

MATRICES ASSOCIATED WITH MOVING LEAST-SQUARES APPROXIMATION AND CORRESPONDING INEQUALITIES

SVETOSLAV NENOV AND TSVETELIN TSVETKOV

ABSTRACT. In this article, some properties of matrices of moving least-squares approximation have been proven. The used technique is based on singular-value decomposition and inequalities for singular-values. Some inequalities for the norm of coefficients-vector of the linear approximation have been proven.

1. STATEMENT

Let us remind the definition of moving least-squares approximation and a basic result.

Let:

- (1) \mathcal{D} be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^d .
- (2) $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$; $\mathbf{x}_i \neq \mathbf{x}_j$, if $i \neq j$.
- (3) $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function.
- (4) $p_i : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous functions, $i = 1, \dots, l$. The functions $\{p_1, \dots, p_l\}$ are linearly independent in \mathcal{D} and let \mathcal{P}_l be their linear span.
- (5) $W : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a strong positive function.

Usually the basis in \mathcal{P}_l is constructed by monomials. For example: $p_l(\mathbf{x}) = x_1^{k_1} \dots x_d^{k_d}$, where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$, $k_1, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_1 + \dots + k_d \leq l - 1$. In the case $d = 1$, the standard basis is $\{1, x, \dots, x^{l-1}\}$.

Following [1], [10], [11], [12], we will use the following definition. The *moving least-squares approximation* of order l at a fixed point \mathbf{x} is the value of $p^*(\mathbf{x})$, where $p^* \in \mathcal{P}_l$ is minimizing the least-squares error

$$\sum_{i=1}^m W(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i\|) (p(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}_i))^2$$

among all $p \in \mathcal{P}_l$.

The approximation is “local” if weight function W is fast decreasing as its argument tends to infinity and interpolation is achieved if $W(0) =$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 93E24.

Key words and phrases. moving least-squares approximation, singular-values.

∞ . So, we define additional function $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, such taht:

$$w(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{W(r)}, & \text{if } (r > 0) \text{ or } (r = 0 \text{ and } W(0) < \infty), \\ 0, & \text{if } (r = 0 \text{ and } W(0) = \infty). \end{cases}$$

Some examples of $W(r)$ and $w(r)$, $r \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} W(r) &= e^{-\alpha^2 r^2} && \text{exp-weight,} \\ W(r) &= r^{-\alpha^2} && \text{Shepard weights,} \\ w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) &= r^2 e^{-\alpha^2 r^2} && \text{McLain weight,} \\ w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) &= e^{\alpha^2 r^2} - 1 && \text{see Levin's works.} \end{aligned}$$

Here and below: $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_2$ is 2-norm, $\|\cdot\|_1$ is 1-norm in \mathbb{R}^d ; the superscript t denotes transpose of real matrix; I is the identity matrix.

We introduce the notations:

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} p_1(\mathbf{x}_1) & p_2(\mathbf{x}_1) & \cdots & p_l(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ p_1(\mathbf{x}_2) & p_2(\mathbf{x}_2) & \cdots & p_l(\mathbf{x}_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ p_1(\mathbf{x}_m) & p_2(\mathbf{x}_m) & \cdots & p_l(\mathbf{x}_m) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{a} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \\ \vdots \\ a_m \end{pmatrix},$$

$$D = 2 \begin{pmatrix} w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_1) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_2) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_m) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{c} = \begin{pmatrix} p_1(\mathbf{x}) \\ p_2(\mathbf{x}) \\ \vdots \\ p_l(\mathbf{x}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Through the article, we assume the following conditions (H1):

- (H1.1) $1 \in \mathcal{P}_l$.
- (H1.2) $1 \leq l \leq m$.
- (H1.3) $\text{rank}(E^t) = l$.
- (H1.4) w is smooth function.

Theorem 1.1 (see [10]). *Let the conditions (H1) hold true.*

Then:

- (1) *The matrix $E^t D^{-1} E$ is non-singular.*
- (2) *The approximation defined by the moving least-squares method is*

$$\hat{L}(f) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i f(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\mathbf{a} = A_0 \mathbf{c} \quad \text{and} \quad A_0 = D^{-1} E (E^t D^{-1} E)^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

- (3) If $w(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_i\|) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, then the approximation is interpolatory.

