

LOWER BOUNDS FOR WEIGHTED CHEBYSHEV AND ORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS

GÖKALP ALPAN AND MAXIM ZINCHENKO

ABSTRACT. We derive optimal asymptotic and non-asymptotic lower bounds on the Widom factors for weighted Chebyshev and orthogonal polynomials on compact subsets of the real line. In the Chebyshev case we extend the optimal non-asymptotic lower bound previously known only in a handful of examples to regular compact sets and a large class weights. Using the non-asymptotic lower bound, we extend Widom's asymptotic lower bound for weights bounded away from zero to a large class of weights with zeros including weights with strong zeros and infinitely many zeros. As an application of the asymptotic lower bound we extend Bernstein's 1931 asymptotics result for weighted Chebyshev polynomials on an interval to arbitrary Riemann integrable weights with finitely many zeros and to some continuous weights with infinitely many zeros. In the case of orthogonal polynomials, we derive optimal asymptotic and non-asymptotic lower bound on arbitrary regular compact sets for a large class of weights in the non-asymptotic case and for arbitrary Szegő class weights in the asymptotic case, extending previously known bounds on finite gap and Parreau–Widom sets.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let K be a non-polar compact subset of \mathbb{C} and denote the logarithmic capacity of K by $\text{Cap}(K)$. We have $\text{Cap}(K) > 0$ in this case and so there exists the equilibrium measure of K which we denote by μ_K . Let Ω_K be the unbounded component of $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus K$, then the Green function for the domain Ω_K is given by

$$g_K(z) = -\log \text{Cap}(K) + \int \log |z - \zeta| d\mu_K(\zeta), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (1.1)$$

We note that g_K has the following asymptotics at infinity

$$g_K(z) = \log |z| - \log \text{Cap}(K) + o(1). \quad (1.2)$$

We use $\|\cdot\|_K$ to denote the sup-norm on K . We call $w : K \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ a weight function on K if w is Borel measurable and takes positive values on a subset of

Date: August 22, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 41A17; Secondary 41A44, 42C05, 33C45.

Key words and phrases. Widom factors, Chebyshev polynomials, orthogonal polynomials, asymptotics, lower bounds.

G.A. is supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK) ARDEB 1001 Grant Number 123F358. G.A is also supported by the BAGEP Award of the Science Academy.

M.Z. is supported in part by the Simons Foundation Grant MP–TSM–00002651.

K containing infinitely many points. If w is a bounded weight function then the n -th Chebyshev polynomial with respect to w on K , denoted by $T_{n,w}$, is the unique minimizer of $\|wP_n\|_K$ over all monic polynomials P_n of degree n . We refer the reader to [22] for a recent review of weighted Chebyshev polynomials. Let

$$t_n(K, w) := \|wT_{n,w}\|_K \quad (1.3)$$

and define the n -th *Widom factor for the sup-norm* with respect to a bounded weight function w on K by

$$W_{\infty,n}(K, w) := \frac{t_n(K, w)}{\text{Cap}(K)^n}. \quad (1.4)$$

In addition, we define the Szegő factor of w on K by

$$S(K, w) := \exp \left[\int_K \log w \, d\mu_K \right]. \quad (1.5)$$

By Jensen's inequality, $S(K, w) \leq \int w d\mu_K$ and hence the Szegő factor is always finite for bounded (and more generally integrable with respect to $d\mu_K$) weights. We say that w is in the *Szegő class* on K if $S(K, w) > 0$. For example, every weight bounded away from zero (i.e., $w(x) \geq c > 0$ for $x \in K$) is in the Szegő class on K .

We refer to the case of constant weight $w = 1$ on K as the unweighted case. It is trivial to see that $S(1) = 1$. When $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ (see [24, Theorem 5.5.4]),

$$W_{\infty,n}(K, 1) \geq 1, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1.6)$$

and when $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ (see [26])

$$W_{\infty,n}(K, 1) \geq 2, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.7)$$

In the weighted case the corresponding lower bound has the following form (see [22, Theorem 13] and also [25, Chapter I, Theorem 3.6]),

$$W_{\infty,n}(K, w) \geq S(K, w), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.8)$$

In general, the lower bound (1.8) cannot be improved. Indeed, if $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\inf_w \frac{W_{\infty,n}(K, w)}{S(K, w)} = 1, \quad (1.9)$$

where the infimum is taken over all polynomials w positive on K (see [22, Theorem 13]). However, several examples of weights are known for which the following doubled lower bound holds,

$$W_{\infty,n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.10)$$

The constant weight gives one such example (cf. (1.7)). In addition, if $-1, 1 \in K$ and $K \subset [-1, 1]$ then (1.10) holds for $w(x) = \sqrt{1-x^2}$ (see [27]) and for $w(x) = \sqrt{1-x}$ and $w(x) = \sqrt{1+x}$ (see [3]). In Theorem 2.3, we show that (1.10) holds for weights that are square roots of rational functions under an additional explicit condition on the zeros. We refer the reader to [14, Lemma 2.12] for a recent relevant result. In

Theorems 2.6 and 2.10, we prove that (1.10) also holds for weights that are certain infinite products of rational functions.

In [32, Theorem 11.5], Widom proved the following asymptotic lower bound on a finite gap set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w), \quad (1.11)$$

for weights w that are Riemann integrable and bounded away from zero on K . In Theorem 3.4, we extend this result to weights of the form $w = w_0 w_1$, where w_1 is Riemann integrable and bounded away from zero on K and w_0 is an arbitrary continuous weight with at most finitely many zeros on K .

In the case of an interval $K = [-1, 1]$, asymptotics of the Widom factors was first studied by Bernstein in [8]. Let

$$w(x) = w_0(x)w_1(x) \text{ on } K, \quad (1.12)$$

where w_1 is a Riemann integrable weight function bounded away from 0 on K and

$$w_0(x) = \prod_{j=1}^d |x - \alpha_j|^{\beta_j}, \quad (1.13)$$

where $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_j \in K$, $\beta_j > 0$ for all j . Then, w is in the Szegő class on K and (see [8] and also [10, Theorem 5])

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) = 2S(K, w). \quad (1.14)$$

In [19], Lubinsky–Saff studied asymptotics of L^p Widom factors on $K = [-1, 1]$. It could be deduced from their work and the work of Widom [32] that Bernstein’s asymptotics (1.14) extends to upper semi-continuous weight functions w satisfying $1/w \in L^p(K, dx)$ for all $p < \infty$. While this extension allows only mild zeros, it nevertheless suggests that the assumption of Riemann integrability in Bernstein’s result is likely unnecessary for (1.14).

In Theorem 3.5, we extend Bernstein’s asymptotics result to weights with more general zeros. In particular, we show that (1.14) holds for $w = w_0 w_1$, where w_1 is as above and w_0 is an arbitrary continuous weight with at most finitely many zeros on K . We pose no restrictions of the type of zeros and, in particular, we allow Szegő class weights with “strong zeros” such as $w(x) = \exp(-1/|x|^\alpha)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, and also non-Szegő class weights. In addition, we show that (1.14) holds for certain continuous weights of the Szegő class with infinitely many zeros on K .

For a non-polar compact set K in \mathbb{C} , let $d\mu = w d\mu_K$ where w is a weight function on K with $w \in L^1(K, d\mu_K) \setminus \{0\}$. Let P_n denote the n -th monic orthogonal polynomial associated with μ . We define the n -th L^2 Widom factor for w on K by

$$W_{2, n}(K, w) := \frac{\|P_n\|_{L^2(\mu)}}{\text{Cap}(K)^n}. \quad (1.15)$$

Then for $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ (see [2], [6]),

$$[W_{2, n}(K, 1)]^2 \geq 1, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1.16)$$

and for $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ (see [6]),

$$[W_{2,n}(K, 1)]^2 \geq 2, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.17)$$

Just like the L^∞ case, there is a universal lower bound when $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ (see [2], [6]):

$$[W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \geq S(K, w), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.18)$$

The inequality (1.18) cannot be improved in the following sense (see [7, Theorem 2.2]): If $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\inf_w \frac{[W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2}{S(K, w)} = 1, \quad (1.19)$$

where the infimum is taken over all polynomials w positive on K . However, several families of weights have been discovered with the improved lower bound

$$[W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \geq 2S(K, w), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.20)$$

The examples with (1.20) include the unweighted case (see [6]), weights defined in terms isospectral torus (see [6]), Jacobi weights for certain parameters (see [6]) and generalized Jacobi measures (see [3]). We prove in Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 that (1.20) holds for certain rational weights and infinite product of rational functions.

When K is a finite gap set and w is an arbitrary weight function in $L^1(K, d\mu_K)$, it follows from [32, Theorem 12.3] that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} [W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \geq 2S(K, w). \quad (1.21)$$

There are also asymptotics results for $[W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2$ beyond finite gap sets [9], [23].

In Theorem 4.2, we show that for any non-polar compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ and arbitrary weight w , (1.21) holds. This is the best general result we can get as the inequality in (1.21) becomes equality when K is an interval in view of Szegő's theorem, see [28, Theorem 13.8.8]. The equality holds in (1.21) if $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an inverse polynomial image of $[-1, 1]$ and $w := 1$, see [7, Theorem 4.4].

Both $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty,n}(K, 1)$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} [W_{2,n}(K, 1)]^2$ can be made arbitrarily large or even ∞ , see [17], [4] and also Remark 4.4. Hence the exact values for these limits are set dependent and might well exceed $2S(K, w)$.

