

Research Report Number 71 - 3  
Department of Computer Science  
YALE UNIVERSITY  
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

April 1971

DISCRETE TCHEBYCHEFF APPROXIMATION

FOR MULTIVARIATE SPLINES

by

#4

Martin E. Schultz

71-3

The preparation of this manuscript was supported in part  
by the Office of Naval Research (NR 044-401).

In this paper we give the theoretical analysis for the combination of two ideas in numerical analysis. The first is to approximate the Tchebycheff approximation to a function over a continuum,  $X$ , in  $R^M$  by Tchebycheff approximations over finite, discrete subsets of  $X$ , cf. [4], [5], [7], and [8], and the second is the use of multivariate spline functions as approximators. Experimental results for this combination have previously been reported in [5].

To be precise, let  $X$  be a compact subset of  $R^M$ . If  $Y$  is any closed subset of  $X$  and  $g$  is a real-valued, continuous function on  $Y$ , let

$$\|g\|_Y \equiv \max \{|g(y)| \mid y \in Y\}.$$

Given a real-valued, continuous function  $f$  and  $n$  linearly independent, real-valued, continuous basis functions  $\{B_j(x)\}_{j=1}^n$ , a common problem in numerical analysis is to solve the optimization problem

$$(1) \quad \inf \left\{ \left\| f - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j B_j \right\|_X \mid \underline{\beta} \in R^n \right\}.$$

The standard difficulties are that (i)  $f$  is usually given only on a finite discrete point set, (ii) the basis functions  $\{B_j\}_{j=1}^n$  don't satisfy the Haar condition in general so that Remez type algorithms don't work, and (iii) interpolation type schemes are impossible to define for general domains in  $R^M$ ,  $M \geq 2$ .

The approach studied in this paper is to replace  $X$  by an appropriate discrete subset  $Y$  and to consider the approximate optimization problem

$$(2) \quad \inf \left\{ \left\| f - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j B_j \right\|_Y \mid \underline{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\},$$

which, following [4], [5], and [7], is solved by being reformulated as a linear programming problem, which in turn is solved by either the simplex or dual simplex method.

We now consider a reformulation of problem (2). Let

$$\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \cap K \equiv \left\{ \underline{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \alpha_i \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq n+1 \right\} \text{ and consider}$$

$$(3) \quad \inf \left\{ \left\| f - \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \alpha_j B_j \right\|_Y \mid \underline{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \cap K \right\}$$

where  $B_{n+1} \equiv - \sum_{j=1}^n B_j$ . The following standard equivalence result is easy to prove.

Theorem 1. The two formulations (2) and (3) of the optimization problem are equivalent.

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j B_j \mid \underline{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} \equiv \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \alpha_j B_j \mid \underline{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \cap K \right\}.$$

Clearly the right-hand side is a subset of the left-hand side and hence

it suffices to show the converse. Given  $\underline{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $\alpha_{n+1} \equiv \max(0, -\min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \beta_j)$

and  $\alpha_j \equiv \alpha_{n+1} + \beta_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j B_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j B_j + \alpha_{n+1} B_{n+1} + \alpha_{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n B_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j B_j + \alpha_{n+1} B_{n+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \alpha_j B_j.$$

QED.

Let  $Y \equiv \{y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ ,  $f_i \equiv f(y_i)$ , and  $B_{ij} \equiv B_j(y_i)$ , for all  $1 \leq j \leq n+1$ ,

$1 \leq i \leq N$ . Then, if  $\epsilon(\underline{\alpha}) \equiv \left\| f - \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \alpha_j B_j \right\|_Y$ , we wish to minimize  $\epsilon$  with

respect to all  $(\underline{\alpha}, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \cap K$  subject to the constraints

$$(4) \quad -\epsilon \leq f_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \alpha_j B_{ij} \leq \epsilon, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N,$$

i.e., there are  $n+2$  unknowns and  $2N$  constraints. Rewriting (4) we have

$$(5) \quad \epsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \alpha_j B_{ij} \geq -f_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(6) \quad \epsilon + \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \alpha_j B_{ij} \geq f_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

But this is the form of a standard linear programming problem, i.e., given  $\underline{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ ,  $A$  a real  $2N \times (n+2)$  matrix, and  $\underline{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}$ , minimize  $(\underline{y}, \underline{b})$  with respect to  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \cap K$  subject to the constraint that  $A \underline{y} \geq \underline{c}$ . This problem has the dual problem of maximizing  $(\underline{x}, \underline{c})$  with respect to  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N} \cap K$  subject to the constraint that  $\underline{x}^T A \leq \underline{b}$ , cf. [6].