For the approximation order of moving least-squares approximation (see [10] and [5]) it is not difficult to receive (for convenience we suppose $d = 1$ and standard polynomial basis, see [5]):

$$\left| f(x) - \hat{L}(f)(x) \right| \leq \|f(x) - p^*(x)\|_\infty \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^m |a_i| \right], \quad (3)$$

and moreover ($C = \text{const.}$)

$$\|f(x) - p^*(x)\|_\infty \leq Ch^{l+1} \max \{ |f^{(l+1)}(x)| : x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}} \}. \quad (4)$$

It follows from (3) and (4) that the error of moving least-squares approximation is upper-bounded from the 2-norm of coefficients of approximation ($\|\mathbf{a}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{m}\|\mathbf{a}\|_2$). That is why, the goal in this short note, is to discuss a method for majorization in the form

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 \leq M \exp(N\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i\|),$$

Here the constants M and N depends on singular values of matrix E^t , and numbers m and l (see Section 3). In Section 2 some properties of matrices associated with approximation (symmetry, positive semi-definiteness, and norm majorization by $\sigma_{\min}(E^t)$ and $\sigma_{\max}(E^t)$) are proven.

The main result in Section 3 is formulated in the case of exp-moving least-squares approximation, but it is not hard to receive analogous results in the different cases: Backus-Gilbert wight functions, McLain wight functions, etc.

2. SOME AUXILIARY LEMMAS

Definition 2.1. We will call the matrices

$$A_1 = A_0 E^t = D^{-1} E (E^t D^{-1} E)^{-1} E^t \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 = A_1 - I$$

A_1 -matrix and A_2 -matrix of the approximation \hat{L} , respectively.

Lemma 2.1. Let the conditions (H1) hold true.

Then, the matrices $A_1 D^{-1}$ and $A_2 D^{-1}$ are symmetric.

Proof. Direct calculation of the corresponding transpose matrices. \square

Lemma 2.2. Let the conditions (H1) hold true.

Then:

- (1) All eigenvalues of A_1 are 1 and 0 with geometric multiplicity l and $m - l$, respectively.
- (2) All eigenvalues of A_2 are 0 and -1 with geometric multiplicity l and $m - l$, respectively.

Proof. Part 1. We will prove that the dimension of the null-space $\dim(\text{null}(A_2))$ is at least l .

Using the definition of $A_2 = D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}E^t - I$, we receive

$$E^t A_2 = (E^t D^{-1} E) (E^t D^{-1} E)^{-1} E^t - E^t = 0.$$

Hence

$$\text{im}(A_2) \subseteq \text{null}(E^t).$$

Using (H1.3), E^t is $(l \times m)$ -matrix with maximal rank l ($l < m$). Therefore $\dim(\text{null}(E^t)) = m - l$. Moreover $\dim(\text{im}(A_2)) = m - \dim(\text{null}(A_2))$. That is why $m - \dim(\text{null}(A_2)) \leq m - l$ or $l \leq \dim(\text{null}(A_2))$.

Part 2. We will prove that -1 is eigenvalue of A_2 with geometric multiplicity $m - l$, or the system

$$A_2 \boldsymbol{\eta} = -\boldsymbol{\eta} \iff A_1 \boldsymbol{\eta} = 0$$

has $m - l$ linearly independent solutions.

Obviously the systems

$$A_1 \boldsymbol{\eta} = D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}E^t \boldsymbol{\eta} = 0 \tag{5}$$

and

$$E^t \boldsymbol{\eta} = 0 \tag{6}$$

are equivalent. Indeed, if $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$ is a solution of (5), then

$$\begin{aligned} D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}E^t \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = 0 &\implies E^t D^{-1}E(E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1}E^t \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = 0 \\ &\implies E^t \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$ is solution of (6).

On the other hand, if $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$ is a solution of (6), then

$$\left(D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}E^t\right) \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = \left(D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}\right) (E^t \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) = 0,$$

i.e. $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$ is solution of (5). Therefore

$$\dim(\text{im}(A_1)) = \dim(\text{im}(E^t)) = m - l.$$

Part 3. It follows from parts 1 and 2 of the proof that 0 is an eigenvalue of A_2 with multiplicity exactly l and -1 is an eigenvalue of A_2 with multiplicity exactly $m - l$.