The inequality (1.21) can be used to obtain a better lower bound than what was previously known for $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty,n}(K, w)$ in the case of $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ and arbitrary bounded Szegő class weight w . We have

$$\left(\frac{\|T_{n,w}w\|_{L^\infty(K)}}{\text{Cap}K^n} \right)^2 \geq \frac{\int T_{n,w}^2 w^2 d\mu_K}{\text{Cap}(K)^{2n}}. \quad (1.22)$$

Taking the \liminf and using (1.21) we get

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} [W_{\infty,n}(K, w)]^2 \geq 2S(K, w^2) \quad (1.23)$$

and thus

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} [W_{\infty,n}(K, w)] \geq \sqrt{2}S(K, w), \quad (1.24)$$

where we get an extra $\sqrt{2}$ term compared to what we would get if we take the liminf of both sides in (1.8).

It is quite likely that (1.24) does not give the optimal lower bound. The lower bound is a result of a simple trick to compare the norms of L^2 and L^∞ extremal polynomials. On the other hand, in the well studied cases such as the case of an interval or a finite gap set K with a sufficiently nice weight w (see [32]) or in the unweighted case for more general compact sets $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ (see [13, Theorem 5.2]), $2S(K, w)$ appears as the value of $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w)$. We also have several other examples in this article with the same property. Hence, we make the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1. Let K be a non-polar compact subset of \mathbb{R} and w be an arbitrary bounded weight function on K . Then,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w). \quad (1.25)$$

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we discuss non-asymptotic lower bounds and in Section 3, we discuss asymptotic lower bounds for $W_{\infty, n}(K, w)$. In Section 4, we prove a sharp asymptotic lower bound for $[W_{2, n}(K, w)]^2$ on \mathbb{R} and also show that the improved non-asymptotic lower bound (1.20) holds for some rational functions and infinite product of rational functions.

2. LOWER BOUNDS FOR L^∞ NORM

In this section, we derive an n -independent lower bound on $W_{\infty, n}(K, w)$ for arbitrary regular compact sets $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ and weights of the form $w(x) = \sqrt{R(x)}$ where R is a rational function bounded and non-negative on K . Earlier work on lower bounds for weighted Chebyshev polynomials include [27, 22, 3]. In [1, Appendix A], Akhiezer gave an explicit formula for weighted Chebyshev polynomials on $[-1, 1]$ for the weights $w = 1/\sqrt{P}$, where P is a strictly positive polynomial on $[-1, 1]$.

We start by extending the well known relation between the capacity of a compact set and the capacity of its polynomial preimage set [24, Theorem 5.2.5] to the case of a rational function preimage.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a regular compact set and let*

$$R(z) = c \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{d_0} (z - a_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{d_1} (z - b_j)} \quad (2.1)$$

be a rational function with a pole at infinity of order $n = d_0 - d_1 \geq 1$ and assume that the numerator and denominator of R have no common zeros. Then the preimage set $L = R^{-1}(K) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : R(z) \in K\}$ is a regular compact set and

$$\text{Cap}(K) = |c| \text{Cap}(L)^n \exp \left[- \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_L(b_j) \right]. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. By assumption $R(\infty) = \infty$ and K is compact hence the preimage set L is compact. Let Ω_K and Ω_L be the unbounded components of $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus K$ and $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus L$, respectively. Then $R(\Omega_L) = \Omega_K$ and $R(\partial\Omega_L) = R(\partial\Omega_K)$. Let g_K and g_L be the Green functions on the domains Ω_K and Ω_L , respectively, and consider the function

$$h(z) = g_K(R(z)) - ng_L(z) - \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_L(z, b_j). \quad (2.3)$$

Note that all the logarithmic poles at $\infty, b_1, \dots, b_{d_1}$ cancel, so h extends to a harmonic function on Ω_L . Since h has zero boundary values q.e. on $\partial\Omega_L$, it follows from the maximum principle that $h \equiv 0$ on Ω_L . By assumption, K is regular, so $g_K(R(z)) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow z_0$ for each $z_0 \in \partial\Omega_L$. Since $g_L(z)$ and $g_L(z, b_j)$ for all j are non-negative on Ω_L it follows that $g_L(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow z_0$ for each $z_0 \in \partial\Omega_L$, that is, L is regular. In addition, we have

$$0 = h(\infty) = \log |c| - \log \text{Cap}(K) + n \log \text{Cap}(L) - \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_L(b_j) \quad (2.4)$$

which implies (2.2). \square

We will also need the following variant of [27, Lemma 13] for compact subsets of the complex plane.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $K \subset L$ be two compact subsets of \mathbb{C} such that L is regular, K is polynomially convex, and $\text{Cap}(K) = \text{Cap}(L)$. Then $K = L$.*

Proof. We only need to show $L \subset K$. Since L is regular we have $\text{Cap}(L) > 0$. Then, by [12, Proposition 2.1], $\text{supp}(\mu_L) \subset K$, where μ_L denotes the equilibrium measure of L . Let Ω be the unbounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu_L)$ and Ω'_K be the unbounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$. Then $\Omega \supset \Omega'_K$. Since K is polynomially convex, we have $K = \mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega'_K$ and hence $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega \subset K$. It follows from (1.1) that $g_L(z)$ is a harmonic function on Ω . Since g_L is non-negative and non-constant on Ω , it must be strictly positive on Ω by the minimum principle for harmonic functions. Then since L is regular, we have $g_L = 0$ on L and hence $L \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega$. Thus, $L \subset K$. \square

Our first main result of this section is the following non-asymptotic lower bound.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a compact non-polar set and let*

$$R(z) = c \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{d_0} (z - a_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{d_1} (z - b_j)} \quad (2.5)$$

be a rational function such that R is bounded, non-negative, and not identically zero on K . Define $d = d_1 - d_0$ and $w = \sqrt{R}$ on K . Then, for all $n > d/2$,

$$W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w) \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d g_K(a_j) \right]. \quad (2.6)$$

In addition, assume that the zeros of R are regular points of K . Then for all $n > d/2$,

$$W_{\infty,n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w). \quad (2.7)$$

Furthermore, the equality in (2.7) is attained for some $n > d/2$ if and only if there is a polynomial Q_n of degree n such that its zeros are disjoint from $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{d_1}$ and

$$K = (RQ_n^2)^{-1}([0, 1]). \quad (2.8)$$

In that case, $Q_n = rT_{n,w}$, where r is a non-zero real number.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that the numerator and denominator of R have no common zeros. By assumption,

$$w(x) = \sqrt{R(x)} = |c|^{1/2} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{d_0} |x - a_j|^{1/2}}{\prod_{j=1}^{d_1} |x - b_j|^{1/2}}, \quad (2.9)$$

hence using (1.5) and (1.1) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} S(K, w) &= \exp \left[\int \log w \, d\mu_K \right] \\ &= |c|^{1/2} \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} \int \log |x - a_j| \, d\mu_K(x) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} \int \log |x - b_j| \, d\mu_K(x) \right] \\ &= |c|^{1/2} \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} (g_K(a_j) + \log \text{Cap}(K)) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} (g_K(b_j) + \log \text{Cap}(K)) \right] \\ &= |c|^{1/2} \text{Cap}(K)^{-d/2} \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_K(b_j) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Next note that $(wT_{n,w})^2 = RT_{n,w}^2$ is a rational function. We cancel any common zeros in the numerator and the denominator of $RT_{n,w}^2$ and assume without loss of generality that after the cancellation, the remaining zeros of the denominator (repeated according to their multiplicities) are $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{d'_1}$ where

$$0 \leq d'_1 \leq d_1. \quad (2.11)$$

Define the rational preimage set

$$\begin{aligned} L_n &= (RT_{n,w}^2)^{-1}([0, t_n(K, w)^2]) \\ &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : R(z)T_{n,w}^2(z) \in [0, t_n(K, w)^2]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Since $\text{Re}[T_{n,w}(x)]$ is a monic polynomial of degree n and $|\text{Re}[T_{n,w}(x)]| \leq |T_{n,w}(x)|$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows that $T_{n,w} = \text{Re}[T_{n,w}]$ so $T_{n,w}$ is a real polynomial. Since w is also real on K we have $w(x)T_{n,w}(x) \in [-t_n(K, w), t_n(K, w)]$ for all $x \in K$. It follows that $K \subset L_n$ and hence

$$\text{Cap}(K) \leq \text{Cap}(L_n) \quad \text{and} \quad g_{L_n} \leq g_K \quad \text{on } \mathbb{C}. \quad (2.13)$$

Since for $n > d/2$ the rational function $RT_{n,w}^2$ has a pole at infinity of order $2n - d$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\frac{1}{4}t_n(K, w)^2 = \text{Cap}([0, t_n(K, w)^2]) = |c| \text{Cap}(L_n)^{2n-d} \exp\left[-\sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_{L_n}(b_j)\right]. \quad (2.14)$$

Then using (2.11), we obtain

$$t_n(K, w) \geq 2|c|^{1/2} \text{Cap}(L_n)^{n-d/2} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_{L_n}(b_j)\right], \quad (2.15)$$

where the inequality is strict if and only if some b_j is a zero of $T_{n,w}$. Now it follows from (2.15), (2.13), and (2.10) that for all $n > d/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\infty,n}(K, w) &= \frac{t_n(K, w)}{\text{Cap}(K)^n} \geq 2|c|^{1/2} \text{Cap}(K)^{-d/2} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_K(b_j)\right] \\ &= 2S(K, w) \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

so the lower bound (2.6) holds.

When all the a_j 's are regular points of K , we have $g_K(a_j) = 0$ for each j and hence (2.7) follows from (2.6).

