

On the rate of convergence of Berrut's interpolant at equally spaced nodes

Walter F. Mascarenhas*

March 12, 2022

Abstract

We extend the work by Mastroianni and Szabados regarding the barycentric interpolant introduced by J.-P. Berrut in 1988, for equally spaced nodes. We prove fully their first conjecture and present a proof of a weaker version of their second conjecture. More importantly than proving these conjectures, we present a sharp description of the asymptotic error incurred by the interpolants when the derivative of the interpolated function is absolutely continuous, which is a class of functions broad enough to cover most functions usually found in practice. We also contribute to the solution of the broad problem they raised regarding the order of approximation of these interpolants, by showing that they have order of approximation of order $1/n$ for functions with derivatives of bounded variation.

1 Introduction

In a recent article [6], professors G. Mastroianni and J. Szabados discuss barycentric interpolation of functions $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at equally spaced nodes

$$x_{k,n} := 2k/n - 1 \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, n.$$

They analyze the order of approximation of the barycentric interpolant introduced by J.-P. Berrut [1]:

$$B_n(f, x) := \frac{N_n(f, x)}{D_n(x)} \quad \text{for } x \notin \{x_{0,n}, \dots, x_{n,n}\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_n(f, x_{k,n}) = f(x_{k,n}), \quad (1)$$

with

$$N_n(f, x) := \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \frac{f(x_{k,n})}{x - x_{k,n}} \quad \text{and} \quad D_n(x) := \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \frac{1}{x - x_{k,n}}. \quad (2)$$

They proved some results and stated two conjectures and a broad open problem about the rate at which $B_n(f)$ approximates f for some classes of functions. Although their proof of their second theorem is incorrect, their conclusions are correct and they have correctly shown that the error $\|B_n(f) - f\|_\infty$ is of order $1/n$ for functions with derivatives in the class $\text{Lip } 1$ of functions with continuity modulus $\omega(t) \leq \kappa t$.

*Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo, Cidade Universitária, Rua do Matão 1010, São Paulo SP, Brazil. CEP 05508-090. Tel.: +55-11-3091 5411, Fax: +55-11-3091 6134, walter.mascarenhas@gmail.com.

In this article we extend their work, by presenting a detailed analysis of the asymptotic behavior of the interpolation error for functions with absolutely continuous derivatives. We denote the class of such functions by AC^1 , and emphasize that, unlike the definition of the Sobolev space $W^{2,1}([-1, 1])$, we require that $f'(x)$ is defined for all $x \in [-1, 1]$ in order for f to belong to AC^1 (we consider directional derivatives at $x \in \{-1, 1\}$.) We also analyze functions with derivatives of bounded variation, and denote their class by BV^1 , with the same requirement on the derivatives.

We prove the first conjecture by Mastroianni and Szabados in full, and present a proof of a weaker version of their second conjecture: their conjecture regards arbitrary functions, our proof makes the additional assumption that the function have absolutely continuous derivatives, but we hope that the readers will agree with us that this class of functions covers a wide range of applications. We also show that the order of convergence of the interpolants $B_n(f)$ above is also of order $1/n$ for $f \in BV^1$. Their first conjecture, which we state below, is about the interpolation error for functions $f \in \text{Lip } 1$, and we prove it in Section 2.

Conjecture 1 (First conjecture by Mastroianni and Szabados) *There exists a function $f \in \text{Lip } 1$ such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\log n} \|B_n(f) - f\|_\infty > 0.$$

▲

Regarding the second conjecture, we have found that if $f \in BV^1$ then we can bound the sequence

$$n \|B(f) - f\|_\infty$$

by a constant depending on f . Moreover, if $f \in AC^1$ and $x \in [-1, 1]$ then we can describe exactly all possible accumulation points of the sequence

$$n (B_n(f, x) - f(x)). \quad (3)$$

This description is given by Theorem 1 below and uses the functions

$$O(f, x) := \frac{f(x) - f(1)}{2(x-1)} - \frac{f(x) - f(-1)}{2(x+1)}, \quad (4)$$

$$E(f, x) := \frac{f(1) - f(x)}{2(x-1)} + \frac{f(-1) - f(x)}{2(x+1)}. \quad (5)$$

(Throughout the article, O stands for *odd* and E stands for *even*.)

We must be careful when analyzing the sequences in Equation (3) when $x = x_{k,n}$ is a node, because both the denominator and the numerator of $B_n(f, x)$ are discontinuous at such x , and the interpolant is defined in a different way for them in Equation (1). As a result, the error has more favourable properties at the nodes and this may confuse our analysis of the convergence for a general x . For instance, if $x \in \{-1, 1\}$ then the error $B_n(f, x) - f(x)$ is zero for all n , and the same holds for $x = 0$ when n is even. In order to handle this issue precisely, we state the following definitions:

Definition 1 (Sequence) *We say that an increasing function $n : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $n(j) = n_j$ is “a sequence n_j .” The sequence is odd if n_j is odd for all j , and it is even if n_j is even for all j . ▲*

Definition 2 (Regular point) We say that $x \in [-1, 1]$ is regular for the sequence n_j if there exists j_0 such that

$$j \geq j_0 \Rightarrow x \notin \{x_{0,n_j}, x_{1,n_j}, \dots, x_{n_j,n_j}\}.$$

▲

Definition 3 (The compactification of \mathbb{R}) In order to handle infinite limits, we write

$$\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$$

as the two point compactification of \mathbb{R} , endowed with the usual topology and extension of the operators $<$ and \leq . In particular, $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and its subset $[\pi/2, +\infty]$, which are relevant to our discussion, are compact in our topology for $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$. ▲

All irrational points are regular for every sequence n_j ; the points ± 1 are not regular for any sequence, and 0 is regular for odd sequences and irregular for even ones. Given $x \in [-1, 1]$, we can decompose any sequence n_j in at most three parts: one in which x is a node for all j , so that $B_{n_j}(f, x) = f(x)$ for all j , an two other sequences for which x is regular, one even and another odd (of course, some parts may not be necessary.) Therefore, by understanding the regular points for odd and even sequences we can get the full picture regarding the pointwise convergence of the interpolation error. We now state our first formal result.

Theorem 1 (The limits of $n_j (B_{n_j}(f, x) - f(x))$ for f in AC^1) Let f be a function in AC^1 , n_j an odd sequence, and $x \in [-1, 1]$ such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_j (B_{n_j}(f, x) - f(x)) = L \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}. \quad (6)$$

If x is irrational then, for the function $O(f, x)$ in Equation (4),

$$L \in \mathcal{O}(f, x) := \left[-\frac{2|O(f, x)|}{\pi}, \frac{2|O(f, x)|}{\pi} \right], \quad (7)$$

and if x is rational then there exists a finite set $\mathcal{O}(x) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, defined in Equation (86) in Section 6, such that and if x is a regular rational point for n_j then

$$L \in \mathcal{O}(f, x) := \{O(f, x)/y, y \in \mathcal{O}(x)\}.$$

Conversely, if $L \in \mathcal{O}(f, x)$ then there exists an odd sequence n_j for which x is regular and Equation (6) holds.

Similarly, if n_j is an even sequence, Equation (6) holds and x is irrational then

$$L \in \mathcal{E}(f, x) := \left[-\frac{2|E(f, x)|}{\pi}, \frac{2|E(f, x)|}{\pi} \right],$$

and if x is rational then there exists a finite set $\mathcal{E}(x) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, defined in Equation (87) in Section 6, such that and if x is a regular rational point for n_j then

$$L \in \mathcal{E}(f, x) := \{E(f, x)/y, y \in \mathcal{E}(x)\}.$$

Conversely, if $L \in \mathcal{E}(f, x)$ then there exists an even sequence n_j for which x is a regular point and Equation (6) holds. ▲

Theorem 1 has far reaching implications for $f \in AC^1$. For instance, it yields a simple proof of second conjecture by Mastroianni and Szabados stated below, with the additional hypothesis that f is in this class:

Conjecture 2 (Second conjecture by Mastroianni and Szabados) *We have*

$$\|B_n(f) - f\|_\infty = o(1/n)$$

if and only if f is constant (when $n = 2, 4, \dots$), or f is linear (when $n = 1, 3, \dots$). ▲

In fact, when $f \in AC^1$, if $\|B_n(f) - f\|_\infty = o(1/n)$ and $z \in (-1, 1)$ is irrational then Theorem 1 implies that $\mathcal{O}(f, z) = \{0\}$ and Equation (4) leads to

$$O(f, z) = \frac{f(z) - f(1)}{2(z-1)} - \frac{f(z) - f(-1)}{2(z+1)} = 0, \quad (8)$$

and by the continuity of f Equation (8) must hold for all $x \in [-1, 1]$. Therefore,

$$f(x) = \frac{f(1) + f(-1)}{2} + \frac{f(1) - f(-1)}{2}x,$$

and f is linear. This proves the second conjecture for odd sequences.

The same argument using the part of Theorem 1 for even sequences leads to

$$E(f, x) = \frac{f(1) - f(x)}{2(x-1)} + \frac{f(-1) - f(x)}{2(x+1)} = 0.$$

For $x \neq 0$ this equation implies that

$$f(x) = \frac{(x-1)f(-1) + (x+1)f(1)}{2x}, \quad (9)$$

the continuity of f at $x = 0$ yields $f(1) = f(-1)$, and Equation (9) shows that f is constant. This finishes the proof of the second conjecture for $f \in AC^1$.

