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Abstract. For a function $f$ defined on an interval $[a, b]$ let

$$
\|f\|_{[a, b]}:=\sup \{|f(x)|: x \in[a, b]\}
$$

The principal result of this paper is the following Markov-type inequality for Müntz polynomials.

Theorem. Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. Let $\lambda_{0}, \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}$ be $n+1$ distinct real numbers. Let $0<a<b$. Then

$$
\frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{1}{4 \log (b / a)}(n-1)^{2} \leq \sup _{0 \neq Q} \frac{\left\|x Q^{\prime}(x)\right\|_{[a, b]}}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}} \leq 11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{128}{\log (b / a)}(n+1)^{2}
$$

where the supremum is taken for all $Q \in \operatorname{span}\left\{x^{\lambda_{0}}, x^{\lambda_{1}}, \ldots, x^{\lambda_{n}}\right\}$ (the span is the linear span over $\mathbb{R}$ ).

## 1. Introduction and Notation

Let $\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}, \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right\}$ be a set of $n+1$ distinct real numbers. The span of

$$
\left\{x^{\lambda_{0}}, x^{\lambda_{1}}, \ldots, x^{\lambda_{n}}\right\}
$$

over $\mathbb{R}$ will be denoted by

$$
M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right):=\operatorname{span}\left\{x^{\lambda_{0}}, x^{\lambda_{1}}, \ldots, x^{\lambda_{n}}\right\} .
$$

Elements of $M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$ are called Müntz polynomials of $n+1$ terms. For a function $f$ defined on an interval $[a, b]$ let

$$
\|f\|_{[a, b]}:=\sup \{|f(x)|: x \in[a, b]\}
$$

[^0]and let
$$
\|f\|_{L_{p}[a, b]}:=\left(\int_{a}^{b}|f(x)|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}, \quad p>0
$$
whenever the Lebesgue integral exists. Newman's beautiful inequality [4] is an essentially sharp Markov-type inequality for $M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$ on $[0,1]$ in the case when each $\lambda_{j}$ is nonnegative.

Theorem 1.1 (Newman's Inequality). Let $\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}, \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right\}$ be a set of $n+1$ distinct nonnegative numbers. Then

$$
\frac{2}{3} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_{j} \leq \sup _{0 \neq Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{\left\|x Q^{\prime}(x)\right\|_{[0,1]}}{\|Q\|_{[0,1]}} \leq 11 \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}
$$

Note that the interval $[0,1]$ plays a special role in the study of Müntz polynomials. A linear transformation $y=\alpha x+\beta$ does not preserve membership in $M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$ in general (unless $\beta=0)$, that is $Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$ does not necessarily imply that $R(x):=Q(\alpha x+\beta) \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$. An analogue of Newman's inequality on $[a, b], a>0$, cannot be obtained by a simple transformation. We can, however, prove the following result.

## 2. New Results

Theorem 2.1. Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. Let $\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}, \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right\}$ be a set of $n+1$ distinct real numbers. Let $0<a<b$. Then

$$
\frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{1}{4 \log (b / a)}(n-1)^{2} \leq \sup _{0 \neq Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{\left\|x Q^{\prime}(x)\right\|_{[a, b]}}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}} \leq 11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{128}{\log (b / a)}(n+1)^{2}
$$

Remarks 2.2. Of course, we can have $Q^{\prime}(x)$ instead of $x Q^{\prime}(x)$ in the above estimate; since an obvious corollary of the above theorem is

$$
\frac{1}{3 b} \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{1}{4 b \log (b / a)}(n-1)^{2} \leq \sup _{0 \neq Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{\left\|Q^{\prime}\right\|_{[a, b]}}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}} \leq \frac{11}{a} \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{128}{a \log (b / a)}(n+1)^{2}
$$

The reason we formulated Theorem 2.1 in the given form is that when $a \rightarrow 0$ then we obtain Theorem 1.1 (with worse absolute constants).

Theorem 2.1 was proved by P. Borwein and T. Erdélyi under the additonal assumptions that $\lambda_{j} \geq \delta j$ for each $j$ with a constant $\delta>0$ and with constants depending on $a, b$ and $\delta$ instead of the absolute constants (see [1] or [2], for instance).

The novelty of Theorem 2.1 is the fact that $\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}, \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right\}$ is an arbitrary set of $n+1$ distinct real numbers, not even the nonnegativity of the exponents $\lambda_{j}$ is needed.

In the $L_{p}[a, b]$ norm $(p \geq 1)$ we can establish the following.

Theorem 2.3. Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. Let $\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}, \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right\}$ be a set of $n+1$ distinct real numbers. Let $0<a<b$ and $1 \leq p<\infty$. Then there is a positive constant $c_{1}(a, b)$ depending only on $a$ and $b$ such that

$$
\sup _{0 \neq P \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{\left\|P^{\prime}\right\|_{L_{p}[a, b]}}{\|P\|_{L_{p}[a, b]}} \leq c_{1}(a, b)\left(n^{2}+\sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|\right) .
$$

Theorem 2.3 was proved by T. Erdélyi under the additonal assumptions that $\lambda_{j} \geq \delta j$ for each $j$ with a constant $\delta>0$ and with $c_{1}(a, b)$ replaced by $c_{1}(a, b, \delta)$, see [3]. The novelty of Theorem 2.3 is the fact again that $\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}, \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right\}$ is an arbitrary set of $n+1$ distinct real numbers, not even the nonnegativity of the exponents $\lambda_{j}$ is needed.

## 3. Lemmas

The following comparison theorem for Müntz polynomials is proved in [1, E. 4 f$]$ of Section 3.3].