It remains to prove that 1 is eigenvalue of A_1 with multiplicity at least l , but this is analogous to the proven part 1 or it follows directly from the definition of $A_1 = A_2 + I$. \square

The following two results are proven in [13].

Theorem 2.1 (see [13], Theorem 2.2). *Suppose U, V are $(m \times m)$ Hermitian matrices and either U or V is positive semi-definite. Let*

$$\lambda_1(U) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_m(U), \quad \lambda_1(V) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_m(V)$$

denote the eigenvalues of U and V , respectively.

Let:

- (1) $\pi(U)$ is the number of positive eigenvalues of U ;
- (2) $\nu(U)$ is the nubver of negative eigenvalues of U ;
- (3) $\xi(U)$ is the number of zero eigenvalues of U .

Then:

- (1) If $1 \leq k \leq \pi(U)$, then

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{\lambda_i(U)\lambda_{k+1-i}(V)\} \geq \lambda_k(VU) \geq \max_{k \leq i \leq m} \{\lambda_i(U)\lambda_{m+k-i}(V)\}.$$

- (2) If $\pi(U) < k \leq m - \nu(U)$, then

$$\lambda_k(VU) = 0.$$

- (3) If $m - \nu(U) < k \leq m$, then

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{\lambda_i(U)\lambda_{m+i-k}(V)\} \geq \lambda_k(VU) \geq \max_{k \leq i \leq m} \{\lambda_i(U)\lambda_{i+1-k}(V)\}.$$

Corollary 2.1 (see [13], Corollary 2.4). *Suppose U, V are $(m \times m)$ Hermitian positive definite matrices.*

Then for any $1 \leq k \leq m$

$$\lambda_1(U)\lambda_1(V) \geq \lambda_k(VU) \geq \lambda_m(U)\lambda_m(V).$$

As a result of Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.1, we may prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let the conditions (H1) hold true.*

- (1) Then $A_1 D^{-1}$ and $-A_2 D^{-1}$ are symmetric positive semi-definite matrices.
- (2) The following inequality hods true

$$\lambda_{\max}(A_1 D^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(D)}.$$

Proof. (1) We apply Theorem 2.1, where

$$U = D, \quad V = A_1 D^{-1}.$$

Obviously, U is a symmetric positive definite matrix (in fact it is a diagonal matrix). Moreover $\pi(U) = m$, $\mu(U) = \xi(U) = 0$, if $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

The matrix V is symmetric, see Lemma 2.1.

From the cited theorem, for any index k ($k = 1, \dots, m = \pi(U)$) we have

$$\lambda_k(A_1) = \lambda_k(A_1 D^{-1} D) = \lambda_k(VU) \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{\lambda_i(U) \lambda_{m+i-k}(V)\}.$$

In particular, if $k = m$:

$$\lambda_m(A_1) \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{\lambda_i(U) \lambda_i(V)\}. \quad (7)$$

Let us suppose that there exists index i_0 ($i_0 = 1, \dots, m-1$) such that

$$\lambda_1(V) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{i_0}(V) \geq 0 > \lambda_{i_0+1}(V) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m(V). \quad (8)$$

It follows from (8) and positive definiteness of U , that

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{\lambda_i(U) \lambda_i(V)\} \leq \lambda_{i_0+1}(U) \lambda_{i_0+1}(V) < 0.$$

Therefore (see (7)) $\lambda_m(A_1) < 0$. This contradiction (see Lemma 2.2) proves that the matrix $A_1 D^{-1}$ is positive semi-definite.

If we set $U = D$, $V = -A_2 D^{-1}$ then by analogical arguments, we see that the matrix $-A_2 D^{-1}$ is positive semi-definite.

(2) From the first statement of Lemma 2.3, $V = A_1 D^{-1}$ is positive semi-definite. Therefore (see Corollary 2.1 and Lemma 2.2):

$$1 \geq \lambda_k(A_1) = \lambda_k(VU) \geq \max \{\lambda_m(U) \lambda_k(V), \lambda_m(V) \lambda_k(U)\}$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, m$. Moreover all numbers $\lambda_k(U)$, $\lambda_k(V)$ are non-negative and

$$\lambda_{\max}(D) = \lambda_1(U) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m(U) = \lambda_{\min}(D), \quad \lambda_1(V) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m(V).$$

Therefore

$$1 \geq \max \{\lambda_m(U) \lambda_1(V), \lambda_m(V) \lambda_1(U)\},$$

or

$$\lambda_{\max}(A_1 D^{-1}) = \lambda_1(V) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_m(U)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(D)}. \quad \square$$

In the following, we will need some results related to inequalities for singular values. So, we will list some necessary inequalities in the next lemma.