It remains to show that the equality in (2.7) is equivalent to (2.8). First assume that, $W_{\infty,n}(K, w) = 2S(K, w)$. Then the inequality in (2.16) becomes equality since by assumption $g_K(a_j) = 0$ for all j . This is possible only if the inequalities in (2.15) and (2.13) become equalities. Thus, the zeros of $T_{n,w}$ are disjoint from $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{d_1}$ and $\text{Cap}(K) = \text{Cap}(L_n)$. Since $K \subset L_n$, L_n is regular, and K is polynomially convex due to $K \subset \mathbb{R}$, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $K = L_n$. In view of (2.12), choosing $Q_n = \frac{1}{t_n(K, w)} T_{n,w}$ then yields (2.8).

Conversely, assume (2.8) holds for some polynomial Q_n of degree n whose zeros do not include any element of $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{d_1}$. Since \sqrt{R} takes non-negative real values on K and $K \subset \mathbb{R}$, it follows that $Q_n = rS_n$ where r is a non-zero real number and S_n is a monic polynomial with real coefficients. Hence $K = (RS_n^2)^{-1}([0, 1/r^2])$. Then, by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\frac{1}{4r^2} = |c| \text{Cap}(K)^{2n-d} \exp\left[-\sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_K(b_j)\right]. \quad (2.17)$$

Combining (2.17), (2.15), and (2.13), we get

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \leq t_n(K, w)^2. \quad (2.18)$$

This implies that $\|wS_n\|_K \leq t_n(K, w)$. Since S_n is monic, it follows from the uniqueness of the weighted Chebyshev polynomial that $S_n = T_{n,w}$. Then $K = L_n$ and

since the zeros of $T_{n,w} = \frac{1}{r}Q_n$ do not include any elements of $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{d_1}$, the inequality in (2.15) and hence in (2.16) become equality. Thus, $W_{\infty,n}(K, w) = 2S(K, w)$ holds. \square

Remark 2.4. (a) The theorem applies to rational weights $w(x) = |R(x)|$ for any complex rational function R which is not identically zero since we can write $w(x) = [R(x)\overline{R}(x)]^{1/2}$, where $\overline{R}(x)$ denotes the rational function $R(x)$ with complex conjugated coefficients. Then using the symmetry $g_K(\bar{z}) = g_K(z)$ one obtains for all $n > d$,

$$W_{\infty,n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w) \exp\left[-\sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j)\right], \quad (2.19)$$

$$S(K, w) = |c| \text{Cap}(K)^{-d} \exp\left[\sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j) - \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_K(b_j)\right], \quad (2.20)$$

where $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{d_0}$ and $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{d_1}$ are the zeros and poles of R on \mathbb{C} , repeated according to their multiplicities, $d = d_1 - d_0$, and c is such that $R(z) \sim cz^{-d}$ at infinity.

In the special case of rational functions R that take real values on K , the lower bound (2.19) can also be deduced from (2.20) and the analog of Bernstein–Walsh lemma for real rational functions [14, Lemma 2.12].

(b) Instead of the square root weight, one can consider m -th root of a rational function, $w = \sqrt[m]{R}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case, a similar proof yields for all $n > d/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\infty,n}(K, w) &\geq A^{1/m} |c|^{1/m} \text{Cap}(K)^{-d/m} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_K(b_j)\right] \\ &= A^{1/m} S(K, w) \exp\left[-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

where $A = 2$ if m is odd and $A = 4$ if m is even. Thus, our approach may lead to the optimal lower bound (2.7) only in the cases $m = 1$ and $m = 2$.

(c) The theorem shows that the optimal lower bound (2.7) holds for the Jacobi weights $w_{\alpha,\beta}(x) = (1-x)^\alpha(1+x)^\beta$ on $K = [-1, 1]$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}_0$.

A simple calculation shows that (2.7) does not hold for the Jacobi weights $w_{\alpha,\alpha}$ with $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $n = 1$ since

$$W_{\infty,1}(K, w_{\alpha,\alpha}) \leq \frac{\|xw_{\alpha,\alpha}\|_K}{\text{Cap}(K)} = \frac{2(2\alpha)^\alpha}{(1+2\alpha)^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}}} < \frac{2}{2^{2\alpha}} = 2S(K, w_{\alpha,\alpha}). \quad (2.22)$$

Our next goal is to show that the optimal lower bound (2.7) extends to some weights with infinitely many zeros on K . As a preliminary step, we'll discuss uniform convergence of infinite products of rational functions. As is customary, we'll denote by $\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} f_j$ the limit of the partial products $\prod_{j=1}^k f_j$ if it exists. To start, we recall a well known result about convergence of infinite products.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\{f_j(z)\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of non-vanishing, continuous functions on a set U such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty (1 - f_j(z))$ converges absolutely and locally uniformly on U (i.e., on compact subsets of U). Then the infinite product $F(z) = \prod_{j=1}^\infty f_j(z)$ converges locally uniformly on U to a finite, non-vanishing, continuous function $F(z)$ on U .*

Theorem 2.6. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a regular compact set and suppose $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset K$ and $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus K$ are sequences such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty g_K(b_j) < \infty$, $\sum_{j=1}^\infty |b_j - a_j| < \infty$, $\left\| \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j} \right\|_K \leq 1$ for every $j \geq 1$, and the set $A = \{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is closed. Then the infinite product*

$$w(x) = \prod_{j=1}^\infty \left| \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j} \right| \quad (2.23)$$

converges uniformly on K to a weight function w such that w is continuous and bounded by 1 on K , w is positive on $K \setminus A$, $S(K, w) > 0$ (i.e., w is in the Szegő class on K), and for all $n \geq 1$,

$$W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w). \quad (2.24)$$

Proof. Denote the partial products by $w_k(x) = \prod_{j=1}^k \left| \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j} \right|$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it follows from $\left\| \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j} \right\|_K \leq 1$ that the sequence w_k is monotone decreasing as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and hence $w_k \rightarrow w$ pointwise on K . In addition, for each $x_0 \in A$ there is k_0 such that $x_0 = a_{k_0}$. Then for all $k \geq k_0$ we have $0 \leq w(x) \leq w_k(x) \leq \left| \frac{x - x_0}{x - b_{k_0}} \right|$ on K which implies that w is continuous at x_0 .

Next, we note that, it follows from $\sum_{j=1}^\infty |b_j - a_j| < \infty$ that $|a_j - b_j| \rightarrow 0$ and hence the only limit points of the set $B = \{b_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ are in A . Then locally uniformly on $K \setminus A$ (i.e., for x on compact subsets of $K \setminus A$) we have $\text{dist}(x, B) \geq c > 0$ and it follows from

$$0 \leq 1 - \left| \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j} \right| \leq \frac{|b_j - a_j|}{|x - b_j|} \leq \frac{|b_j - a_j|}{\text{dist}(x, B)} \quad (2.25)$$

that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty (1 - \left| \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j} \right|)$ converges absolutely and locally uniformly on $K \setminus A$. Since all the partial products w_k are nonzero and continuous on $K \setminus A$, it follows from Lemma 2.5 that the infinite product w is also nonzero and continuous on $K \setminus A$.

Combining continuity of w at every point of A with continuity of w on the (relatively) open set $K \setminus A$, we conclude that w is continuous on K . Since w_k are decreasing to w as $k \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from Dini's theorem that $w_k \rightarrow w$ uniformly on K . This implies that, for each fixed $n \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|w_k T_{n, w}\|_K \rightarrow \|w T_{n, w}\|_K. \quad (2.26)$$

In addition, $w_k \searrow w$ and $w_k \leq 1$ imply that $-\log w_k$ are non-negative and monotone increasing to $-\log w$ hence by the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S(K, w_k) = S(K, w). \quad (2.27)$$

Since by (2.20), $S(K, w_k) = \exp[-\sum_{j=1}^k g_K(b_j)]$ for $k \geq 1$, it follows from (2.27) that $S(K, w) = \exp[-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g_K(b_j)] > 0$.

Finally, for each fixed $n \geq 1$ we have by (2.19),

$$2S(K, w_k) \leq \frac{\|w_k T_{n, w_k}\|_K}{\text{Cap}(K)^n} \leq \frac{\|w_k T_{n, w}\|_K}{\text{Cap}(K)^n}. \quad (2.28)$$

Then taking limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (2.26) and (2.27) yield (2.24). \square

Remark 2.7. (a) The theorem applies to any sequence $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset K$ with finitely many limit points all of which appears among the sequence elements. The latter condition can always be achieved by appending the finite number of the limit points to the sequence. For the sequence $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ one can choose, for example, $b_j = a_j + i\varepsilon_j$ with $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ sufficiently fast so that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g_K(b_j) < \infty$. In particular, if $a_j = a$ for all j we get a weight function w with a strong zero at a , that is, $w(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow a$ faster than any power function $|x - a|^\alpha$.

(b) Under an additional assumption that the partial products $\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j}$ are non-negative on K for all large k , a minor modification of the proof that relies on (2.6) instead of (2.19), shows that (2.24) also holds $w(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j} \right|^{1/2}$.

(c) The assumption that K is regular and $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset K$ can be dropped. In this case, the proof remains the same except (2.28) which becomes

$$2S(K, w_k) \exp\left[-\sum_{j=1}^k g_K(a_j)\right] \leq \frac{\|w_k T_{n, w_k}\|_K}{\text{Cap}(K)^n} \leq \frac{\|w_k T_{n, w}\|_K}{\text{Cap}(K)^n} \quad (2.29)$$

and yields

$$W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w) \exp\left[-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g_K(a_j)\right], \quad n \geq 1. \quad (2.30)$$

For future use, we introduce the following definition and record a few simple observations.

