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Abstract. We establish a sharp characterization of the error of the Szász-
Mirakjan operator in uniform norm with power-type weights in terms of a
K-functional. The weight exponents are optimal. We also state a sharp char-
acterization of the K-functional by means of the classical unweighted fixed-step
modulus of smoothness.

1. Introduction

1.1. Notations and main result. The Szász-Mirakjan operator for a function \( f \)
defined on \([0, \infty)\) is given by

\[
S_nf(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f \left( \frac{k}{n} \right) s_{n,k}(x), \quad s_{n,k}(x) = e^{-nx} \frac{(nx)^k}{k!}, \quad n \geq 1, \quad x \geq 0.
\]

Here \( n \) is not necessarily an integer.

In order to describe the approximation properties of \( S_n \) we need a number of
function spaces. Let \( C[0, \infty) \) denote the space of all continuous functions on \([0, \infty)\)
and \( L_{\infty}[0, \infty) \) denote the Lebesgue measurable and essentially bounded on \([0, \infty)\)
functions with the essential supremum norm \( \| \cdot \| \). For continuous functions \( \| \cdot \| \)
coincides with the uniform norm on \([0, \infty)\). Also, we denote the first derivative
operator by \( D = \frac{d}{dx} \), thus \( Dg(x) = g'(x) \) and \( D^2g(x) = g''(x) \). We further set
\( \varphi(x) = x \). Now, for a weight function \( w \) on \((0, \infty)\) we put

\[
C\left( w \right)(0, \infty) = \{ f \in C[0, \infty) : w f \in L_{\infty}[0, \infty) \},
\]

\[
W^2\left( w\varphi \right)(0, \infty) = \{ g \in AC_{loc}(0, \infty) : Dg \in AC_{loc}(0, \infty), w\varphi D^2g \in L_{\infty}[0, \infty) \},
\]

\[
W^3\left( w\varphi^{3/2} \right)(0, \infty) = \{ g \in AC_{loc}(0, \infty) : Dg, D^2g \in AC_{loc}(0, \infty),
\]

\[
\varphi^{3/2} D^3g \in L_{\infty}[0, \infty) \},
\]

where \( AC_{loc}(0, \infty) \) consists of the functions which are absolutely continuous in \([a, b]\)
for every \([a, b] \subset (0, \infty)\). Finally, \( \pi_1 \) stands for the set of algebraic polynomials of
first degree.

In [13] the second author introduces the concept of a natural weight for an
approximation operator.
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Definition 1.1. A weight $w$ is called a natural weight for approximation by a sequence $Q_n$ of operators in a specified norm if the norm of the weighted approximation error $w(f - Q_n f)$ allows matching direct and strong inverse estimates for the widest reasonable class of functions $f$.

Here we shall consider weights on $(0, \infty)$ of the form
\begin{equation}
(1.1)
    w(x) = w(\gamma_0, \gamma_\infty; x) = \left( \frac{x}{1+x} \right)^{\gamma_0} (1+x)^{\gamma_\infty}
\end{equation}
and show that they are natural for the uniform approximation by the Szász-Mirakjan operator for any $\gamma_0 \in [-1,0]$ and $\gamma_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$. More precisely, let the $K$-functional $K_w(f,t)$ be defined for $f \in C(w)(0,\infty) + \pi_1$ and $t > 0$ by
\begin{equation}
(1.2)
    K_w(f,t) = \inf \{ \|w(f-g)\| + t\|wD^2g\| : g \in W^2(w\varphi)(0,\infty) \}.
\end{equation}

We establish the following characterization.

Theorem 1.2. Let $w = w(\gamma_0, \gamma_\infty)$ be given by (1.1) with $\gamma_0 \in [-1,0]$ and $\gamma_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for all $f \in C(w)(0,\infty) + \pi_1$ and $n \geq 1$ there holds
\begin{equation*}
    \|w(f - S_n f)\| \sim K_w(f, \theta),
\end{equation*}
where $\theta(f,t)$ to be defined below. The relation $\psi(f,t) \sim \theta(f,t)$ means that there exists a positive constant independent of $f$ and $t$ such that
\begin{equation*}
    e^{-1}\theta(f,t) \leq \psi(f,t) \leq c \theta(f,t).
\end{equation*}

The relation $\psi(f,t) \sim \theta(f,t)$ means that there exists a positive constant independent of $f$ and $t$ such that
\begin{equation*}
    e^{-1}\theta(f,t) \leq \psi(f,t) \leq c \theta(f,t).
\end{equation*}

Let us note that the range of $\gamma_0$ cannot be reasonably extended. Indeed, if $\gamma_0 < -1$ then we must assume that $f(x) = 0$ in a neighbourhood of 0, otherwise $S_n f$ will not be bounded. On the other hand, if $\gamma_0 > 0$, then $f(x)$ is not generally defined at 0 and hence $S_n f$ is not defined. Moreover, we cannot settle this case by restricting to functions $f \in C([0,\infty)$ because then $S_n f$ is not a bounded operator in the weighted uniform norm.

1.2. Characterization of the weighted $K$-functionals. The $K$-functional $K_w(f,t)$ is equivalent to the Ditzian-Totik modulus of smoothness if $\gamma_0 = 0$ (see [4, Theorem 6.1.1]), whereas for $\gamma_0 < 0$ it is only weakly equivalent to the so called weighted main-part modulus (see [4, Section 6.2]). Also, this $K$-functional with $\gamma_0 = \gamma_\infty = 0$ was shown to be equivalent to a modulus introduced by the second author in [12]. In a series of papers [5, 6, 7, 8] the authors introduced and studied moduli of smoothness which are equivalent to weighted $K$-functionals like $K_w(f,t)$. They are defined by means of the classical unweighted fixed-step modulus and a continuous linear transform of the function. In particular, we can characterize $K_w(f,t)$ by such moduli by first splitting the singularities
\begin{equation*}
    K_w(f,t) \sim K_w(f,t)_{[0,2]} + K_w(f,t)_{[1,\infty)},
\end{equation*}
which is valid for all $f \in C(w)(0,\infty)$ and $t \in (0,1]$. The $K$-functional $K_w(f,t)_I$ is defined as in (1.2) with the supremum taken on the interval $I$. By [8, Theorem 6.2 and 6.8] we have
\begin{equation}
(1.3)
    K_w(f,t)_{[0,2]} \sim \omega_2(A_{\gamma_0} f, t)_{[0,2]}.
\end{equation}
where $\omega_2(f, t)_{[0, 2]}$ is the classical modulus of smoothness of second order in uniform norm on the interval $[0, 2]$ and

$$A_m f(x) = \begin{cases} f(x^2) - x \int_1^x y^{-2} f(y^2) \, dy & \text{for } \gamma_0 = 0, \\ x^2 f(x^2) + \frac{4\gamma^2 - 1}{5} x \int_1^x y^{2\gamma - 2} f(y^2) \, dy & \\ - \frac{4(\gamma_0 + 2)(\gamma_0 + 3)}{5} x^{-4} \int_0^x y^{2\gamma + 3} f(y^2) \, dy & \text{for } -1 < \gamma_0 < 0, \\ x^{-2} f(x^2) + 3x \int_1^x y^{-4} f(y^2) \, dy & \text{for } \gamma_0 = -1, \end{cases}$$

for $x \in [0, 2]$. Relation (1.3) holds provided that $w f$ has a limit at 0, which is, moreover, equal to 0 if $\gamma_0 \in (-1, 0)$.

Similarly, one can construct a modulus equivalent to $K_w(f, t)_{[1, \infty]}$. We shall present this case in [9].

1.3. Related works. Many mathematicians investigated the approximation behaviour of the Szász-Mirakjan operator. First, Becker [2] established direct and weak converse estimates for $w(x) = (1 + x)^{-N}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Amonov [1] proved a weak equivalence result for $w(x) = (1 + x)^{\gamma}$, $\gamma \leq 0$. He studied also more general weights. Holhos [11] introduced a general approach to verifying direct estimates in weighted uniform norm. As an application he obtained a direct result for $S_n$ in the case $w(x) = (1 + x)^{\gamma}$, $\gamma \leq 0$.