In this case,  $\underline{b} \equiv (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ ,  $\underline{y} \equiv (\epsilon, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n+1})$ ,  $\underline{c} \equiv (-f_1, \dots, -f_N, f_1, \dots, f_N)$ , and

$$A \equiv \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} & \boxed{-B} \\ \vdots & \\ \vdots & \\ \vdots & \boxed{B} \\ \vdots & \end{array} \right] \quad \text{where } B \equiv [B_{ij}] \text{ . Since, in general}$$

we use the simplex method to solve a linear program the number of arithmetic operations involved is directly proportional to the number of constraints and in general  $2N > (n+2)$ . Hence, we expect that the dual program, solved by the simplex method, will be more efficient, cf. [6]. Furthermore, we remark that in general we expect to obtain a "degenerate" programming problem. However, such problems present no difficulties for the simplex method, cf. [1], [3], [4], and [6].

Hence, in general we seek to maximize

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \{ s_i f_i + t_i (-f_i) \} = \sum_{i=1}^N f_i (s_i - t_i) \text{ with respect to}$$

$$(\underline{s}, \underline{t}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N} \cap K \text{ subject to the constraints } \sum_{i=1}^N B_{ij} (s_i - t_i) \leq 0,$$

$$1 \leq i \leq n+1 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^N (s_i + t_i) \leq 1.$$

We turn now to the choice of the basis functions,  $\{B_j\}_{j=1}^n$ .

We first examine the one dimensional case of  $X \equiv [0,1]$ . The classical choice for basis functions are the algebraic polynomials, cf. [8]. However, polynomials are numerically unstable and give rise to unwanted oscillations in the approximation. Moreover, the matrices  $A$  are dense and many function evaluations are needed. To remedy these we consider polynomial spline basis functions.

In particular, let  $P$  denote the set of all partitions,  $\Delta$ , of  $[0,1]$  of the form,  $\Delta : 0 = x_0 < \dots < x_N < x_{N+1} = 1$  and for each  $\Delta \in P$  and each positive integer  $d$ ,  $S(\Delta, d)$  denote the set of functions  $s(x)$  which are a polynomial of degree  $d$  on each sub-interval  $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$  defined by  $\Delta$  and which are in  $C^{d-1}[0,1]$ .

We remark that all the results of this paper may easily be extended to the case in which  $s(x)$  is assumed to be in  $C^z$ ,  $0 \leq z_i \leq d-1$ , at each interior knot  $x_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ .

To define suitable basis functions for  $S(\Delta, d)$ , we follow [2]

and augment the partition  $\Delta : 0 = x_0 < \dots < x_{N+1} = 1$  with the

points  $x_{-d} < x_{-d+1} < \dots < x_{-1} < x_0$  and  $x_{N+1} < x_{N+1+1} < \dots < x_{N+1+d}$

to form a new partition  $\tilde{\Delta} : x_{-d} < \dots < x_0 < \dots < x_{N+1} < x_{N+1+1} < \dots < x_{N+1+d}$ .

$$\text{Letting } x_+^d \equiv \begin{cases} x^d & , \text{ if } x \geq 0, \\ 0 & , \text{ if } x < 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and } W_1(x) \equiv \prod_{k=0}^{d+1} (x - x^{i+k})$$

$$\text{for } -d \leq i \leq N, \text{ we define } M_{d,i}(x; \tilde{\Delta}) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{d+1} \binom{d+1}{k} \frac{(x^{i+k} - x)^d}{W_1(x^{i+k})}$$

for  $-d \leq i \leq M$ . As a basis for  $S(\Delta, d)$  we take the restriction of the

functions  $\{ M_{d,i}(x; \tilde{\Delta}) \}_{i=-d}^N$  to the interval  $[0, 1]$ .