Besides the weakened version of the second conjecture above, we can prove other interesting results using Theorem 1. For instance, if x is rational then $0 \notin \mathcal{O}(x) \cup \mathcal{E}(x)$ and the reader will be able to prove the following corollary:

Corollary 1 (Large errors for rational x) *If $f \in AC^1$ and $x \in [-1, 1]$ is rational and regular for the sequence n_j , $O(f, x) \neq 0$ and $E(f, x) \neq 0$ then*

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_j |B_{n_j}(f, x) - f(x)| > 0.$$

▲

However, Theorem 1 has a serious limitation: it is only a pointwise result, and it does not imply the more interesting bound

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \|B_n(f) - f\|_\infty < +\infty$$

considered by Mastroianni and Szabados in their open problem. Fortunately, we can also prove uniform convergence results for $f \in AC^1$:

Theorem 2 (Uniform convergence for $f \in AC^1$) *If $f \in AC^1$ and n_j is an odd sequence then, for the function $O(f)$ defined in Equation (4),*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_j \|B_{n_j}(f) - f - O(f)/D_{n_j}\|_\infty = 0$$

and if n_j is an even sequence then

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_j \|B_{n_j}(f) - f - E(f)/D_{n_j}\|_\infty = 0,$$

for $E(f)$ defined in Equation (5), ▲

Lemma 6 in Section 3 yields $\|n/D_n\|_\infty \leq 1$, and it is clear that $\|O(f)\|_\infty \leq \|f'\|_\infty$ and $\|E(f)\|_\infty \leq \|f'\|_\infty$. These observations combined with Theorem 2 lead to an uniform upper bound of order $1/n$ in the interpolation error for $f \in AC^1$, but we can derive this bound under the weaker assumption of derivatives of bounded variation:

Theorem 3 (Uniform convergence when $f \in BV^1$) *If $f \in BV^1$ then*

$$n \|B_n(f) - f\|_\infty \leq T_{f'}[-1, 1]/2 + \max\{\|O(f)\|_\infty, \|E(f)\|_\infty\}, \quad (10)$$

where $T_{f'}[-1, 1]$ is the total variation of f' in $[-1, 1]$. ▲

We prove the results above in the next sections. In Section 2 we prove the first conjecture. In Section 3 we discuss the denominator of the interpolant defined in Equation (1). In Section 4 we analyze the numerator of the error $B_n(f, x) - f(x)$ for functions in AC^1 . In Section 5 we analyze the numerator for $f \in BV^1$. Finally, in Section 6 we combine the results in Sections 3, 4 and 5 to prove Theorems 1, 2 and 3.

We would like to mention that André Pierro de Camargo suggested another proof of the second conjecture for functions with continuous third derivatives. For odd n , Theorem 5 in Section 4 indicates that

$$N_n(f, x) - f(x) D_n(x) \approx \frac{f(x) - f(1)}{2(x-1)} - \frac{f(x) - f(-1)}{2(x+1)},$$

and by solving this expression for $f(x)$ we derive the interpolant

$$f(x) \approx \tilde{B}_n(f, x) := \frac{N_n(f, x) + \frac{f(-1)}{2(x+1)} - \frac{f(1)}{2(x-1)}}{D_n(x) + \frac{1}{2(x+1)} - \frac{1}{2(x-1)}}.$$

Note that \tilde{B}_n is obtained by changing the absolute value of the first and last weights of the interpolant in Equation (1) from 1 to $1/2$. A similar argument applies to even n and the resulting barycentric interpolant \tilde{B}_n has better convergence properties than Berrut's interpolant. In fact, \tilde{B}_n is the interpolant corresponding to $d = 1$ in the Floater-Hormann family [4], and using the theory presented in [4] we could prove the second conjecture for $f \in C^3$ by analyzing the asymptotic behavior of $B_n - \tilde{B}_n$.

In summary, the present article shows that actually, from the perspective of order of approximation, Berrut's interpolants are biased by the functions $O(f)$ and $E(f)$, and we see little reason for using them instead of the interpolant \tilde{B}_n above. In fact, in his latter work [2] prof. Berrut himself has mentioned that using half integer weights at the endpoints instead of ± 1 leads to a better convergence rate.

Theorem 2 shows that the interpolant \tilde{B}_n has order of approximation $o(1/n)$, and the most relevant questions in this subject are not the ones raised by professors Mastroianni and Szabados, and which we discuss in detail here. It is our opinion that it

is more important to understand how we should choose the weights in the barycentric interpolants in order to improve them, so that we can justify the expensive $2n + 3$ divisions per evaluation required by these interpolants. This will be the subject of our next article about barycentric interpolation.

2 Proof of the first conjecture

In this section we prove Conjecture 1 by presenting $f \in \text{Lip } 1$ such that, for

$$t_n := 1/n \quad \text{and} \quad n_j := 2^{2^j}, \quad (11)$$

we have

$$B_{n_j}(f, t_{n_j}) - f(t_{n_j}) = B_{n_j}(f, t_{n_j}) \geq \frac{\ln(n_j)}{20n_j}. \quad (12)$$

The function f is given by

$$f(x) := \sum_{i=100}^{\infty} f_{n_i}(x), \quad (13)$$

for functions f_m defined for m such that \sqrt{m} is an integer multiple of 4, as follows:

$$f_m(x) := 0 \quad \text{for } x < \frac{1}{m} \text{ or } x \geq \frac{\sqrt{m}-3}{m}, \quad (14)$$

$$f_m(x) := x - \frac{1}{m} \quad \text{for } \frac{1}{m} \leq x < \frac{2}{m}, \quad (15)$$

$$f_m(x) := \frac{4p+3}{m} - x \quad \text{for } 0 \leq p \leq \frac{\sqrt{m}-8}{4} \text{ and } \frac{4p+2}{m} \leq x < \frac{4p+4}{m}, \quad (16)$$

$$f_m(x) := x - \frac{4p+1}{m} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq p \leq \frac{\sqrt{m}-8}{4} \text{ and } \frac{4p}{m} \leq x < \frac{4p+2}{m}, \quad (17)$$

$$f_m(x) := x - \frac{\sqrt{m}-3}{m} \quad \text{for } \frac{\sqrt{m}-4}{m} \leq x < \frac{\sqrt{m}-3}{m}. \quad (18)$$




Figure 1: The function f_m . The support of f_m is $[1/m, (\sqrt{m}-3)/m]$. The plot is divided in raise and fall regions, with R_p starting at $x = 4p/m$ and F_p starting at $x = (4p+2)/m$. By joining R_p and F_p we obtain the hat H_p .

Note that the series in Equation (13) converges to $f \in \text{Lip } 1$ because $n_j = 2^{2^j}$ and the identities

$$n_j^2 = 2^{2^{j+1}} = n_{j+1} \Rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{n_{j+1}} - 3}{n_{j+1}} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_{j+1}}} = \frac{1}{n_j} \quad (19)$$

imply that the support of the functions f_{n_j} are disjoint, and $f_m \in \text{Lip } 1$.

Equation (12) follows from Equation (13) and the following Lemmas:

Lemma 1 (The error for the first terms) *If $100 \leq i < j$ then*

$$f_{n_i}(t_{n_j}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad B_{n_j}(f_{n_i}, t_{n_j}) \geq -\frac{9}{8n_j}. \quad (20)$$

▲

Lemma 2 (The error for the main term) *For $j \geq 100$ we have that*

$$f_{n_j}(t_{n_j}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad B_{n_j}(f_{n_j}, t_{n_j}) \geq \frac{\ln(n_j)}{16n_j}. \quad (21)$$

▲

Lemma 3 (The error for the last terms) *For $i > j \geq 100$ and $0 \leq k \leq n_j$ we have*

$$f_{n_i}(t_{n_j}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f_{n_i}(x_{k,n_j}) = 0. \quad (22)$$

▲

The lemmas above show that $f(t_{n_j}) = 0$ for $j \geq 100$, and the second part of Equation (12) follows from these lemmas because

$$\begin{aligned} B_{n_j}(f, t_{n_j}) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} (-1)^k \frac{\sum_{i=100}^{\infty} f_{n_i}(x_{k,n_j})}{t_{n_j} - x_{k,n_j}} \bigg/ \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} (-1)^k \frac{1}{t_{n_j} - x_{k,n_j}} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} (-1)^k \frac{\sum_{i=100}^j f_{n_i}(x_{k,n_j})}{t_{n_j} - x_{k,n_j}} \bigg/ \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} (-1)^k \frac{1}{t_{n_j} - x_{k,n_j}} \\ &= \sum_{i=100}^j \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} (-1)^k \frac{f_{n_i}(x_{k,n_j})}{t_{n_j} - x_{k,n_j}} \bigg/ \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^k \frac{1}{t_{n_j} - x_{k,n_j}} \\ &= \sum_{i=100}^j B_{n_j}(f_{n_i}, t_{n_j}) \geq B_{n_j}(f_{n_j}, t_{n_j}) - 9 \frac{j-100}{8n_j} \geq \frac{\ln(n_j)}{16n_j} - 9 \frac{j}{8n_j} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and, finally, the reader can verify that for $j \geq 100$

$$j < \ln(2^{2^j}) / 1000 = \ln(n_j) / 1000$$

and Equation (12) follows from Equation (23).