As for strong converse estimates, Totik [15] established the assertion of Theorem 1.2 in the unweighted case $w = 1$. Quite recently Finta [10] developed a general method, which in particular enable him to verify a two-term strong converse inequality for the weights $w(x) = x^{\gamma}$, $\gamma \in (-1, 0]$.

As can be seen, most researchers were interested in studying the rate of approximation in weighted spaces that are larger than $C[0, \infty)$ and thus allowing for more function to be approximated. In our opinion, it is also worthwhile finding in which weighted spaces the norm of the approximation error can be neatly characterized since that reveals intrinsic properties of the operator.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

First, let us recall several basic properties of the Szász-Mirakjan operator:

(2.1) $S_n$ is a positive linear operator;

(2.2) $S_n f = f \quad \forall f \in \pi_1$;

(2.3) $S_n((\circ - x)^2)(x) = \frac{x}{n}, \quad S_n((\circ - x)^3)(x) = \frac{x}{n^2};$

(2.4) $S_n((\circ - x)^4)(x) = d_1 \frac{x^2}{n^2} + d_2 \frac{x}{n^3}, \quad S_n((\circ - x)^6)(x) = d_3 \frac{x^3}{n^3} + d_4 \frac{x^2}{n^4} + d_5 \frac{x}{n^5};$

(2.5) $S_n f = (S_f(F_x))_n$, where $F_x(x) = F(\nu x)$, $\nu > 0$.

Above, $d_1, \ldots, d_5$ are constants independent of $n$. For (2.3)-(2.4) see e.g. [4, (9.1.13) and Lemma 9.5.5].

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on [3, Theorem 4.1 and (1.2)-(1.4)]. So, we proceed to the verification of their hypotheses. The first concerns the boundedness of the Szász-Mirakjan operator in weighted uniform norm. Below $c, c_1, c_2, \ldots$ denote positive constants which do not depend on $f$ and $n$. 


Proposition 2.1. Let \( w = w(\gamma_0, \gamma_{\infty}) \) be given by (1.1) with \( \gamma_0 \in [-1,0] \) and \( \gamma_{\infty} \in \mathbb{R} \). Then
\[
\|wS_n f\| \leq c_1 \|w f\| \quad \forall f \in C(w)(0,\infty) \quad \forall n \geq 1.
\]

Proof. Using the positivity of \( S \), we get
\[
|S_n f(x)| \leq (S_n(w^{-1}))(x)\|w f\|
\]
Thus it remains to show that
\[
(S_n(w^{-1}))(x) \leq c w(x)^{-1}.
\]
To this end we apply a routine technique based on Hölder’s inequality. If \( \gamma_0 \neq \gamma_{\infty} \), we fix \( r \in \mathbb{Z} \) such that \( r/(\gamma_0 - \gamma_{\infty}) \geq 1 \); if \( \gamma_0 = \gamma_{\infty} \), we set \( r = 1 \). Then consecutive applications of Hölder’s inequality yield
\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} \left( \frac{k}{n} \right)^{-\gamma_0} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^{\gamma_0 - \gamma_{\infty}} s_{n,k}(x)
\]
\[
\leq \left\{ \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{k}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^{\gamma_0 - \gamma_{\infty}} s_{n,k}(x) \right\}^{-\gamma_0} \left\{ \sum_{k \geq 0} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^{\gamma_0 - \gamma_{\infty}} s_{n,k}(x) \right\}^{1+\gamma_0}
\]
\[
\leq \left\{ \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{k}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^{\gamma_0(\gamma_{\infty} - \gamma_0)/r} s_{n,k}(x) \right\}^{1+\gamma_0(\gamma_{\infty} - \gamma_0)/r} \left\{ \sum_{k \geq 0} s_{n,k}(x) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{k \geq 0} s_{n,k}(x) \right\}^{(1+\gamma_0)(\gamma_{\infty} - \gamma_0)/r}
\]
It is known that (cf. [4, p. 163]),
\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^{r} s_{n,k}(x) \leq c (1 + x)^r, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z};
\]
and also
\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{k}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^{r} s_{n,k}(x) \leq c x \sum_{k \geq 0} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^{r} s_{n,k}(x) \leq c x (1 + x)^r.
\]
Now, (2.6) readily follows from (2.2) and (2.7)-(2.9).

Next, we establish a Jackson-type inequality.

Proposition 2.2. Let \( w = w(\gamma_0, \gamma_{\infty}) \) be given by (1.1) with \( \gamma_0 \in [-1,0] \) and \( \gamma_{\infty} \in \mathbb{R} \). Then
\[
\|w(g - S_n g)\| \leq c_2 \|w \varphi D^2 g\| \quad \forall g \in W^2(w \varphi)(0,\infty) \quad \forall n \geq 1.
\]

Proof. Since \( g \in W^2(w \varphi)(0,\infty) \), then \( g \in C[0,\infty) \). By Taylor’s formula we have for \( x > 0 \) and \( t \geq 0 \) that
\[
g(t) = g(x) + (t - x) Dg(x) + \int_x^t (t - u) D^2 g(u) \, du.
\]
We apply $S_n$ to both sides of this identity with regard to the variable $t$. Then, taking into account that $S_n$ preserves the linear functions (see (2.2)), we get

$$S_n g(x) = g(x) + S_n \left( \int_x^1 (u - x) D^2 g(u) \, du \right)(x).$$

Next, by the positivity of $S_n$, we derive the estimate

$$|g(x) - S_n g(x)| \leq S_n \left( \int_x^1 (u - x) |D^2 g(u)| \, du \right)(x) \leq R_{1,n}(x) \|w \varphi^2 D^2 g\|,$$

where we have set

$$R_{1,n}(w; x) = S_n \left( \int_0^\infty Q_1(o, u, x) w(u)^{-1} \, du \right)(x)$$

and $Q_1(t, u, x) = |t - u|^{-1}$ for $u$ between $t$ and $x$ and $Q_1(t, u, x) = 0$ otherwise.

Thus it is sufficient to show that

$$R_{1,n}(w; x) \leq \frac{c}{n} w(x)^{-1}.$$  

Just as in the proof of Proposition 2.1 we get

$$R_{1,n}(w(\gamma_0, \gamma_\infty); x) \leq R_{1,n}(w(-1, -r - 1); x)^{\gamma_0(\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r} \times R_{1,n}(w(-1, 0); x)^{-\gamma_0(1 + (\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r)} \times R_{1,n}(w(0, -r); x)^{(1 + \gamma_0)(\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r} \times R_{1,n}(w(0, 0); x)^{(1 + \gamma_0)(1 + (\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r)}.$$  

We estimate separately each of the $R_{1,n}$'s above. By (2.3) we immediately get

$$R_{1,n}(w(-1, 0); x) \leq S_n((o - x)^2)(x) = \frac{x}{n}.$$  

Next, we observe that for $u$ between $t$ and $x$ there hold

$$\frac{|t - u|}{u} \leq \frac{|t - x|}{x}, \quad (1 + u)^r \leq (1 + x)^r + (1 + t)^r.$$  

The first of these inequalities is verified directly and the second one is trivial. The first inequality above and (2.2) yield

$$R_{1,n}(w(0, 0); x) \leq \frac{1}{x} S_n((o - x)^2)(x) = \frac{1}{n}.$$  

Further, by means of the second inequality in (2.14) we arrive at

$$R_{1,n}(w(-1, -r - 1); x) \leq (1 + x)^r S_n((o - x)^2)(x) + S_n((o - x)^2(1 + \gamma)^r)(x)$$

