

A lower estimate for the Lebesgue constants of linear means of Laguerre expansions

GEORGE GASPER¹ AND WALTER TREBELS²

Dedicated to P. L. Butzer on the occasion of his 70th birthday in gratitude

(Oct. 14, 1997 version)

Abstract. S. G. Kal'neĭ derived in [5], [6] a quite sharp necessary condition for the multiplier norm of a finite sequence in the setting of Fourier-Jacobi series on L^1 with “natural weight” (which ensures a nice convolution structure). In this paper, Kalneĭ's problem is considered in the setting of Laguerre series on weighted L^1 -spaces; the admitted scale of weights contains in particular the appropriate “natural weights” occurring in transplantation and convolution.

Key words. Laguerre polynomials, linear means, Lebesgue constants, weighted Lebesgue spaces

AMS(MOS) subject classifications. Primary: 33C45, 42A45, 42C10; Secondary: 39A70

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to derive a good lower bound for the L^1 -Laguerre multiplier norm of a finite sequence $m = \{m_k\}$, $m_k = 0$ when $k \geq n + 1$. Such sequences occur when one considers linear summability methods generated by a lower triangular numerical matrix $\Lambda = \{\lambda_k^n\}$. A very important example is the Cesàro method for which the general necessary criteria in [9], [2] only give a constant as a lower bound at the critical index whereas discussing the Cesàro means (at the critical index) directly gives a logarithmic divergence (see [3], [4]). To become more precise let us first introduce some notation. Consider the Lebesgue spaces

$$L_{w(\gamma)}^p = \{f : \|f\|_{p,\gamma} = (\int_0^\infty |f(x)e^{-x/2}|^p x^\gamma dx)^{1/p} < \infty\}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty,$$

$$L_{w(\gamma)}^\infty = \{f : \|f\|_{\infty,\gamma} = \text{ess sup}_{x>0} |f(x)e^{-x/2}x^{\alpha-\gamma}| < \infty\}, \quad p = \infty,$$

¹Department of Mathematics, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA. The work of this author was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-9401452.

²Fachbereich Mathematik, TH Darmstadt, Schloßgartenstr.7, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany.

where $\alpha \geq \gamma > -1$. Let $L_n^\alpha(x)$, $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$, denote the classical Laguerre polynomials (see Szegő [10, p. 100]) and set

$$R_n^\alpha(x) = L_n^\alpha(x)/L_n^\alpha(0), \quad L_n^\alpha(0) = A_n^\alpha = \binom{n+\alpha}{n} = \frac{\Gamma(n+\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)}.$$

Then one can associate to f its formal Laguerre series

$$f(x) \sim (\Gamma(\alpha+1))^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{f}_\alpha(k) L_k^\alpha(x),$$

where the Fourier-Laguerre coefficients of f are defined by

$$\hat{f}_\alpha(n) = \int_0^\infty f(x) R_n^\alpha(x) x^\alpha e^{-x} dx \quad (1)$$

(if the integrals exist). A sequence $m = \{m_k\}_{k \in \mathbf{N}_0}$ is called a (bounded) multiplier on $L_w^p(\gamma)$, notation $m \in M_{\alpha, \gamma}^p$, if

$$\left\| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} m_k \hat{f}_\alpha(k) L_k^\alpha \right\|_{p, \gamma} \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{f}_\alpha(k) L_k^\alpha \right\|_{p, \gamma} \quad (2)$$

for all polynomials f ; the smallest constant C for which this holds is called the multiplier norm $\|m\|_{M_{\alpha, \gamma}^p}$.

