply the regularization. Algorithm 2c finds the solution within 43 iterations with the precision $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$. The rate of convergence in those iterations is almost perfectly linear, Fig. 6c. The algorithm works slower than in the previous case of a non-degenerate alternance, but still quite fast.

9.3. Recovery of highly non-stationary signal

The following highly non-stationary signal on the segment $[0, 1]$ was analysed in [18]:

$$f(t) = \underbrace{\cos(4\pi\lambda(t)t)}_{\varphi_1(t)} + 2 \underbrace{\sin(4\pi t)}_{\varphi_2(t)}, \quad (12)$$

Figure 6




where

$$\lambda(t) = \begin{cases} 4 + 32t & , \quad 0 \leq t \leq 0.5, \\ 4 + 32(1 - t) & , \quad 0.5 < t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

The polynomial p of the best approximation by the system $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$ is, of course, equal to f , i.e., $\|p - f\|_{C[0,1]} = 0$. Algorithm 2 finds this solution by two iterations. .

Approximating the same signal by the system $\phi_1 = 1, \phi_2 = \cos(4\pi t), \phi_3 = \sin(4\pi t)$ is shown in Fig. (7). The polynomial of the best approximation is $p(t) = 2 \sin(4\pi t)$, Algorithm 2 finds it within three iterations. In fact, it decomposes the signal $f(t)$ into the

Figure 7



sum of $2 \sin(4\pi t)$ and $f(t) - 2 \sin(4\pi t) = \varphi_1(t)$ as the Empirical Mode Decomposition (EMD) using a non-uniform mask [27][Section: Numerical Experiments].

9.4. Markov-Bernstein type inequalities

We apply Algorithm 2c to find the sharp constants in the Markov-Bernstein inequalities (subsection 8.2) for various functional systems.

Lacunary algebraic polynomials by the system of power functions $\Phi = \{t^{m_k}\}_{k=1}^n$. We apply Algorithm 2c to the problem (9) with $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$. By Proposition 2 the constant C_j is the reciprocal to the solution of this problem.

Table 1: The Markov-Bernstein constants C_1, C_2 for different systems of lacunary algebraic polynomials.

Basis in \mathcal{P}	C_1	C_2
$1, t, t^2, t^3, t^4, t^5, t^6$	36	420
$1, t, t^2, t^3, t^5, t^6$	25.060144	201.979398
$1, t, t^3, t^5, t^6$	25	200
$1, t, t^5, t^6$	13.831259	69.1085
$1, t, t^6$	12	60

Note that if we remove monomials of even degree from the Chebyshev system $\mathcal{C}_6 = \{1, t, t^2, t^3, t^4, t^5, t^6\}$, the constants C_1, C_2 become closer to the corresponding constants for the Chebyshev system $\mathcal{C}_5 = \{1, t, t^2, t^3, t^4, t^5\}$ (Table 1). Moreover, the solution of problem (9) for the system \mathcal{C}_6 coincides with the Chebyshev polynomial by the the system \mathcal{C}_5 for $j = 1, 2$. However, in case of arbitrary lacunary algebraic polynomials, such dependency cannot be obtained in a simple way (see last two rows of the table).

Complex exponents. We find the Markov-Bernstein constants for the space of quasipolynomials $\mathcal{P} = \{e^{-t}(a_1 \cos t + a_2 \sin t + a_3) \mid a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Algorithm 2c applied to the problem $\|p\|_{C(\mathbb{R}_+)} \rightarrow \min, p'(0) = 1$. returns the coefficients $a_1 = 1.006772$, $a_2 = 0.884983$, $a_3 = 1.121789$. By Proposition 3, the corresponding Markov-Bernstein constant is $C_1 = \frac{1}{\|p(t)\|_{C(\mathbb{R}_+)}} = 8.694367$. The alternance is nondegenerate and consists of $m = 3$ points, the precision $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ is achieved within 8 iterations of Algorithm 2c. The algorithm runs 1.7 sec. in a standard laptop.

9.5. How often does the degeneracy occur?

In our numerical experiments with polynomials by complex exponents, shifts of Gaussian and Cauchy functions, lacunary algebraic and trigonometric polynomials, in 12 % of non-constrained problems degenerate simplices occur in Algorithm 1, after which the algorithm suffers and we had to apply the regularization and Algorithm 2. Moreover, 8 % of those cases have degenerate alternances, which consists of less than $n+1$ points. For problems with linear constraints, there number of degenerate cases is much larger: in 82 % of cases degenerate

simplices appear in Algorithm 2c, and 73 % of cases produce degenerate alternances. This is our statistics calculated among our numerical examples and problems from applications.