$$\text{If } Y \text{ is a finite subset of } [0, 1] \text{ and } |Y| \equiv \max_{x \in [0, 1]} \min_{y \in Y} |x - y|,$$

then we obtain the following new error bound which relates the error in approximating  $f$  by a solution,  $s_Y$ , of the discrete optimization problem to the error in approximating  $f$  by a solution  $s_X$  of the continuous optimization problem. The proof uses a technique developed in [8] for the case of polynomial basis functions.

Theorem 2. If  $\Delta \in P$  and  $2d^2 \Delta^{-1} |Y| < 1$ , where  $\Delta \equiv \min_{0 < i < N} (x_{i+1} - x_i)$ ,

then

$$(7) \quad \|f - s_Y\|_X \leq [2(1 - 2d^2 \Delta^{-1} |Y|)^{-1} + 1] \|f - s_X\|_X.$$

Proof. By the triangle inequality

$$(8) \quad \|f - s_Y\|_X \leq \|f - s_X\|_X + \|s_X - s_Y\|_X.$$

Let  $t \in [0, 1]$  be such that  $|(s_X - s_Y)(t)| = \|s_X - s_Y\|_X$ .

Then there exists  $y \in Y$  such that  $|t - y| \leq |Y|$  and

$$|(s_X - s_Y)(t)| \leq |(s_X - s_Y)(y)| + |Y| \|D(s_X - s_Y)\|_X.$$

Hence, using the Markov inequality for polynomial splines, cf. [9],

$$(9) \quad \|s_X - s_Y\|_X \leq \|s_X - s_Y\|_Y + |Y| 2d^2 \Delta^{-1} \|s_X - s_Y\|_X$$

$$\text{and } \|s_X - s_Y\|_X \leq (1 - |Y| 2d^2 \Delta^{-1})^{-1} \|s_X - s_Y\|_Y$$

$$\leq (1 - |Y| 2d^2 \Delta^{-1})^{-1} (\|f - s_X\|_Y + \|f - s_Y\|_Y)$$

$$\leq (1 - |Y| 2d^2 \Delta^{-1})^{-1} (2 \|f - s_X\|_X). \text{ The required result}$$

now follows from the triangle inequality and (7) and (8). QED.



If we assume a certain regularity of the function  $f$ , then we can bound the right hand side of (7). Using results of deBoor, cf. [2], we obtain

Corollary 1. Let  $2d^2 \underline{\Delta}^{-1} |Y| < 1$  and  $f \in W^{t,\infty} [0,1]$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq d+1$ ,

i.e.,  $D^{t-1}f$  is absolutely continuous and  $D^t f \in L^\infty [0,1]$ .

There exists a positive constant,  $K_{d,t}$ , such that if  $\Delta \in P$  and

$2d^2 \underline{\Delta}^{-1} |Y| < 1$  then

$$(10) \quad \|f - s_Y\|_X \leq [2(1 - 2d^2 \underline{\Delta}^{-1} |Y|)^{-1} + 1] K_{d,t} \bar{\Delta}^{-t} \|D^t f\|_X,$$

where  $\bar{\Delta} \equiv \max_{0 \leq i \leq N} (x_{i+1} - x_i)$ .

We remark that for  $S(\Delta, d)$ ,  $|Y|$  need only be of order  $\underline{\Delta}$ , for Theorem 2 to hold. While for polynomials of degree  $n$ ,  $|Y|$  need be of order  $n^{-2}$ , for the corresponding result to hold, cf. [8].

We may obtain still a further Corollary about computing the maximum absolute value of a polynomial spline function,  $s(x)$ . The idea is that by sampling the size of a spline at a sufficiently large number of points we may give a rigorous estimate of it everywhere.

