

# Expansion into Bernoulli polynomials based on matching definite integrals of derivatives

Andrej Liptaj\*

March 5, 2018

## Abstract

A method of function expansion is presented. It is based on matching the definite integrals of the derivatives of the function to be approximated by a series of (scaled) Bernoulli polynomials. The method is fully integral-based, easy to construct and presumably slightly outperforms Taylor series in the convergence rate. Text presents already known results.

## Important Notice

This text presents already known results. Learning about their existence at the time when the text was already published, I refused to remove the text: some minor ideas of mine may still be new.

As mathematical hobbyist, I sometimes miss a general overview and overlook what was already done. This is also the case of the expansion into Bernoulli polynomials. Only after publishing it I discovered that the results were already presented in [1] (pp. 15–17) and [2] (pp. 253–254). Actually, I am not the only one: in [3], published four years after [1], the author (well known mathematician, it seems) says: “a result apparently new is given by the“. Dividing the shame makes is little smaller...

Still, some minor and rather trivial ideas presented in this text may be new: the interpretation (i.e. matching definite integrals of derivatives) and generalization to a greater interval than just an interval with length one (scaling). Actually the last generalization is not out of interest: convergence of the series depends on the integral length.

The following text is written as if new results were presented. The words “novel” and “original” are not justified.

## 1 Introduction

Different ideas can be forwarded when discussing function approximations. For example, the case of Fourier series is often interpreted as a decomposition of a vector (function) into the basis of the vector space (sines and cosines). Yet, a more general view can be adopted: if a function  $g(x)$  is to be approximated by an approximation  $A_g(x)$  then one usually tries to formulate an infinite number of conditions/restrictions respected by the function  $g$  and build  $A_g$  such as to respect them too. As examples:

- Taylor series, Neumann series (of Bessel functions) and Padé approximation are based on matching derivatives

$$\frac{d^n}{dx^n} A_g(x) |_{x=x_0} = \frac{d^n}{dx^n} g(x) |_{x=x_0}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

---

\*Institute of Physics, Bratislava, Slovak Academy of Sciences, [andrej.liptaj@savba.sk](mailto:andrej.liptaj@savba.sk)  
I am willing to publish any of my ideas presented here in a journal, if someone (an editor) judges them interesting enough.  
Journals in the “*Current Contents*” database are strongly preferred.

- Fourier and Fourier-like (Legendre polynomials) series match integrals of the function to be approximated with a predefined function set

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{2\pi} \sin(nx) A_g(x) dx &= \int_0^{2\pi} \sin(nx) g(x) dx, \\ \int_0^{2\pi} \cos(nx) A_g(x) dx &= \int_0^{2\pi} \cos(nx) g(x) dx, \\ n &= 0, 1, 2, \dots\end{aligned}$$

If, in addition to an infinite set of conditions, further requirements are adopted (integrability, smoothness, analyticity) one may be lucky to get an approximation which works for a large set of functions. The approximation very often converges for some trivial cases (e.g.  $g(x) = 0$ ) but, also usually, fails on a large set of functions<sup>1</sup>.

In case of the Taylor and Fourier series a huge number of results exists and specific criteria on convergence are established. This is not the case of the approximation I present in this text. This text should be seen as “brainstorming”: the principle is presented without actually providing nice criteria for convergence or proving the convergence for specific cases. Well, for some trivial scenarios, like  $g(x) = 0$ , the convergence is guaranteed.

## 2 Approximation method

A function  $g$  can be characterized by a set of numbers

$$c_n[g] = \int_a^b [g^{(n)}(x)] dx,$$

where

$$g^{(n)}(x) = \frac{d^n}{dx^n} g(x)$$

and  $a < b$  are arbitrary real numbers on which the expansion depends. A rather natural choice is  $a = 0$ ,  $b = 1$ . By construction, the coefficients  $c_n$  can be computed easily

$$c_n = [g^{(n-1)}(x)]_a^b = g^{(n-1)}(b) - g^{(n-1)}(a).$$

The approximation  $A_g(x)$  is built requiring the same characterization

$$c_n[A_g] = c_n[g] \text{ for each } n.$$

Clearly, for some choice of  $a$  and  $b$ , two different functions can have the same characterization, e.g. function  $g_1(x) = \sin(x)$  and  $g_2(x) = 0$  when  $a = 0$  and  $b = 2\pi$ , leading so to a failure of the approximation. Yet, for a different interval, the approximation can be valid. One may notice a similarity with Taylor polynomials: the coefficients  $c_n$  are as easy to determine as the Taylor series coefficients, only the derivatives need to be computed at two points instead of one.