We are interested in good lower estimates of $\|m\|_{M_{\alpha, \gamma}^1}$ for **finite** sequences $m = \{m_k\}$, $m_k = 0$ when $k \geq n+1$. By the definition of the multiplier norm we have

$$\|m\|_{M_{\alpha, \gamma}^1} = \sup_{\|f\|_{1, \gamma} \leq 1} \left\| \sum_{k=0}^n m_k \hat{f}_\alpha(k) L_k^\alpha \right\|_{1, \gamma} \geq C(n+1)^{\gamma-\alpha} \left\| \sum_{k=0}^n m_k L_k^\alpha \right\|_{1, \gamma}. \quad (3)$$

Here the particular test function Φ_n is given via its coefficients $(\Phi_n)_\alpha(k) = \phi(k/n)$ where ϕ is a smooth cut-off function with $\phi(t) = 1$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $= 0$ for $t \geq 2$. For this function there holds by [2], formula (9) in I, $\|\Phi_n\|_{1, \gamma} \leq C(n+1)^{\alpha-\gamma}$, $\alpha \geq \gamma > -1$, hence (3).

Generic positive constants that are independent of the parameter n and of the sequence m will be denoted by C . Our main result now reads

THEOREM 1. *Suppose $\alpha \geq 0$, $\alpha/2 \leq \gamma \leq \alpha$. Then for any finite sequence $m = \{m_k\}$, $m_k = 0$ for $k \geq n+1$, there holds*

$$\|m\|_{M_{\alpha, \gamma}^1} \geq C(n+1)^{\gamma-\alpha} \sum_{k=0}^n |m_k| \frac{(k+1)^{\gamma+1/2}}{(n+1-k)^{2\gamma-\alpha+3/2}}, \quad (4)$$

where C is a constant independent of n .

In the following remarks we discuss this result for the standard weight $\gamma = \alpha/2$, which is the natural setting for transplantation theorems (see Kanjin [7]), and the weight $\gamma = \alpha$, which is the natural setting for a nice convolution structure (see Görlich and Markt [4]).

REMARKS. 1) Taking only the $(k = n)$ -term in (4) and $\gamma = \alpha$ one arrives at the Cohen type inequality (1.8) in [9], whereas $\gamma = \alpha/2$ leads to (1.9) in [9].

2) The Cesàro means of order δ are generated by the matrix $\Lambda = (\lambda_k^n)$ where $\lambda_k^n = A_{n-k}^\delta/A_n^\delta$. If one evaluates the $\sum_{[n/2]}^n \dots$ -portion in (4) in the case of the critical index $\delta_c = 1/2$ when $\gamma = \alpha/2$ or $\delta_c = \alpha + 1/2$ when $\gamma = \alpha$ one obtains

$$\|\{A_{n-k}^{\delta_c}/A_n^{\delta_c}\}\|_{M_{\alpha,\gamma}^1} \geq C \log(n+1), \quad \alpha \geq 0.$$

For $\gamma = \alpha/2$ this is directly computed in [3], for $\gamma = \alpha$ in [4].

In the case $0 \leq \delta < \delta_c = 2\gamma - \alpha + 1/2$ already the $(k = n)$ -term of the sum (cf. the above mentioned Cohen type inequalities) leads to the estimate (for $\gamma = \alpha/2$ see [3], for $\gamma = \alpha$ [4])

$$\|\{A_{n-k}^\delta/A_n^\delta\}\|_{M_{\alpha,\gamma}^1} \geq C(n+1)^{\delta_c - \delta}, \quad 0 \leq \delta < \delta_c.$$

3) Obviously, by omitting the terms on the right side of (4) with $k < [n/2]$, there holds

$$\|m\|_{M_{\alpha,\gamma}^1} \geq C(n+1)^{\delta_c} \sum_{k=[n/2]}^n |m_k|(n+1-k)^{-\delta_c-1}. \quad (5)$$

which is equivalent to (4) since $M_{\alpha,\gamma}^1 \subset l^\infty$ (just choose $f = L_k^\alpha$ in (2)). Condition (5) may be compared with the necessary conditions given in [2].