We end this section presenting a proof of the lemmas above and one more lemma:

Lemma 4 (Shifted harmonic sums) *If $a > 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$ is an integer then*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{a+j} \geq \ln(a+\ell) - \ln(a) + \frac{1}{2a} - \frac{1}{2(a+\ell)}. \quad (24)$$

▲

Proof of Lemma 1. If $i < j$ then $n_i < n_j$, $t_{n_j} = 1/n_j < 1/n_i$ and Equation (14) implies that $f_{n_i}(t_{n_j}) = 0$. This proves the first part of Equation (20). Let $N_{n_j}(f_{n_i}, t_{n_j})$ and $D_{n_j}(t_{n_j})$ be as in Equation (2). Lemma 6 in Section 3 shows that $|D_{n_j}(t_{n_j})| \geq n_j$ and this reduces the proof of Lemma 1 to the verification of the equation

$$N_{n_j}(f_{n_i}, t_{n_j}) \geq -3/4, \quad (25)$$

as we do below. Note that the definition of n_j in Equation (11) implies that if $100 \leq i < j$ then, for $m = n_i$,

$$n_j = 4qm \quad \text{with} \quad q \geq 16, \quad t_{n_j} = \frac{1}{n_j} = \frac{1}{4qm} \quad \text{and} \quad x_{k,n_j} = \frac{2k}{4qm} - 1.$$

Equation (14) shows that

$$f_m(x_{k,n_j}) = f_m\left(\frac{2k}{4qm} - 1\right) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad k < 2qm + 2q \quad \text{or} \quad k \geq 2qm + 2q(\sqrt{m} - 3),$$

and Equation (2), with the index k replaced by $k + 2qm$, leads to

$$N_{n_j}(f_{n_i}, t_{n_j}) = \sum_{k=2q}^{2q(\sqrt{m}-3)-1} (-1)^k \frac{f_m\left(\frac{2k}{4qm}\right)}{\frac{1}{4qm} - \frac{2k}{4qm}} = 4qm \sum_{k=2q}^{2q(\sqrt{m}-3)-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{f_m\left(\frac{2k}{4qm}\right)}{2k-1}.$$

Motivated by Figure 1, we split the parcels of $N_{n_j}(f_{n_i}, t_{n_j})$ in $h := (\sqrt{m} - 8)/4$ hats plus the last half of R_0 , which we call by R_- , the part F_0 , and the first half of $R_{(\sqrt{m}-4)/4}$, which we call by R_+ . Formally we have

$$\frac{N_{n_j}(f_{n_i}, t_{n_j})}{4qm} = R_- + F_0 + \left(\sum_{p=1}^h (F_p + R_p) \right) + R_+ = R_- + F_0 + \left(\sum_{p=1}^h H_p \right) + R_+,$$

for

$$R_- := \sum_{k=2q}^{4q-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{f_m\left(\frac{2k}{4qm}\right)}{2k-1}, \quad (26)$$

$$F_p := \sum_{k=8pq+4q}^{8(p+1)q-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{f_m\left(\frac{2k}{4qm}\right)}{2k-1}, \quad (27)$$

$$R_p := \sum_{k=8pq}^{8pq+4q-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{f_m\left(\frac{2k}{4qm}\right)}{2k-1}, \quad (28)$$

$$R_+ := \sum_{k=2q(2\sqrt{m}-4)}^{q(\sqrt{m}-3)-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{f_m\left(\frac{2k}{4qm}\right)}{2k-1}, \quad (29)$$

$$H_p := R_p + F_p,$$

and to prove Equation (25) it suffices to show that $R_-, R_+, H_p > 0$ and

$$F_0 \geq \frac{-3}{16qm}, \quad (30)$$

and this is done from this point to the end of this proof.

Let us start by writing R_p as a sum of positive terms. In raising ranges f_m is defined by Equations (15), (17) and (18), and Equation (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned} R_p &= \sum_{k=8pq}^{8pq+4q-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{\left(\frac{2k}{4qm} - \frac{4p+1}{m}\right)}{2k-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{4qm} \sum_{k=8pq}^{8pq+4q-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{(2k-4q-16pq)}{2k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Splitting the indexes k in even and odd groups we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_p &= \frac{-1}{4qm} \sum_{\ell=4pq}^{4pq+2q-1} \left(\frac{4\ell-4q-16pq}{4\ell-1} - \frac{4\ell+2-4q-16pq}{4\ell+1} \right) \\ &= \frac{-1}{4qm} \sum_{\ell=4pq}^{4pq+2q-1} \left(\frac{1-4q-16pq}{4\ell-1} - \frac{1-4q-16pq}{4\ell+1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$R_p = \frac{16pq+4q-1}{2qm} \sum_{\ell=4pq}^{4pq+2q-1} \frac{1}{16\ell^2-1} > 0. \quad (31)$$

The same argument using Equations (26) and (29) shows that $R_-, R_+ > 0$. Similarly, for F_p Equations (16) and (27) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} F_p &= \sum_{k=8pq+4q}^{8(p+1)q-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{\left(\frac{4p+3}{m} - \frac{2k}{4qm}\right)}{2k-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{4qm} \sum_{k=8pq+4q}^{8(p+1)q-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{(16pq+12q-2k)}{2k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

As before,

$$\begin{aligned} F_p &= \frac{1}{4qm} \sum_{\ell=4pq+2q}^{4(p+1)q-1} \left(\frac{4\ell-16pq-12q}{4\ell-1} - \frac{4\ell+2-16pq-12q}{4\ell+1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4qm} \sum_{\ell=4pq+2q}^{4(p+1)q-1} \left(\frac{1-16pq-12q}{4\ell-1} - \frac{1-16pq-12q}{4\ell+1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$F_p = -\frac{16pq+12q-1}{2qm} \sum_{\ell=4pq+2q}^{4(p+1)q-1} \frac{1}{16\ell^2-1}. \quad (32)$$

In particular, for $p = 0$ we have

$$F_0 = -\frac{12q-1}{2qm} \sum_{\ell=2q}^{4q-1} \frac{1}{16\ell^2-1} \geq -\frac{12q-1}{2qm} \frac{2q}{64q^2-1} = -\frac{1}{2qm} \frac{24q^2-2q}{64q^2-1} \geq \frac{-3}{16qm},$$

and this proves Equation (30).

We now show that, for $p \geq 1$, $H_p = R_p + F_p > 0$. Replacing ℓ by $k + 2q$ in Equation (32) and ℓ by k in Equation (31) we obtain

$$H_p = \frac{1}{2qm} \sum_{k=4pq}^{4pq+2q-1} a_k,$$

for

$$a_k = \frac{16pq + 4q - 1}{16k^2 - 1} - \frac{16pq + 12q - 1}{16(k + 2q)^2 - 1},$$

and our final goal is to show that $a_k > 0$. We can write a_k as u_k/v_k for

$$u_k := (16pq + 4q - 1)(16(k + 2q)^2 - 1) - (16pq + 12q - 1)(16k^2 - 1)$$

and

$$v_k := (16k^2 - 1)(16(k + 2q)^2 - 1).$$

The denominator v_k is clearly positive, and in order to analyze u_k we replaced k by $4pq + \xi q$, with $\xi \in [0, 2)$, and used Wolfram Alpha to obtain

$$u_k = 8q(256p^2q^2 + 256pq^2 - 32pq - 16q^2\xi^2 + 32q^2 + 32q^2\xi - 8q\xi - 8q + 1).$$

Since we are concerned with $q \geq 16$, $p \geq 1$ and $\xi \in [0, 2)$, it is clear that $u_k > 0$ and the proof of Lemma 1 is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Let us write $m = n_j$. According to Equation (11), $t_m = 1/m$, and Equation (15) yields $f_m(t_m) = 0$. We have that

$$B_m(f_m, t_m) = N_m(f_m, t_m) / D_m(t_m)$$

for $N_m(f_m, t_m)$ and $D_m(t_m)$ in Equation (2). Since

$$\frac{1}{2m} = x_{\frac{m}{2}, m} + \frac{1}{2m} < t_m = \frac{1}{m} < x_{\frac{m}{2}+1, m} - \frac{1}{2m} = \frac{3}{2m}$$

and m is a multiple of four and we have that

$$t_m = \frac{2 \times (2m) + 0 + 1}{4m} - 1.$$

Equation (39) in Section 3 with $\rho_n(x) = 0$ shows that

$$0 < D_m(t_m) \leq A(0) + 1/2 = \pi m/2 + 1/2 < 4m,$$

and in order to prove Lemma 2 it suffices to show that

$$N_m(f_m, t_m) \geq \ln(m)/4. \quad (33)$$

This is our goal now. Equations (14)–(18) imply that $f_m(2k/m - 1) = (-1)^{k+1}/m$ for

$$k = m/2 + 1, \dots, m/2 + (\sqrt{m} - 4)/2$$

and $f_m(2k/m - 1) = 0$ for the remaining k s (see Figure 1.). Therefore,

$$N_m(f_m, t_m) := \sum_{k=m/2+1}^{m/2+\frac{\sqrt{m}-4}{2}} (-1)^k \frac{f_m(2k/m - 1)}{1/m - 2k/m + 1}.$$

Making the change of indexes $k = m/2 + i$ and noting that $m/2$ is even we obtain

$$N_m(f_m, t_m) = \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\sqrt{m}-4}{2}} (-1)^i \frac{(-1)^{i+1}/m}{1/m - 2i/m} = \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\sqrt{m}-4}{2}} \frac{1}{2i-1} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{\sqrt{m}-6}{2}} \frac{1}{i+1/2},$$

and Lemma 4 with $a = 1/2$ and $\ell = (\sqrt{m} - 4)/2$ yields

$$2N_m(f_m, t_m) \geq \ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{m}-3}{2}\right) - \ln(1/2) + 1 - \frac{1}{2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{m}-4}{2}\right)} = \ln(\sqrt{m}-3) + 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}-3}.$$

Therefore,

$$N_m(f_m, t_m) = \ln(\sqrt{m})/2 + \delta_m/2 = \ln(m)/4 + \delta_m/2 \quad (34)$$

for

$$\delta_m = 1 + \ln\left(1 - \frac{3}{\sqrt{m}}\right) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}-3}.$$

Since $4m \geq 2^{2^{100}}$ we have that $\delta_m > 0$. Therefore, Equation (34) implies Equation (33) and this proof is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Equation (19) implies that if $i > j$ then

$$\frac{\sqrt{n_i}-3}{n_i} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_i}} \leq \frac{1}{n_j} = t_{n_j},$$

and Equation (14) implies that $f_{n_i}(t_{n_j}) = 0$. In order to show that $f_{n_i}(x_{k,n_j}) = 0$ we recall that $x_{k,n_j} = 2k/n_j - 1$ and analyze two possibilities:

(i) If $k \leq n_j/2$ then $x_{k,n_j} \leq 0$, and Equation (14) implies that $f_{n_i}(x_{k,n_j}) = 0$.