In this section we show the statistics over random system of functions, and it turns out to be quite similar. For this purpose, we generate m random independent uniformly distributed points (knots) on $[-1, 1]$, order them as $-1 < t_1 < \dots < t_m < 1$, then generate other m random points v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m (the values of the function) on the same segment $[-1, 1]$, interpolate the points $(t_1, v_1), \dots, (t_m, v_m)$ with a cubic spline $\varphi_1(t)$. This is a unique interpolating $C^2[-1, 1]$ spline with the “not-a-knot” boundary conditions, i.e., the two extreme polynomials coincide on each side of the segment.

In the same way we generate functions $\varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_n$. The boundary conditions are chosen so that the first and second segment at a curve end are the same polynomial. Having generated the system Φ on the segment $[-1, 1]$, we test Algorithm 2 with finding the best approximations for two functions: 1) $f(t) = |t|$ and 2) a random function f generated as above (in the same way as all φ_i). Then we test Algorithm 2c with the problem $\|p\|_{C[-1,1]} \rightarrow \min$ under the constraint $\ell(p) = \sum_{i=1}^n p^i = 1$. For each pair (m, n) we run 100 random systems Φ and then calculate the proportion of degenerate cases, average number of iterations and average program runtime for degenerate and non-degenerate cases. We call a case degenerate if at least in one iteration we have $q_{i_1, i_2}(t_0) < 0.05$ for some $i_1 \neq i_2$, where t_0 is the point of maximum of $|p_k(t) - f(t)$ on the segment $[-1, 1]$. The polynomial q_{i_1, i_2} is normalized as $\|q_{i_1, i_2}\| = 1$. The results are given in Table 2.

Table 2: The performance of Algorithms 2 and 2c for random polynomial systems

Problem	Parameters	Non-degenerate cases			Degenerate cases		
		share	iter.	time (sec)	share	iter.	time (sec)
$f = 0, \ell(p) = 1$	$m = 10, n = 3$	0.83	5.66	1.75	0.17	19.41	6.85
	$m = 10, n = 5$	0.59	12.02	4.14	0.41	18.95	7.26
	$m = 5, n = 7$	0.27	11.04	3.75	0.73	24.79	10.24
$f = t $	$m = 10, n = 3$	0.33	10.81	8.27	0.67	17.27	14.51
	$m = 10, n = 5$	0.17	15.5	10.38	0.83	22.12	21.79
	$m = 5, n = 7$	0.37	11.47	10.56	0.63	17.29	20.18
f is random	$m = 10, n = 3$	0.63	8.16	5.51	0.37	19.24	16.21
	$m = 10, n = 5$	0.36	13.74	8.13	0.64	26	17.85
	$m = 5, n = 7$	0.39	12.47	6.76	0.61	24.31	15.39

Several empirical conclusions can be made from Table 2. The share of degenerate cases increases in the degree n of the system. Also approximation of a non-smooth function (in our case $f = |t|$) admits more degenerate cases. The number of iterations in degenerate cases is, on average, from 1.5 to 2 times greater than in non-degenerate ones.

10. Discussion. Recursive approximations vs convex programming

Both constrained and unconstrained problems of uniform polynomial approximation can be solved by tools of convex optimisation. However, in practice they are less efficient that

Remez-like recursive methods. In particular, for approximating by Chebyshev systems, in particular, for algebraic polynomial approximation, everybody uses the Remez algorithm. The main reason is that it gives an a posteriori estimate and hence, usually reaches a desired accuracy by much less number of iterations than it is prescribed theoretically. Another reason is that convex optimization algorithms are usually suffer because of the non-smoothness of this problem. Actually, it belongs to the class of minimax problems:

$$\min_{p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{R}} \max_{t \in \mathcal{K}} |f(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \varphi_i(t)|. \quad (13)$$

A popular way to solve it by the gradient descent ascent method (GDA) with the iteration:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha_k \nabla_x F(x_k, y_k), \quad y_{k+1} = y_k + \beta_k \nabla_y F(x_k, y_k); \quad \alpha_k, \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},$$

Usually it is quite efficient for minimax problems [11, 24, 49]. However, in our case the objective function $F(p, t) = |f(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \varphi_i(t)|$ is non-smooth and not necessarily concave with respect to variable t . The most of literature deals with GDA algorithms for solving minimax problems of the form $\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} F(x, y)$, where the objective function $F(x, y)$ is at least smooth and $F(x, \cdot)$ is concave for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ [26, 33].