For the **proof of the Theorem** we follow the lines of Kal'neĭ and first observe that by the converse of Hölder's inequality we may continue the estimate (3) as follows

$$\|m\|_{M_{\alpha,\gamma}^1} \geq C(n+1)^{\gamma-\alpha} \sup_{\|g\|_{\infty,\gamma} \leq 1} \int_0^\infty \sum_{k=0}^n m_k L_k^\alpha(x) g(x) e^{-x} x^\alpha dx. \quad (6)$$

If we choose a particular g we make the right hand side of (6) smaller. Consider the test function $g = g_n$,

$$g_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n (\text{sgn } m_j) \Delta_{2(n+1-j)}^N R_j^\alpha(x) \frac{(j+1)^{\gamma+1/2}}{(n+1-j)^{2\gamma-\alpha+3/2}}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Delta_k R_j^\alpha = R_j^\alpha - R_{j+k}^\alpha$, $\Delta^N = \Delta(\Delta^{N-1})$, and $N \in \mathbf{N}$ is so large that $N-1 \leq 2\gamma - \alpha + 1/2 < N$. Suppose that the lemma below holds, then $g_n \in L_{w(\gamma)}^\infty$ is obviously true and the assertion of the Theorem immediately follows by the orthogonality of the Laguerre polynomials.

Thus there only remains to prove the following result.

LEMMA. Suppose that $0 \leq \alpha/2 \leq \gamma \leq \alpha$ and set

$$f_n^{\alpha,\gamma}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n |\Delta_{2(n+1-j)}^N R_j^\alpha(x)| \frac{(j+1)^{\gamma+1/2}}{(n+1-j)^{2\gamma-\alpha+3/2}},$$

where $N-1 \leq 2\gamma-\alpha+1/2 < N \in \mathbf{N}$. Then there holds $\|f_n^{\alpha,\gamma}\|_{\infty,\gamma} \leq C$ with C independent of n .

2 Proof of the Lemma

We use the standard notation $\nu = 4n + 2\alpha + 2$ and note that on account of formulae (2.5) and (2.7) in [8] there holds for $\alpha > -1$ and some positive ξ

$$|e^{-x/2} R_n^\alpha(x)| \leq C \begin{cases} 1 & , 0 \leq x \leq 2/\nu, \\ (x\nu)^{-\alpha/2-1/4} & , 1/2\nu \leq x \leq 3\nu/4, \\ (x\nu)^{-\alpha/2} (\nu(\nu^{1/3} + |x-\nu|))^{-1/4} & , \nu/4 \leq x \leq 2\nu, \\ (x\nu)^{-\alpha/2} e^{-\xi x} & , 5\nu/4 \leq x. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Thus, if we choose $n_* := [(\nu-40)/20]$, these estimates are also true for $R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)$ and $R_{n+k+2}^\alpha(x)$ on the x -intervals $[0, 1/\nu]$, $[1/\nu, \nu/2]$, $[\nu/2, 3\nu/2]$, $[3\nu/2, \infty)$, resp., when $k \leq n_*$.

We start with the case $N = 1$, thus $2\gamma - \alpha < 1/2$, and decompose $f_n^{\alpha,\gamma}$ as follows

$$f_n^{\alpha,\gamma}(x) = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n_*} + \sum_{k=n_*+1}^n \right) |\Delta_{2(k+1)} R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| \frac{(n+1-k)^{\gamma+1/2}}{(k+1)^{2\gamma-\alpha+3/2}} =: \Sigma_{n,1}(x) + \Sigma_{n,2}(x). \quad (9)$$

Let us first handle the contribution coming from $\Sigma_{n,2}$. By [8], formula (2.9), one has $\text{ess sup}_x |R_n^\alpha(x) x^{\alpha-\gamma} e^{-x/2}| \leq C(n+1)^{\gamma-\alpha}$ and, therefore,

$$\text{ess sup}_x |\Sigma_{n,2}(x) x^{\alpha-\gamma} e^{-x/2}| \leq C(n+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \sum_{k=n_*+1}^n (n+1-k)^{\gamma+1/2+(\gamma-\alpha)} \leq C \quad (10)$$

uniformly in n .