Definition 2.8. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a regular compact set. We call a weight w on K a *rational product weight* if it is not identically zero and is of one of the following two forms:

$$w(x) = \left| \frac{P_{d_0}(x)}{Q_{d_1}(x)} \right| \quad \text{or} \quad w(x) = \left| \frac{P_{d_0}(x)}{Q_{d_1}(x)} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{x - a_j}{x - b_j} \right|, \quad (2.31)$$

where $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset K$, $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus K$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.6, P_{d_0} is a polynomial of degree d_0 with all zeros in K , and Q_{d_1} is a polynomial of degree d_1 with all zeros outside of K .

By (2.20) and Theorem 2.6, every rational product weight w is in the Szegő class on K , that is, $S(K, w) > 0$ since $S(K, w_1 w_2) = S(K, w_1) S(K, w_2)$ for any bounded weights w_1, w_2 .

Lemma 2.9. *A product of finitely many rational product weights is again a rational product weight.*

Proof. A product of finitely many polynomials is again a polynomial. Moreover, m pairs of sequences $\{a_{k,j}, b_{k,j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2.6 can be rearranged into a single pair of sequences $\{a_j, b_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$, defined by $a_{(j-1)m+k} = a_{k,j}$, $b_{(j-1)m+k} = b_{k,j}$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, $j \geq 1$, which again satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.6 and hence $\prod_{k=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{x-a_{k,j}}{x-b_{k,j}} \right| = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{x-a_j}{x-b_j} \right|$. \square

Theorem 2.10. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a regular compact set and suppose w is a rational product weight on K of the form (2.31). Then for all $n > d_1 - d_0$,*

$$W_{\infty,n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w). \quad (2.32)$$

Proof. In the case of a rational weight w , (2.32) follows from (2.19). In the other case of w , the proof requires only a slight modification of the proof of Theorem 2.6.

Let $w_0 = |P_{d_0}/Q_{d_1}|$ and recall that $w_k(x) = \prod_{j=1}^k \left| \frac{x-a_j}{x-b_j} \right|$ converge monotonically and uniformly on K . Then $w_0 w_k \rightarrow w$ monotonically and uniformly on K and so as in (2.26) and (2.27), we get $\|w_0 w_k T_{n,w}\|_K \rightarrow \|w T_{n,w}\|_K$ and $S(K, w_0 w_k) \rightarrow S(K, w)$. By (2.19), we have for all $n > d_1 - d_0$,

$$2S(K, w_0 w_k) \leq \frac{\|w_0 w_k T_{n,w_0 w_k}\|_K}{\text{Cap}(K)^n} \leq \frac{\|w_0 w_k T_{n,w}\|_K}{\text{Cap}(K)^n}. \quad (2.33)$$

Then taking the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ finishes the proof. \square

Remark 2.11. The assumption that P_{d_0} has zeros on K can be dropped. In this case, instead of (2.32) we get (2.19), where $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{d_0}$ are the zeros of P_{d_0} repeated according to their multiplicities.

3. ASYMPTOTIC LOWER BOUNDS FOR L^∞ NORM

In this section, we extend Widom's asymptotic lower bound (1.11) to Szegő class weights with finitely many zeros on K . We start with some preparatory results.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a compact set containing an interval $I = [\alpha, \beta]$. Then for all $z = x + iy$ with $x \in (\alpha, \beta)$ the Green function $g_K(z)$ satisfies*

$$|g_K(z)| \leq \frac{|y|}{\sqrt{(\beta-x)(x-\alpha)}}. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. By the maximum principle for harmonic functions, $g_K(z) \leq g_I(z)$ for all z and hence it suffices to prove the inequality for g_I . By shifting and scaling, we may assume without loss of generality that $I = [-1, 1]$ in which case $g_I(z) = \log|z + \sqrt{z^2 - 1}| = \text{Re} \log(z + \sqrt{z^2 - 1})$. Then using the Cauchy–Riemann equations, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} g_I(z) = -\text{Im} \frac{d}{dz} \log(z + \sqrt{z^2 - 1}) = -\text{Im} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z^2 - 1}}. \quad (3.2)$$

It follows that $|\frac{\partial}{\partial y}g_I(z)| \leq \frac{1}{|z+1|^{1/2}|z-1|^{1/2}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}$. Then since $g_I(x) = 0$ we have

$$|g_I(z)| = \left| \int_0^y \frac{\partial}{\partial t} g_I(x+it) dt \right| \leq \frac{|y|}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}. \quad (3.3)$$

□

Theorem 3.2. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a compact set given by a disjoint union of a closed interval $[\alpha, \beta]$ and some other closed set. Let w be a bounded weight of the Szegő class on K (i.e., $S(K, w) > 0$), continuous at almost every point of $[\alpha, \beta]$, and bounded away from zero outside arbitrarily small neighborhoods of $x_0 \in K$ (i.e., for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $L > 0$ such that $w(x) \geq L$ for all $x \in K$ with $|x - x_0| > \varepsilon$). Then there exists a weight function w_0 of the form (2.23) with the zeros and poles satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2.6 and such that for some $C > 0$,*

$$Cw_0(x) \leq w(x), \quad x \in K. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $w \leq \frac{1}{2}$ on K and x_0 is not the left end point of $[\alpha, \beta]$. Pick a strictly increasing sequence $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset (\alpha, \beta)$ such that $y_k \rightarrow x_0$. Since w is of the Szegő class and $\log w \leq 0$ we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{y_k}^{y_{k+1}} |\log w(x)| d\mu_K(x) \leq \int_K |\log w(x)| d\mu_K(x) < \infty. \quad (3.5)$$

It is known that the equilibrium measure μ_K can be regarded as the balayage of the Dirac point mass at infinity onto K . This connection together with the properties of balayage measures [30, Section 2.1] imply that on the interval $[\alpha, \beta]$, the equilibrium measure $d\mu_K$ is absolutely continuous $d\mu_K(x) = w_K(x)dx$ with the density function $w_K(x)$ continuous on (α, β) and satisfying,

$$w_K(x) \geq \frac{D}{\sqrt{(x-\alpha)(\beta-x)}}, \quad x \in (\alpha, \beta), \quad (3.6)$$

for some $D > 0$.

By assumption, $w(x)$ is continuous at a.e. $x \in [\alpha, \beta]$ and $\log w$ is bounded on each $[y_k, y_{k+1}]$. It follows that $\log w$ is Riemann–Stieltjes integrable with respect to $d\mu_K$ on each $[y_k, y_{k+1}]$ and hence $\int_{y_k}^{y_{k+1}} |\log w(x)| d\mu_K(x)$ can be approximated by the upper Darboux sum. For each $k \geq 1$, let $\{x_j\}_{j=n_k}^{n_{k+1}}$ be a partition of $[y_k, y_{k+1}]$ such that

$$\left| \int_{y_k}^{y_{k+1}} |\log w(x)| d\mu_K(x) - \sum_{j=n_k}^{n_{k+1}-1} \ell_j \mu_K([x_j, x_{j+1}]) \right| < \frac{1}{2^k}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $\ell_j = \sup_{x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]} |\log w(x)|$, $j \geq 1$. Then by (3.5) and (3.7),

$$\sum_{j=1}^\infty \ell_j \mu_K([x_j, x_{j+1}]) < \infty. \quad (3.8)$$

The remainder of the proof is split into two cases.

Case I: Assume that x_0 is a boundary point of $[\alpha, \beta]$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $x_0 = \beta$. Now set

$$a_0 = x_0, \quad b_0 = a_0 + i, \quad r_0 = 1 \quad (3.9)$$

$$a_j = x_j, \quad b_j = a_j + i(x_{j+1} - x_j), \quad r_j = \lceil \ell_j / \log 2 \rceil, \quad j \geq 1, \quad (3.10)$$

and define the weight function w_0 by the infinite product $w_0(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \left| \frac{x-a_j}{x-b_j} \right|^{r_j}$. Since by construction $\left| \frac{x-a_j}{x-b_j} \right| \leq 1$ on \mathbb{R} and $\left| \frac{x-a_j}{x-b_j} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ on $[x_j, x_{j+1}]$ we have $w_0 \leq 1$ on \mathbb{R} and $w_0 \leq 2^{-r_j}$ on $[x_j, x_{j+1}]$, hence

$$w_0(x) \leq e^{-r_j \log 2} \leq e^{-\ell_j} \leq w(x), \quad x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}], \quad j \geq 1. \quad (3.11)$$

In addition, $w_0(x_0) = 0$ by construction, so we have

$$w_0(x) \leq w(x), \quad x \in [y_1, x_0]. \quad (3.12)$$

Since $[\alpha, \beta]$ is a positive distance away from $K \setminus [\alpha, \beta]$, (3.12) implies that $w_0 \leq w$ in an (open) neighborhood of x_0 . Then by assumption there is $L > 0$ such that $w \geq L$ outside of that neighborhood of x_0 hence (3.4) holds with $C = \min\{1, L\}$.

Since $x_j \rightarrow x_0 = \beta$, it follows from (3.6) and (3.8) that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \ell_j \frac{x_{j+1} - x_j}{\sqrt{\beta - x_j}} < \infty. \quad (3.13)$$

Recalling that $w \leq \frac{1}{2}$ we have $\ell_j \geq |\log w| \geq \log 2$ and hence $r_j = \lceil \ell_j / \log 2 \rceil \leq C_1 \ell_j$ for all j with some universal constant $C_1 > 0$. Then using (3.1), for some constants $C_2, C_3 > 0$, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_j g_K(b_j) \leq C_2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_j \frac{|b_j - a_j|}{\sqrt{\beta - a_j}} \leq C_3 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \ell_j \frac{x_{j+1} - x_j}{\sqrt{\beta - x_j}} < \infty. \quad (3.14)$$

In addition, since $x_j \in (\alpha, \beta)$ for all $j \geq 1$ we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_j |b_j - a_j| &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_j (x_{j+1} - x_j) \leq C_1 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \ell_j (x_{j+1} - x_j) \\ &\leq C_1 \sqrt{\beta - \alpha} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \ell_j \frac{x_{j+1} - x_j}{\sqrt{\beta - x_j}} < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Thus, the assumptions of Theorem 2.6 are satisfied for the infinite product w_0 .