A more complicated task one needs to fulfill to guarantee the simplicity of the approximation is to find a set of functions  $b_n(x)$  having the delta-property with respect to the presented characterization

$$c_n[b_m(x)] = \delta_{n,m}.$$

Once these functions are found the approximation can be very easily written as

$$A_g(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n b_n(x),$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Non-analytic smooth functions in case of derivative matching or non-periodic functions when Fourier series are concerned.

where

$$c_n = c_n[g] = g^{(n-1)}(b) - g^{(n-1)}(a).$$

Indeed, one has

$$\begin{aligned} c_n[A_g] &= c_n \left[ \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} c_m [g] b_m(x) \right] \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} c_m [g] c_n [b_m(x)] \quad (\text{because } c_n[f] \text{ is linear in } f) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} c_m [g] \delta_{n,m} \\ &= c_n [g] \end{aligned}$$

I would like to bring the attention to the nature of the method: it is a fully “integral” method and in this sense it can be compared to the Fourier series. And yet, it is based on differentiation. The “integral” approach is however applied to the derivatives which might lead to a specific behavior: different regions of the  $(a, b)$  interval might have different weights, in fact in some situations a very small region can have a large effect on the approximation<sup>2</sup>. I believe this is an interesting mix of properties which makes the method unique and unlike others.

Now the focus should be given to the construction of the functions  $b_n$ . Without loss of generality I assume  $a = 0$  and  $b = 1$ . Then one is free to chose a function  $b_{-1}(x)$  which satisfies

$$\int_0^1 [b_{-1}^{(n)}(x)] dx = 0 \text{ for any } n \geq 0.$$

As already stated this choice is ambiguous, an infinite number of functions fulfills this requirement. In what follows I adopt the most natural choice

$$b_{-1}(x) = 0.$$

Then, by integration with carefully chosen integration constants, one can progressively build a sequence of functions having the property

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 b_0(x) dx &= 1, \\ \int_0^1 b_n(x) dx &= 0 \text{ for } n > 0, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\frac{d}{dx} b_n(x) = b_{n-1}(x).$$

It turns out that such functions are know, the above-mentioned properties are fulfilled by scaled Bernoulli polynomials

$$b_n(x) = \frac{1}{n!} B_n(x).$$

The functions  $b_n$  can be easily further scaled to any interval  $(a, b)$

$$b_n^{a,b}(x) = (b-a)^{n-1} b_n \left( \frac{x-a}{b-a} \right). \quad (1)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Consider a situation where some derivative is close to a delta function - and it can well be situated somewhere inside the  $(a, b)$  interval.

### 3 Numerical results, observations, comments, conjectures

#### Approximation of polynomials

Bernoulli polynomials represent a linearly independent set of polynomials with progressively increasing order and therefore the following statement holds: any polynomial  $P_n$ , if approximated by the presented method, leads to an exact expression

$$A_{P_n}(x) = P_n(x) = \sum_{m=0}^n c_m b_m(x).$$

This expansion always exists and is unique. It follows from the “vector space” point of view and can be seen as linear algebra problem of combining the basal vectors  $b_m$  to construct the vector  $P_n$ .

#### When approximation fails

As already stated, the approximation fails, in a convergent manner, when one has a non-zero function  $g$  which is characterized on the interval  $(a, b)$  by zeros  $c_n[g] = 0$ . From this, one can generalize to other functions: if a function  $f$  can be split to two non-zero functions  $f = g_1 + g_2$  such that  $A_{g_1}(x) = g_1(x)$  and  $c_n[g_2] = 0$ , then the approximation  $A_f(x)$  fails to approximate  $f$ . This is a trivial statement which wants only to say that a non-working but convergent (to a different value) expansions do not happen only for functions characterized by zeros but also for functions which have components (additive parts) characterized by zeros. As an example: expansion for  $g_1(x) = \exp(x)$  seems to work for  $a = -1$  and  $b = 1$  but the approximation fails for  $g_1(x) = \exp(x) + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1-x^2}\right)$  on the same interval<sup>3</sup>.

It is unclear whether a different scenario exists, where a convergent but non-approximating expansion occurs. In other words: can one from  $A_g(x) \neq g(x)$  deduce  $c_n[A_g(x) - g(x)] = 0$  for any  $n$ ?