Concerning the estimate of $\Sigma_{n,1}(x)$ we first consider the case $0 < x < 1/\nu$. Use of the identity

$$\Delta_{2k+2} R_{n-k}^\alpha(x) = \frac{x}{\alpha+1} \left(R_{n-k}^{\alpha+1}(x) + R_{n-k+1}^{\alpha+1}(x) + \cdots + R_{n+k+1}^{\alpha+1}(x) \right) \quad (11)$$

in combination with the first case of (8) gives

$$|e^{-x/2} \Delta_{2(k+1)} R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| \leq \frac{x e^{-x/2}}{\alpha+1} \sum_{j=0}^{2k+1} |R_{n-k+j}^{\alpha+1}(x)| \leq C(k+1)x, \quad (12)$$

and thus the desired estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |x^{\alpha-\gamma}e^{-x/2}\Sigma_{n,1}(x)| &\leq Cx^{\alpha-\gamma+1}(n+1)^{\gamma+1/2}\sum_{k=0}^{n_*}(k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-1/2} \\ &\leq Cx^{\alpha-\gamma+1}(n+1)^{\alpha-\gamma+1} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

It is similarly simple to deal with the case $x \geq 3\nu/2$. In this case we have by (8) (note $\xi > 0$) that

$$|x^{\alpha-\gamma}e^{-x/2}\Sigma_{n,1}(x)| \leq C(n+1)^{\gamma-\alpha/2+1/2}x^{\alpha/2-\gamma}e^{-\xi x}\sum_{k=0}^{n_*}(k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \leq C. \quad (13)$$

To deal with $\Sigma_{n,1}(x)$ for $1/\nu \leq x \leq \nu/2$ we make use of formula (2.5) in [8] and (11) to obtain

$$|e^{-x/2}\Delta_{2k+2}R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| \leq Cx(k+1)(x\nu)^{-\alpha/2-3/4}.$$

If one considers a fixed x , $1/\nu \leq x \leq \nu/2$, one can find a real number λ , $-1 < \lambda < 1$, such that $\nu^\lambda/2 \leq x \leq \nu^\lambda$. Choosing $\mu = 1/2 - \lambda/2 > 0$ we obtain with the previous asymptotic and the second case in (8)

$$\begin{aligned} |x^{\alpha-\gamma}e^{-x/2}\Sigma_{n,1}(x)| &\leq C(n+1)^{\gamma+1/2}x^{\alpha-\gamma}e^{-x/2}\sum_{k=0}^{[n_*^\mu]} |R_{n-k}^\alpha(x) - R_{n+k+2}^\alpha(x)|(k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ &\quad + (n+1)^{\gamma+1/2}x^{\alpha-\gamma}e^{-x/2}\sum_{k=[n_*^\mu]+1}^{n_*} (|R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| + |R_{n+k+2}^\alpha(x)|)(k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ &=: \Sigma_{n,3}(x) + \Sigma_{n,4}(x) \leq C(n+1)^{\gamma+1/2-(\alpha/2+3/4)}x^{\alpha-\gamma+1-(\alpha/2+3/4)}\sum_{k=0}^{[n_*^\mu]}(k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-1/2} \\ &\quad + C(n+1)^{\gamma+1/2-(\alpha/2+1/4)}x^{\alpha-\gamma-(\alpha/2+1/4)}(n+1)^{(\alpha-2\gamma-1/2)\mu} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in n .

Concerning an estimate of $\Sigma_{n,1}(x)$ for $x \in [\nu/2, 3\nu/2]$ we may restrict ourselves to $x \in [\nu/2, \nu]$ since the interval $[\nu, 3\nu/2]$ is handled in the same way.

We start with fixed x , $\nu - 2\nu^{1/3} \leq x \leq \nu$, hence $x \approx n+1$, and use the preceding decomposition $|x^{\alpha-\gamma}e^{-x/2}\Sigma_{n,1}(x)| \leq \Sigma_{n,3}(x) + \Sigma_{n,4}(x)$ with $\mu = 1/3$. By (8), third case, there follows

$$\Sigma_{n,4}(x) \leq C(n+1)^{1/2-1/3}\sum_{k=[n_*^{1/3}]+1}^{n_*}(k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \leq C$$

uniformly in n . In order to dominate $\Sigma_{n,3}(x)$ we have to use precise asymptotics for the orthonormal Laguerre functions