(ii) If $k > n_j/2$ then

$$x_{k,n_j} \geq \frac{2}{n_j} \geq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n_i}} > \frac{\sqrt{n_i}-3}{n_i},$$

and Equation (14) shows that $f_{n_i}(x_{k,n_j}) = 0$.

Therefore, $f_{n_i}(x_{k,n_j}) = 0$ in both cases we have proved Lemma 3. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. For $b > 0$, let $h_b : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function

$$h_b(t) := \frac{1}{b} + \left(\frac{1}{b+1} - \frac{1}{b}\right)t - \frac{1}{b+t} = \frac{1}{b} - \frac{t}{b(b+1)} - \frac{1}{b+t}.$$

Since $h_b(0) = h_b(1) = 0$ and h_b is concave we have that $h_b \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$0 \leq \int_0^1 h_b(t) dt = \frac{1}{b} - \frac{1}{2b(b+1)} - \ln(b+1) + \ln(b)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{b} \geq \frac{1}{2b(b+1)} + \ln(b+1) - \ln(b) = \frac{1}{2b} - \frac{1}{2(b+1)} + \ln(b+1) + \ln(b).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{a+j} &\geq \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{2(a+j)} - \frac{1}{2(a+j+1)} + \ln(a+j+1) - \ln(a+j) = \\ &\ln(a+\ell) - \ln(a) + \frac{1}{2a} - \frac{1}{2(a+\ell)} \end{aligned}$$

and we are done. \square

3 The denominator

In this section we analyse the denominator $D_n(x)$ of the interpolant in Equation (1), using the function $A : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$A(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{4k+2}{(2k+1)^2 - x}. \quad (35)$$

This function is increasing and can be extended to a homeomorphism between $[0, 1]$ and $[\pi/2, +\infty] \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, with the topology in the introduction, as shown by the next lemma. In the rest of the article we work with this extension of A and its inverse A^{-1} .

Lemma 5 (The function A) *The function A defined in Equation (35) is increasing, $A(0) = \pi/2$ and*

$$-1/2 \leq A(x) - \frac{2}{1-x} \leq \frac{\pi-4}{2} < -0.42. \quad (36)$$

In particular, A can be extended to a homeomorphism between $[0, 1]$ and $[\pi/2, +\infty]$. \blacktriangle

The section is based upon the observation that for a regular x , as j tends to infinity the denominator $D_{n_j}(x)$ can be accurately described by the expression

$$D_{n_j}(x) \approx (-1)^{l_{n_j}(x)} n_j A(\rho_{n_j}^2(x)),$$

where A is the function defined in Equation (35),

$$l_n(x) := \lfloor n(x+1)/2 \rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_n(x) := n(x - x_{l_n(x),n}) - 1, \quad (37)$$

so that $l_n(x) \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$,

$$x = \frac{2l_n(x) + \rho_n(x) + 1}{n} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_n(x) \in (-1, 1). \quad (38)$$

Formally, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 6 (The size and sign of the denominator) *If $x \in (-1, 1) \setminus \{x_{0,n}, \dots, x_{n,n}\}$ then*

$$\rho_n(x) \in (-1, 1), \quad \text{sign}(D_n(x)) = (-1)^{l_n(x)},$$

$$| |D_n(x)/n| - A(\rho_n^2(x)) | \leq \frac{1}{4(1+l_n(x))} + \frac{1}{4(n-l_n(x))} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (39)$$

and

$$|D_n(x)/n| \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |D_n(x)/n| \geq A(\rho_n^2(x))/2 \geq \frac{3}{4(1-\rho_n^2(x))}. \quad (40)$$

In particular, if x is regular for the sequence n_j then

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|D_{n_j}(x)|}{n_j A(\rho_{n_j}^2(x))} = 1. \quad (41)$$

▲

The last two lemmas imply that the possible values for $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} D_{n_j}(x)/n_j$ can be found by analysing the limits $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} t_{n_j}(x)$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n_j}^2(x)$.

Corollary 2 (Convergence of $D_n(x)/n$) *If x is regular for the sequence n_j then*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_j} D_{n_j}(x) = L \in \overline{\mathbb{R}} \quad (42)$$

if and only if

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^{t_{n_j}(x)} = \text{sign}(L), \quad |L| \geq \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n_j}^2(x) = A^{-1}(|L|). \quad (43)$$

▲

This corollary leads to a clean description of the limits $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} D_{n_j}(x)/n_j$ when x is irrational, due to the following theorem by S. Hartmann:

Theorem 4 (Hartmann's Theorem [5]) *For every irrational number ξ , and integers s, a, b , with $s \geq 1$, there are infinitely many integers u and $v > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \xi - \frac{u}{v} \right| \leq \frac{2s^2}{v^2} \quad \text{with} \quad u \equiv a \pmod{s} \quad \text{and} \quad v \equiv b \pmod{s}. \quad (44)$$

▲

Using Hartmann's theorem we can prove the following Lemma:

Lemma 7 (Convergence of the denominator for irrational x) *If $x \in (-1, 1)$ is irrational then for each $r_n \in \{0, 1\}$ and y with $|y| \in [\pi/2, +\infty]$ there exists a sequence n_j such that*

$$n_j \equiv r_n \pmod{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_j} D_{n_j}(x) = y. \quad (45)$$

▲

In words, Lemma 7 shows that if x is irrational then we can obtain all elements in the extended intervals $[-\infty, -\pi/2]$ and $[\pi/2, +\infty]$ as limits for $D_{n_j}(x)/n_j$, for sequences n_j with the same parity, be this parity odd or even. Unfortunately things are more complex when x is rational and we must consider a few cases, as we do in the next lemmas. The first one shows that the set of possible limits for $D_n(x)/n$ is finite in this case.

Lemma 8 (Finitely many limits $D_n(x)/n$ for x rational) For $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, with $q \neq 0$. If $x = p/q - 1 \in (-1, 1)$ is regular for the sequence n_j and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_j} D_{n_j}(x) = L \in \overline{\mathbb{R}} \quad (46)$$

then L is finite and $|L| = A(m^2/q^2)$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \leq m < q$. Moreover, there exists j_0 such that if $j \geq j_0$ then

$$(-1)^{t_{n_j}(x)} = \text{sign}(L) \quad \text{and} \quad |\rho_{n_j}(x)| = m/q.$$

▲

The hypothesis of Lemma 8 accounts for $L = \pm\infty$, but its thesis states that this case is actually not possible. In particular, this Lemma implies that if x is regular for n_j then the $D_{n_j}(x)/n_j$ are bounded. Lemma 8 also shows that if the sequence $D_{n_j}(x)/n_j$ converges in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and x is rational and regular then $|\rho_{n_j}(x)|$ and the parity of $t_{n_j}(x)$ become eventually constant, and L belongs to one of the two finite sets

$$\mathcal{O}(p/q) := \{L \in \overline{\mathbb{R}} \text{ such that Equation (46) holds for some odd sequence } n_j \text{ for which } x = p/q - 1 \text{ is regular}\} \quad (47)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(p/q) := \{L \in \overline{\mathbb{R}} \text{ such that Equation (46) holds for some even sequence } n_j \text{ for which } x = p/q - 1 \text{ is regular}\}. \quad (48)$$

The description of the sets of limits $\mathcal{O}(p/q)$ and $\mathcal{E}(p/q)$ is a tedious exercise in elementary number theory, but we present it below for completeness. The possible cases are listed in the next three corollaries. After the statement of these corollaries we end this section with the proofs of the result stated in it.

