## MARKOV'S AND BERNSTEIN'S INEQUALITIES ON DISJOINT INTERVALS

PETER B. BORWEIN

1. Introduction. In 1889, A. A. Markov proved the following inequality:

Inequality 1. (Markov [4]). If $p_{n}$ is any algebraic polynomial of degree at most $n$ then

$$
\left\|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}\right\|_{[a, b]} \leqq \frac{2 n^{2}}{b-a}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b]}
$$

where $\left\|\|_{A}\right.$ denotes the supremum norm on $A$.
In 1912, S. N. Bernstein established
Inequality 2. (Bernstein [2]). If $p_{n}$ is any algebraic polynomial of degree at most $n$ then

$$
\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqq \frac{n}{((x-a)(b-x))^{1 / 2}}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b]}
$$

for $x \in(a, b)$.
In this paper we extend these inequalities to sets of the form $[a, b] \cup[c, d]$. Let $\Pi_{n}$ denote the set of algebraic polynomials with real coefficients of degree at most $n$.

Theorem 1. Let $a<b \leqq c<d$ and let $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$. Then

$$
\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqq\left(\frac{c-x}{d-x}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{n}{((b-x)(x-a))^{1 / 2}}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b]} \cup[c, a]
$$

for $x \in(a, b)$.
We note that Inequality 2 is a special case $(b=c=d)$ of the above theorem.

Corollary 1. Let $a<b \leqq c<d$ and let $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$. Then

$$
\left|p^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqq\left(\frac{x-b}{x-a}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{n}{((x-c)(d-x))^{1 / 2}}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b] \cup[c, d]}
$$

for $x \in(c, d)$.
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Corollary 2. Let $a<b \leqq c<d$ and let $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$. Then,

$$
\left\|p_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{[c, d]} \leqq\left(\frac{d-b}{d-a}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{2 n^{2}}{d-c}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b] \cup[c, d]} .
$$

Thus, we obtain sharper bounds than those we achieve by applying Inequality 1 or Inequality 2 directly to $[c, d]$.
On sets of the form $[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]$ we can derive an asymptotically "best possible" form of Markov's inequality.

Theorem 2. a) If $0<a<b, n$ is even and $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$, then

$$
\left\|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b] \text { § }\left(1+\frac{9}{n^{2}}\right) \frac{n^{2} b}{\bar{b}^{2}-a^{2}}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]}
$$

provided that $n$ is large enough to satisfy

$$
\frac{b^{2}-a^{2}}{3 a b n}+\frac{(b+a)}{2 b}\left(1+\frac{6}{n}\right)^{2} e^{6\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right) 5 a b n} \leqq 1 .
$$

b) For each even $n$ there exists $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ so that

$$
\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]=\frac{n^{2} b}{b^{2}-a^{2}}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b] .
$$

Corollary 3. Suppose $n$ is even and $n \geqq 50$. If $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ then

$$
\left\|p_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{[-2,-1] \cup[1,2]} \leqq\left(1+\frac{9}{n^{2}}\right) \frac{2 n^{2}}{3}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[-2,-1]} \cup[1,2] .
$$

2. Characterizing polynomials that maximize Markov's or Bernstein's inequalities. In this section we show that polynomials that maximize $\left|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(t)\right|$, subject to $\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I} \leqq 1$ where $I$ is compact, must be of the form

$$
\alpha x^{n}+\beta x^{n-1}-q_{n-2}(x)
$$

where $g_{n-2} \in \Pi_{n-2}$ is the best approximation to $\alpha x^{n}+\beta x^{n-1}$ on $I$. In particular, we show, as Bernstein did for the interval $[0,1]$ (see [2]), that the polynomial that satisfies $\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I} \leqq 1$ and has maximum derivative at $\max I$ is of the form

$$
p_{n}(x)=a x^{n}-q_{n-1}(x)
$$

where $q_{n-1} \in \Pi_{n-1}$ and $g_{n-1}$ is the best approximation to $a x^{n}$ on $I$.
Theorem 3. Let I be any infinite compact set of real numbers and let $\zeta \in R$. Suppose $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ satisfies
(1) $\frac{\left|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|}{\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}}=\max _{\substack{q_{n} \in \Pi_{n} \\ n_{n} \neq 0}} \frac{\left|q_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|}{\left\|q_{n}\right\|_{I}}$.