Case II: Assume that x_0 is an interior point of $[\alpha, \beta]$. In this case, the construction in the left vicinity of x_0 from the beginning of the proof has to be repeated for the right vicinity of x_0 . Thus, we pick a strictly decreasing sequence $\{\tilde{y}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset (\alpha, \beta)$ and approximate Riemann–Stieltjes integrals $\int_{\tilde{y}_{k+1}}^{\tilde{y}_k} |\log w(x)| d\mu_K(x)$ by the upper Darboux sums. As before this gives us a strictly decreasing sequence $\{\tilde{x}_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ such

that $\tilde{x}_1 = \tilde{y}_1$, $\tilde{x}_j \rightarrow x_0$ and $\tilde{\ell}_j := \sup_{x \in [\tilde{x}_{j+1}, \tilde{x}_j]} |\log w(x)|$, $j \geq 1$, satisfy

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\ell}_j \mu_K([\tilde{x}_{j+1}, \tilde{x}_j]) < \infty. \quad (3.16)$$

Then we set

$$a_0 = x_0, \quad b_0 = a_0 + i, \quad r_0 = 1, \quad (3.17)$$

$$a_{2j} = x_j, \quad b_{2j} = a_{2j} + i(x_{j+1} - x_j), \quad r_{2j} = \lceil \ell_j / \log 2 \rceil, \quad (3.18)$$

$$a_{2j-1} = \tilde{x}_j, \quad b_{2j-1} = a_{2j-1} + i(\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{x}_{j+1}), \quad r_{2j-1} = \lceil \tilde{\ell}_j / \log 2 \rceil, \quad j \geq 1, \quad (3.19)$$

and define the weight function w_0 by the infinite product $w_0(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \left| \frac{x-a_j}{x-b_j} \right|^{r_j}$. As before the construction yields $w_0 \leq w$ on $[y_1, x_0]$ and now also on $[x_0, \tilde{y}_1]$. Thus, the inequality holds on a neighborhood of x_0 and hence as before we conclude that (3.4) holds with some constant $C > 0$.

Since $\alpha < x_1 < x_j, \tilde{x}_j < \tilde{x}_1 < \beta$ for all j , it follows from (3.6) and (3.8), (3.16) that for some constant $C_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_j |b_j - a_j| &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_{2j} (x_{j+1} - x_j) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_{2j-1} (\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{x}_{j+1}) \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \ell_j \mu_K([x_j, x_{j+1}]) + C_1 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\ell}_j \mu_K([\tilde{x}_{j+1}, \tilde{x}_j]) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Then using (3.1) and the above inequality we also get that for some $C_2 > 0$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_j g_K(b_j) \leq C_2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_j |b_j - a_j| < \infty. \quad (3.21)$$

Thus, the assumptions of Theorem 2.6 are satisfied for the infinite product w_0 . \square

A compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ is called finite gap if it is a disjoint union of intervals. It is known that finite gaps sets are regular for potential theory.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite gap compact set and suppose w is a bounded, Szegő class weight on K such that w is continuous at a.e. point of K and bounded away from zero outside of arbitrarily small neighborhoods of some finite set $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset K$. Then, there exists a rational product weight w_0 such that $w_0 \leq w$ on K .*

Proof. Let U_j 's be disjoint neighborhoods of x_j 's and define $w_j = w$ on U_j and $w_j = 1$ on $K \setminus U_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. In addition, let $w_{m+1} = 1$ on $\cup_{j=1}^m U_j$ and $w_{m+1} = w$ on $K \setminus (\cup_{j=1}^m U_j)$ so that $w = w_1 \cdots w_{m+1}$. Then the weights w_1, \dots, w_{m+1} satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 and hence there are constants $C_j > 0$ and weights $w_{0,j}$ of the form (2.23) satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2.6 such that $C_j w_{0,j} \leq w_j$ on K for each $j = 1, \dots, m+1$. Hence $w_0 := C_1 w_{0,1} \cdots C_{m+1} w_{0,m+1}$

satisfies $w_0 \leq w_1 \cdots w_{m+1} = w$. Moreover, since each $C_j w_j$ is a rational product weight, by Lemma 2.9, w_0 is also a rational product weight. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite gap compact set and suppose w is a Riemann integrable weight on K and either*

- (a) *there exists a rational product weight w_0 such that $w_0 \leq w$ on K or*
- (b) *w is bounded away from zero outside of arbitrarily small neighborhoods of some finite set $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset K$.*

Then,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w). \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. The inequality is trivial for non-Szegő class weights, so assume $S(K, w) > 0$.

(a) Since w is Riemann integrable, it is bounded on K and continuous at almost every point of K . Let $f(x) = w_0(x)/w(x)$ for all $x \in K$ where $w(x) \neq 0$ and $f(x) = 1$ where $w(x) = 0$. Then $f \leq 1$ on K and f is continuous at a.e. point of K . It follows that there is a sequence of polynomials P_j with zeros outside of K such that $f \leq P_j \leq 2$ on K and $P_j \rightarrow f$ pointwise a.e. on K . Let $w_j(x) = w_0(x)/P_j(x)$. Then each w_j is a rational product weight satisfying $\frac{1}{2}w_0 \leq w_j \leq w$ on K and $w_j \rightarrow w$ a.e. on K . Hence

$$\|w_j T_{n, w_j}\|_K \leq \|w_j T_{n, w}\|_K \leq \|w T_{n, w}\|_K \quad (3.23)$$

so $W_{\infty, n}(K, w_j) \leq W_{\infty, n}(K, w)$.

By Theorem 2.10, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w_j T_{n, w_j}\|_K \geq 2S(K, w_j)$, hence

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w_j) \geq 2S(K, w_j). \quad (3.24)$$

Since w_0 is in the Szegő class and $\frac{1}{2}w_0 \leq w_j$, it follows from the dominated convergence theorem that $S(K, w_j) \rightarrow S(K, w)$. Thus, taking $j \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.24) yields (3.22).

(b) follows from (a) since by Corollary 3.3 there is a rational product weight w_0 such that $w_0 \leq w$ on K . \square

Theorem 3.5. *Let w be a Riemann integrable weight on an interval $K = [\alpha, \beta]$ such that either*

- (a) *there exists a rational product weight w_0 such that $w_0 \leq w$ on K , or*
- (b) *w is bounded away from zero outside of arbitrarily small neighborhoods of some finite set $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset K$, or*
- (c) *w is not of the Szegő class, that is, $S(K, w) = 0$.*

Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) = 2S(K, w). \quad (3.25)$$

Proof. Since by assumption w is Riemann integrable on K , it is continuous at almost every point of K and hence $w(x)$ equals its upper semi-continuous modification

$$\hat{w}(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{t \in K, |t-x| < r} w(t) \quad (3.26)$$

a.e. on K . Then $S(K, \hat{w}) = S(K, w)$ and it is also known (see e.g. [22, Lemma 1]) that $W_{\infty, n}(K, \hat{w}) = W_{\infty, n}(K, w)$ for all n . Thus, by replacing w with \hat{w} we may assume without loss of generality that w is upper semi-continuous.

For a bounded, non-negative, upper semi-continuous, Szegő class weight w on an interval K , Widom showed in [32, Theorem 11.4] that,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \leq 2S(K, w). \quad (3.27)$$

This asymptotic upper bound also holds for non-Szegő class weights w . Indeed, let $w_\varepsilon = w + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a constant. Then the weight w_ε is upper semi-continuous and bounded away from zero hence w is of the Szegő class. Thus, (3.27) holds for w_ε . Since $w \leq w_\varepsilon$ we have $W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \leq W_{\infty, n}(K, w_\varepsilon)$ for all n and hence $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \leq 2S(K, w_\varepsilon)$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ then yields $S(K, w_\varepsilon) \rightarrow S(K, w)$ hence (3.27) holds for all upper semi-continuous weights.

The corresponding asymptotic lower bound,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty, n}(K, w) \geq 2S(K, w), \quad (3.28)$$

trivially holds for non-Szegő class weights and follows from Theorem 3.4 for Szegő class weights. The two matching asymptotic bounds then give (3.25). \square

Remark 3.6. The assumption (b) in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 is satisfied for $w = w_0 w_1$, where w_1 is a Riemann integrable weight bounded away from zero on K and w_0 is an arbitrary continuous weight with at most finitely many zeros on K . The assumption (a) in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 is satisfied for any rational product weight w (Definition 2.8), in particular, (a) holds for some continuous, Szegő class weights with infinitely many zeros.

4. LOWER BOUNDS FOR L^2 NORM

In this section we derive lower bounds for L^2 norms of monic polynomials. We assume that w is a weight function on K with $w \in L^1(K, d\mu_K)$, $\|w\|_{L^1(K, d\mu_K)} > 0$ and define $d\mu = w d\mu_K$. As is well known the n -th degree monic orthogonal polynomial P_n minimizes the $L^2(K, d\mu)$ norm among all monic polynomials of degree n . The Widom factors for the $L^2(K, d\mu)$ norm are defined in (1.15).