Corollary 3 ($\mathcal{O}(p/q)$ and $\mathcal{E}(p/q)$ for odd p and q) If $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ and p and q are odd then

$$\mathcal{O}(p/q) = \{\pm A(4\ell^2/q^2) \text{ with } \ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, (q-1)/2\}\} \quad (49)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(p/q) = \{\pm A((2\ell+1)^2/q^2) \text{ with } \ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, (q-3)/2\}\}. \quad (50)$$

▲

Corollary 4 ($\mathcal{O}(2p/q)$ and $\mathcal{E}(2p/q)$) If $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ and q is odd then

$$\mathcal{O}(2p/q) = \left\{ (-1)^s A\left((4\ell + 2p - 2s - q)^2/q^2\right) \text{ for } s \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } s - p + 1 \leq 2\ell \leq s - p + q - 1 \right\} \quad (51)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(2p/q) = \left\{ (-1)^s A\left((4\ell - 2s - q)^2/q^2\right) \text{ for } s \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } s + 1 \leq 2\ell \leq s + q - 1 \right\}. \quad (52)$$

▲

Finally,

Corollary 5 ($\mathcal{O}(p/2q)$ and $\mathcal{E}(p/2q)$) *If $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ and p is odd then*

$$\mathcal{O}(p/2q) = \left\{ \pm A \left(\frac{(2\ell+1)^2}{4q^2} \right) \text{ with } \ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\} \right\} \quad (53)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(p/2q) = \{ \pm A(\ell^2/q^2) \text{ with } \ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\} \}. \quad (54)$$

▲

Proof of Lemma 5. The derivative of A

$$A'(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{4k+2}{((2k+1)^2 - x)^2}$$

has parcels of alternating signs and decreasing absolute values, with a positive first term. Therefore $A'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1)$, and A is a increasing function of x . Moreover, executing the command

Sum[2 (-1)^k / (2 k + 1), k = 0 to Infinity]

in the software Wolfram Alpha we obtain that $A(0) = \pi/2$.

The same argument used above shows that the function $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$h(x) = A(x) - \frac{2}{1-x} = - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{4k+2}{(2k+1)^2 - x}$$

is decreasing, and executing

Sum[2 (-1)^k / (2 k + 1), k = 1 to Infinity]

and

Sum[(-1)^k (4 k + 2) / ((2 k + 1)^2 - 1), k = 1 to Infinity]

in Wolfram Alpha we obtain that

$$h(0) = (\pi - 4)/2 \approx -0.429036 \quad \text{and} \quad h(1) = -1/2.$$

This proves Equation (36). □

Proof of Lemma 6. We have that

$$x_{l_n(x),n} < x < x_{l_n(x)+1,n} \Rightarrow 0 < \theta_n(x) := n(x+1)/2 - l_n(x) < 1.$$

Equation (37) defines $\rho_n(x) := n(x - x_{l_n(x),n}) - 1$ and

$$\rho_n(x) = n(x - 2(n(x+1)/2 - \theta_n(x))/n + 1) - 1 = 2\theta_n(x) - 1 \in (-1, 1).$$

Therefore $\rho_n^2(x) < 1$, and the definition of D_n in Equation (2) leads to

$$D_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{l_n(x)} (-1)^k \frac{1}{x - x_{k,n}} + \sum_{k=l_n(x)+1}^n (-1)^k \frac{1}{x - x_{k,n}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k=0}^{l_n(x)} (-1)^{l_n(x)-k} \frac{1}{x - x_{l_n(x)-k,n}} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-l_n(x)-1} (-1)^{l_n(x)+k} \frac{1}{x_{l_n(x)+k+1,n} - x} \\
&= (-1)^{l_n(x)} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{l_n(x)} (-1)^k \frac{1}{x - x_{l_n(x),n} + 2k/n} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-l_n(x)-1} (-1)^k \frac{1}{x_{l_n(x)+1,n} - x + 2k/n} \right) \\
&= (-1)^{l_n(x)} n \left(\sum_{k=0}^{l_n(x)} (-1)^k \frac{1}{n(x - x_{l_n(x),n}) + 2k} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-l_n(x)-1} (-1)^k \frac{1}{n(x_{l_n(x)+1,n} - x) + 2k + 2} \right) \\
&= (-1)^{l_n(x)} n \left(\sum_{k=0}^{l_n(x)} (-1)^k \frac{1}{2k + 1 + \rho_n(x)} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-l_n(x)-1} (-1)^k \frac{1}{2k + 1 - \rho_n(x)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$D_n(x) = (-1)^{l_n(x)} n (U_n(x) + V_n(x)) \quad (55)$$

for

$$U_n(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{l_n(x)} (-1)^k \frac{1}{2k + 1 + \rho_n(x)} \quad (56)$$

and

$$V_n(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-l_n(x)-1} (-1)^k \frac{1}{2k + 1 - \rho_n(x)}. \quad (57)$$

Since $\rho_n(x) \in (-1, 1)$ the absolute values of the parcels of the sum $U_n(x)$ and $V_n(x)$ decrease with k , their sign alternate, and the first parcel is positive. Therefore, $U_n(x)$ and $V_n(x)$ are positive and Equation (55) shows that $D_n(x)$ has the sign claimed by Lemma 6. Moreover, the definition (35) of the function A shows that

$$A(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \left(\frac{1}{2k + 1 - \sqrt{x}} + \frac{1}{2k + 1 + \sqrt{x}} \right)$$

and Equation (55) yields

$$|D_n(x)| / n - A(\rho_n^2(x)) = \sum_{k=l_n(x)+1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{1}{2k + 1 + \rho_n(x)} + \sum_{k=n-l_n(x)}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{1}{2k + 1 - \rho_n(x)}.$$

It follows that

$$||D_n(x)| / n - A(\rho_n^2(x))| \leq G_n(x) + H_n(x),$$

for

$$G_n(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{1}{2k + 2l_n(x) + 3 + \rho_n(x)}$$

and

$$H_n(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{1}{2k + 2(n - l_n(x)) + 1 - \rho_n(x)}.$$

Replacing k by 2ℓ and $2\ell + 1$ in the expression of G_n above we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
G_n(x) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4\ell + 2l_n(x) + 3 + \rho_n(x)} - \frac{1}{4\ell + 2l_n(x) + 5 + \rho_n(x)} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{(4\ell + 2l_n(x) + 3 + \rho_n(x))(4\ell + 2l_n(x) + 5 + \rho_n(x))}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{(4t + 2\iota_n(x) + 3 + \rho_n(x))(4t + 2\iota_n(x) + 5 + \rho_n(x))} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \ln \left(1 + \frac{2}{2\iota_n(x) + 3 + \rho_n(x)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2(2\iota_n(x) + 3 + \rho_n(x))} \leq \frac{1}{4(1 + \iota_n(x))}. \end{aligned}$$

The integral above was computed with Wolfram Alpha, and a similar computation shows that

$$H_n(x) \leq \frac{1}{4(n - \iota_n(x))},$$

and the second part of Equation (39) holds. It follows that

$$|D_n(x)/n| \geq A(\rho_n^2(x)) - 1/2 \geq \frac{\pi}{2} - 1/2 > 1.07 > 1,$$

because $A(\rho_{n_j}^2(x)) \geq \pi/2$. This proves the first part of bound (40). We also have

$$|D_n(x)/n| \geq A(\rho_n^2(x)) - 1/\pi A(\rho_n^2(x)) > A(\rho_n^2(x))/2,$$

and $2/(1 - \rho_n^2(x)) \geq 2$ because $\rho_n^2(x) \in [0, 1)$. Equation (36) shows that

$$A(\rho_n^2(x)) \geq \frac{2}{1 - \rho_n^2(x)} - \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{2}{1 - \rho_n^2(x)} - \frac{1}{4} \times \frac{2}{1 - \rho_n^2(x)} = \frac{3}{4(1 - \rho_n^2(x))},$$

and this proves the second Equation in (40).

Finally, for every $x \in (-1, 1)$ regular we have that

$$\lim_{n_j \rightarrow \infty} \iota_{n_j}(x) = \lim_{n_j \rightarrow \infty} n - \iota_{n_j}(x) = +\infty.$$

This observation and the equations above imply Equation (41). \square

Proof of Corollary 2. Let us assume Equation (42) and prove Equation (43). Lemma 6 shows that $|D_n(x)/n| \geq 1$ for all x and n . Therefore, $L \neq 0$ and for j large enough we must have

$$\text{sign}(D_{n_j}(x)) = \text{sign}(L),$$

and Equation (39) shows that this is also the sign of $(-1)^{\iota_{n_j}(x)}$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^{\iota_{n_j}(x)} = \text{sign}(L).$$

Moreover, Equation (41) implies that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} A(\rho_{n_j}^2(x)) = L. \tag{58}$$

Since A is continuous and $[0, 1]$ is compact, this implies that $L \in A([0, 1]) = [\pi/2, +\infty]$ and $L \geq \pi/2$. Finally, since A^{-1} is continuous Equation (58) implies that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n_j}^2(x) = A^{-1}(L)$ and the proof of Equation (43) is complete.