Acknowledgements. The research is performed with the support of the Theoretical Physics and Mathematics Advancement Foundation “BASIS”.

References

- [1] C. Basso. *Switch-mode power supplies spice simulations and practical designs*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1 edition, 2008.
- [2] J. Berent, P.L. Dragotti, T. Blu, *Sampling piecewise sinusoidal signals with finite rate of innovation methods*, IEEE Trans. Signal Process. 58 (2010), no 2, 613–625.
- [3] G. Beylkin, L. Monzòn, *On approximation of functions by exponential sums*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. 19 (2005), 17–48.
- [4] F. Blanchini, D. Casagrande and S. Miani, *Modal and transition dwell time computation in switching systems: a set-theoretic approach*, Automatica J. IFAC, 46 (2010), no 9, 1477–1482.
- [5] P.B. Borwein and T. Erdélyi *Upper bounds for the derivative of exponential sums* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 123 (1995), 1481 – 1486.
- [6] P.B. Borwein and T. Erdélyi *A sharp Bernstein-type inequality for exponential sums*, J.Reine Angew. Math. 476 (1996), 127–141.
- [7] E.W. Cheney and H.L. Loeb, *Generalized Rational Approximation*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., Series B, (1964), 11–25.

- [8] Y. Chitour, N. Guglielmi, V.Yu. Protasov, M. Sigalotti, *Switching systems with dwell time: computing the maximal Lyapunov exponent*, Nonlinear Anal. Hybrid Syst. 40 (2021), Paper No. 101021, 21 pp
- [9] L. Collatz, W. Krabs, *Tschebyscheffsche Approximation mit Anwendungen*, Teubner Studienbücher Mathematik (TSBMA), Stuttgart, 1973.
- [10] V.K. Dzyadyk and I.A. Shevchuk, *Theory of uniform approximation of functions by polynomials*, Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- [11] A. Fallah, A. Ozdaglar, S. Pattathil, *An optimal multistage stochastic gradient method for minimax problems*, in 2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), IEEE, 2020, pp. 3573–3579.
- [12] J.P. Francoise, *Bernstein inequalities and applications to analytic geometry and differential equations*, Journal of functional analysis 146 (1997), 185–205.
- [13] W. Fraser, *A Survey of methods of computing minimax and near-minimax polynomial approximations for functions of a single independent variable*, J. ACM 12 (1965), no 295.
- [14] G. Freud, *On two polynomial inequalities*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar., 22 (1971), no 1–2, 109–116.
- [15] J. C. Geromel and P. Colaneri, *Stability and stabilization of continuous-time switched linear systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 45 (2006), no 5, 1915–1930.
- [16] D.V. Gorbachev, *Sharp Bernstein–Nikolskii inequalities for polynomials and entire functions of exponential type*, Chebyshevskii Sb., 22 (2021), no 5.
- [17] L. Gurvits and A. Olshevsky, *On the NP-Hardness of checking matrix polytope stability and continuous-time switching stability*, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control, 54 (2009), no 2, 337–341.
- [18] J.F. Huang, L. Yang, *Empirical mode decomposition based on locally adaptive filters*, preprint.
- [19] A.C. Ionita, A.C. Antoulas, *Data-driven parametrized model reduction in the Loewner framework*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 36(3), A984—A1007 (2014).
- [20] R. Kamalov and V.Yu. Protasov, *On the length of switching intervals of a stable dynamical system*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 321 (2023) no 1, 149–157.
- [21] S. Karlin and W.J. Studden, *Tchebycheff systems: with applications in analysis and statistics*, Interscience, New York, 1966
- [22] F. Knaepkens, A. Cuyt, W.S. Lee, de Villiers, I.L. Dirk, *Regular sparse array direction of arrival estimation in one dimension*, IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag. 68 (2020), no 5, 3997–4006 (2020)