We start with a preparatory result on the invariance of harmonic measures under the universal covering map. While there are several versions of Theorem 4.1 in the literature, neither is stated in a suitable form or sufficient generality for our purposes. In [15, Section 2.4], regularity of the set is assumed and in [18, Section 3.7B], Martin boundary is considered instead of Euclidean boundary. We use $\omega_{\Omega_K}(a; \cdot)$ to denote the harmonic measure for Ω_K at $a \in \Omega_K$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let K be a non-polar compact subset of \mathbb{C} . Let $\mathbf{x} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega_K$ be the universal covering map uniquely fixed by the conditions $\mathbf{x}(0) = \infty$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} z\mathbf{x}(z) > 0$. Let \mathbf{x}^* denote the non-tangential limit of \mathbf{x} on $\partial\mathbb{D}$. Let $a \in \Omega_K$*

and $z \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $\mathbf{x}(z) = a$. Then for any $f \in L^1(K, d\mu_K)$, we have

$$\int_K f(t) d\omega_{\Omega_K}(a; t) = \int_0^{2\pi} \operatorname{Re} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} f(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad (4.1)$$

and in particular

$$\int_K f(t) d\mu_K(t) = \int_0^{2\pi} f(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Let $d\mu_{z; \partial\mathbb{D}}$ be $\operatorname{Re} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$ and $d\mu_{\partial\mathbb{D}}$ be the normalized Lebesgue measure on $\partial\mathbb{D}$. Since \mathbf{x} is a universal covering map, the non-tangential limit $\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})$ exists a.e. $d\theta$ and $\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}) \in \partial\Omega_K$, a.e. $d\theta$, see e.g. [21, Chapter 7].

Let ν be the push-forward measure of $d\mu_{z; \partial\mathbb{D}}$ through \mathbf{x}^* . Thus, for every $u \in L^1(d\nu)$, we have

$$\int u d\nu = \int_0^{2\pi} u(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) d\mu_{z; \partial\mathbb{D}}(\theta). \quad (4.3)$$

Let E be the set of irregular boundary points and F be the set of regular boundary points of the domain Ω_K . Then E is a F_σ polar set, see e.g. [24, Theorem 4.2.5]. In view of [31, Theorem VIII.44], $\mu_{\partial\mathbb{D}}((\mathbf{x}^*)^{-1}(E)) = 0$ and thus $\mu_{\partial\mathbb{D}}((\mathbf{x}^*)^{-1}(F)) = 1$. Let u be a continuous real-valued function on $\partial\Omega_K$ and H_u denote the solution of the Dirichlet problem in Ω_K for the boundary function u . Then, for any $z_0 \in F$,

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \Omega_K} H_u(z) = u(z_0), \quad (4.4)$$

see e.g. [25, Theorem 2.1, Appendix A.2]. Therefore,

$$\lim_{r \uparrow 1} H_u(\mathbf{x}(re^{i\theta})) = u(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) \text{ a.e. } d\theta. \quad (4.5)$$

Hence, $H_u(\mathbf{x})$ is harmonic and bounded in \mathbb{D} with non-tangential boundary values $u(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))$ for $d\theta$ a.e. Therefore,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} u(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) d\mu_{z; \partial\mathbb{D}}(\theta) = H_u(\mathbf{x}(z)) = H_u(a) = \int u(t) d\omega_{\Omega_K}(a; t) \quad (4.6)$$

Clearly, (4.6) holds for any complex valued continuous function u on $\partial\Omega_K$. Combining (4.3) and (4.6), we see that, for any continuous $u : \partial\Omega_K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$\int u d\nu = \int u(t) d\omega_{\Omega_K}(a; t). \quad (4.7)$$

Since $\operatorname{supp}(\nu) \subset \partial\Omega_K$, this implies that $d\nu = d\omega_{\Omega_K}(a; \cdot)$. So (4.3) implies (4.1). The equation (4.2) is just a special case of (4.1) for $z = 0$ and $a = \infty$. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a non-polar compact set and w be a weight function on K such that $w \in L^1(K, d\mu_K)$ and $S(K, w) > 0$. Then,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} [W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \geq 2S(K, w). \quad (4.8)$$

Suppose, in addition that, K is regular and the weight w is a rational function,

$$w(x) = c \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{d_0} (x - a_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{d_1} (x - b_j)}, \quad (4.9)$$

which is bounded on K and let $d = d_1 - d_0$. Then for all $n > d/2$,

$$[W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \geq \frac{2S(K, w)}{1 + \sqrt{1 - \exp[-2 \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j)]}}. \quad (4.10)$$

Furthermore, assume that $a_j \in K$ for each j . Then for all $n > d/2$,

$$[W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \geq 2S(K, w). \quad (4.11)$$

The equality in (4.11) is attained for some $n > d/2$ if and only if there is a polynomial Q_n of degree n such that its zeros are disjoint from $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{d_1}$ and

$$K = (wQ_n^2)^{-1}([0, 1]). \quad (4.12)$$

In that case, $P_n = T_{n, \sqrt{w}}$ and $Q_n = rP_n$, where r is a non-zero real number.

Proof. We will proceed by transferring the problem to the unit disk using the uniformization (see [15, Chapter 2], [20, Chapters 13–16]). Let $\mathbf{x} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus K$ be the universal covering map uniquely fixed by the conditions $\mathbf{x}(0) = \infty$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} z\mathbf{x}(z) > 0$. Let $B(z)$ be the analytic function in \mathbb{D} determined by

$$|B(z)| = e^{-g_K(\mathbf{x}(z))} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{x}(z)B(z) = \text{Cap}(K) \quad (4.13)$$

and $B(z, z_0)$ be the analytic function in \mathbb{D} determined by

$$|B(z, z_0)| = e^{-g_K(\mathbf{x}(z), \mathbf{x}(z_0))} \quad \text{and} \quad B(0, z_0) > 0. \quad (4.14)$$

The covering map has radial limits $\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}) \in K$ a.e. on $\partial\mathbb{D}$ and the equilibrium measure is preserved under the covering map (see Theorem 4.1),

$$\int_K f(t) d\mu_K(t) = \int_0^{2\pi} f(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \quad \text{for all } f \in L^1(K, d\mu_K). \quad (4.15)$$

By assumption $w \in L^1(K, \mu_K)$ and $S(K, w) > 0$ hence $\log(w(\cdot)) \in L^1(K, d\mu_K)$ and so $\log(w \circ \mathbf{x}^*) \in L^1(\partial\mathbb{D}, \frac{d\theta}{2\pi})$. It follows that there is an analytic function $R(z)$ on \mathbb{D} with $R(0) > 0$ and the boundary values $|R(e^{i\theta})|^2 = w(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))$,

$$R(z) = \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \log[w(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))] \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right). \quad (4.16)$$

We note that $R \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and by (4.15) and (1.5),

$$R(0) = \sqrt{S(K, w)}. \quad (4.17)$$

Let P_n denote the n -th monic orthogonal polynomial in $L^2(d\mu)$ where $d\mu = w d\mu_K$. Since $B^n(z)P_n(\mathbf{x}(z))$ is a bounded analytic function on \mathbb{D} we have $B^n P_n(\mathbf{x}(\cdot))R \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and hence

$$\int_0^{2\pi} B^n(e^{i\theta})P_n(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))R(e^{i\theta})\frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \text{Cap}(K)^n R(0) = \text{Cap}(K)^n \sqrt{S(K, w)}. \quad (4.18)$$

Let $U(e^{i\theta}) = R(e^{i\theta})/|R(e^{i\theta})|$ so that $R(e^{i\theta}) = \sqrt{w(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))}U(e^{i\theta})$. Since the orthogonal polynomials on the real line are necessarily real we have

$$\int_0^{2\pi} P_n(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))\sqrt{w(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))}\text{Re}[U(e^{i\theta})B^n(e^{i\theta})]\frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \sqrt{S(K, w)}\text{Cap}(K)^n. \quad (4.19)$$

Then by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$S(K, w)\text{Cap}(K)^{2n} \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |P_n(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))|^2 w(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))\frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |\text{Re}[U(e^{i\theta})B^n(e^{i\theta})]|^2 \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}. \quad (4.20)$$

Since $|U(e^{i\theta})B^n(e^{i\theta})| = 1$, we have

$$2|\text{Re}[U(e^{i\theta})B^n(e^{i\theta})]|^2 = 1 + \text{Re}[U^2(e^{i\theta})B^{2n}(e^{i\theta})] \quad (4.21)$$

and hence

$$2S(K, w) \leq [W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \left(1 + \text{Re} \int_0^{2\pi} U^2(e^{i\theta})B^{2n}(e^{i\theta})\frac{d\theta}{2\pi}\right). \quad (4.22)$$

As noted in [11, Lemma 8.5], the functions $\{B^m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are orthonormal in $L^2(\partial\mathbb{D}, \frac{d\theta}{2\pi})$ by Cauchy's theorem, hence it follows from Bessel's inequality that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{2\pi} U^2(e^{i\theta})B^{2n}(e^{i\theta})\frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = 0. \quad (4.23)$$

Thus, the asymptotic lower bound (4.8) follows from (4.22) and (4.23).

Next, we turn to the non-asymptotic lower bound (4.10) for bounded rational weights w . Without loss of generality, we assume that the numerator and denominator of w in (4.9) have no common zeros. By reordering the zeros if necessary, we also assume that $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{d'_0}$, $0 \leq d'_0 \leq d_0$, are the zeros of w (repeated according to their multiplicities) that lie outside of K .