$$\mathcal{L}_n^\alpha(x) = \left(\frac{\Gamma(n + \alpha + 1)}{\Gamma(n + 1)} \right)^{1/2} R_n^\alpha(x) x^{\alpha/2} e^{-x/2}$$

as given in Askey and Wainger [1, p. 699]. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{n,3}(x) &\leq C(n+1)^{\alpha/2+1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^{1/3} \rfloor} \left| \frac{\mathcal{L}_{n-k}^\alpha(x)}{\sqrt{L_{n-k}^\alpha(0)}} - \frac{\mathcal{L}_{n+k+2}^\alpha(x)}{\sqrt{L_{n+k+2}^\alpha(0)}} \right| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ &\leq C(n+1)^{1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^{1/3} \rfloor} |\mathcal{L}_{n-k}^\alpha(x) - \mathcal{L}_{n+k+2}^\alpha(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ &\quad + C(n+1)^{\alpha/2+1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^{1/3} \rfloor} |\Delta_2(L_{n-k}^\alpha(0))^{-1/2}| |\mathcal{L}_{n+k+2}^\alpha(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ &=: \Sigma'_{n,3}(x) + \Sigma''_{n,3}(x) \end{aligned}$$

(note that $x \approx (n+1)$).

That $|\Sigma''_{n,3}(x)| \leq C$ holds is obvious when one uses the third case of (8) and observes that for $0 \leq k \leq n^*$ one has

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_{n-k}^\alpha(0)}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_{n+k+2}^\alpha(0)}} \right| \leq \frac{C(k+1)}{(n+1)^{\alpha/2+1}}.$$

The crucial term $\Sigma'_{n,3}(x)$ also turns out to be uniformly bounded when we use the fourth asymptotic in [1, p. 699].

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma'_{n,3}(x) &\leq C(n+1)^{1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^{1/3} \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^k |\Delta_2 \mathcal{L}_{n+2j-k}^\alpha(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ &\leq C(n+1)^{1/2-2/3} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^{1/3} \rfloor} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-1/2} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider the remaining x , $\nu/2 \leq x \leq \nu - 2\nu^{1/3}$. Then there exists a λ , $1/3 < \lambda < 1$, such that $\nu - 2\nu^\lambda \leq x \leq \nu - \nu^\lambda$. Associate to λ the number μ , $4\mu = (1-\lambda)/(2\gamma-\alpha+1/2)$; then obviously $0 < \mu < 1$. Analogously to the above we decompose $\Sigma_{n,1}(x)$ in the following way

$$|x^{\alpha-\gamma} e^{-x/2} \Sigma_{n,1}(x)| \leq C(n+1)^{1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^k |\Delta_2 \mathcal{L}_{n+2j-k}^\alpha(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +C(n+1)^{\alpha/2+1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} |\Delta_2(L_{n-k}^\alpha(0))^{-1/2}| |\mathcal{L}_{n+k+2}^\alpha(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\
& +C(n+1)^{\alpha+1/2} e^{-x/2} \sum_{k=\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor+1}^{n_*} (|R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| + |R_{n+k+2}^\alpha(x)|) (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\
& =: \Sigma'_{n,3}(x) + \Sigma''_{n,3}(x) + \Sigma_{n,4}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate $\Sigma'_{n,3}(x)$ we note that by [1, p. 699]

$$|\Delta_2 \mathcal{L}_{n+2j-k}^\alpha(x)| \leq C(n+2j-k)^{-3/4} |4(n+2j-k) + 2\alpha + 2 - x|^{1/4} \leq C(n+1)^{-3/4+\lambda/4}$$

since $n+2j-k \geq n-k \geq n/2$ and $|4(n+2j-k) + 2\alpha + 2 - x| \leq C|8j-4k+\nu^\lambda| \leq C\nu^\lambda$ (observe that $k \leq \lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor \leq Cn^\lambda$, $\mu \leq \lambda$, and $\lambda > 1/3$). Thus

$$\Sigma'_{n,3}(x) \leq C(n+1)^{1/2} (n+1)^{-3/4+\lambda/4} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-1/2} \leq C.$$