Lemma 2.4 (see [19], [8]). *Let U be an $(d_1 \times d_2)$ -matrix, V be an $(d_3 \times d_4)$ -matrix.*

Then:

$$\sigma_{\max}(UV) \leq \sigma_{\max}(U)\sigma_{\max}(V), \quad (9)$$

$$\sigma_{\max}(U^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(U)}, \quad \text{if } d_1 = d_2, \det U \neq 0, \quad (10)$$

$$\sigma_{\max}(V)\sigma_{\min}(U) \leq \sigma_{\max}(UV), \quad \text{if } d_1 \geq d_2 = d_3, \quad (11)$$

$$\sigma_{\max}(U)\sigma_{\min}(V) \leq \sigma_{\max}(UV), \quad \text{if } d_4 \geq d_3 = d_2, \quad (12)$$

If $d_1 = d_2$ and U is Hermitian matrix, then $\|U\| = \sigma_{\max}(U)$, $\sigma_i(U) = |\lambda_i(U)|$, $i = 1, \dots, d_1$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let the conditions (H1) hold true and let $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.*

Then:

$$\|A_1 D^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(D)}, \quad (13)$$

$$\sigma_{\max}(A_1)\sigma_{\min}(D^{-1}) \leq \sigma_{\max}(A_1 D^{-1}), \quad (14)$$

$$1 \leq \|A_1\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\max}(D)}{\sigma_{\min}(D)}}. \quad (15)$$

Proof. The matrix $A_1 D^{-1}$ is symmetric and positive semi-definite (see Lemma 2.3(1)). Using the second statement of Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, we receive

$$\|A_1 D^{-1}\| = \sigma_{\max}(A_1 D^{-1}) = \lambda_{\max}(A_1 D^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(D)}.$$

The inequality (14) follows from (12) ($d_4 = d_3 = m$).

From (14) and (10), we receive

$$\sigma_{\max}(A_1) \leq \frac{\sigma_{\max}(A_1 D^{-1})}{\sigma_{\min}(D^{-1})} = \frac{\sigma_{\max}(D)}{\sigma_{\min}(D)}.$$

Therefore the equality $\|A_1\| = \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}(A_1)}$ implies the right inequality in (15).

Using $E^t = E^t A_1$ and inequality (9), we receive

$$\sigma_{\max}(E^t) \leq \sigma_{\max}(E^t)\sigma_{\max}(A_1),$$

or $1 \leq \sigma_{\max}(A_1) = \|A_1\|^2$, i.e. the left inequality in (15).

The lemma has been proved. \square

3. AN INEQUALITY FOR THE NORM OF APPROXIMATION COEFFICIENTS

We will use the following hypotheses:

H2.1. The hypotheses (H1) hold true.

H2.2. $d = 1$, $x_1 < \dots < x_m$.

H2.3. The map \mathbf{c} is C^1 -smooth in $[x_1, x_m]$.

H2.4. $w(|x - x_i|) = \exp(\alpha(x - x_i)^2)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let the following conditions hold true:*

- (1) *Hypotheses (H2).*
- (2) *Let $x \in [x_1, x_m]$ be a fixed point.*
- (3) *The index $k_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ is chosen such that*

$$|x - x_{k_0}| = \min\{|x - x_i| : i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

Then, there exist constants $M_1, M_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{a}(x)\| \leq \left(\|\mathbf{a}(x_{k_0})\| + M_1|x - x_{k_0}| \right) \exp(M_2|x - x_{k_0}|).$$