#### Determining coefficient $c_0$

A very nice feature of the proposed expansion lies in the fact that one does not need to integrate (unlike in Fourier series, for example). The exception is the coefficient  $c_0$ :

$$c_0 = g^{(-1)}(b) - g^{(-1)}(a),$$

where the integral of  $g$  appears. Clearly, the “ $c_0$ ” issue is only an issue of an absolute offset (because  $b_0$  is constant). To avoid integration a different strategy for its determination can be adopted: one first determines  $c_n$  for  $n > 0$ , builds the series and then adjusts  $c_0$  such as to match the function value at some point

$$c_0 \text{ such as to provide } A_g(x_0) = g(x_0)$$

where some natural choice of  $x_0$  can be made, such as

$$x_0 = a, b, \frac{a+b}{2} \dots$$

#### Relation to Taylor series

An obvious idea comes to the mind: the approximation is based on the evaluation of the derivatives at two points,  $a$  and  $b$ , and therefore, maybe, it can be expressed as some function of the Taylor series at these points,  $T_a(x)$  and  $T_b(x)$ . Let me now give some arguments that a simple link between the proposed expansion and the Taylor series is improbable.

First, the coefficients inside the Bernoulli polynomials (in front of monomials) are rather complicated objects (binomial coefficient times Bernoulli number). It seems unlikely that some simple combination of Taylor polynomials could lead to the same result as the summation of the  $b_n$  functions.

---

<sup>3</sup>A “standard” bump function is used here, where the value at  $|x| = 1$  is assumed to be zero.

In addition, the numerical results seem to also dismiss this hypothesis. The numerical observation is as follows: the proposed approximation, when applied to the exponential function, works for  $a = 0$  and  $b = 1$  but fails for  $a = -5$  and  $b = 5$ . On the other hand, the Taylor series  $T_a(x)$  and  $T_b(x)$  converge expanded at any point. If the method presented in this text depends on the Taylor series expanded at the endpoints of the integral, then this dependence is clearly a complicated one: it does or does not provide a converging result depending on  $a$  and  $b$ , while, at least in the case of the exponential function, there is nothing special about Taylor expansions at any of these points whatever the distance between them is.

An interesting scenario is the limit  $a \rightarrow b$ . In this limit the integrals (i.e. the  $c_n$  coefficients) go to zero but the functions  $b_n$  are scaled also, see (1). The multiplicative factor makes them smaller, the argument scaling greater. Because many changing parameters are in game, it is difficult to see what actually happens. It might well be that the Taylor series is obtained.

Clearly, the question about how is the presented expansion related with the Taylor series is a good one. One cannot conclude that a simple relation is impossible; however, in the defense of the originality of the new method I try to provide (some rough) arguments that it is improbable.

## Convergence

Let me first focus on the case  $a = 0$  and  $b = 1$ . For this setting the numerical observation is as follows: when the absolute value of all derivatives is bounded (by a common bound, uniformly bounded) then the approximation converges. This is, obviously, a very constraining criterion which implies that the method does not do better than the Taylor series: bounded derivatives imply analyticity. Yet, the previous statement is an implication. Numerical observation is, that even growing derivatives may lead to a convergent result, but the growth cannot be very fast. Let the toy function be  $\exp(\alpha x)$ . Its derivatives are bounded by the value at  $x = 1$  and, if  $\alpha > 1$ , the bound is growing in geometrical progression (with growing derivative order). It seems the convergence is lost somewhere around  $\alpha \approx 6.2$ . One should notice that the  $b_n$  functions are greater than the  $\frac{1}{n!}x^n$  functions (for high values of  $n$ ), the latter being the basic building blocks of the Taylor series. In both cases one may expect the coefficients to be of the order of the derivatives<sup>4</sup>, thus the  $b_n$  functions have greater chances to diverge when comparable coefficients are used. This are rather pessimistic statements about the new expansion and naturally lead to the question: are there any cases where the new expansion outperforms the Taylor series<sup>5</sup>? I did not find such an example for now and hopes are rather small: a non-analytic smooth function should be targeted (because here the Taylor expansion fails), yet, such functions have to have unbounded derivatives... can their growth be slow enough?

In the case  $a \neq 0$ ,  $b \neq 1$  further factors come into the play: the  $b_n$  functions are scaled and the factor  $(b - a)^{n-1}$  becomes important, see (1). It makes the function smaller if  $b - a < 1$ , it makes the function greater if  $b - a > 1$ . In the latter case the convergence become “worse”, the function which has a converging approximation on  $(a, b) = (0, 1)$  might not have it on a larger interval. Let me chose the test function to be  $\exp(x)$  and the interval in the form  $(a, b) = (0, b)$ . It turns out<sup>6</sup> that the convergence is lost somewhere around  $b \approx 6.2$ , which is a similar number<sup>7</sup> to the one from the previous paragraph. It seems the convergence scales with scaling the argument. One cannot approximate a larger portion of a function by scaling it to a smaller interval. What is gained by the interval becoming smaller, that is lost by the increase of the function derivatives: the convergence remains the same.