Corollary 2. If  $\Delta \in P$ ,  $s(x) \in S(\Delta, d)$ , and  $2d^2 \underline{\Delta}^{-1} |Y| < 1$ , then

$$(11) \quad \|s\|_Y \leq \|s\|_X \leq (1 - 2d^2 \underline{\Delta}^{-1} |Y|)^{-1} \|s\|_Y,$$

and

$$(12) \quad 0 \leq \|s\|_Y - \|s\|_X \leq [(1 - 2d^2 \underline{\Delta}^{-1} |Y|)^{-1} - 1] \|s\|_Y \\ \leq (2d^2 \underline{\Delta}^{-1} |Y|) (1 - 2d^2 \underline{\Delta}^{-1} |Y|)^{-1} \|s\|_Y.$$

We now turn to the multivariate case. Let  $\Omega \in R^M$  be a closed

set contained in the unit cube  $\prod_{i=1}^M [0,1]_i$  in  $R^M$  and for each

$$1 \leq i \leq N \text{ let } \Delta_i : 0 = x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{N_i} < x_{N_i+1} = 1$$

be a partition of  $[0,1]_i$ . Let  $P_M$  denote the set of all partitions,  $P$ ,

of the cube of the form  $P \equiv \prod_{i=1}^M \Delta_i$ ,  $\bar{P} \equiv \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \{\bar{\Delta}_i\}$ , and

$\underline{P} \equiv \min_{1 \leq i \leq M} \{\underline{\Delta}_i\}$ , i.e.,  $\underline{P}$  is the minimum distance between two

partition points. Furthermore, let  $S(d, P) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^N S(d, \Delta_i)$ ,

i.e.,  $S(d, P)$  is the space of multivariate polynomial spline functions

of degree  $d$  with respect to  $P$ ,  $\Omega_p \equiv \{x \in \Omega \mid \text{the "N" - cell" of } P$

containing  $x$  is contained in  $\Omega\}$ , and  $Y_p \equiv \{y \in Y \mid y \in \Omega_p\}$ .

Finally, let  $|Y_p| \equiv \max_{x \in \Omega_p} \min_{y \in Y_p} \inf \{ \int_{\alpha \in \Gamma(x,y)} \|d\alpha\|_{\ell_1} \mid \Gamma(x,y) \}$

is a piecewise smooth curve all of whose points lie in  $\Omega_p$  and which connect  $y$  to  $x$ , i.e., given  $x \in \Omega_p$  there exists  $y \in Y_p$  such that the  $\ell_1$ -distance in  $\Omega_p$  between  $x$  and  $y$  is no more than  $|Y_p|$ .

The following result is a multivariate analogue of Theorem 2.

Theorem 3. If  $\Delta \in P$  and,  $2d^2 \underline{p}^{-1} |Y_p| < 1$ , then

$$(13) \quad \|f - s_{Y_p}\|_{\Omega_p} \leq [2(1 - 2d^2 \underline{p}^{-1} |Y_p|)^{-1} + 1] \|f - s_{\Omega_p}\|_{\Omega_p}$$

Proof.  $\|f - s_{Y_p}\|_{\Omega_p} \leq \|f - s_{\Omega_p}\|_{\Omega_p} + \|s_{Y_p} - s_{\Omega_p}\|_{\Omega_p}$ .

Let  $t \in \Omega_p$  be such that  $|s(t)| \equiv |s_{Y_p}(t) - s_{\Omega_p}(t)|$

$= \|s_{Y_p} - s_{\Omega_p}\|_{\Omega_p}$ . There exists a point  $y \in Y_p$  such that

$$|s(t)| \leq |s(y)| + \sum_{i=1}^N |D_i s(\xi_i)| |y_i - t_i|$$

$$\leq \|s\|_{Y_p} + \sum_{i=1}^N \|D_i s\|_{\Omega_p} |y_i - t_i|$$

$$\leq \|s\|_{Y_p} + 2d^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \underline{\Delta}_i^{-1} \|s\|_{\Omega_p} |y_i - t_i|$$

$$\leq \|s\|_{Y_P} + 2d^2 \underline{P}^{-1} |Y_P|.$$

Thus,

$$\|s_{Y_P} - s_{\Omega_P}\|_{\Omega_P} \leq (1 - |Y_P| 2d^2 \underline{P}^{-1})^{-1} \|s_{Y_P} - s_{\Omega_P}\|_{Y_P},$$

and the result follows as in Theorem 2.