Let us now assume Equation (43) and prove Equation (42). The continuity of A implies that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} A(\rho_{n_j}^2(x)) = |L|,$$

and Equation (41) implies that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_j} |D_{n_j}(x)| = |L|.$$

This equation combined with the assumption

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^{t_{n_j}(x)} = \text{sign}(L)$$

and Equation (39) implies Equation (42) and we are done. \square

Proof of Lemma 7. Let $r_i \in \{0, 1\}$ be such that $(-1)^{r_i} = \text{sign}(y)$ and

$$z := \sqrt{A^{-1}(|y|)},$$

so that if z_j is a sequence such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} z_j = z$ then

$$y = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^{r_i} A(z_j^2).$$

Lemma 6 shows that to prove Lemma 7 it suffices to define a sequence n_j such that

$$n_j \equiv r_n \pmod{2}, \quad t_{n_j}(x) \equiv r_i \pmod{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n_j}(x) = z. \quad (59)$$

Since the image of A^{-1} is $[0, 1]$ we have that $z \in [0, 1]$, and there exist sequences $p_j, q_j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} p_j/q_j = z$ and $0 < p_j/q_j < 1$. We start with an empty set of integers n_j , and build them by induction. At the j th step we use Hartmann's Theorem with $\xi = x + 1$, $s = 4q_j$, $a = 2q_j r_i + p_j + q_j$ and $b = q_j r_n$, and conclude that there exist infinitely many numbers u and v such that

$$\left| x + 1 - \frac{4q_j u + 2q_j r_i + p_j + q_j}{4q_j v + q_j r_n} \right| < \frac{32q_j^2}{(4q_j v + q_j r_n)^2} \leq \frac{2}{v^2}.$$

This implies that

$$x + 1 = \frac{4u + 2r_i + 1 + p_j/q_j}{4v + r_n} + \theta_j \frac{1}{v^2} \quad (60)$$

for some $\theta_j \in [-2, 2]$. Taking a pair (u_j, v_j) with v_j so large that

$$0 < 1 + p_j/q_j - 2(4v_j + r_n)/v_j^2 < 1 + p_j/q_j + 2(4v_j + r_n)/v_j^2 < 2, \quad (61)$$

and for which $n_j := 4v_j + r_n$ is larger than the previous n_j , we obtain a n_j which satisfies the parity requirement in Lemma 7 and

$$n_j(x + 1)/2 = 2u_j + r_i + (1 + p_j/q_j + \theta_j n_j/v_j^2)/2.$$

The definition (37) of t_n and Equation (61) implies that

$$t_{n_j}(x) = \lfloor n_j(x + 1)/2 \rfloor = 2u_j + r_i,$$

and this $t_{n_j}(x)$ has the parity claimed by Equation (59), and Equation (60) yields

$$x - x_{t_{n_j}(x), n_j} = x + 1 - 2 \frac{2u_j + r_i}{4v_j + r_n} = \frac{1 + p_j/q_j}{4v_j + r_n} + \theta_j \frac{1}{v_j^2},$$

and the definition (37) of ρ yields

$$\rho_{n_j}(x) = n_j \left(x - x_{l_{n_j}(x), n_j} \right) - 1 = p_j/q_j + \theta_j (4v_j + r_n) / v_j^2.$$

Since $|\theta_j| \leq 2$ and $r_n \in \{0, 1\}$, we have that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n_j}(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} p_j/q_j = z,$$

and the proof of Lemma 7 is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 8. Corollary 2 shows that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\rho_{n_j}(x)| = M := A^{-1}(|L|), \quad (62)$$

and there exists j_0 such that if $j \geq j_0$ then $(-1)^{l_{n_j}(x)} = \text{sign}(L)$ and

$$|\rho_{n_j}(x)| = M + \varepsilon_j \quad \text{with} \quad |\varepsilon_j| \leq \frac{1 - (qM - \lfloor qM \rfloor)}{2q}. \quad (63)$$

Equation (38) and the hypothesis $x = p/q - 1$ imply that

$$p/q = (2l_{n_j}(x) + \sigma_j(M + \varepsilon_j) + 1) / n_j, \quad (64)$$

with $\sigma_j \in \{-1, 1\}$, and

$$pn_j - 2ql_{n_j}(x) - \sigma_j \lfloor qM \rfloor - q = \sigma_j (q\varepsilon_j + (qM - \lfloor qM \rfloor)). \quad (65)$$

Since $|\sigma_j| = 1$, Equation (63) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_j (q\varepsilon_j + (qM - \lfloor qM \rfloor))| &\leq (1 - (qM - \lfloor qM \rfloor)) / 2 + qM - \lfloor qM \rfloor \\ &= (1 + (qM - \lfloor qM \rfloor)) / 2 < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since the left hand side of Equation (65) is integer, we have that

$$q\varepsilon_j + (qM - \lfloor qM \rfloor) = 0 \Rightarrow \varepsilon_j = \lfloor qM \rfloor / q - M,$$

Equation (63) yields

$$|\rho_{n_j}(x)| = \lfloor qM \rfloor / q,$$

and Equation (62) implies that $\lfloor qM \rfloor = qM$. It follows that $qM \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $M = m/q$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, $|\rho_{n_j}(x)| = m/q$, and the proof of Lemma 8 is complete. \square

Proof of Corollary 3. For a regular $x = p/q - 1$, with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} D_{n_j}(x) / n_j = L$, Lemma 8 implies that there exist $i_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|m| < q$, and $s \in \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$p/q = (2(2i_j + s) + m/q + 1) / n_j, \quad (-1)^s = \text{sign}(L) \quad \text{and} \quad |L| = A(m^2/q^2),$$

and the first Equation above is equivalent to

$$pn_j = 2(2i_j + s)q + m + q. \quad (66)$$

When n_j is odd, this equation implies that $\ell := m/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $|\ell| \leq (q-1)/2$. Therefore, $|L| = A(4\ell^2/q^2)$ and the set in Equation (49) does contain all relevant limits L . Conversely, with $m = 2\ell$ and $m_j = (n_j - 1)/2$, Equation (66) is equivalent to

$$pm_j = (2i_j + s)q + \ell + (q - p)/2 = (2q)i_j + (sq + \ell + (q - p)/2).$$

For every s and ℓ this equation has infinitely many solutions $(m_j, i_j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ because $\gcd(p, 2q) = 1$. Therefore, for every $m = 2\ell$, and $s \in \{0, 1\}$ there exist infinitely many $n_j = 2m_j + 1$ which satisfy Equation (66), and all elements in the set $\mathcal{O}(p/q)$ in Equation (49) are indeed limits of sequences $D_{n_j}(x)/n_j$ with odd n_j . This completes the verification of Equation (49).

When n_j is even, Equation (66) implies that $\ell := (m-1)/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|2\ell+1| < q$ and $|L| = A((2\ell+1)^2/q^2)$, and the set in Equation (50) does contain all the relevant limits L . Moreover, for $m_j = n_j/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m = 2\ell+1$, Equation (66) reduces to

$$pm_j = (2i_j + s)q + \ell + (q+1)/2 = (2q)i_j + (sq + \ell + (q+1)/2)$$

and, as before, we can find infinitely many (m_j, i_j) which satisfy this equation, and use then to generate sequences n_j with all the limits in the set in Equation (50). As a result, Equation (50) is valid, and this proof is complete. \square

Proof of Corollary 4. If $x = 2p/q - 1$ is regular and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} D_{n_j}(x)/n_j = L$ then Lemma 8 implies that there exist $i_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|m| < q$ and $s \in \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$2p/q = (2(2i_j + s) + m/q + 1)/n_j, \quad (-1)^s = \text{sign}(L) \quad \text{and} \quad |L| = A(m^2/q^2).$$

The first Equation above is equivalent to

$$2pn_j = 2(2i_j + s)q + m + q,$$

and it implies that $h := (m-1)/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore,

$$pn_j = (2i_j + s)q + h + (q+1)/2. \tag{67}$$

If n_j is odd then $\ell := (s+h-p+(q+1)/2) \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $m = 4\ell + 2p - 2s - q$. Since $|m| < q$ we have that

$$-q+1 \leq 4\ell + 2p - 2s - q \leq q-1$$

and

$$1 - 2p + 2s \leq 4\ell \leq -2p + 2s + 2q - 1 \Rightarrow s - p + 1 \leq 2\ell \leq s - p + q - 1,$$

and the set in Equation (51) contains all the relevant limits. Conversely, for $m_j := (n_j + 1)/2$ and $h = 2\ell + p - s - (q+1)/2$, Equation (67) reduces to

$$pm_j = i_j q + \ell + s(q-1)/2,$$

and since $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ there exist infinitely many m_j and i_j which satisfy this equation, and all elements of the set $\mathcal{O}(2p/q)$ in Equation (51) are indeed limits corresponding to conveniently chosen odd sequences.

If n_j is even then Equation (67) yields $\ell := (s+h+(q+1)/2) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $m = 2h+1$, we obtain

$$h = 2\ell - s - (q+1)/2 \Rightarrow m = 4\ell - 2s - q,$$

and the bound $|m| < q$ leads to $1 + s \leq 2\ell < s + q - 1$, and Equation (52) is correct. Finally, with $m_j := n_j/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and h above, Equation (67) reduces to

$$pm_j = i_j q + \ell + s(q-1)/2,$$

and since $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ there exist infinitely many (m_j, i_j) which satisfy this equation. \square

Proof of Corollary 5. If $x = p/2q - 1$ is regular and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} D_{n_j}(x)/n_j = L$ then Lemma 8 implies that there exist $i_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|m| < 2q$, and $s \in \{0, 1\}$, such that

$$\frac{p}{2q} = (2(2i_j + s) + m/2q + 1)/n_j, \quad (-1)^s = \text{sign}(L) \quad \text{and} \quad |L| = A\left(\frac{m^2}{4q^2}\right).$$

The first equation above is equivalent to

$$pn_j = 4(2i_j + s)q + m + 2q. \quad (68)$$

When n_j is odd, $\ell := (m-1)/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the bound $|m| < 2q$ implies that $|\ell| \leq q-1$ and Equation (53) is correct. Conversely, for $m = 2\ell + 1$ and $m_j = (n_j - 1)/2$ Equation (68) reduces to

$$pm_j + = (4q)i_j + sq + \ell + \frac{1-p}{2} + q,$$

and since $\gcd(p, 4q) = 1$, for each s and ℓ this equation has infinitely many solutions (n_j, i_j) , which we can use to build sequences with the limits in the set in Equation (53).