Analogously we have that $\Sigma''_{n,3}(x)$ is uniformly bounded in n on the interval $[\nu - 2\nu^\lambda, \nu - \nu^\lambda]$. To dominate $\Sigma_{n,4}(x)$ we note that by (8), third case, the worst contribution estimate comes from $|R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)|$ so that the k -range has to be examined in order to know which asymptotic to use. Since $|4(n-k) + 2\alpha + 2 - x| \approx |\nu^\lambda - 4k|$ we further split up

$$\Sigma_{n,4}(x) \leq C(n+1)^{\alpha+1/2} e^{-x/2} \sum_{k=\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor+1}^{n_*} \dots =: \Sigma'_{n,4}(x) + \Sigma''_{n,4}(x)$$

where in Σ' only over those k is summed for which $|\nu^\lambda - 4k| \geq \nu^\lambda/2$, thus the summation variable k in the sum associated to Σ' runs from $\lfloor \nu^\lambda/8 \rfloor$ to $\lfloor 3\nu^\lambda/8 \rfloor$. Then, dealing with Σ' and observing that for these k there holds $|x^{\alpha/2} e^{-x/2} R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| \leq C(n+1)^{-1/4-\alpha/2} \nu^{-\lambda/4}$ we obtain

$$\Sigma'_{n,4}(x) \leq C(n+1)^{1/4} \nu^{-\lambda/4} \sum_{k=\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor+1}^{n_*} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \leq C$$

by the choice of λ and μ since $\alpha \leq 2\gamma$ by hypothesis. Turning to Σ'' we note that for these k in any case $|x^{\alpha/2} e^{-x/2} R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| \leq C(n+1)^{-1/3-\alpha/2}$ holds so that

$$\Sigma''_{n,4}(x) \leq C(n+1)^{1/2} (n+1)^{-1/3} \sum_{k=\lfloor \nu^\lambda/8 \rfloor}^{\lfloor 3\nu^\lambda/8 \rfloor} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \leq C$$

since $\lambda > 1/3$.

Now let α, γ be such that $N - 1 \leq 2\gamma - \alpha + 1/2 < N$, $N \in \mathbf{N}$, $N \geq 2$. We make again a decomposition analogous to (9), this time choosing $n_* := [(\nu - 40)/100N]$, replacing Δ by Δ^N , and denoting the two resulting sums by $\Sigma_{n,1,N}(x)$ and $\Sigma_{n,2,N}(x)$. The estimate analogous to (10) remains valid on account of the triangle inequality. If instead of (12) one uses the estimate $|\Delta_{2(k+1)}^N R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| \leq C(k+1)^N x^N$ it is clear that $|x^{\alpha-\gamma} e^{-x/2} \Sigma_{n,1,N}(x)| \leq C$ holds for $0 < x < 1/\nu$. Also the analog of (13) is obvious for $x \geq 3\nu/2$ so that there is only to discuss the case $1/\nu \leq x \leq 3\nu/2$.

By definition we have $\Delta_{2k+2}^N = \Delta_{2k+2} \Delta_{2k+2}^{N-1}$. Following Kal'neĭ [6] we use the equality

$$\Delta_{2k+2}^{N-1} R_{n-k}^\alpha(x) = \sum_{m=0}^k \cdots \sum_{l=0}^k \Delta_2^{N-1} R_{n-k+2l+\dots+2m}^\alpha(x) \quad (14)$$

with $(N-1)$ summations, and also observe that, by formula (3) in Part I of [2],

$$\Delta_2^{N-1} R_k^\alpha(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} C_{j,N} \Delta_1^{N-1} R_{k+j}^\alpha(x) = C_{\alpha,N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} C_{j,N} x^{N-1} R_{k+j}^{\alpha+N-1}(x).$$

Hence, when we need to work with $\Delta_{2k+2}^N R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)$, $0 \leq k \leq n_* = [(\nu - 40)/100N]$, it suffices to replace this by a linear combination (in j , $0 \leq j \leq N-1$), of $(k+1)^{N-1}$ terms (in i coming from (14)) of the type

$$x^{N-1} \Delta_{2k+2} R_{n+j+2i-k}^{\alpha+N-1}(x), \quad 0 \leq j \leq N-1, \quad 0 \leq i \leq k(N-1), \quad 0 \leq k \leq n_*.$$

We note, since n_* is chosen so small, that on $1/\nu \leq x \leq 3\nu/2$ the R_{n-k+2i}^α have the same asymptotics for the relevant k, i as well as $R_{n+j+2i-k}^{\alpha+N-1}$ for the relevant k, j, i .