Let us consider $S_n((o - x)^2(1 + \gamma)^r)(x)$. For $nx \geq 1$ we apply the Cauchy inequality, (2.4) and (2.8) to get

$$S_n((o - x)^2(1 + \gamma)^r)(x) \leq \sqrt{S_n((o - x)^2)(x) S_n(1 + \gamma)^2(x)} \leq \frac{c x (1 + x)^r}{n}.$$  

To verify this inequality for $nx \leq 1$ we proceed as follows:

$$S_n((o - x)^2(1 + \gamma)^r)(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^r s_{n,k}(x).$$
Next, by the positivity of taking into account (2.2) and (2.3), we get

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{k}{n}\right)^r s_n,k(x) - 2x \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{k}{n} \left(1 + \frac{k}{n}\right)^r s_n,k(x)$$

$$+ x^2 \sum_{k \geq 0} \left(1 + \frac{k}{n}\right)^r s_n,k(x)$$

$$\leq c x \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{k}{n} \left(1 + \frac{k}{n}\right)^r s_n,k(x) + c \left(\frac{x}{n} + x^2\right) \sum_{k \geq 0} \left(1 + \frac{k}{n}\right)^r s_n,k(x)$$

$$\leq c \left(\frac{x}{n} + x^2\right) (1 + x)^r \leq \frac{c x(1 + x)^r}{n},$$

as at the last but one step we have applied (2.8) and (2.9).

Thus we have established the estimate

$$(2.17) \quad S_n((\circ - x)^2(1 + \circ)^r)(x) \leq \frac{c x(1 + x)^r}{n}, \quad x \geq 0.$$  

Now, (2.16), (2.3) and (2.17) imply

$$(2.18) \quad R_{1,n}(w(-1, -r - 1); x) \leq \frac{c x(1 + x)^r}{n}.$$  

Finally, by means of (2.14) we get

$$R_{1,n}(w(0, -r); x) \leq \frac{(1 + x)^r}{x} - S_n((\circ - x)^2)(x) + \frac{1}{x} S_n((\circ - x)^2(1 + \circ)^r)(x),$$

which along with (2.3) and (2.17), gives

$$R_{1,n}(w(0, -r); x) \leq \frac{c(1 + x)^r}{n}, \quad x \geq 0.$$  

The estimate (2.11) follows from (2.12), (2.13), (2.15), (2.18) and (2.19). The proof of the proposition is completed. \)

We shall also need the following Voronovskaya-type inequality.

**Proposition 2.3.** Let $w = w(\gamma_0, \gamma_\infty)$ be given by (1.1) with $\gamma_0 \in [-1, 0]$ and $\gamma_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\left\| w \left( S_n g - g - \frac{1}{2n} \varphi D^2 g \right) \right\| \leq \frac{c_3}{n^{3/2}} \| w \varphi^{3/2} D^3 g \| \forall g \in W^3(\varphi^{3/2})(0, \infty) \forall n \geq 1.$$

**Proof.** The proof is quite similar to the one of the previous proposition. We first use Taylor’s formula to get the representation

$$g(t) = g(x) + (t - x)Dg(x) + \frac{(t - x)^2}{2} D^2 g(x) + \frac{1}{2} \int_x^t (t - u)^2 D^3 g(u) du.$$  

We apply $S_n$ to both sides of this identity with regard to the variable $t$. Then, taking into account (2.2) and (2.3), we get

$$S_n g(x) = g(x) + \frac{1}{2n} \varphi(x) D^2 g(x) + \frac{1}{2} S_n \left( \int_x^0 (\circ - u)^2 D^3 g(u) du \right) (x).$$  

Next, by the positivity of $S_n$, we derive the estimate

$$(2.20) \quad \left| S_n g(x) - g(x) - \frac{1}{2n} \varphi(x) D^2 g(x) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left| S_n \left( \int_x^0 (\circ - u)^2 |D^3 g(u)| du \right) (x) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} R_{2,n}(x) \| w \varphi^{3/2} D^3 g \|,$$
where we have set
\[ R_{2,n}(w; x) = S_n \left( \int_0^\infty Q_2(\gamma_0, \gamma, x) w(u)^{-1} \, du \right) (x) \]
and \( Q_2(t, u, x) = (t - u)^2 u^{-3/2} \) for \( u \) between \( t \) and \( x \) and \( Q_2(t, u, x) = 0 \) otherwise.

We shall show that
\[ R_{2,n}(w(\gamma_0, \gamma_\infty); x) \leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} w(x)^{-1}. \]

As in the proof of the previous propositions we get
\[ R_{2,n}(w(\gamma_0, \gamma_\infty); x) \leq R_{2,n}(w(-1, -r - 1); x)^{\gamma_\infty(\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r} \times R_{2,n}(w(-1, 0); x)^{-\gamma_0(1 + \gamma_\infty)/r} \times R_{2,n}(w(0, -r); x)^{(1 + \gamma_0)(\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r} \]
\[ \times R_{2,n}(w(0, 0); x)^{(1 + \gamma_0)(1 + (\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r)}. \]

Thus it is sufficient to establish (2.21) only for each of the \( R_{2,n}'s \) on the right above.

This is done by arguments similar to those in the proof of the previous proposition based on the following relations:
\[ (2.22) \quad \frac{(t - u)^2}{u^{1/2}} \leq \frac{(t - x)^2}{x^{1/2}}, \quad \frac{(t - u)^2}{u^{3/2}} \leq \frac{(t - x)^2}{x^{3/2}} \]
for \( u \) between \( t \) and \( x \),
\[ (2.23) \quad S_n(|\circ - x|^3(1 + \circ)^i)(x) \leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} x^{3/2}(1 + x)^i, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad nx \geq 1, \]
\[ (2.24) \quad \sum_{k \geq 2} \left( \frac{k}{n} - 1 \right)^3 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right) s_{n,k}(x) \leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} x^{3/2}(1 + x)^i, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad nx \leq 1, \]
and
\[ (2.25) \quad \left| \int_x^{x/k} \frac{(k - u)^2}{u^{3/2}} u^n(1 + u)^{\beta} \, du \right| s_{n,k}(x) \leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} w(-\alpha, -\beta; x)^{-1}, \quad nx \leq 1, \]
for \( k = 0, 1 \) and each of the couples
\[ (\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0), \quad (\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0), \quad (\alpha, \beta) = (0, r), \quad (\alpha, \beta) = (1, r). \]

The inequalities (2.22) are verified directly.

To prove (2.23) we apply the Cauchy inequality, (2.4) and (2.8) and thus get
\[ S_n(|\circ - x|^3(1 + \circ)^i)(x) \leq \sqrt{S_n(|\circ - x|^3)(x)} \sqrt{S_n((1 + \circ)^{2i})(x)} \]
\[ \leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} x^{3/2}(1 + x)^i \]
since \( nx \geq 1 \).
To establish (2.24) we observe that

\[
\sum_{k \geq 2} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right)^3 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x)
\]

\[
= \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{k}{n} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x) - x \sum_{k \geq 2} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x)
\]

\[
\leq c x \sum_{k \geq 1} \left( \frac{k+1}{n} - x \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x)
\]

\[
= c x \left[ \sum_{k \geq 1} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x) + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k \geq 1} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right) \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x)
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k \geq 1} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x) \right]
\]

\[
\leq \frac{c x^2 (1 + x)^i}{n} \leq \frac{c x^{3/2} (1 + x)^i}{n^{3/2}}, \quad nx \leq 1,
\]

as at the last but one step we have used (2.8), (2.9), (2.17) and the estimate

\[
\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k \geq 1} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x) = \frac{x}{n} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k-1}(x)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{c x}{n} \sum_{k \geq 0} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^i s_{n,k}(x) \leq \frac{c x (1 + x)^i}{n}.
\]

It remains to prove (2.25). Set

\[
A_{n,k}(\alpha, \beta; x) = \left| \int_{x}^{k/n} \frac{(\frac{k}{n} - u)^2}{u^{3/2}} u^{\alpha} (1 + u)^{\beta} \, du \right| s_{n,k}(x).
\]