Then, there exist $\alpha$ and $\beta$ so that $p_{n}(x)=\alpha x^{n}+\beta x^{n-1}-s_{n-2}(x)$ where $s_{n-2} \in \Pi_{n-2}$ is the best Chebyshev approximation to $\alpha x^{n}+\beta x^{n-1}$ on $I$. (The best Chebyshev approximation is the one that minimizes the supremum norm.)

We need the following lemma for the proof of this theorem:
Lemma 1. Let $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ and let $\zeta$ be any point that is not a root of $p_{n}$. Suppose that there exist at most $k \leqq n-2$ points $x_{1}<x_{2}<\ldots<x_{k}$ where $p_{n}$ changes sign. Then there exists $q_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ so that
a) $\operatorname{sgn} q_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)=\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)$,
b) $\operatorname{sgn} q_{n}(x)=-\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}(x)$, except possibly at the roots of $q_{n}$.

Proof. Let

$$
s(x)=-\left(\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}(-\infty)\right)(-1)^{k} \prod_{i=1}^{n}\left(x-x_{i}\right)
$$

and consider $q_{n}{ }^{y}(x)=s(x)(x-y)^{2}$. Then, if $s(\zeta) \neq 0$,

$$
\left.\frac{d q_{n}{ }^{y}(x)}{d x}\right|_{\zeta}=(\zeta-y)\left(2 s(\zeta)+(\zeta-y) s^{\prime}(\zeta)\right)
$$

which as a function of $y$ changes sign at $\zeta$. Thus, for an appropriate $y$ close to $\zeta, q_{n}{ }^{y}$ satisfies a) and b).

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $p_{n}$ satisfy the assumptions of the theorem (that such a $p_{n}$ exists is a simple consequence of $\Pi_{n}$ being finite dimensional).

Suppose $p_{n}$ has at most $n-2$ changes of sign and suppose $p_{n}(\zeta) \neq 0$. If $q_{n}$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 1 , then for sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$,

$$
\left\|p_{n}+\epsilon q_{n}\right\|_{I} \leqq\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I} \text { and }\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)+\epsilon q_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|>\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|
$$

which contradicts the assumption that $p_{n}$ satisfies (1). Now suppose $p_{n}(\zeta)=0$ and $p_{n}$ changes sign at $x_{1}<\ldots<x_{k}$. If

$$
q_{n}(x)=-\left(\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}(-\infty)\right)(-1)^{k}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k}\left(x-x_{i}\right)\right)(x-\zeta)^{2}
$$

then, for sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$,

$$
\left\|p_{n}+\epsilon q_{n}\right\|_{I}<\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I} \text { and }\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)+\epsilon q_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|=\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|
$$

which also contradicts the assumption that $p_{n}$ satisfies (1). Thus, $p_{n}$ has at least $n-1$ sign changes.

We now suppose that the coefficient of $x^{n}$ is non-zero for $p_{n}$. It follows that $p_{n}$ has $n$ real roots $x_{1}<x_{2}<\ldots<x_{n}$. We claim that in each interval $\left(x_{j}, x_{j+1}\right)$ there exists a point $y_{i} \in I$ so that
(2) $\left|p_{n}\left(y_{i}\right)\right|=\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}$.