When n_j is even, Equation (68) implies that $\ell := m/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the bound $|m| < 2q$ implies that $|\ell| \leq q-1$ and Equation (54) is correct. Conversely, for $m = 2\ell$ above and $m_j := n_j/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, Equation (68) reduces to

$$pm_j = 4i_j + 2sq + \ell + q,$$

and since $\gcd(p, 4q) = 1$, for each s and ℓ this equation has infinitely many solutions (n_j, i_j) , from which we can obtain sequences with the limits in Equation (54). \square

4 The numerator of the error for f in AC^1

In this section we explore the consequences of the observation in the introduction that Berrut's interpolants are biased. After we remove the bias, the relevant quantity for understanding the convergence of the interpolants B_n is defined as

$$\Delta_n(f, x) := \frac{f(-1) - f(x)}{2(x+1)} + (-1)^n \frac{f(1) - f(x)}{2(x-1)} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-1)^k \frac{f(x_{k,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k,n}} \quad (69)$$

for $x \notin \{x_{0,n}, \dots, x_{n,n}\}$, and $\Delta_n(f, x_{k,n}) := 0$. We can then express the combination of $\Delta_n(f, x)$ and the bias $O(f, x)$ for $n_j = 2j+1$ odd as

$$B_{2n+1}(f, x) - f(x) = (\Delta_{2n+1}(f, x) + O(f, z)) / D_{2n+1}(x). \quad (70)$$

For $n_j = 2n$ the bias is $E(f, x)$ and we have

$$B_{2n}(f, x) - f(x) = (\Delta_{2n}(f, x) + E(f, x)) / D_{2n}(x). \quad (71)$$

The expression for $\Delta_n(f, x)$ for both parities is the same, that is, the bias is related to parity, but the mean term $\Delta_n(f, x)$ is not. We can then obtain a clean result regarding the convergence of the numerator of the error, which we prove in the end of this section.

Theorem 5 (The uniform convergence of the numerator) *If $f \in AC^1$ then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Delta_n(f)\|_\infty = 0.$$

▲

Proof of Theorem 5. Given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, by the absolute continuity of $f'(x)$ there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ for which

$$\sum_{k=0}^m |y_k - z_k| \leq \delta \Rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^m |f'(y_k) - f'(z_k)| < \varepsilon/3, \quad (72)$$

and we now define

$$n_0 := 1024 + \left\lceil \left(1 + \|f''\|_1^2\right) \frac{1}{100\delta\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil, \quad (73)$$

take $n \geq n_0$ and $x \in [-1, 1]$ and show that $|\Delta_n(f, x)| \leq \varepsilon$. If $x \in \{x_{0n}, \dots, x_{n,n}\}$ then $\Delta_n(f, x) = 0$ by definition and we are done. For $x \notin \{x_{0n}, \dots, x_{n,n}\}$, let i be the index such that $x_{i,n}$ is the node closest to x . We split the sum which defines $\Delta_n(f, x)$ in Equation (69) in at most three parts: F (first), M (middle) and L (last), according to the distance of x to ± 1 . When x is too close to -1 we leave the First region empty, and if x is too close to 1 then the Last range is left empty. When not empty, the First range corresponds to parcels with indexes from 0 to $2m$. The Middle range spans the indexes from $2m$ to $n - 2\ell$, and contains of the order of $\sqrt{\delta n}$ parcels (the parcel corresponding to $k = 2m$ is split between the First and Middle ranges.) When not empty, the Last range starts at index $n - 2\ell$ and ends a index n , and the parcel of index $n - 2\ell$ is split between the Middle and Last ranges.

Formally, we define

1. If $i < \sqrt{\delta n}/4$ then, since $n \geq n_0$, Equation (73) implies that $n > i + \sqrt{\delta n}/4$ and we define $m := 0$,

$$\ell = n - 2 \left\lfloor \left(n - i - \sqrt{\delta n}/4 \right) / 2 \right\rfloor + 2, \quad (74)$$

$F := 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} M := & \frac{f(x_{2m,n}) - f(x)}{2(x - x_{2m,n})} + (-1)^n \frac{f(x_{n-2\ell,n}) - f(x)}{2(x - x_{n-2\ell,n})} \\ & + \sum_{k=2m+1}^{n-2\ell-1} (-1)^k \frac{f(x_{k,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k,n}} \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} L := & (-1)^n \frac{f(x_{n-2\ell,n}) - f(x)}{2(x - x_{n-2\ell,n})} + (-1)^n \frac{f(1) - f(x)}{2(x - 1)} + \\ & \sum_{k=n-2\ell+1}^n (-1)^k \frac{f(x_{k,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k,n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

2. If $\sqrt{\delta n}/4 \leq i < n - \sqrt{\delta n}/4$ then we set

$$m := 2 \left\lceil \left(i - \sqrt{\delta n}/4 \right) / 2 \right\rceil + 2, \quad (77)$$

define M and L as in Equations (76) and (77), and

$$F := \frac{f(-1) - f(x)}{2(x+1)} + \frac{f(x_{2m,n}) - f(x)}{2(x - x_{2m,n})} + \sum_{k=1}^{2m-1} (-1)^k \frac{f(x_{k,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k,n}}. \quad (78)$$

3. Finally, if $i \geq n - \sqrt{\delta n}/4$ then we define m as in Equation (77), $\ell = 0$, M and F as in Equations (76) and (78), and $L := 0$.

We now bound M . Splitting each parcel in two parts, and grouping consecutive halves and using the Mean Value Theorem we obtain

$$2|M| = \left| \sum_{k=2m}^{n-2\ell-1} \left(\frac{f(x_{k,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k,n}} - \frac{f(x_{k+1,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k+1,n}} \right) \right| \leq \sum_{k=2m}^{n-2\ell-1} |f'(\xi_k) - f'(\xi_{k+1})|$$

with

$$|\xi_k - x| \leq 2 \max \{i - 2m, n - 2\ell - i\} / n.$$

The indexes ℓ and m were defined in Equations (74) and (77) so that

$$0 < i - 2m \leq \sqrt{\delta n}/4, \quad 0 < n - 2\ell - i \leq \sqrt{\delta n}/4 \quad \text{and} \quad |\xi_k - x| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\delta n}}{2n}$$

This implies that $|\xi_k - \xi_{k+1}| \leq \sqrt{\delta/n}$,

$$\sum_{k=2m}^{n-2\ell} |\xi_k - \xi_{k+1}| \leq (n - 2\ell - 2m) \sqrt{\delta/n} \leq \sqrt{\delta n}/2 \times \sqrt{\delta/n} \leq \delta,$$

and Equation (72) implies that $M \leq \varepsilon/3$. We now show that $L \leq \varepsilon/3$ in the case in which it is different from zero (By symmetry, the same bound applies to F .)

Defining $y_k = x_{n-2\ell+k,n}$, we can group the terms of L as

$$\begin{aligned} -2(-1)^n L &= \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \left(\left(\frac{f(y_{2j+1}) - f(x)}{y_{2j+1} - x} - \frac{f(y_{2j+2}) - f(x)}{y_{2j+2} - x} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left(\frac{f(y_{2j}) - f(x)}{y_{2j} - x} - \frac{f(y_{2j+1}) - f(x)}{y_{2j+1} - x} \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} [y_{2j}, x, y_{2j+1}, f] - [y_{2j+2}, x, y_{2j+1}, f], \end{aligned}$$

where $[x_1, x_2, x_3, f]$ denotes the divided difference of second order corresponding to x_1, x_2, x_3 and f , because

$$y_{2j} - y_{2j+1} = y_{2j+1} - y_{2j+2} = -2/n.$$

Since f' is absolutely continuous, the Genocchi-Hermite formula [3] yields

$$[u, v, w, f] = \int_0^1 \int_0^{1-t} f''((1-t-s)u + sv + tw) ds dt,$$

and leads to

$$-2(-1)^n L = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \int_0^1 h_j(t) dt, \quad (79)$$

with $z_j := y_j - x > 0$ and

$$h_j(t) := \int_0^{1-t} f''(x + t z_{2j} + s z_{2j+1}) ds - \int_0^{1-t} f''(x + t z_{2j+2} + s z_{2j+1}) ds.$$

The changes of variables

$$u = x + t z_{2j} + s z_{2j+1} \quad \text{and} \quad v = x + t z_{2j+2} + s z_{2j+1}$$

have the same Jacobian z_{2j+1} with respect to s and

$$z_{2j+1} h_j(t) = \int_{x+t z_{2j}}^{x+t z_{2j}+(1-t)z_{2j+1}} f''(u) du - \int_{x+t z_{2j+2}}^{x+t z_{2j+2}+(1-t)z_{2j+1}} f''(v) dv.$$

Since $z_{k+1} - z_k = 2/n$,

$$\begin{aligned} z_{2j+1} h_j(t) &= \int_{x+t z_{2j}}^{x+z_{2j+1}-2t/n} f''(u) du - \int_{x+t z_{2j+2}}^{x+z_{2j+1}+2t/n} f''(u) du \\ &= \int_{x+t z_{2j}}^{x+t z_{2j+2}} f''(u) du - \int_{x+z_{2j+1}-2t/n}^{x+z_{2j+1}+2t/n} f''(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