Pick $z_j \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $\mathbf{x}(z_j) = a_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, d'_0$ and $p_j \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $\mathbf{x}(p_j) = b_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, d_1$. Consider the function

$$L(z) = w(\mathbf{x}(z))B^{d_0}(z) \prod_{j=1}^{d_1} B(z, p_j) \text{ on } \mathbb{D}. \quad (4.24)$$

By construction, $L(z)$ has removable singularities at the poles of $w(\mathbf{x}(z))$ and we extend $L(z)$ to an analytic function on \mathbb{D} . Since by assumption w is bounded on K ,

it is also bounded in a neighborhood of K and hence $L(z)$ is bounded on \mathbb{D} . Then by the inner-outer factorization,

$$L(z) = \vartheta(z)B^{d_1}(z) \prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(z, z_j)R^2(z), \quad (4.25)$$

where $\vartheta(z)$ is some inner function, in particular $|\vartheta(z)| \leq 1$ on \mathbb{D} . Then, using (4.25), (4.24), (4.13), (4.14), (4.17), and (2.20) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\vartheta(0)| &= \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{w(\mathbf{x}(z))B^{d_0}(z) \prod_{j=1}^{d_1} B(z, p_j)}{B^{d_1}(z) \prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(z, z_j)R^2(z)} \right| \\ &= \frac{|c|\text{Cap}(K)^{d_0} \exp \left[-\sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_K(b_j) \right]}{\text{Cap}(K)^{d_1} \exp \left[-\sum_{j=1}^{d'_0} g_K(a_j) \right] S(K, w)} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

which implies, by the maximum modulus principle, that $\vartheta(z)$ is a unimodular constant on \mathbb{D} . Thus, for some constant $\psi \in \partial\mathbb{D}$,

$$R^2(z) = \psi w(\mathbf{x}(z))B^{-d}(z) \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{d_1} B(z, p_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(z, z_j)}, \quad (4.27)$$

and hence

$$U^2(z) = \psi B^{-d}(z) \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{d_1} B(z, p_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(z, z_j)}. \quad (4.28)$$

It follows from Cauchy's theorem that in $L^2(\partial\mathbb{D}, \frac{d\theta}{2\pi})$ the constant function $\mathbf{1}$ is orthogonal to $\prod_{j=1}^{d_1} B(\cdot, p_j)B^m(\cdot)$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and both have unit norm. Then by Bessel's inequality, we have for $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left\langle \prod_{j=1}^{d_1} B(\cdot, p_j)B^m(\cdot), \prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(\cdot, z_j) \right\rangle \right|^2 &\leq \left\| \prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(\cdot, z_j) \right\|^2 - \left| \left\langle \mathbf{1}, \prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(\cdot, z_j) \right\rangle \right|^2 \\ &= 1 - \left| \prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(0, z_j) \right|^2 = 1 - \exp \left[-2 \sum_{j=1}^{d'_0} g_K(\mathbf{x}(z_j)) \right] = 1 - \exp \left[-2 \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

Hence for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > d/2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re} \int_0^{2\pi} U^2(e^{i\theta})B^{2n}(e^{i\theta}) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} &\leq \left| \int_0^{2\pi} U^2(e^{i\theta})B^{2n}(e^{i\theta}) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right| \\ &= \left| \left\langle \prod_{j=1}^{d'_0} B(\cdot, z_j), \prod_{j=1}^{d_1} B(\cdot, p_j)B^{2n-d}(\cdot) \right\rangle \right| \leq \left(1 - \exp \left[-2 \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j) \right] \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Combining (4.30) with (4.22) we obtain

$$2S(K, w) \leq [W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \left(1 + \left(1 - \exp \left[-2 \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j) \right] \right)^{1/2} \right) \quad (4.31)$$

which yields the desired lower bound (4.10).

When $a_j \in K$ for all j , we have $g_K(a_j) = 0$ for all j and hence (4.11) follows from (4.10).

The only remaining part is the equivalence of (4.12) with the equality in (4.11). First, let us assume that the equality in (4.11) holds. Since by assumption K is regular and $a_j \in K$ for all j , it follows from (4.30) that

$$\operatorname{Re} \int_0^{2\pi} U^2(e^{i\theta}) B^{2n}(e^{i\theta}) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \leq 0. \quad (4.32)$$

Hence, we have equality in both (4.22) and (4.20) and also

$$\operatorname{Re} \int_0^{2\pi} U^2(e^{i\theta}) B^{2n}(e^{i\theta}) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = 0. \quad (4.33)$$

Equality in the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality (4.20) and the identity (4.21) yield

$$\frac{|P_n(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))|^2 w(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))}{\|P_n \sqrt{w}\|_{L^2(d\mu_K)}^2} = 1 + \operatorname{Re}(U^2(e^{i\theta}) B^{2n}(e^{i\theta})) \text{ for a.e. } \theta. \quad (4.34)$$

Since $1 + \operatorname{Re}(U^2(e^{i\theta}) B^{2n}(e^{i\theta})) \leq 2$ for a.e. θ , combining (4.34) with the equality in (4.11), we see that

$$\|P_n(\mathbf{x}^*(\cdot)) \sqrt{w(\mathbf{x}^*(\cdot))}\|_{L^\infty(d\theta)}^2 \leq 4S(K, w) \operatorname{Cap}(K)^{2n}. \quad (4.35)$$

The inequality (4.35) implies

$$\|P_n \sqrt{w}\|_{L^\infty(d\mu_K)} \leq 2S(K, \sqrt{w}) \operatorname{Cap}(K)^n. \quad (4.36)$$

In view of the regularity assumption on K , we have $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_K) = K$ (see [24, Theorem 4.2.3] and [29, Corollary 5.5.12]). Since $P_n \sqrt{w}$ is continuous on K , it follows from (4.36) that

$$\|P_n \sqrt{w}\|_K \leq 2S(K, \sqrt{w}) \operatorname{Cap}(K)^n. \quad (4.37)$$

Thus, $W_{\infty,n}(K, \sqrt{w}) \leq 2S(K, \sqrt{w})$. It was shown in (2.7) that $W_{\infty,n}(K, \sqrt{w}) \geq 2S(K, \sqrt{w})$. Thus, it follows from Theorem 2.3 that $K = (wQ_n^2)^{-1}([0, 1])$ where Q_n is a polynomial of degree n whose zeros are disjoint from $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{d_1}$. So (4.12) holds.

Conversely, let us assume that (4.12) holds. Let $F_n := 2wQ_n^2 - 1$. Then

$$K = (wQ_n^2)^{-1}([0, 1]) = F_n^{-1}([-1, 1]). \quad (4.38)$$

In view of Theorem 2.3,

$$Q_n = rT_{n, \sqrt{w}} \quad (4.39)$$

where $|r| = \frac{1}{t_n(K, \sqrt{w})}$. Besides, we have equality in (2.13) and (2.15) which implies that

$$\frac{1}{|r|} = t_n(K, \sqrt{w}) = 2|c|^{1/2} \text{Cap}(K)^{n-d/2} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} g_{L_n}(b_j) \right], \quad (4.40)$$

We argue as in [14, Theorem 2.10]. Let $J(u) = \frac{1}{2}(u + \frac{1}{u})$ be the Joukowski map which maps \mathbb{D} onto $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus [-1, 1]$ conformally. Then $J^{-1}(F_n(\mathbf{x}(\cdot)))$ is a bounded analytic function on \mathbb{D} with the boundary values $|J^{-1}(F_n(\mathbf{x}(e^{i\theta})))| = 1$ a.e. $d\theta$, hence by the inner-outer factorization $J^{-1}(F_n(\mathbf{x}(z))) = \vartheta(z)C(z)$, where $\vartheta(z)$ is a singular inner function and

$$C(z) = B^{2n-d}(z) \prod_{j=1}^{d_1} B(z, p_j) \text{ on } \mathbb{D}. \quad (4.41)$$

In view of (4.40), (4.41), (4.13), (4.14), we have

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{J^{-1}(F_n(\mathbf{x}(z)))}{C(z)} \right| = 1, \quad (4.42)$$

hence ϑ is constant. Then $J^{-1}(F_n(\mathbf{x}(\cdot))) = \phi C$ for some constant $\phi \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ and hence $F_n(\mathbf{x}(\cdot)) = \frac{1}{2}(\phi C + \frac{1}{\phi C})$. Since $\int_0^{2\pi} C(e^{i\theta}) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = 0$ and $|C(e^{i\theta})| = 1$, a.e. θ , for any ϕ , this implies that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} [2w(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))Q_n^2(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) - 1] \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \int_0^{2\pi} F_n(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = 0. \quad (4.43)$$

Hence

$$\int wQ_n^2 d\mu_K = \int_0^{2\pi} w(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta}))Q_n^2(\mathbf{x}^*(e^{i\theta})) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.44)$$

Combining (4.39), (4.44) and (4.38), we get

$$\int wT_{n, \sqrt{w}}^2 d\mu_K = \frac{1}{2r^2} = \frac{\|\sqrt{w}T_{n, \sqrt{w}}\|_K^2}{2} = 2S(K, w)\text{Cap}(K)^{2n}. \quad (4.45)$$

It follows from (4.45) that

$$[W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 \leq 2S(K, w). \quad (4.46)$$

Combined with (4.11) this yields $[W_{2,n}(K, w)]^2 = 2S(K, w)$. Moreover, since the $L^2(d\mu)$ extremal polynomial P_n is unique, it follows from (4.45) that $P_n = T_{n, \sqrt{w}}$ and hence $Q_n = rP_n$ by (4.39). \square

As in the case of Chebyshev polynomials, we can extend the non-asymptotic lower bound (4.11) to rational product weights.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a regular compact set and suppose w is a rational product weight on K of the form (2.31). Then (4.11) holds. In addition, if the assumption that P_{d_0} has zeros on K is dropped in Definition 2.8, then (4.10) holds, where $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{d_0}$ are the zeros of P_{d_0} repeated according to their multiplicities.*

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as in Theorem 2.10. It suffices to consider only the second part where the polynomial P_{d_0} from Definition 2.8 is not assumed to have zeros on K .