If (2) is false then as in the proof of the lemma, we can, for a suitably
chosen $y$, construct

$$
\begin{aligned}
& q_{n}(x)=-\left(\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}(-\infty)\right)(-1)^{n}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1}\left(x-x_{i}\right)\right)\left(\prod_{i=j+2}^{n}\left(x-x_{i}\right)\right) \\
& \times(x-y)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where
a) $\operatorname{sgn} q_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)=\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)$
and
b) $\operatorname{sgn} q_{n}(x)=-\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}(x)$,
except possibly for $x \in\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, y\right\} \cup\left[x_{j}, x_{j+1}\right]$. We note that since the $y$ of Lemma 1 can be chosen from an interval, we may assume that $\left|p_{n}(y)\right| \neq\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}$. It follows from a), b) and the assumption

$$
\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{\left[x_{j}, x_{j}+1\right]}<\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}
$$

that for sufficiently smail $\epsilon>0$,

$$
\left\|p_{n}+\epsilon q_{n}\right\|_{I}<\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}
$$

and

$$
\left|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)+\epsilon q_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right| \geqq\left|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right| .
$$

This contradiction establishes (2).
We may by a similar argument show that there exists $y_{n}$ so that

$$
y_{n} \in I \cap\left(-\infty, x_{1}\right) \text { or } \quad y_{n} \in I \cap\left(x_{n}, \infty\right)
$$

and

$$
\left|p_{n}\left(y_{n}\right)\right|=\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I} .
$$

Thus, if $p_{n}(x)=\alpha x^{n}+\beta x^{n-1}-s_{n-2}(x)$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then $p_{n}$ achieves its maximum norm, with alternate sign, at $n$ points $y_{1}<y_{2}<\ldots<y_{n}$ in $I$. This suffices to establish the theorem.

If $p_{n}$ is actually of degree $n-1$, then $p_{n}(x)=\beta x^{n-1}-q_{n-2}(x)$. A similar argument shows that $q_{n-2}(x)$ is the best approximation to $\beta x^{n-1}$ on $I$.

Theorem 4. Let I be any infinite compact set and let $\zeta \geqq \delta=\max I$. Suppose $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ satisfies
(1) $\frac{\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\xi)\right|}{\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}}=\max _{\substack{q_{n} \in n_{n} \\ q_{n} \neq 0}} \frac{\left|q_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|}{\left\|q_{n}\right\|_{I}}$.

Then $p_{n}(x)=\alpha x^{n}-q_{n-1}(x)$ where $q_{n-1} \in \Pi_{n-1}$ and $q_{n-1}$ is the best Chebyshev approximation to $\alpha x^{n}$ on $I$.

Proof. Let $\gamma=\min I$. The preceding theorem guarantees the existence of $n-1$ points $\gamma<x_{1}<\ldots<x_{n-1}<\delta$ where $p_{n}$ changes sign. We first show that $p_{n}$ has $n$ distinct roots in $[\gamma, \delta]$. Suppose $p_{n}$ does not change sign at any point in $[\gamma, \delta]$ other than $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}$. Consider

$$
\begin{aligned}
& q_{n}{ }^{y}(x)=-\operatorname{sgn}\left(p_{n}(\delta)\right)\left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1}\left(x-x_{k}\right)\right)(y-x) \\
& =s_{n}(x)(y-x)
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\left.\frac{d q_{n}{ }^{y}(x)}{d x}\right|_{\zeta}=s_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)(y-\zeta)-s_{n}(\zeta)
$$

Since $\operatorname{sgn} s_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)=\operatorname{sgn} s_{n}(\zeta) \neq 0$ we may, for a suitable choice of $y>\zeta$, set $t_{n}=q_{n}{ }^{y}$ where
a) $\operatorname{sgn} t_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)=\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)$
b) $\operatorname{sgn} t_{n}=-\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}$ on $I$.

Thus, for sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$,

$$
\left\|p_{n}+\epsilon t_{n}\right\|_{I}<\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I} \text { and }\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)+\epsilon t_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|>\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|
$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, $p_{n}$ has $n$ distinct roots $\gamma \leqq x_{1}<x_{2}<\ldots$ $<x_{n} \leqq \delta$. We now show that

$$
\left|p_{n}(\delta)\right|=\left|p_{n}(\gamma)\right|=\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}
$$