Proof. Part 1. Let

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha(x - x_1) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 2\alpha(x - x_2) & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 2\alpha(x - x_m) \end{pmatrix},$$

then

$$\frac{dD}{dx} = HD, \quad \frac{dD^{-1}}{dx} = -HD^{-1}.$$

We have (obviously $D = D(x)$, $H = H(x)$, and $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(x)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbf{a}(x)}{dx} &= \frac{d}{dx} \left(D^{-1}E (E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1} \mathbf{c} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{d}{dx} D^{-1} \right) E (E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1} \mathbf{c} + D^{-1}E \left(\frac{d}{dx} (E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1} \right) \mathbf{c} \\ &\quad + D^{-1}E (E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1} \frac{d}{dx} \mathbf{c} \\ &= -HD^{-1}E (E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1} \mathbf{c} \\ &\quad + D^{-1}E \left(- (E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1} \left(\frac{d}{d\alpha} E^t D^{-1}E \right) (E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1} \right) \mathbf{c} \\ &\quad + D^{-1}E (E^t D^{-1}E)^{-1} \frac{d}{dx} \mathbf{c} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -H\mathbf{a} \\
&\quad + D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}(E^tHD^{-1}E)(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}\mathbf{c} \\
&\quad + D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}\frac{d}{dx}\mathbf{c} \\
&= \left(D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}E^t - I\right)H\mathbf{a} \\
&\quad + D^{-1}E(E^tD^{-1}E)^{-1}\frac{d}{dx}\mathbf{c} \\
&= A_2H\mathbf{a} + A_0\frac{d}{dx}\mathbf{c}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the function $\mathbf{a}(x)$ satisfies the differential equation

$$\frac{d\mathbf{a}(x)}{dx} = A_2H\mathbf{a} + A_0\frac{d}{dx}\mathbf{c}. \quad (16)$$

Part 2. Obviously

$$\|A_2H\| = \|(A_1 - I)H\| \leq (\|A_1\| + 1)\|H\|.$$

It follows from (15) that

$$\|A_1\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\max}(D)}{\sigma_{\min}(D)}}.$$

Here $\sigma_{\max}(D) \leq 2\exp(\alpha r^2)$, $r = x_m - x_1$, and $\sigma_{\min}(D) \geq 2$. Hence

$$\|A_1\| \leq \sqrt{\exp(\alpha r^2)}.$$

For the norm of diagonal matrix H , we receive

$$\|H\| \leq 2\alpha r.$$

Therefore $\|A_2H\| \leq M_2$, where

$$M_2 = 2\alpha r \left(1 + \sqrt{\exp(\alpha r^2)}\right).$$

We will use Lemma 2.4 to obtain the norm of A_0 .

Obviously $A_0E^t = A_1$. Therefore by (12) ($m = d_4 \geq d_3 = l$) we have

$$\sigma_{\max}(A_0)\sigma_{\min}(E^t) \leq \sigma_{\max}(A_1),$$

i.e.

$$\|A_0\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(E^t)} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\max}(D)}{\sigma_{\min}(D)}}.$$

Therefore, if we set $M_{11} = \frac{M_2}{\sigma_{\min}(E^t)}$, then $\|A_0\| \leq M_{11}$.

Let the constant M_{12} is choosen such that

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dx} \mathbf{c}(x) \right\| \leq M_{12}, \quad x \in [x_1, x_m]$$

and let $M_1 = M_{11}M_{12}$.

Part 3. On the end, we have only to apply Lemma 4.1 form [7] to the equation (16):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{a}(x)\| &\leq \left(\|\mathbf{a}(x_{k_0})\| + \left| \int_{x_{k_0}}^x \left\| A_0 \frac{d}{dx} \mathbf{c} \right\| dx \right| \right) \exp \left| \int_{x_{k_0}}^x \|A_2 H\| dx \right| \\ &\leq (\|\mathbf{a}(x_{k_0})\| + M_1|x - x_{k_0}|) \exp(M_2|x - x_{k_0}|). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. Let the hypotheses (H2) hold true and let moreover

$$p_1(x) = 1, \quad p_2(x) = x, \quad \dots, \quad p_l(x) = x^{l-1}, \quad l \geq 1.$$

In such a case, we may replace the differentiation of vector-fuction

$$\mathbf{c}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} p_1(x) \\ p_2(x) \\ \vdots \\ p_l(x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ x \\ \vdots \\ x^{l-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

by left-multiplication:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbf{c}(x)}{dx} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 2x \\ 3x^2 \\ \vdots \\ (l-2)x^{l-3} \\ (l-1)x^{l-2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & l-2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & l-1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ x \\ x^2 \\ \vdots \\ x^{l-2} \\ x^{l-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \bar{\partial} \mathbf{c}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The singular values of the matrix $\bar{\partial}$ are: $0, 1, \dots, l-1$. Therefore $\|\bar{\partial}\| = \sqrt{l-1}$.