For \( \alpha = \beta = 0 \) we have by straightforward calculations

\[
A_{n,0}(0, 0; x) = \int_{0}^{x} \frac{u^2}{u^{3/2}} \, du \, s_{n,0}(x) = \frac{2}{3} x^{3/2} e^{-nx} \leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} w(0, 0; x)^{-1}
\]

and

\[
A_{n,1}(0, 0; x) = \int_{x}^{1/n} \frac{(\frac{1}{n} - u)^2}{u^{3/2}} \, du \, s_{n,1}(x)
\]

\[
= e^{-nx} \left( 2(1-nx)^2 x^{1/2}/n - 4nx \int_{x}^{1/n} \frac{1}{u^{1/2}} \, du \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} w(0, 0; x)^{-1}.
\]

For \( \alpha = 1, \beta = 0 \) we calculate

\[
A_{n,0}(1, 0; x) = \int_{0}^{x} \frac{u^2}{u^{3/2}} \, du \, s_{n,0}(x) = \frac{2}{5} x^{5/2} e^{-nx} \leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} w(-1, 0; x)^{-1}
\]
and
\[ A_{n,1}(1,0;x) = \int_{x}^{1/n} \frac{(\frac{1}{n} - u)^2}{u^{3/2}} u \, du \, s_{n,1}(x) \]
\[ = e^{-nx} \left( -2(1-nx)^{23/2} n + \frac{8}{3} (1-nx)^{5/2} - \frac{8}{3} n \int_{x}^{1/n} u^{3/2} \, du \right) \]
\[ \leq \frac{c}{n^{3/2}} w(-1,0;x)^{-1}. \]

In the other two cases (2.25) follows from the inequality
\[ A_{n,k}(\alpha,r;x) \leq c \, A_{n,k}(\alpha,0;x)(1+x)^r, \quad x \in [0,1], \]
and the estimates we have already established.

The last two propositions contain Bernstein-type inequalities.

**Proposition 2.4.** Let \( w = w(\gamma_0,\gamma_\infty) \) be given by (1.1) with \( \gamma_0 \in [-1,0] \) and \( \gamma_\infty \in \mathbb{R} \). Then
\[ \| w\varphi D^2(S_n f) \| \leq c_{4n} \| w f \| \forall f \in C(w)(0,\infty) \forall n \geq 1. \]

**Proof.** Analogously to the assertions we proved so far we shall show that
\[ |\varphi(x)D^2(S_n f)(x)| \leq c \| w f \| w(x)^{-1}. \]

To this end, we shall consider the cases \( nx \leq 1 \) and \( nx \geq 1 \) separately.

For \( nx \leq 1 \) we use the representation
\[ D^2 S_n f(x) = n^2 S_n(\Delta_{1/n}^2 f)(x). \]

It follows from
\[ DS_n f(x) = n S_n(\Delta_{1/n} f)(x), \]
which is established straightforwardly. By (2.27), we have for \( nx \leq 1 \)
\[ |\varphi(x)D^2 S_n f(x)| \leq n^2 x \sum_{k \geq 0} \left( w\left( \frac{k+2}{n} \right) -1 + 2w\left( \frac{k+1}{n} \right) -1 + w\left( \frac{k}{n} \right) -1 \right) s_{n,k}(x) \| w f \|. \]

But since \( nx \leq 1 \) and \( \gamma_0 \in [-1,0] \)
\[ \left( \frac{k+i}{n} \right)^{-\gamma_0} \leq \left( \frac{k}{n} \right)^{-\gamma_0} + c n^{\gamma_0} \leq \left( \frac{k}{n} \right)^{-\gamma_0} + c n x^{-1-\gamma_0}, \quad i = 1,2. \]

Consequently,
\[ w\left( \frac{k+i}{n} \right)^{-1} \leq c w\left( \frac{k}{n} \right)^{-1} + c n x^{-1-\gamma_0} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^{\gamma_0-\gamma_\infty}, \quad i = 1,2. \]

Relations (2.29), (2.30) and (2.6) imply (2.26) for \( nx \leq 1 \). Let now \( nx \geq 1 \). In this case we use that
\[ s_{n,k}'(x) = \frac{n}{x} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right) s_{n,k}(x). \]

Therefore
\[ DS_n f(x) = \frac{n}{x} S_n((\varphi - x)f(\varphi))(x); \]
hence
\[ D^2 S_n f(x) = \frac{n^2}{x^2} S_n((\circ - x)^2 f(\circ))(x) - \frac{n}{x} S_n((\circ - x)^2 f(\circ))(x). \]

Consequently,
\[ (2.32) \quad |\varphi(x) D^2 S_n f(x)| \leq \frac{n}{x} [n S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(\circ)^{-1})(x) + S_n(|\circ - x| w(\circ)^{-1})(x)] \| w f \|. \]

For the first summand on the right above we have by Hölder’s inequality the estimate (cf. (2.7))
\[ S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(\circ)^{-1})(x) \leq S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(1, r + 1; \circ))(x)^{(\gamma + \gamma_0)/r} \]
\[ \times S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(1, 0; \circ))(x)^{-\gamma_0(1 + (\gamma_0 - \gamma_0)/r)} \]
\[ \times S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(0, r; \circ))(x)^{(1 + \gamma)(\gamma_0 - \gamma_0)/r} \]
\[ \times S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(0, 0; \circ))(x)^{(1 + \gamma)(1 + (\gamma_0 - \gamma_0)/r)}. \]

To estimate \( S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(1, 0; \circ))(x) \) we observe that by (2.3)
\[ S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(1, 0; \circ))(x) = x S_n((\circ - x)^2)(x) + S_n((\circ - x)^3)(x) \]
\[ = \frac{x^2}{n} + \frac{x}{n^2} \leq \frac{2x^2}{n}. \]

Similarly, we have
\[ (2.35) \quad S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(1, r + 1; \circ))(x) \leq cx \sum_{k \geq 0} \left( \frac{k + 1}{n} - x \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^r s_{n,k}(x) \]
\[ = cx \left[ \sum_{k \geq 0} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^r s_{n,k}(x) + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{k}{n} - x \right] \left( 1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^r s_{n,k}(x) \]
\[ \leq c \left( \frac{x^2}{n} + \frac{x}{n^2} \right)(1 + x)^r \leq \frac{c x^2 (1 + x)^r}{n}, \]

as at the last but one step we have used (2.8), (2.9) and (2.17).

Now, (2.33), (2.3), (2.17), (2.34) and (2.35) yield for \( nx \geq 1 \)
\[ (2.36) \quad S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(\circ)^{-1})(x) \leq \frac{c x}{n} w(x)^{-1}. \]

For the second summand on the right of (2.32) we have by the Cauchy inequality, (2.36) and (2.6)
\[ S_n(|\circ - x| w(\circ)^{-1})(x) \leq \sqrt{S_n((\circ - x)^2 w(\circ)^{-1})(x) S_n(w^{-1})(x)} \]
\[ \leq c \sqrt{\frac{x}{n} w(x)^{-1}} \leq c x w(x)^{-1}, \]

as \( nx \geq 1 \).

The inequalities (2.32), (2.36) and the last estimate above imply (2.26) for \( nx \geq 1 \). This completes the proof of the proposition. □
The next proposition is the analogue of a result of Knoop and Zhou concerning the Bernstein operator [14, Theorem 2.1]. We prove it following their argument. Perhaps it is worth noting that it fits even more naturally and is easier to apply for the Szász-Mirakjan operator than for the Bernstein operator, for which it was originally developed.