This, coupled with (2) of the proof of Theorem 3, suffices to complete the result. We will only show that $\left|p_{n}(\delta)\right|=\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}$ since the proof that $\left|p_{n}(\gamma)\right|=\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}$ is similar. Suppose $\left|p_{n}(\delta)\right|<\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{I}$. Let

$$
q_{n}(x)=-\left(\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}(-\infty)\right)(-1)^{n-1}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(x-x_{i}\right)\right)(y-x)
$$

where, as before, $y>\zeta$ is chosen so that

$$
\operatorname{sgn} q_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)=\operatorname{sgn} p_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)
$$

Then, for sufficiently small $\epsilon>0, p_{n}+\epsilon q_{n}$ contradicts the assumption that $p_{n}$ satisfies (1).
3. Bernstein's inequality on $[a, b] \cup[c, d]$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $A=[a, b] \cup[c, d]$ and let $\tau \in A$. Let $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ satisfy

$$
\frac{\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\tau)\right|}{\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{A}}=\max _{q_{n} \in \Pi_{n}} \frac{\left|q_{n}^{\prime}(\tau)\right|}{\left\|q_{n}\right\|_{A}}
$$

and

$$
\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{A}=1
$$

We may, by the proof of Theorem 3, assume that $p_{n}$ has all its roots in $A$ with the possible exceptions of a root $\lambda_{1} \in(b, c)$ and a root $\lambda_{2}>d$ or $\lambda_{2}<a$. We treat the case where $\lambda_{1} \in(b, c)$ and $\lambda_{2}>d$. The other cases proceed analogously. We observe that if we increase $c$ or $a$ and if we decrease $b$ or $d$ we strengthen the inequality in the statement of the theorem. Thus, we may also assume that for $y \in\{a, b, c, d\}$,

$$
\left|p_{n}(y)\right|=1 \quad \text { and } \quad\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(y)\right| \neq 0
$$

(If there is no point $z \in(b, c)$ where $\left|p_{n}(z)\right| \geqq 1$ then we can deduce the result from Inequality 2.) We have guaranteed the existence of points

$$
b<\epsilon_{1}<\delta_{1}<\lambda_{1}<\delta_{2}<\epsilon_{2}<c
$$

and

$$
d<\epsilon_{3}<\delta_{3}<\lambda_{2}<\delta_{4}
$$

so that

$$
\left|p_{n}^{\prime}\left(\epsilon_{i}\right)\right|=0 \quad i=1,2,3
$$

and

$$
\left|p_{n}\left(\delta_{i}\right)\right|=1 \quad i=1,2,3,4
$$

We deduce from Theorem 3 and a comparison of roots and leading terms that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\left(p_{n}^{\prime}(x)\right)^{2}(x-a)(x-b)(x-c)(x-d)\left(x-\delta_{1}\right)\left(x-\delta_{2}\right)\left(x-\delta_{3}\right) \\
\times\left(x-\delta_{4}\right)
\end{array}
$$

$$
=n^{2}\left(\left(p_{n}(x)\right)^{2}-1\right)\left(x-\epsilon_{1}\right)^{2}\left(x-\epsilon_{2}\right)^{2}\left(x-\epsilon_{3}\right)^{2} .
$$

Thus, if $\tau \in(a, b)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\tau)\right)^{2} \leqq \frac{n^{2}\left(\tau-\epsilon_{2}\right)^{2}}{|(\tau-a)(\tau-b)(\tau-c)(\tau-d)|} \cdot \frac{\left(\tau-\epsilon_{1}\right)^{2}}{\left(\tau-\delta_{1}\right)\left(\tau-\delta_{2}\right)} \\
& \cdot \frac{\left(\tau-\epsilon_{3}\right)^{2}}{\left(\tau-\delta_{3}\right)\left(\tau-\delta_{4}\right)} \leqq \frac{n^{2}(\tau-c)^{2}}{|(\tau-a)(\tau-b)(\tau-c)(\tau-d)|}
\end{aligned}
$$

and the result now follows.
Corollary 1 follows immediately from Theorem 1 . Corollary 2 is a consequence of Corollary 1 and the next inequality.