Let us now consider $\Sigma_{n,1,N}(x)$ on $1/\nu \leq x \leq \nu/2$. As in the case $N=1$ we fix x , can find a real λ , $-1 < \lambda < 1$, such that $\nu^\lambda/2 \leq x \leq \nu^\lambda$ and choose $\mu = 1/2 - \lambda/2 > 0$. Then, by the preceding discussion and with the abbreviation $N_k^* := (2k+1)(N-1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |x^{\alpha-\gamma} e^{-x/2} \Sigma_{n,1,N}(x)| &\leq C(n+1)^{\gamma+1/2} x^{\alpha-\gamma} e^{-x/2} \sum_{k=0}^{[n_*^\mu]} |\Delta_{2k+2}^N R_{n-k}^\alpha(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ &\quad + C(n+1)^{\gamma+1/2} x^{\alpha-\gamma} e^{-x/2} \sum_{k=[n_*^\mu]+1}^{n_*} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N} |R_{n+2j(k+1)-k}^\alpha(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ &\leq C(n+1)^{\gamma+1/2} x^{\alpha-\gamma+(N-1)} e^{-x/2} \sum_{k=0}^{[n_*^\mu]} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N_k^*} |\Delta_{2k+2} R_{n+j-k}^{\alpha+N-1}(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2+(N-1)} \\ &\quad + C(n+1)^{\gamma+1/2-(\alpha/2+1/4)} x^{\alpha-\gamma-(\alpha/2+1/4)} \sum_{k=[n_*^\mu]+1}^{n_*} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C(n+1)^{\gamma-\alpha/2-N/2+1/4} x^{\alpha/2-\gamma+N/2-1/4} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2+N} + C \leq C$$

uniformly in n .

To complete the proof of Lemma we may restrict ourselves, as in the case $N = 1$, to discussing the x -interval $[\nu/2, \nu]$. We start with $\nu - 2\nu^{1/3} \leq x \leq \nu$ and set $6\mu := 1/(2\gamma - \alpha + 1/2)$. Then, as in the case $1/\nu \leq x \leq \nu/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |x^{\alpha-\gamma} e^{-x/2} \Sigma_{n,1,N}(x)| \\ & \leq C(n+1)^{\alpha+N-1/2} e^{-x/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N_k^*} |\Delta_{2k+2} R_{n+j-k}^{\alpha+N-1}(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2+(N-1)} \\ & \quad + C(n+1)^{\alpha+1/2} e^{-x/2} \sum_{k=\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor+1}^{n_*} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N} |R_{n+2j(k+1)-k}^\alpha(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2} \\ & =: \Sigma_{n,3,N}(x) + \Sigma_{n,4,N}(x) \end{aligned}$$