## Approximation power

I use to test the approximation power on four elementary functions and make comparison to the Taylor polynomials. The functions are  $x^2$ ,  $\exp(x)$ ,  $\sin(x)$  and  $\ln(x + 1)$ . Here, however, the function  $x^2$  is by both methods reconstructed exactly, therefore it is dropped. The method presented in this text also needs a choice of the interval limits  $a$  and  $b$ . To be symmetric with respect to zero, I adopt the choice  $a = -1$  and  $b = 1$  (and

---

<sup>4</sup>Exactly derivatives in case of the Taylor series.

<sup>5</sup>Converges in a scenario where the Taylor series does not.

<sup>6</sup>Pure numerical observation.

<sup>7</sup>Is not that close to  $2\pi$ ?

use scaled  $b_n$  functions). This choice is made for  $\exp(x)$  and  $\sin(x)$ , the function  $\ln(x+1)$  is not defined at  $-1$ . A different choice needs to be made: it turns out that in addition to the divergence at  $-1$ , the function  $\ln(x+1)$  needs a small interval for the expansion to converge, e.g. the expansion on the interval  $(-0.5, 0.5)$  seems to diverge. Therefore I shrink the interval enough to get a convergent regime: the function  $\ln(x+1)$  is expanded on the interval  $(a, b) = (-0.1, 0.1)$ .

With these settings and using 11 terms for each series I get descriptions shown on Fig. 1. At last some good news: it seems that in all three cases the new expansion outperforms the Taylor series, the approximation stays longer with the original function than its concurrent. The expansion proposed in this text seems to depart more quickly from the logarithm function on the positive side, the zoom however reveals that, on the most of the interval where the approximation is good (up to  $x \approx 0.92$ ) it actually stays closer to the original function than the Taylor series. One must honestly admit that the improvement with respect to the Taylor series is very modest.

## 4 Summary, conclusion

In this text I presented a method of approximation based on matching the definite integrals of derivatives. It turns out that the Bernoulli polynomials are suitable functions to be used for this purpose. The method is (presumably) an original one and has several appealing features: it is fully integral-based, simple to construct and, it seems, it performs somewhat better than the Taylor series when the rate of the convergence is concerned. This text is based only on numerical evidence, a future development of a rigorous treatment is desirable.

## References

- [1] V. I. Krylov, "Approximate Calculation of Integrals", Macmillan Company, New York (1962).  
<https://books.google.sk/books?id=ELeRwR27IRIC&lpg=PP1&dq=Approximate%20Calculation%20of%20Integrals&hl=sk&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q=Approximate%20Calculation%20of%20Integrals&f=false>
- [2] C. Jordan, "Calculus of Finite Differences (third ed.)", Chelsea, New York (1965).  
<http://crypto.cs.mcgill.ca/~simonpie/webdav/ipad/EBook/Math%C3%A9matique/Calculus/Math%20-%20Calculus%20of%20Finite%20Differences.pdf>
- [3] L. J. Mordell, "Expansion of a function in a series of Bernoulli polynomials, and some other polynomials", Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 15/1, 132 - 140, 1966,  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022247X66901466>

## A Program

Here follows the WxMaxima code of the new expansion, the Taylor polynomials are, for comparison purposes, displayed also.

```
kill(all);
***** START OF THE INPUT *****
/* Enter function to expand */
fun(x) := exp(x)$
/* Enter number of terms */
N: 5$ 
/* Enter interval limits */
a : -1$ 
b : 1$ 
/* Enter graphic window interval */
gLL:-3$ 
gUL:2$ 
***** END OF THE INPUT *****
```

```

dL : b-a$  

N : N-1$  

b(n,x) := bernpoly(x,n)/n!$  

sb(n,x) := dL^(n-1)*b(n, (x-a)/dL )$  

cf[n] := at( diff( fun(x),x,n-1),x=b)-at( diff( fun(x),x,n-1),x=a)$  

approx(x) := ''( sum( cf[n]*sb(n,x),n,1,N ) )$  

mdp : (a+b)/2$  

shift : fun(mdp)-approx(mdp)$  

approx(x) := ''( approx(x) + shift )$  

wxplot2d([fun(x),approx(x),taylor(fun(x), x, 0, N)], [x,gLL,gUL], [legend,"f","A_{f }","T_{f }"]);

```




Figure 1: Approximations of three function  $\exp(x)$ ,  $\sin(x)$  and  $\ln(x+1)$  by Taylor polynomials ( $T$ ) and the expansion presented in this text ( $A$ ) with 11 terms in both cases. For  $\exp(x)$  and  $\ln(x+1)$  a zoom into the tail-region area on both sides is provided.