**Proposition 2.5.** Let \( w = w(\gamma_0, \gamma_\infty) \) be given by (1.1) with \( \gamma_0 \in [-1, 0] \) and \( \gamma_\infty \in \mathbb{R} \). Let \( r \in \mathbb{Z} \) be such that \( r/(\gamma_0 - \gamma_\infty) > 1 \) if \( \gamma_0 \neq \gamma_\infty \), and let \( r = 1 \) if \( \gamma_0 = \gamma_\infty \). We set \( \gamma = (1 + \gamma_0)(\gamma_0 - \gamma_\infty)/r \). Let also \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) as \( m \geq 2 \). Then

\[
\|w \varphi^{3/2} D^3(S^m_n g)\| \leq c_5 \sqrt{m\gamma - 1} (\log m)^{1+\gamma} \sqrt{n} \|w \varphi D^2 g\| \\
\forall g \in W^2(w\varphi)(0, \infty) \quad \forall n \geq m^2.
\]

The value of the constant \( c_5 \) depends only on \( r \).

**Proof.** For \( g \in W^2(w\varphi)(0, \infty) \) the formulae (2.27) and (2.28) give

\[
(2.37) \quad DS_n g(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} n \int_0^{1/n} Dg \left( \frac{k}{n} + u \right) du \, s_{n,k}(x)
\]

and

\[
(2.38) \quad D^2S_n g(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} n^2 \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} D^2g \left( \frac{k}{n} + u + v \right) du \, dv \, s_{n,k}(x).
\]

Iterating the latter we arrive at

\[
(2.39) \quad D^2S^m_n g(x) = \sum_{j_1, \ldots, m_{j_1 \geq 0}} n^2 \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} D^2g \left( \frac{k_{j_1}}{n} + u + v \right) du \, dv \, s_{n,k_{j_1}}(x),
\]

where we have set \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_m) \),

\[
S_{n,k} = \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} s_{n,2,k_j} \left( \frac{k_{j+1}}{n} \right)
\]

and

\[
s_{n,t_1 \ldots t_i}(x) = n^i \int_0^{1/n} \cdots \int_0^{1/n} s_{n,k}(x + t_1 + \cdots + t_i) \, dt_1 \cdots dt_i.
\]

Next, just as in [14, pp. 319-320], using (2.37) and (2.39), we arrive at the following \( m - 1 \) representations of \( D^3S^m_n g \)

\[
(2.40) \quad D^3S^m_n g(x) = \sum_{j_1, \ldots, m_{j_1 \geq 0}} n^2 \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} D^3g \left( \frac{k_{j_1}}{n} + u + v \right) du \, dv \, s_{n,k_{j_1}} Q_{n,j,k} s_{n,k_{j_1}}(x), \quad j = 1, \ldots, m-1,
\]

where

\[
Q_{n,j,k} = \ell_{n,k_j}^* \left( \frac{k_{j+1}}{n} \right) \ell_{n,k_{j+1}}^* \left( \frac{k_{j+2}}{n} \right) \cdots \ell_{n,k_{m-1}}^* \left( \frac{k_m}{n} \right), \quad j = 1, \ldots, m-2,
\]

\[
Q_{n,m-1,k} = \ell_{n,k_{m-1}}^* \left( \frac{k_m}{n} \right)
\]
and 
\[ \ell_{n,k}^* = \frac{n}{s_{n,2,k}(x+t)} s_{n,2,k}(x) \]

Summing the relations in (2.40) we get

\[ (2.41) \quad D^3 S_m^n g(x) = \frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} n^2 \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} D^2 g \left( \frac{k_1}{n} + u + v \right) \, du \, dv \, S_{n,k} Q_{n,k} s_{n,k_m}(x) \]

with

\[ Q_{n,k} = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} Q_{n,j,k} \]

Further, let us observe that

\[ (2.42) \quad \left| n^2 \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} D^2 g \left( \frac{k}{n} + u + v \right) \, du \, dv \right| \leq n^2 \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} w \left( \frac{k}{n} + u + v \right)^{-1} \varphi \left( \frac{k}{n} + u + v \right)^{-1} \, du \, dv \, \| w \varphi D^2 g \| \]

and

\[ (2.43) \quad n^2 \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} w \left( \frac{k}{n} + u + v \right)^{-1} \varphi \left( \frac{k}{n} + u + v \right)^{-1} \, du \, dv \]

\[ \leq c w \left( \frac{k + 1}{n} \right)^{-1} \varphi \left( \frac{k + 1}{n} \right)^{-1} . \]

The first of these estimates is obvious. To verify the second one we proceed as follows:

\[ n^2 \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} w \left( \frac{k}{n} + u + v \right)^{-1} \varphi \left( \frac{k}{n} + u + v \right)^{-1} \, du \, dv \]

\[ = n^2 \int_{-1/n}^{1/n} \left( \frac{1}{n} - |u| \right) w \left( \frac{k + 1}{n} + u \right)^{-1} \varphi \left( \frac{k + 1}{n} + u \right)^{-1} \, du \]

\[ \leq c \left( 1 + \frac{k + 1}{n} \right)^{-\gamma_0 - \gamma_\infty} n^2 \int_{-1/n}^{1/n} \left( \frac{1}{n} - |u| \right) \left( \frac{k + 1}{n} + u \right)^{-\gamma_0 - 1} \, du \]

\[ \leq c w \left( \frac{k + 1}{n} \right)^{-1} \varphi \left( \frac{k + 1}{n} \right)^{-1} , \]

as at the last estimate we have used that the function \((1/n - |u|)(k+1)/n + u)^{-\gamma_0 - 1}\) is increasing on \([-1/n, 0]\) and decreasing on \([0, 1/n]\). We derive from (2.41) by the Cauchy inequality and (2.42)-(2.43) the estimate

\[ |D^3 S_m^n g(x)| \leq \frac{1}{m-1} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} S_{n,k} Q_{n,k}^2 s_{n,k_m}(x) \right\| \]
\[
\times \sqrt{\sum_{k_j \geq 0} \int_0^{1/n} \int_0^{1/n} \left| \frac{k_1}{n} + u + v \right|^2 D^2 g \left( \frac{k_1}{n} + u + v \right) du dv} \left| s_{n,k_m}(x) \right|
\]
\[
\leq \frac{c}{m} \sum_{k_j \geq 0} S_{n,k} Q_{n,k}^2 s_{n,k_m}(x)
\]
\[
\times \sqrt{\sum_{k_j \geq 0} w \left( \frac{k_1 + 1}{n} \right)^{-2} \varphi \left( \frac{k_1 + 1}{n} \right)^{-2} S_{n,k} s_{n,k_m}(x)} \left| w \varphi D^2 g \right|.
\]

Thus we can finish the proof of the proposition if we show that
\[
(2.44) \quad \sum_{k_j \geq 0} S_{n,k} Q_{n,k}^2 s_{n,k_m}(x) \leq c \nu m \varphi(x)^{-1}
\]

and
\[
(2.45) \quad \sum_{k_j \geq 0} w \left( \frac{k_1 + 1}{n} \right)^{-2} \varphi \left( \frac{k_1 + 1}{n} \right)^{-2} S_{n,k} s_{n,k_m}(x)
\]
\[
\leq c w(x)^{-2} \varphi(x)^{-2} m^\gamma (\log m)^{1+\gamma}, \quad n \geq m^2.
\]

In order to simplify these two assertions we take into account that \( s_{n,i,k}(x) = s_{1,i,k}(nx) \). Consequently,
\[
S_{n,k} = S_{1,k},
\]
\[
\ell_{n,k}^*(x) = n \ell_{1,k}^*(nx), \quad \ell_{n,k}(x) = \ell_{1,k}(nx),
\]
\[
Q_{n,j,k} = n Q_{1,j,k}.
\]

Also, we have (cf. \([14, \text{pp. 327-328}]\))
\[
\sum_{k_j \geq 0} S_{n,k} Q_{n,j',k} Q_{n,j'',k} s_{n,k_m}(x) \equiv 0, \quad j' \neq j''.
\]