That is why, we may chose

$$M_{22} = \sqrt{l-1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq l} \left\{ \max_{x_1 < x < x_m} |p_i(x)| \right\}.$$

Additionally, if we suppose $|x_1| \leq |x_m|$, then

$$\max_{x_1 < x < x_m} |p_i(x)| = |p_i(x_m)|, \quad i = 1, \dots, l.$$

Therefore, in such a case:

$$M_{22} = \sqrt{(l-1)} \max_{1 \leq i \leq l} \{|p_i(x_m)|\}.$$

If we suppose $-1 \leq x_1 \leq x \leq x_m \leq 1$, then obviously, we may set

$$M_{22} = \sqrt{l-1}.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Marc Alexa, Johannes Behr, Daniel Cohen-Or, Shachar Fleishman, David Levin, Claudio T. Silva, Point-Set Surfaces, <http://www.math.tau.ac.il/~levin/>
- [2] G.E. Backus, F. Gilbert, The resolving power of gross Earth data, *Geophysical Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **16** (1968), 169-205.
- [3] G.E. Backus, F. Gilbert, Uniqueness in the inversion of inaccurate gross Earth data, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, **266** (1970), 123-192.
- [4] Åke Björck, The calculation of linear least squares problems, *Acta Numerica*, **13** (2004), 1-53, doi: 10.1017/S0962492904000169.
- [5] G. Fasshauer, *Multivariate Meshfree Approximation*, http://www.math.iit.edu/~fass/603_ch7.pdf
- [6] *Handbook of Linear Algebra*, Ed. Leslie Hogben, CRC Press (2006), 1400 pp.
- [7] Philip Hartman, *Ordinary Differential Equations*, Second Edition, Classics in Applied Mathematics, **38**, SIAM (2002).
- [8] Faryar Jabbari, *Linear System Theory II*, Chapter 3: Eigenvalue, singular values, pseudo-inverse, The Henry Samueli School of Engineering, University of California, Irvine (2015), <http://gram.eng.uci.edu/~fjabbari/me270b/me270b.html>.
- [9] P. Lancaster, K. Salkauskas, Surfaces generated by moving least squares methods, *Mathematics of Computation*, **37** (1981), 141-158.
- [10] D. Levin, The approximation power of moving least-squares, <http://www.math.tau.ac.il/~levin/>
- [11] D. Levin, Mesh-independent surface interpolation, <http://www.math.tau.ac.il/~levin/>
- [12] D. Levin, Stable integration rules with scattered integration points, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, **112** (1999), 181-187, <http://www.math.tau.ac.il/~levin/>
- [13] L.-Z. Lu, C.E.M. Pearce, Some new bounds for singular values and eigenvalues of matrix products, *Annals of Operations Research*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, **98** (2000), 141-148.
- [14] D.H. McLain, Two Dimensional Interpolation from Random Data, *The Computer Journal*, **19**, No. 2 (1976), 178-181, doi: 10.1093/comjnl/19.2.178.
- [15] Kaare Brandt Petersen, Michael Syskind Pedersen, *The Matrix Cookbook*, Version: February 16, 2006, http://www.mit.edu/~wingated/stuff_i_use/matrix_cookbook.pdf
- [16] Siegfried M. Rump, Verified bounds for singular values, in particular for the spectral norm of a matrix and its inverse, *BIT*, **51**, No. 2 (2011).

- [17] Donald Shepard, A two-dimensional interpolation function for irregularly-spaced data, In: *Proceedings of the 1968 ACM National Conference* (1968), 517-524, doi:10.1145/800186.810616.
- [18] Thomas Sonar, Difference operators from interpolating moving least squares and their deviation from optimality, *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, **39**, No 5 (2005), 883908, doi: 10.1051/m2an:2005039.
- [19] Jorma K. Merikoski, Ravinder Kumar, Inequalities for spreads of matrix sums and products, *Applied Mathematics E-Notes*, **4** (2004), 150-159.

E-mail address, Corresponding author: `nenov@uctm.edu`

E-mail address: `tstsvetkov@uctm.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY
AND METALLURGY, SOFIA 1756, BULGARIA