That $\Sigma_{n,4,N}$ is uniformly bounded follows by our choice of μ when we use the third line of (8). Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{n,3,N}(x) & \leq C(n+1)^{(\alpha+N)/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N_k^*} \left| \Delta_{2k+2} \frac{\mathcal{L}_{n+j-k}^{\alpha+N-1}(x)}{\sqrt{L_{n+j-k}^{\alpha+N-1}(0)}} \right| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-5/2+N} \\ & \leq C(n+1)^{1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N_k^*} |\Delta_{2k+2} \mathcal{L}_{n+j-k}^{\alpha+N-1}(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-5/2+N} \\ & \quad + C(n+1)^{(\alpha+N)/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N_k^*} |\Delta_{2k+2} (L_{n+j-k}^{\alpha+N-1}(0))^{-1/2}| |\mathcal{L}_{n+j+k+2}^{\alpha+N-1}(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-5/2+N} \\ & \leq C(n+1)^{-1/6} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2+N} + C(n+1)^{-1/2-1/3} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2+N} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in n since $N \geq 2$. Hence there remains to consider fixed $x \in [\nu/2, \nu - 2\nu^{1/3}]$. As in the $(N = 1)$ -case there is a λ , $1/3 < \lambda < 1$, such that $\nu - 2\nu^\lambda \leq x \leq \nu - \nu^\lambda$; choose μ , $4\mu = (1 - \lambda)/(2\gamma - \alpha + 1/2)$. Since $1 \leq N - 1 \leq 2\gamma - \alpha + 1/2$ we obviously have $\mu < 1/6$. Make the same decomposition as in the preceding $[\nu - 2\nu^{1/3}, \nu]$ -case. Concerning the $\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor}$ -contribution we use the third line of the asymptotics in [1, p. 699] and observe that $|x - 4(n+j-k) - 2\alpha - 2| \leq C\nu^\lambda$ since $0 \leq j \leq (2k+1)(N-1) \leq Cn^\mu$, thus

$$\Sigma_{n,3,N}(x) \leq C(n+1)^{1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n_*^\mu \rfloor} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N_k^*} \sum_{i=0}^k |\Delta_2 \mathcal{L}_{n+j+2i-k}^{\alpha+N-1}(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-5/2+N}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +C(n+1)^{-1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{[n_*^\mu]} \sup_{0 \leq j \leq N_k^*} |\mathcal{L}_{n+j+k+2}^{\alpha+N-1}(x)| (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2+N} \\
& \leq C(n+1)^{1/2-3/4+\lambda/4} \sum_{k=0}^{[n_*^\mu]} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2+N} \\
& \quad + C(n+1)^{-1/2-1/4-\lambda/4} \sum_{k=0}^{[n_*^\mu]} (k+1)^{\alpha-2\gamma-3/2+N} \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to dominate the $\sum_{k=[n_*^\mu]}^{n_*}$ -contribution we use the method, analogous to the corresponding $(N=1)$ -case. Hence, we split $\Sigma_{n,4,N}$ into a sum Σ' where the summation variable k also satisfies the inequality $|\nu^\lambda - 4k| \geq \nu^\lambda/2$ and a sum Σ'' over the remaining k 's. Then, as in the corresponding $(N=1)$ -case, both contributions turn out to be uniformly bounded.

References

- [1] R. Askey and S. Wainger, Mean convergence of expansions in Laguerre and Hermite series, *Amer. J. Math.*, 87 (1965), 695 – 708.
- [2] G. Gasper and W. Trebels, On necessary multiplier conditions for Laguerre expansions, *Canad. J. Math.*, 43 (1991), 1228 – 1242; II, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 25 (1994), 384 – 391.
- [3] E. Görlich and C. Markett, Mean Cesàro summability and operator norms for Laguerre expansions, *Comment. Math. Prace Mat.*, Tomus specialis II (1979), 139 – 148.
- [4] E. Görlich and C. Markett, A convolution structure for Laguerre series, *Indag. Math.*, 44 (1982), 161 – 171.
- [5] S. G. Kal'neĭ, Uniform boundedness in the L -metric of polynomials with respect to the Jacobi polynomials, *Soviet. Mat. Dokl.*, 16 (1975), 714 – 718.
- [6] S. G. Kal'neĭ, On a lower estimate of the Lebesgue function of linear means of Fourier-Jacobi series, *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.*, 170 (1987), 127 – 133.
- [7] Y. Kanjin, A transplantation theorem for Laguerre series, *Tohoku Math. J.*, 43 (1991), 537 – 555.
- [8] C. Markett, Mean Cesàro summability of Laguerre expansions and norm estimates with shifted parameter, *Anal. Math.*, 8 (1982), 19 – 37.

- [9] C. Markett, Cohen type inequalities for Jacobi, Laguerre and Hermite expansions, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 14 (1983), 819 – 833.
- [10] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, 4th ed., Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ. 23, Providence, R.I., 1975.