Hence (2.44) and (2.45) reduce respectively to
\[
\sum_{k_j \geq 0} S_{1,k} Q_{1,j,k}^2 s_{1,k_m}(x) \leq c \varphi(x)^{-1}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m - 1,
\]
and
\[
(2.46) \quad \sum_{k_j \geq 0} (1 + k_1)^{-2(1+\gamma)} (n + k_1)^{2(\gamma_m - \gamma_\infty)} S_{1,k} s_{1,k_m}(x)
\]
\[
\leq c x^{-2(1+\gamma)} (n + x)^{2(\gamma_m - \gamma_\infty)} m^\gamma (\log m)^{1+\gamma}, \quad n \geq m^2.
\]
The first estimate is verified in Lemma 2.6 below. As for the second we use Hölder’s inequality as in the proof of the previous propositions to get
\[
\sum_{k_j \geq 0} \left(1 + k_1\right)^{-2(1+\gamma_0)} (n + k_1)^{2(\gamma_0 - \gamma_\infty)} s_{1,k_1} s_{1,k_m}(x) \leq \left\{ \sum_{k_j \geq 0} (1 + k_1)^{-4} s_{1,k_1} s_{1,k_m}(x) \right\} \frac{(1+\gamma_0)(\gamma_0 - \gamma_\infty)/(2r)}{(1+\gamma_0)(1+(\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r)} \times \left\{ \sum_{k_j \geq 0} (1 + k_1)^{-2} s_{1,k_1} s_{1,k_m}(x) \right\} \frac{\gamma_0(\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r}{(1+\gamma_0)(\gamma_0 - \gamma_\infty)/(2r)} \times \left\{ \sum_{k_j \geq 0} (n + k_1)^{2r} s_{1,k_1} s_{1,k_m}(x) \right\} \frac{(1+\gamma_0)(\gamma_0 - \gamma_\infty)/r}{\gamma_0(1+(\gamma_\infty - \gamma_0)/r)} \times \left\{ \sum_{k_j \geq 0} s_{1,k_1} s_{1,k_m}(x) \right\} .
\]

Now, (2.46) follows from Lemma 2.7 and the fact that the last term above is equal to 1.

Now we shall establish the two lemmas used in the proof above.

**Lemma 2.6.** Let \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) as \( m \geq 2 \). Then there hold
\[
\sum_{k_j \geq 0} s_{1,k} Q^2_{1,j,k} s_{1,k_m}(x) \leq c \varphi(x)^{-1}, \quad x > 0,
\]
for \( j = 1, \ldots, m - 1 \). The value of the constant \( c \) does not depend on \( x \) or \( m \).

**Proof.** We follow the argument of Knoop and Zhou [14]. We start with the equality
\[
(2.47) \quad \sum_{k_j \geq 0} s_{1,k} Q^2_{1,j,k} s_{1,k_m}(x) = \sum_{k_m \geq 0} s_{1,k_m}(x) \sum_{k_{m-1} \geq 0} s_{1,2,k_{m-1}}(k_m) \ell_{1,k_{m-1}}(k_m)^2
\]
\[
\cdots \sum_{k_{j+1} \geq 0} s_{1,2,k_{j+1}}(k_{j+2}) \ell_{1,k_{j+1}}(k_{j+2})^2 \sum_{k_j \geq 0} s_{1,2,k_j}(k_{j+1}) \ell_{1,k_j}(k_{j+1})^2.
\]
Next, we establish that
\[
(2.48) \quad \sum_{k \geq 0} s_{1,2,k}(i) \ell_{1,k}^*(i)^2 \leq \frac{c}{1+i}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_0,
\]
and
\[
(2.49) \quad \sum_{k \geq 0} s_{1,2,k}(i) \ell_{1,k}(i)^2 \leq \frac{1}{1+i}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_0.
\]
Then the lemma follows from (2.47)-(2.49) and (2.8) (with \(r = -1\)).

To prove (2.48) for \(i = 0\) we use that \(s_{n,k}^*(x) = n(s_{n-1,k}(x) - s_{n,k}(x))\), \(k > 0\), to derive the estimate
\[
\left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 s'_{1,k}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3) dt_1 dt_2 dt_3 \right| \leq \frac{3^k(k+1)}{k!}.
\]
Since, also, we have
\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 s_{1,k}(t_1 + t_2) dt_1 dt_2 \geq \frac{1}{e^{2k}} \int_0^1 t^k dt = \frac{1}{e^2(k+1)!},
\]
we arrive at
\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} s_{1,2,k}(0) \ell_{1,k}^*(0)^2 \leq \frac{\left( \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 s'_{1,k}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3) dt_1 dt_2 dt_3 \right)^2}{\int_0^1 \int_0^1 s_{1,k}(t_1 + t_2) dt_1 dt_2}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{e^{23k}(k+1)^3}{k!};
\]
hence (2.48) follows for \(i = 0\).

To prove (2.48) for \(i \geq 1\) we apply the formula (2.31) and the Cauchy inequality to get
\[
(2.50) \quad s_{1,2,k}(i) \ell_{1,k}^*(i)^2 \leq \frac{\left( \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 s'_{1,k}(i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3) dt_1 dt_2 dt_3 \right)^2}{\int_0^1 \int_0^1 s_{1,k}(i + t_1 + t_2) dt_1 dt_2}
\]
\[
\leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left( \frac{k - (i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3)}{i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3} \right)^2 \frac{s_{1,k}(i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3)^2}{s_{1,k}(i + t_1 + t_2)^2} dt_1 dt_2 dt_3
\]
\[
\leq \frac{c}{i^2} \left( [k - (i + 5)]^2 + 1 \right) s_{1,k}(i + 5)
\]
for \(t_1, t_2, t_3 \in [0,1]\)
\[
\left( \frac{k - (i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3)}{i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3} \right)^2 \leq \frac{c}{i^2} \left( [k - (i + 5)]^2 + 1 \right)
\]
and
\[
\frac{(i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3)^2}{i + t_1 + t_2} \leq i + 5, \quad i \geq 1.
\]
Now, (2.48) follows for \(i \geq 1\) from (2.50), (2.2) and (2.3).
The inequality (2.49) is derived by similar though more precise estimates. First, let \( i = 0 \). We observe that

\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 s_{1,k}(t_1 + t_2) \, dt_1 \, dt_2 = \frac{1}{k!} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 e^{-t_1-t_2}(t_1 + t_2)^k \, dt_1 \, dt_2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} \int_0^1 e^{-t_1} t_1^l \, dt_1 \int_0^1 e^{-t_2} t_2^{k-l} \, dt_2
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} \int_0^1 e^{-t_1} t_1^l \, dt_1 \frac{1}{e(k-l+1)}
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{e(k+1)} \frac{1}{k!} \int_0^1 e^{-t_1} \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} t_1^l \, dt_1
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{k+1} \int_0^1 s_{1,k}(1+t_1) \, dt_1.
\]

Then by the Cauchy inequality we get

\[
s_{1,2,k}(0) \ell_{1,k}(0)^2 \frac{1}{1+k} = \frac{1}{1+k} \left( \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 s_{1,k}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3) \, dt_1 \, dt_2 \, dt_3 \right)^2
\]

\[
\leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 s_{1,k}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3)^2 \, dt_1 \, dt_2 \, dt_3
\]

\[
= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 e^{t_1-t_2-2t_3} \frac{1}{k+1} \left( \frac{(t_1 + t_2 + t_3)^2}{1+t_1} \right)^k \, dt_1 \, dt_2 \, dt_3.
\]

Now, to estimate the sum on the left hand-side of (2.49) for \( i = 0 \) we calculate separately its term for \( k = 0 \) whereas for the terms with \( k \geq 1 \) we apply the inequality above. Thus we get