The bound

$$z_{2j+1} = x_{2j+n-2\ell,n} - x \geq x_{n-2\ell,n} - x \geq \frac{2\sqrt{\delta n} - 4}{4n} \geq \sqrt{\delta/n}/3$$

and the fact that $t \in [0, 1]$ lead to

$$|h_j(t)| \leq 3\sqrt{n/\delta} \left(\int_{x+t z_{2j}}^{x+t z_{2j+2}} |f''(u)| du + \int_{x+z_{2j}}^{x+z_{2j+2}} |f''(u)| du \right).$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} |h_j(t)| \leq 3\sqrt{n/\delta} \left(\int_{x+t z_0}^{x+t z_{2\ell}} |f''(u)| du + \int_{x+z_0}^{x+z_{2\ell}} |f''(u)| du \right) \leq 6\sqrt{n/\delta} \|f''\|_1,$$

and the same bound applies to $\int_0^1 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} |h_j(t)| dt$. The choice of n_0 in Equation (73) and Equation (79) yield

$$|L| \leq 3\sqrt{\frac{1}{n\delta}} \|f''\|_1 \leq \varepsilon/3,$$

and we are done. \square

5 The numerator of the error for f in BV^1

In this section we analyze the function $\Delta_n(f, x)$ defined in Equation (69) for functions f with derivatives of bounded variation. In summary, we show that in this case Δ_n is bounded by half the total variation of f' . Our proof follows from this version of the Mean Value Theorem:

Theorem 6 (A monotone Mean Value Theorem) *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $a < b$, and let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, which is differentiable in (a, b) . If c and ξ_c are such that $a < \xi_c < c < b$ and*

$$f'(\xi_c) = \frac{f(c) - f(a)}{c - a} \quad (80)$$

then there exists $\xi_b \in [\xi_c, b)$ such that

$$f'(\xi_b) = \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a}. \quad (81)$$

▲

We prove Theorem 6 at the end of this section. By induction, we conclude from this theorem that given an increasing sequence b_0, \dots, b_m , with $b_0 > a$, we can find a non decreasing sequence ξ_i , with $\xi_i \in (a, b_i)$, such that

$$f'(\xi_i) = \frac{f(b_i) - f(a)}{b_i - a}.$$

Using this observation, it is easy to prove the following corollary:

Corollary 6 (The numerator of the error for f in BV^1) *If $f \in BV^1$ and its derivative has total variation $T_{f'}[-1, 1] < +\infty$ then the function Δ_n in Equation (69) satisfies*

$$|\Delta_n(f, x)| \leq T_{f'}[-1, 1]/2.$$

▲

In fact, if $x \in \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$, then $\Delta_n(f, x) = 0$ by definition. For $x \notin \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$, Equation (69) leads to

$$\Delta_n(f, x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{f(x_{k,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k,n}} - \frac{f(x_{k+1,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k+1,n}} \right),$$

and Theorem 6 yields an increasing sequence $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n \in [-1, 1]$ such that

$$f'(\xi_k) = -\frac{f(x_{k,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k,n}}.$$

It then follows that

$$|\Delta_n(f, x)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left| \frac{f(x_{k,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k,n}} - \frac{f(x_{k+1,n}) - f(x)}{x - x_{k+1,n}} \right|$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |f'(\xi_k) - f'(\xi_{k+1})| \leq T_{f'}[-1, 1]/2,$$

This proves Corollary 6, and we now present the proof of Theorem 6.

Proof of Theorem 6. Let us start the proof with the particular case in which

$$f(c) = f(a). \quad (82)$$

By the traditional Mean Value Theorem, there exists $\mu \in (c, b)$ such that

$$f(b) - f(c) = f'(\mu)(b - c) = v(b - a) \quad \text{for} \quad v := f'(\mu) \frac{b - c}{b - a}. \quad (83)$$

Equations (80) and (82) imply that $f'(\xi_c) = 0$, and since

$$0 < \frac{b - c}{b - a} < 1$$

we have that v lies between $0 = f'(\xi_c)$ and $f'(\mu)$. Since derivatives have the intermediate value property, there exists $\xi_b \in [\xi_c, \mu] \subset [\xi, b)$ such that $f'(\xi_b) = v$. As a result, Equations (82) and (83) lead to

$$f'(\xi_b)(b - a) = f(b) - f(c) = f(b) - f(a),$$

and we have verified Equation (81) assuming that (82) holds. To handle the general case it suffices to apply the argument above to

$$g(x) = f(x) - (x - a) \frac{f(c) - f(a)}{c - a}. \quad (84)$$

In fact, $g(c) = f(c) = g(a)$ and Equation (80) implies that

$$g'(\xi_c) = f'(\xi_c) - \frac{f(c) - f(a)}{c - a} = 0 = \frac{f(a) - f(a)}{c - a} = \frac{g(c) - g(a)}{c - a}.$$

As a result, the argument above yields $\xi_b \in [\xi_c, b)$ such that

$$\frac{g(b) - g(a)}{b - a} = g'(\xi_b) = f'(\xi_b) - \frac{f(c) - f(a)}{c - a}.$$

It then follows from Equation (84) that

$$f'(\xi_b) = \frac{1}{b - a} \left(g(b) - g(a) + (b - a) \frac{f(c) - f(a)}{c - a} \right) = \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a},$$

and we are done with the general case. \square

6 Combining the numerator with the denominator

In this section we combine the results from the previous sections to prove Theorems 1, 2 and 3.

Proof of Theorem 1. We start with an odd sequence n_j and an irrational x for which $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_j (B_{n_j}(f, x) - f(x))$ converges to $L \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. According to Equation (69),

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_j (B_{n_j}(f, x) - f(x)) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_j}{D_{n_j}(x)} (\Delta_{n_j}(f, x) + O(f, x)) = L.$$

Theorem 5 in Section 4 shows that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_{n_j}(f, x) = 0,$$

and if $O(f, x) = 0$ then $L = 0$, because the sequence $n_j/D_{n_j}(x)$ is bounded by Lemma 6 in Section 3. Since $0 \in \mathcal{O}(f, x)$, we are done when $O(f, x) = 0$. Let us then assume that $O(f, x) \neq 0$. The equations above imply that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{n_j}{D_{n_j}(x)} \right| = |L/O(f, x)|,$$

and Lemma 6 shows that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{n_j}{D_{n_j}(x)} \right| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_j A(\rho_n^2(x))}{|D_{n_j}(x)|} \frac{1}{A(\rho_n^2(x))} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{A(\rho_n^2(x))} \leq 2/\pi.$$

Therefore, $|L| \leq 2|O(f, x)|/\pi$ and Equation (7) is correct. Conversely, if $z \in \mathcal{O}(f, x)$ then either $z = 0$ or $|z| \in (0, 2O(f, x)/\pi]$. In the first case, Lemma 7 yields an odd sequence n_j such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_j} D_{n_j}(x) = +\infty$$

and we have that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_j (B_{n_j}(f, x) - f(x)) = \Delta_n(f, z) \frac{n_j}{D_{n_j}(x)} = O(f, x) \times 0 = z.$$

Otherwise, when $z \neq 0$,

$$y = z/O(f, x) \in [-2/\pi, 2/\pi] \setminus \{0\} \quad (85)$$

and Lemma 7 yields an odd sequence n_j such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_j} D_{n_j}(x) = 1/y,$$

and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_j (B_{n_j}(f, x) - f(x)) = \Delta_n(f, z) \frac{n_j}{D_{n_j}(x)} = O(f, x) \times z/O(f, x) = z.$$

Therefore, we have proved the converse part of Theorem 1 for an irrational x and an odd sequence n_j . The same argument applies for an irrational x and an even sequence n_j , replacing $O(f, x)$ by $E(f, x)$ and $\mathcal{O}(f, x)$ by $\mathcal{E}(f, x)$.

Let us then analyze a rational x . Since x is regular, we must have $x \in (-1, 1)$, and there exist positive integers p and q with $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ such that $x = p/q - 1$, and we can use the argument applied in the irrational case replacing the interval $[-2/\pi, 2/\pi]$

in Equation (85) by the set $\mathcal{O}(p/q)$ or $\mathcal{E}(p/q)$ in Corollaries 3, 4 and 5 in Section 3 corresponding to the parity of p and q , and replacing the intervals

$$[-2 |O(f, x)|/\pi, 2 |O(f, x)|/\pi] \quad \text{and} \quad [-2 |E(f, x)|/\pi, 2 |E(f, x)|/\pi]$$

by the sets

$$\mathcal{O}(f, x) = \{O(f, x)/y, y \in \mathcal{O}(p/q)\} \quad (86)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(f, x) = \{E(f, x)/y, y \in \mathcal{E}(p/q)\}. \quad (87)$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2. Theorem 2 follows from Lemma 6 and Theorem 5. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Equations (70) and (71) show that

$$n \|B_n(f) - f\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\Delta_n(f)\|_\infty + \max\{\|O(f)\|_\infty, \|E(f)\|_\infty\}}{\|D_n\|_\infty/n},$$

and Equation (40) and Corollary 6 imply Equation (10). □

References

- [1] Berrut, J.-P., (1988) Rational functions for guaranteed and experimentally well-conditioned global interpolation, *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 15 (1), 1–16.
- [2] Berrut, J.-P., (2017) Linear Barycentric Rational Interpolation with Guaranteed Degree of Exactness, in *Approximation Theory XV: San Antonio 2016*, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics 201, G.E. Fasshauer and L.L. Schumaker (eds.), 1–20.
- [3] de Boor, C., (2005) Divided differences, *Surv. Approx. Theory*, 1, 46–69.
- [4] Floater, M. S. and K. Hormann, K., (2007) Barycentric rational interpolation with no poles and high rates of approximation, *Numer. Math.*, 107 (2), 315–331.
- [5] Hartman, S., (1951) Sur une condition supplémentaire dans les approximations diophantiques, *Colloq. Math.*, (2), 48–51.
- [6] Mastroianni G., and J. Szabados (2017) Barycentric interpolation at equidistant nodes, *Jaen Journal on Approximation* 9(1)