- [23] M.G. Krein and A.A. Nudelman, *The Markov moment problem and extremal problems: ideas and problems of P.L. Chebyshev and A.A. Markov and their further development*, Translations of mathematical monographs, Providence, R.I., v. 50 (1977).
- [24] T. Liang, J. Stokes, *Interaction matters: A note on non-asymptotic local convergence of generative adversarial networks*, in The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR (2019), 907–915.
- [25] D. Liberzon, *Switching in systems and control*, Systems & Control: Foundations and Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2003.
- [26] T. Lin, C. Jin, M. Jordan, *On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems*, In Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2020), 6083–6093.
- [27] L. Lin, Y. Wang, H. Zhou, *Iterative filtering as an alternative algorithm for empirical mode decomposition*, Adv. Adapt. Data Anal. 1 (2009), no 4, 543–560.
- [28] G.G. Magaril-Ilyaev, V.M. Tikhomirov, *Convex Analysis: Theory and Applications*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Amer. Mathematical Society (2003).
- [29] L. Milev and N. Naidenov, *Exact Markov inequalities for the Hermite and Laguerre weights*, J. Approx. Theory, 138 (2006), no 1, 87–96.
- [30] A. P. Molchanov and Y. S. Pyatnitskiy. *Criteria of asymptotic stability of differential and difference inclusions encountered in control theory*, Systems Control Lett., 13 (1989), no 1, 59–64.
- [31] Y. Nakatsukasa, O. Sete, and L.N. Trefethen, *The AAA algorithm for rational approximation*, SIAM J.Sci. Comput. 40 (2018), no 3, A1494–A1522.
- [32] D.J. Newman, *Derivative bounds for Müntz polynomials*, J. Approx. Theory 18 (1976), 360–362.
- [33] M. Nouiehed, M. Sanjabi, T. Huang, J.D. Lee, M. Razaviyayn, *Solving a class of nonconvex min-max games using iterative first order methods*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (2019), 14905–14916
- [34] O. Bar-Ilan, Y.C. Eldar, *Sub-nyquist radar via doppler focusing*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 62 (2014), no 7, 1796–1811.
- [35] G. Plonka, M. Tasche, *Prony methods for recovery of structured functions*, GAMM Mitt. 37 (2014), no 2, 239–258.
- [36] M. Petz, G. Plonka, and N. Derevianko, *Exact reconstruction of sparse non-harmonic signals from their Fourier coefficients*, Sampling Theory, Signal Processing, and Data Analysis (2021) 19:7.
- [37] V. Yu. Protasov and R. Kamalov, *How do the lengths of switching intervals influence the stability of a dynamical system?*, arXiv:2312.10506v1

- [38] V.Yu. Protasov and R.M. Jungers, *Is switching systems stability harder for continuous time systems?*, Proc. IEEE Conference Decision and Control (2013), art. no. 6759964, 704–709.
- [39] V.Yu. Protasov, and R.M. Jungers, *Analysing the stability of linear systems via exponential Chebyshev polynomials*, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control, 61 (2016), no 3, art. no. 7131458, 795–798.
- [40] V.Yu. Protasov, *Generalized Markov–Bernstein inequalities and stability of dynamical systems*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 319 (2022) no 1, 237–252.
- [41] E.Ya. Remez, *Sur le calcul effectiv des polynomes d’approximation des Tschebyscheff*, Compt. Rend. Acade. Sc. 199, 337 (1934).
- [42] R.T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press (1979).
- [43] R. Tur, Y.C. Eldar, Z. Friedman, *Innovation rate sampling of pulse streams with application to ultrasound imaging*, Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on, 59 (2011), no 4, :1827–1842.
- [44] V.P. Sklyarov, *The sharp constant in Markov’s inequality for the Laguerre weight*, Sb. Math., 200 (2009), no 6, 887–897.
- [45] G.S. Smirnov and R.G. Smirnov, *Best uniform approximation of complex-valued functions by generalized polynomials having restricted ranges*, J. Approx. Theory 100 (1999), 284–303.
- [46] G. Szegö, *On some problems of approximations*, Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl., 9 (1964), 3–9.
- [47] N. Sukhorukova and J. Ugon, *A generalisation of de la Vallée Poussin procedure to multivariate approximations*, Advanc. Comput. Math., 48 (2022), no. 5
- [48] Y. Hua and T.K. Sarkar. *Matrix pencil method for estimating parameters of exponentially damped/undamped sinusoids in noise*. Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on, 38 (1990), no 5, 814–824.
- [49] G. Zhang, Y. Wang, L. Lessard, R. B. Grosse, *Near-optimal local convergence of alternating gradient descent-ascent for minimax optimization*, in International Conference on Art. Intel. Statistics, PMLR, 2022, pp. 7659–7679.