\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} s_{1,2,k}(0) \ell_{1,k}(0)^2 \frac{1}{1+k}
\]

\[
\leq (1-e^{-1})^4 + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left( e^{\frac{(1-t_2-t_3)^2}{1+t_1}} - e^{1-t_1-2t_2-2t_3} \right) \, dt_1 \, dt_2 \, dt_3
\]

\[
= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 e^{\frac{(1-t_2-t_3)^2}{1+t_1}} \, dt_1 \, dt_2 \, dt_3 - \frac{e}{4} (1-e^{-1})(1-e^{-2})^2 + (1-e^{-1})^4;
\]

hence, in view of [14, (4.9)], (2.49) follows for \( i = 0 \).
For \( i \geq 1 \) we have by the Cauchy inequality

\[
\frac{s_{1,2,k}(i) \ell_{1,k}(i)^2}{1 + k} \leq \frac{1}{1 + k} \left( \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 s_{1,k}(i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3) dt_1 dt_2 dt_3 \right)^2
\]

Summing on \( k \geq 0 \) we arrive at the estimate

\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} s_{1,2,k}(i) \ell_{1,k}(i)^2 \frac{1}{1 + k} \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{i + t_1 + t_2}{i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3} e^{\frac{c_2}{i + t_1 + t_2}} s_{1,k+1} \left( \frac{(i + t_1 + t_2 + t_3)^2}{i + t_1 + t_2} \right) dt_1 dt_2 dt_3.
\]

Now, (2.49) follows for \( i \geq 1 \) from [14, (4.10)].

**Lemma 2.7.** Let \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) as \( m \geq 2 \).

(a) For \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_- \) we have

\[
\sum_{k_j \geq 0 \atop j=1,\ldots,m} (1 + k_1)^i s_{1,k}(x) \leq e x^i m^{-i/2} \log m, \quad x > 0.
\]

(b) For \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_- \) we have

\[
\sum_{k_j \geq 0 \atop j=1,\ldots,m} (n + k_1)^i s_{1,k}(x) \leq c (n + x)^i, \quad x \geq 0, \quad n \geq m^2.
\]

(c) For \( i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) we have

\[
\sum_{k_j \geq 0 \atop j=1,\ldots,m} (n + k_1)^i s_{1,k}(x) \leq c (n + x)^i, \quad x \geq 0, \quad n \geq m.
\]

The value of the constant \( c \) depends only on \( i \).

**Proof.** We again follow the argument of Knoop and Zhou [14]. For \( i \leq -1 \) we set \( \ell = -i \). We shall use the representation

\[
(n + k_1)^i = \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 (\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^{n+k-1} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell
\]

and the formula

\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} a^k s_{1,2,k}(x) = e^{-(1-a)x} \left( \frac{1 - e^{-(1-a)} x}{1-a} \right)^2.
\]

The latter is checked directly by means of the argument

\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} a^k s_{1,2,k}(x) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 e^{-x-t_1-t_2} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(a(x+t_1+t_2))^k}{k!} dt_1 dt_2
\]

\[
= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 e^{a(x-1+t_1+t_2)} dt_1 dt_2
\]
Similarly, \((2.51)\) and the right inequality in \((2.52)\) directly imply the relation

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{m} (n + k_1)^j \mathcal{S}_{j,k} s_1 s_{k_m}(x)
\]

\[
= \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 (\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^{n-1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)x} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell,
\]

where

\[
F_0(\tau) = 1 - \tau, \quad F_\rho(\tau) = 1 - e^{-F_{\rho-1}(\tau)}, \quad \rho = 1, 2, \ldots.
\]

Let \(D \subset [0,1]^\ell\) be a rectangle with at least one side of the form \([0,1/2]\). Then, clearly,

\[
(2.51) \quad F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell) \geq 1/2, \quad (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_\ell) \in D.
\]

It can be shown by induction that

\[
(2.52) \quad \frac{1 - \tau}{m} \leq F_{m-1}(\tau) \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq 1.
\]

Also, since \(y^i e^{-y} \leq c, \ y \geq 0, \) then

\[
(2.53) \quad F_{m-1}(\tau)^i e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau)x} \leq c x^i, \quad \tau \geq 0, \ x > 0.
\]

Now, \((2.51)\), the left inequality in \((2.52)\) and \((2.53)\) imply

\[
(2.54) \quad \int_D \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)x} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell \leq c m^{-i-2} x^i.
\]

Similarly, \((2.51)\) and the right inequality in \((2.52)\) directly imply the relation

\[
(2.55) \quad \int_D (\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^{n-1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)x} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell \leq c n^i, \quad n \geq 1.
\]

For \(n \geq m \ (2.51)\), the left inequality in \((2.52)\) and \((2.53)\) yield

\[
(2.56) \quad \int_D (\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^{n-1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)x} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell 
\leq c m^{i-2} (nx)^i \leq c x^i, \quad n \geq m.
\]

Now, by means of \((2.54)\) we derive

\[
\int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)x} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell 
\leq \int_{1/2}^1 \cdots \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)x} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell + c m^{-i-2} x^i;
\]

and similarly by \((2.55)-(2.56)\) we get

\[
\int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 (\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^{n-1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)x} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell 
\leq \int_{1/2}^1 \cdots \int_{1/2}^1 (\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^{n-1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_\ell)x} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_\ell 
+ c (n + x)^i, \quad n \geq m.
\]
So, to complete the proof of (a) and (b) it is enough to show respectively that that
\[
(2.57) \int_{1/2}^{1} \cdots \int_{1/2}^{1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})x} \, d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_{\ell} \leq c \, x^i \, m^{-i-2} \log m,
\]
and
\[
(2.58) \int_{1/2}^{1} \cdots \int_{1/2}^{1} (\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})^{n-1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})x} \, d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_{\ell} \leq c \, (n + x)^i, \quad n \geq m^2.
\]
We set
\[
F_n(\tau, x) = \tau^{n-1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau)}{F_0(\tau)^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau)x}.
\]
In the integral in (2.58) we make the change of the variables, defined by the formulae
\[
\sigma_{\rho} = \tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\rho}, \quad \rho = 1, \cdots, \ell,
\]
and arrange the order of integration from \(\sigma_1\) to \(\sigma_\ell\) to get the estimate
\[
(2.59) \int_{1/2}^{1} \cdots \int_{1/2}^{1} F_n(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell}, x) \, d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_{\ell}
\]
\[
\leq c \int_{2}^{1} \left[ F_n(\sigma_\ell, x) \int_{\sigma_\ell}^{1} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_{\ell-1}} \cdots \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_3} \int_{\sigma_3}^{1} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_2} \int_{\sigma_2}^{1} \frac{1}{\sigma_1} \, d\sigma_1 \right) \, d\sigma_2 \right) \cdots \right) \, d\sigma_{\ell-1} \right] \, d\sigma_\ell
\]
\[
\leq c \int_{2}^{1} F_n(\sigma_\ell, x) (1 - \sigma_\ell)^{\ell-1} \, d\sigma_\ell
\]
\[
\leq c \int_{0}^{1} (1 - v)^{n-1} v^{\ell-3} G_{m-1}(v)^2 e^{-G_{m-1}(v)x} \, dv,
\]
as at the last step we have made the change of the variable \(\sigma_{\ell} = 1 - v\) and set
\[
G_0(v) = v, \quad G_\rho(v) = 1 - e^{-G_{\rho-1}(v)}, \quad \rho = 1, 2, \ldots.
\]
Routine considerations show that
\[
(2.60) \quad v - \frac{m}{2} \, v^2 \leq G_{m-1}(v) \leq v, \quad 0 \leq v \leq 1.
\]
For \(n = 1\) (2.59) reads
\[
\int_{1/2}^{1} \cdots \int_{1/2}^{1} \frac{F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})^2}{F_0(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})^2} e^{-F_{m-1}(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{\ell})x} \, d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_{\ell}
\]
\[
\leq c \int_{0}^{1} v^{\ell-3} G_{m-1}(v)^2 e^{-G_{m-1}(v)x} \, dv.
\]
We split the integral on the right by means of the intermediate point \(1/m\). For the one between 0 and \(1/m\) we apply (2.60) to get
\[
(2.61) \quad \int_{0}^{1/m} v^{\ell-3} G_{m-1}(v)^2 e^{-G_{m-1}(v)x} \, dv \leq c \int_{0}^{1} v^{\ell-1} e^{-v x} \, dv \leq c \, x^i,
\]
as the last estimate is verified by integration by parts.
For the other integral we again use (2.52) and (2.53) to arrive at

\[(2.62) \int_{1/m}^1 v^{\ell-3}G_{m-1}(v)^2 e^{-G_{m-1}(v)x} \, dv \leq cm^{\ell-2}x^i \int_{1/m}^1 \frac{dv}{v} = cx^i m^{-i-2} \log m.\]

Now, (2.61)-(2.62) imply (2.57), which completes the proof of assertion (a).