Let $w_0 = |P_{d_0}/Q_{d_1}|$. If $w = w_0$, the result is contained in Theorem 4.2. So assume $w(x) = w_0(x) \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{x-a_j}{x-b_j} \right|$. Let $w_k(x) = \prod_{j=1}^k \left| \frac{x-a_j}{x-b_j} \right|$ and recall that $w_0 w_k \rightarrow w$ monotonically and uniformly on K . Then, as in (2.26) and (2.27), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{w_0 w_k} P_{n,w}\|_{L^2(d\mu_K)} &\rightarrow \|\sqrt{w} P_{n,w}\|_{L^2(d\mu_K)} = W_{2,n}(K, w) \text{Cap}(K)^n, \\ S(K, w_0 w_k) &\rightarrow S(K, w), \end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

where $P_{n,w}$ is the n -th monic orthogonal polynomial in $L^2(wd\mu_K)$. By (4.10), we have for all $n > d_1 - d_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2S(K, w_0 w_k)}{1 + \sqrt{1 - \exp[-2 \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} g_K(a_j)]}} &\leq [W_{2,n}(K, w_0 w_k)]^2 \\ &= \frac{\|\sqrt{w_0 w_k} P_{n,w_0 w_k}\|_{L^2(d\mu_K)}^2}{\text{Cap}(K)^{2n}} \leq \frac{\|\sqrt{w_0 w_k} P_{n,w}\|_{L^2(d\mu_K)}^2}{\text{Cap}(K)^{2n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.48)$$

Then taking the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (4.47) finishes the proof. \square

Remark 4.4. The following construction can be found in [16]. Let $\gamma_0 = 1$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence satisfying $0 < \gamma_n < 1/4$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \log(1/\gamma_n) < \infty.$$

Let $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ by

$$f_1(z) := \frac{2z(z-1)}{\gamma_1} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f_n(z) := \frac{z^2}{2\gamma_n} + 1 - \frac{1}{2\gamma_n}$$

for $n > 1$.

Let $E_0 = [0, 1]$ and $E_n = (f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1)^{-1}([-1, 1])$. Then $K(\gamma) := \bigcap_{s=0}^{\infty} E_s$ is a non-polar Cantor set in $[0, 1]$ where $\{0, 1\} \subset K(\gamma)$. It was shown in [17, Proposition 3.1] that

$$W_{\infty, 2^n}(K(\gamma), 1) = \frac{1}{2} \exp \left[2^n \sum_{s=n+1}^{\infty} 2^{-s} \log(1/\gamma_s) \right] \quad (4.49)$$

and it was proved in [4, Eq. (5.3)] that

$$W_{2, 2^n}(K(\gamma), 1) = \frac{\sqrt{1 - 2\gamma_{n+1}}}{2 \exp(\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} 2^{n-k} \log \gamma_k)} \quad (4.50)$$

Assume that $\gamma_n \rightarrow 1/4$. Then it follows from (4.49) and (4.50) that

$$[W_{2, 2^n}(K(\gamma), 1)]^2 \rightarrow 2 \quad \text{and} \quad W_{\infty, 2^n}(K(\gamma), 1) \rightarrow 2. \quad (4.51)$$

Since $[W_{2,s}(K(\gamma), 1)]^2 \geq 2$ ([6, Theorem 3.1]) and $W_{\infty,s}(K(\gamma), 1) \geq 2$ ([26, Theorem 2]), we have

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} [W_{2,s}(K(\gamma), 1)]^2 = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} W_{\infty,s}(K(\gamma), 1) = 2. \quad (4.52)$$

Hence, such a set $K(\gamma)$ is an example of a Cantor set which realizes the equality in both (3.22) and (4.8) for $w \equiv 1$. In addition, depending on how fast γ_n converges to $1/4$ (see [5, Section 7] for the precise statement), we can find a Cantor set $K(\gamma)$ which is a Parreau–Widom set or a non-Parreau–Widom set with this property.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. I. Achieser, *Theory of Approximation*, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1956.
- [2] G. Alpan, *Szegő's condition on compact subsets of \mathbb{C}* , J. Approx. Theory. **245** (2019), 130–136.
- [3] G. Alpan, *Widom factors for generalized Jacobi measures*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **511** (2022), 126098.
- [4] G. Alpan and A. Goncharov, *Orthogonal polynomials for the weakly equilibrium Cantor sets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (2016), 3781–3795.
- [5] G. Alpan and A. Goncharov, *Orthogonal polynomials on generalized Julia sets*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory **11**, (2017), 1845–1864.
- [6] G. Alpan and M. Zinchenko, *Sharp lower bounds for the Widom factors on the real line*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **484** (2020), 123729.
- [7] G. Alpan and M. Zinchenko, *On the Widom factors for L_p extremal polynomials*, J. Approx. Theory **259** (2020), 105480.
- [8] S. N. Bernstein, *Sur les polynômes orthogonaux relatifs à un segment fini*, J. Math. **9** (1930) 127–177; **10** (1931) 219–286.
- [9] J. S. Christiansen, *Szegő's theorem on Parreau-Widom sets*, Adv. Math. **229**, (2012), 1180–1204.
- [10] J. S. Christiansen, B. Eichinger, and O. Rubin, *Extremal polynomials and polynomial preimages*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.12992>
- [11] J. S. Christiansen, B. Simon, and M. Zinchenko, *Finite gap Jacobi matrices, II. The Szegő class*, Constr. Approx. **33** (2011), 365–403.
- [12] J. S. Christiansen, B. Simon, and M. Zinchenko, *Asymptotics of Chebyshev Polynomials, III. Sets Saturating Szegő, Schiefermayr, and Totik–Widom Bounds*, in *Analysis as a Tool in Mathematical Physics – in Memory of Boris Pavlov*, ed. P. Kurasov, A. Laptev, S. Naboko and B. Simon, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. **276** Birkhäuser, Basel, 2020, pp. 231–246. 207–223.
- [13] J. S. Christiansen, B. Simon, and M. Zinchenko, *Asymptotics of Chebyshev polynomials, V. residual polynomials*, Ramanujan J. **61** (2023), 251–278.
- [14] B. Eichinger, M. Lukić, G. Young, *Asymptotics of Chebyshev rational functions with respect to subsets of the real line*, Constr. Approx. **59** (2024), 541–581.
- [15] S. D. Fisher, *Function theory on planar domains*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, (1983).
- [16] A. Goncharov, *Weakly Equilibrium Cantor-type Sets*, Potential Anal. **40** (2014), 143–161.
- [17] A. Goncharov and B. Hatinoğlu, *Widom factors*, Potential Anal. **42** (2015), 671–680.
- [18] M. Hasumi, *Hardy classes on infinitely connected Riemann surfaces*, Lecture Notes in Math. **1027**, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [19] D. S. Lubinsky and E. B. Saff, *Strong asymptotics for L_p extremal polynomials ($1 < p \leq \infty$) associated with weights on $[-1, 1]$* . In: Saff, E.B. (eds) Approximation Theory, Tampa. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol 1287. Springer, Berlin, 1987.
- [20] D. Marshall, *Complex Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 2019.

- [21] R. Nevanlinna, *Analytic Functions*, Springer-Verlag (1970).
- [22] G. Novello, K. Schiefermayr, M. Zinchenko, *Weighted Chebyshev Polynomials on Compact Subsets of the Complex Plane*, In: Gesztesy, F., Martinez-Finkelshtein, A. (eds) *From Operator Theory to Orthogonal Polynomials, Combinatorics, and Number Theory . Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*, **285**. Birkhäuser, Cham, 2021, pp. 357–370.
- [23] F. Peherstorfer and P. Yuditskii, *Asymptotic behavior of polynomials orthonormal on a homogeneous set*, *J. Anal. Math.* **89** (2003), 113–154.
- [24] T. Ransford, *Potential Theory in the Complex Plane*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [25] E. Saff and V. Totik, *Logarithmic Potentials with External Fields*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften **316**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [26] K. Schiefermayr, *A lower bound for the minimum deviation of the Chebyshev polynomial on a compact real set*, *East J. Approx.* **14** (2008), 223–233.
- [27] K. Schiefermayr, M. Zinchenko, *Norm estimates for Chebyshev polynomials, I*, *J. Approx. Theory*, **265** (2021), 105561.
- [28] B. Simon, *Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle, Part 1: Classical Theory, Part 2: Spectral Theory*, AMS Colloquium Publication Series, Vol. 54, Providence, RI, 2005.
- [29] B. Simon, *Szegő's Theorem and Its Descendants: Spectral Theory for L^2 Perturbations of Orthogonal Polynomials*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2011.
- [30] V. Totik, *Metric Properties of Harmonic Measures*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **184** (2006), no. 867, vi+163 pp.
- [31] M. Tsuji, *Potential theory in modern function theory*, Chelsea Publishing Co., New York (1975), Reprinting of the 1959 original.
- [32] H. Widom, *Extremal polynomials associated with a system of curves in the complex plane*, *Adv. in Math.* **3** (1969), 127–232.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND NATURAL SCIENCES, SABANCI UNIVERSITY, İSTANBUL, TURKEY
Email address: gokalp.alpan@sabanciuniv.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87131, USA
Email address: maxim@math.unm.edu