QED.

Let  $W^{t,\infty}(\Omega)$  denote the closure of the set of real-valued, infinitely differentiable functions on  $\Omega$  with respect to the norm

$$\|\phi\|_{W^{t,\infty}(\Omega)} \equiv \max_{|\alpha| \leq t} \|D^\alpha \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Using the results of [9] we obtain the following multivariate analogue of Corollary 1 of Theorem 2.

Corollary 1. Let  $f \in W^{t,\infty}(\Omega)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq d+1$ .

There exists a positive constant,  $C_{d,t}$ , such that if  $P \in P_M$

and  $2d^2 \underline{P}^{-1} |Y_P| < 1$ , then

$$(14) \quad \|f - s_{Y_P}\|_{\Omega_P} \leq [2(1 - 2d^2 \underline{P}^{-1} |Y_P|)^{-1} + 1] C_{d,t} \bar{P}^t \|f\|_{W^{t,\infty}(\Omega)}$$

Similarly, we can prove the following multivariate analogue of Corollary 2 of Theorem 2.

Corollary 2. If  $P \in P_M$ ,  $s \in S(P, d)$  and  $2d^2 \underline{p}^{-1} |Y_P| < 1$ , then

$$(15) \quad \|s\|_{Y_P} \leq \|s\|_{\Omega_P} \leq (1 - |Y_P| 2d^2 \underline{p}^{-1})^{-1} \|s\|_{Y_P}, \text{ and}$$

$$(16) \quad 0 \leq \|s\|_{\Omega_P} - \|s\|_{Y_P} \leq [(1 - |Y_P| 2d^2 \underline{p}^{-1})^{-1} - 1] \|s\|_{Y_P}$$

$$\leq (2d^2 |Y_P| \underline{p}^{-1}) (1 - |Y_P| 2d^2 \underline{p}^{-1})^{-1} \|s\|_{Y_P} .$$

References

- [1] Beale, E.M.L., Cycling in the Dual Simplex Algorithm.  
Naval Res. Logist. Quart. 2, 269-275 (1955).
- [2] deBoor, C., On Uniform Approximation by Splines.  
J. Approx Theory 1, 219-235 (1968).
- [3] Charnes, A., Optimality and Degeneracy in Linear Programming.  
Econometrica 20, 160-170 (1952).
- [4] Descloux, J., Dégénérescence dans les approximations  
de Tschebyscheff lineaires et discretees.  
Numer. Math. 3, 180-187 (1961).
- [5] Each, R.E. and W.L. Eastman, Computational Methods for  
Best Spline Function Approximation.  
J. Approx. Theory 2, 85-96 (1969).
- [6] Hadley, G., Linear Programming. Addison-Wesley, Reading. (1962).
- [7] Kelley, J.E., Jr., An Application of Linear Programming to  
Curve Fitting. SIAM Journal on Applied Math 6, 15-22 (1958).
- [8] Rivlin. T.J., and Cheney E.W., A Comparison of Uniform  
Approximations on an Interval and a Finite Subset Thereof.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 3, 311-320 (1966).
- [9] Schultz, M.H.,  $L^\infty$  - Multivariate Approximation Theory.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 6, 161-183 (1969).
- [10] Schultz, M.H., On the Approximation of Linear Functions.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 7, 107-113 (1970).
- [11] Schultz, M.H., On the Approximation of Linear Functions.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 7, 107-113 (1970).
- [12] Schultz, M.H., On the Approximation of Linear Functions.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 7, 107-113 (1970).
- [13] Schultz, M.H., On the Approximation of Linear Functions.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 7, 107-113 (1970).
- [14] Schultz, M.H., On the Approximation of Linear Functions.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 7, 107-113 (1970).
- [15] Schultz, M.H., On the Approximation of Linear Functions.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 7, 107-113 (1970).