The estimate (2.58) is established in a similar way. Using the right inequality in (2.60), we get

\[(2.63) \int_{0}^1 (1-v)^{n-1}v^{\ell-3}G_{m-1}(v)^2 e^{-G_{m-1}(v)x} \, dv \leq \int_{0}^1 (1-v)^{n-1}v^{\ell-1} \, dv = \frac{(\ell-1)!(n-1)!}{(\ell+n-1)!} \leq c n^i.\]

As above we get

\[(2.64) \int_{0}^{1/m} (1-v)^{n-1}v^{\ell-3}G_{m-1}(v)^2 e^{-G_{m-1}(v)x} \, dv \leq c \int_{0}^1 v^{\ell-1}e^{-vx} \, dv \leq cx^i.\]

To estimate the integral between $1/m$ and 1, we first observe that

\[(2.65) m^{\ell} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{m} \right)^{m^2} \leq m^{\ell} e^{-m} \leq c,\]

which follow from $(1-y)^n \leq e^{-ny}$, $y \in [0,1]$, and $g^e e^{-v} \leq c$, $y \geq 0$. Now, by means of the first inequality in (2.52), (2.53) and (2.65), we get for $n \geq m^2$

\[(2.66) \int_{1/m}^1 (1-v)^{n-1}v^{\ell-3}G_{m-1}(v)^2 e^{-G_{m-1}(v)x} \, dv \leq c \left( 1 - \frac{1}{m} \right)^{n-1} m^{\ell-1} x^i \leq c m^{\ell} e^{-m} x^i \leq c x^i, \quad n \geq m^2.\]

The estimates (2.59), (2.63), (2.64) and (2.66) imply (2.58). Thus assertion (b) is established.

For the proof of (c) we first observe that for $\theta \geq 0$ there holds

\[\sum_{k \geq 0} (\theta + k)^i s_{1,k}(x) \leq (\theta + x) \sum_{k \geq 0} (\theta + 1 + k)^{-1} s_{1,k}(x).\]

Iterating it we arrive at

\[(2.67) \sum_{k \geq 0} (\theta + k)^i s_{1,k}(x) \leq (\theta + x)(\theta + 1 + x) \cdots (\theta + i - 1 + x) \leq (\theta + i + x)^i.\]

Similarly,

\[\sum_{k \geq 0} (\theta + k)^i s_{1,2,k}(x) \leq (\theta + 2 + x) \sum_{k \geq 0} (\theta + 1 + k)^{-1} s_{1,2,k}(x);\]

hence

\[(2.68) \sum_{k \geq 0} (\theta + k)^i s_{1,2,k}(x) \leq (\theta + 2 + x)(\theta + 3 + x) \cdots (\theta + i + 1 + x) \leq (\theta + i + 1 + x)^i.\]
Now, applying \((2.68)\) consecutively with \(\theta = n, n + i + 1, \ldots, n + (m - 2)(i + 1)\) and then \((2.67)\) with \(\theta = n + (m - 1)(i + 1)\) we get
\[
\sum_{k_j \geq 0} (n + k_1)^j S_{1,k} s_{1,k_m}(x)
\]
\[
\quad = \sum_{k_m \geq 0} s_{1,k_m}(x) \sum_{k_m-1 \geq 0} s_{1,2,k_m-1}(k_m) \cdots \sum_{k_i \geq 0} (n + k_1)^i s_{1,2,k_i}(k_i)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{k_m \geq 0} s_{1,k_m}(x) \sum_{k_m-1 \geq 0} s_{1,2,k_m-1}(k_m) \cdots \sum_{k_2 \geq 0} (n + i + k_2)^i s_{1,2,k_2}(k_2)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{k_m \geq 0} [n + (m - 1)(i + 1) + k_m]^i s_{1,k_m}(x)
\]
\[
\leq [n + (m - 1)(i + 1) + i + x]^i,
\]
which, in view of \(n \geq m\), implies assertion \((c)\) of the lemma. \(\square\)

We are ready to proof our main result.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** It is enough to prove the theorem for \(f \in C(\nu,w)(0,\infty)\) since \(\|w(f - S_n f)\|\) and \(K_w(f,n^{-1})\) are invariant under addition of a linear function to \(f\).

The upper error estimate of the theorem follows from Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 via a direct and well-known argument.

To verify the strong converse inequality we apply [3, Theorem 4.1] with \(Q_\alpha = S_n, \alpha = n^{-1}, X = C(\nu)(0,\infty), Y = W^2(w\varphi)(0,\infty), Z = W^3(w\varphi^{1/2})(0,\infty), \) the differential operator \(D\) of [3, Theorem 4.1] is \(\varphi D^2, \Phi(g) = \|w\varphi^{1/2}D^2g\|, M = c_1, \lambda(\alpha) = (2n)^{-1}, \lambda_1(\alpha) = c_3n^{-3/2}, \ell = 1, B = c_4/2\) and \(m\) replaced with \(m + 1\).

Then
\[
A = 2c_3c_5\sqrt{m^{\gamma-1}(\log m)^{1+\gamma}}.
\]

We fix \(m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq 2,\) so large that \(A < 1\). Note that \(\gamma < 1\). Then [3, Theorem 4.1], Propositions 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 imply the left hand-side inequality of Theorem 1.2 for any \(n \geq m^2\). To extend the latter for \(1 \leq n \leq m^2 - 1\), we first observe that the property \((2.5)\) of the Szász-Mirakjjan operator yields
\[
S_n f = [S_{m'}(f_{m'}/n)]_{n/m'},
\]
where we have set \(m' = m^2\).

Consequently,
\[
(2.69) \quad \|w(f - S_n f)\| = \|w_{m'/n}(f_{m'}/n - S_{m'}(f_{m'}/n))\| \geq c \|w(f_{m'}/n - S_{m'}(f_{m'}/n))\|
\]
with a constant \(c > 0\) whose value is independent of \(f\) and \(n\) because \(1 \leq m'/n \leq m'\) and
\[
w_{\nu}(x) \geq \nu^{\min\{\gamma_0,\gamma_\infty\}} w(x), \quad \nu \geq 1.
\]

On the other hand,
\[
K_w(f_{\nu}, t) = K_{w_{1/\nu}}(f, \nu t) \geq \nu^{-\max\{\gamma_0,\gamma_\infty\}} K_w(f, \nu t), \quad \nu \geq 1,
\]
because \((g_{\nu'}) = \nu(g')\) and
\[
w_{1/\nu}(x) \geq \nu^{-\max\{\gamma_0,\gamma_\infty\}} w(x), \quad \nu \geq 1.
\]

Now, combining the relation
\[
K_w \left( f, \frac{1}{m'} \right) \leq c \|w(f - S_{m'} f)\| \quad \forall f \in C(\nu,w)(0,\infty)
\]

with (2.69) and (2.70) with \( \nu = m'/n \in [1, m'] \) and \( t = 1/m' \), we get
\[
K_w \left( f, \frac{1}{n} \right) \leq c \| w(f - S_n f) \| \quad \forall f \in C(w)(0, \infty)
\]
for \( 1 \leq n \leq m^2 - 1 \) as well. \( \square \)
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