Inequality 3. (Schur [3] p. 41). If $p_{n-1} \in \Pi_{n-1}$ and

$$
\left|p_{n-1}(x)\right| \leqq \frac{L}{((x-a)(b-x))^{1 / 2}} \text { for } a<x<b
$$

then

$$
\left\|p_{n-1}(x)\right\|_{[a, b]} \leqq \frac{2 L n}{b-a}
$$

4. Markov's inequality on $[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]$. We require the following results for the proof of Theorem 2.

Theorem 5. (Achieser [1], p. 287). Let $n$ be an even integer. The polynomial $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ with leading coefficient 1 that deviates least from zero on $[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]$ is

$$
S_{n}(x)=\frac{\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right)^{n / 2}}{2^{n-1}} T_{n / 2}\left(\frac{2 x^{2}-b^{2}-a^{2}}{b^{2}-a^{2}}\right)
$$

where $T_{n}$ is the $n^{\text {th }}$ Chebyshev polynomial $\left(T_{n}=\cos n \cos ^{-1} x\right)$.
Lemma 2. Let $n$ be even and let $S_{n}$ be defined as in Theorem 5. Then,

$$
\frac{\left\|S^{\prime}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}{\|S\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}=\frac{\left|S^{\prime}(b)\right|}{\|S\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}=\frac{n^{2} b}{b^{2}-a^{2}}
$$

The proof of Lemma 2 is straightforward and is omitted.
Lemma 3. Suppose $n$ is even. Then

$$
\max _{\substack{p_{n} \in \Pi_{n} \\ p, \neq 0}} \frac{\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(b)\right|}{\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}=\frac{n^{2} b}{b^{2}-a^{2}} .
$$

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 4, Theorem 5 and Lemma 2.

Lemma 4. (Soble [5]). If $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ has non-negative coefficients then, for $x>0$

$$
\left|p_{:}^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqq \frac{n}{x}\left|p_{: 3}(x)\right|
$$

Proof of Theorem 2. Suppose $p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}$ satisfies

$$
\frac{\left\|p_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}{\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}=\max _{q_{n} \in \Pi_{n}} \frac{\left\|q_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}{\left\|q_{n}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}
$$

Suppose $\zeta \in[a, b]$ is a point where

$$
\left|p^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|=\left\|p^{\prime}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]
$$

and
(1) $\left|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|>\frac{n^{2} b}{b^{2}-a^{2}}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]}$.

Then, by Inequality 2 applied to $[a, b]$

$$
\frac{n^{2} b}{b^{2}-a^{2}} \leqq \frac{n}{((b-\zeta)(\zeta-a))^{1 / 2}}
$$

and

$$
(b-\zeta)(\zeta-a) \leqq \frac{\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right)^{2}}{n^{2} b^{2}}
$$

Since either $(b-\zeta) \geqq \frac{1}{2}(b-a)$ or $(\zeta-a) \geqq \frac{1}{2}(b-a)$, either

$$
(b-\zeta) \leqq \frac{2(b+a)\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right)}{b^{2} n^{2}} \text { or } \quad(\zeta-a) \leqq \frac{2(b+a)\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right)}{b^{2} n^{2}} .
$$

Suppose

$$
\begin{equation*}
(b-\zeta) \leqq \frac{2(b+a)}{b} \cdot \frac{\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right)}{b n^{2}} \leqq \frac{4\left(b^{2}-a^{1}\right)}{b n^{2}} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, by Lemma 3 and (2), for $n \geqq 10$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \max _{\substack{p_{n} \in \mathbb{I n}_{n} \\
p_{n} \neq 0}} \frac{\left\|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}\right\|_{[-b,-a]} \cup[a, b]}{} \leqq \max _{n}\left\|_{[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]} \frac{\left|p_{n}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|}{\substack{p_{n} \in \Pi_{n}, p_{n} \neq 0}}| | p_{n}\right\|_{[-\zeta,-a] \cup[a\}]} \leqq \frac{n^{2} \zeta}{\xi^{2}-a^{2}} \\
& \leqq \frac{n^{2} b}{\left(b-\frac{4\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right)}{b n^{2}}\right)^{2}}-a^{2} \leqq\left(1+\frac{9}{n^{2}}\right) \frac{n^{2} b}{b^{2}-a^{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose now that $(\zeta-a) \leqq 4\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right) / b n^{2}$. Write $p_{n}(x)=q_{m}(x) r_{h}(x)$ where $q_{m}(x)$ has all its roots in $[-b,-a]$ and $r_{n}(x)$ has no roots in $[-b,-a]$. By Theorem 3, $p_{n}$ oscillates between its maximum and minimum at least $n$ times on $[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]$. Hence, $p_{n}$ has at least $n-2$ distinct roots in $[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]$. By the proof of Theorem 3, between any two roots of $p_{n}$ there is a point of $[-b,-a] \cup[a, b]$ where $p_{n}$ attains its norm. Suppose now that $m \geqq 2+n / 2$. Then, $p_{n}(x)-p_{n}(-x)$ $\in \Pi_{n-1}$ has at least $n / 2$ roots in $[-b,-a]$ and at least $n / 2$ roots in $[a, b]$ and hence, $p_{n}(x)=-p_{n}(-x)$. However, if $p_{n}$ is even, then it follows from Theorem 3, Theorem 5 and Lemma 3 that $p_{n}=S_{n}$ and we are done. Thus, we may assume $m \leqq n / 2+1$. Similarly, since $r_{n}$ has at least $h-2$ roots in $[a, b]$, we may assume that $h \leqq n / 2+3$. We may also assume that $n \geqq 10$.
(3) $\left|q_{m}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right| \leqq \frac{m}{a+\zeta}\left|q_{m}(\zeta)\right| \leqq \frac{n+2}{4 a}\left|q_{m}(\zeta)\right|$.

Also, since $q_{m}(x)=\alpha \Pi\left(x+x_{i}\right)$ with $x_{i} \geqq a$,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\frac{\left|q_{m}(\zeta)\right|}{\left|q_{m}(a)\right|}=\dot{\Pi}\left(\frac{\xi+x_{i}}{a+x_{i}}\right) \leqq \Pi\left(1+\frac{\zeta-a}{a+x_{i}}\right) \leqq\left(1+\frac{2\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right)}{a b n^{2}}\right)^{(n+2) / 2}  \tag{4}\\
\leqq e^{6\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right) / 5 a b n} .
\end{array}
$$

By Inequality 1,
(5) $\left|r_{h}{ }^{\prime}(\zeta)\right| \leqq \frac{2 h^{2}}{b-a}\left\|r_{h}\right\|_{[a, b]} \leqq \frac{2\left(\begin{array}{l}n \\ 2\end{array}+3\right)^{2}}{b-a}\left\|r_{h}\right\|_{[a, b]}$.

Thus, by (3), (4) and (5),

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|p_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right| & \leqq\left|q_{m}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|\left|r_{h}(\zeta)\right|+\left|r_{n}^{\prime}(\zeta)\right|\left|q_{m}(\zeta)\right| \\
& \leqq \frac{n+2}{4 a}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b]}+\frac{2\left(\frac{n}{2}+3\right)^{2}}{b-a}| | r_{n} \|_{[a, b]}\left|q_{m}(\zeta)\right| \\
& \leqq \frac{n+2}{4 a}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b]}+\frac{2\left(\frac{n}{2}+3\right)^{2}}{b-a}\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b]} \frac{\left|q_{m}(\zeta)\right|}{\left|q_{m}(a)\right|} \\
& \leqq\left(\frac{b^{2}-a^{2}}{3 a b n}+\frac{(b+a)}{2 b}\left(1+\frac{6}{n}\right)^{2} e^{6\left(b^{2}-a^{2}\right) / 5 a b n}\right) \frac{n^{2} b}{b^{2}-a^{2}} \\
& \times\left\|p_{n}\right\|_{[a, b] .}
\end{aligned}
$$
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