Lemma 3.1 (A Comparison Theorem). Suppose

$$
\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}<\lambda_{1}<\cdots<\lambda_{n}\right\} \quad \text { and } \quad \Gamma_{n}:=\left\{\gamma_{0}<\gamma_{1}<\cdots<\gamma_{n}\right\}
$$

$\lambda_{n} \geq 0$, and $\lambda_{j} \leq \gamma_{j}$ for each $j=0,1, \ldots, n$. Let $0<a<b$. Then

$$
\max _{0 \neq Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{\left|Q^{\prime}(b)\right|}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}} \leq \max _{0 \neq Q \in M\left(\Gamma_{n}\right)} \frac{\left|Q^{\prime}(b)\right|}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}} .
$$

The following result is essentially proved by Saff and Varga [5]. They assume that $\Lambda:=\left(\lambda_{j}\right)_{j=0}^{\infty}$ is an increasing sequence of nonnegative integers and $\delta=1$ in the next lemma, however, this assumption can be easily dropped from their theorem, see [1, E. 9 of Section 6.1]. In fact, their proof remains valid almost word for word, the modifications are straightforward.

Lemma 3.2 (The Interval Where the Norm of a Müntz Polynomial Lives). Let

$$
\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}<\lambda_{1}<\cdots<\lambda_{n}\right\} \quad \text { and } \quad \lambda_{0} \geq 0
$$

Let $0 \neq P \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$ and $Q(x):=x^{k \delta} P(x)$, where $k$ is a nonnegative integer and $\delta$ is a positive real number. Let $\xi \in[0,1]$ be a point so that $|Q(\xi)|=\|Q\|_{[0,1]}$. Suppose $\lambda_{j} \geq \delta j$ for each $j$. Then

$$
\left(\frac{k}{k+n}\right)^{2 / \delta} \leq \xi
$$

## 4. Proofs

Proof of Theorem 2.1. First we prove the upper bound. Let $P \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$. We want to show that

$$
y\left|P^{\prime}(y)\right| \leq\left(11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{128(n+1)^{2}}{\log (b / a)}\right)\|P\|_{[a, b]}
$$

for every $y \in[a, b]$. To this end we distinguish two cases. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\lambda_{k}=0$ for some $k$, otherwise we add the 0 exponent by changing $n$ for $(n+1)$.

Case 1. Let $y \in\left[(a b)^{1 / 2}, b\right]$. First we examine the subcase when $\lambda_{0}:=0$. That is, we have $0=\lambda_{0}<\lambda_{1}<\cdots<\lambda_{n}$. Let

$$
0<\delta:=\min \left\{1, \min _{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{\lambda_{j}}{j}\right\} \leq 1
$$

Observe that the inequalities

$$
\lambda_{j} \geq \delta j, \quad j=1,2, \ldots, n
$$

are satisfied. We define $Q(x):=x^{m n \delta} P(x)$, where with the choice $m:=\left\lfloor\frac{8 \log 2}{\delta \log (b / a)}\right\rfloor$, using the inequality $2^{-2 u} \leq 1-u(0 \leq u \leq 1 / 2)$ we have

$$
a=\sqrt{a b} \sqrt{\frac{a}{b}} \leq \sqrt{a b} 2^{-\frac{4}{\delta(m+1)}} \leq \sqrt{a b}\left(1-\frac{1}{m+1}\right)^{2 / \delta}=\sqrt{a b}\left(\frac{m}{m+1}\right)^{2 / \delta}
$$

Scaling Newman's Inequality from $[0,1]$ to $[0, y]$, then using Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
y\left|Q^{\prime}(y)\right| & \leq 11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\lambda_{j}+m n \delta\right)\|Q\|_{[0, y]} \\
& =11\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}+m n(n+1) \delta\right)\|Q\|_{\left[y\left(\frac{m}{m+1}\right)^{2 / \delta}, y\right]} \\
& \leq 11\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}+m n(n+1) \delta\right)\|Q\|_{[a, y]} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
y\left|P^{\prime}(y)\right| & \leq\left|Q^{\prime}(y)\right| y^{1-m n \delta}+m n \delta|P(y)| \\
& \leq y^{-m n \delta} 11\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}+m n(n+1) \delta\right)\|Q\|_{[a, y]}+m n \delta\|P\|_{[a, y]} \\
& \leq\left(11 \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}+m n(11 n+12) \delta\right)\|P\|_{[a, y]} \\
& \leq\left(11 \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}+\frac{128 n^{2}}{\log (b / a)}\right)\|P\|_{[a, b]} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This finishes the proof in Case 1 under the additional assumption $\lambda_{0}:=0$. Now we drop this additional assumption. Suppose

$$
\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}<\lambda_{1}<\cdots<\lambda_{n}\right\}
$$

and $\lambda_{k}=0$ for some $0 \leq k \leq n$. For a fixed $\varepsilon>0$ let

$$
\Gamma_{n, \varepsilon}:=\left\{\gamma_{0, \varepsilon}<\gamma_{1, \varepsilon}<\cdots<\gamma_{n, \varepsilon}\right\}
$$

with

$$
\gamma_{j, \varepsilon}:=(j-k) \varepsilon, \quad j=0,1,2, \ldots k
$$

and

$$
\gamma_{j, \varepsilon}:=\lambda_{j}, \quad j=k+1, k+2, \ldots, n
$$

If $\varepsilon>0$ is sufficiently small, then by Lemma 3.1 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{0 \neq Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{y\left|Q^{\prime}(y)\right|}{\|Q\|_{[a, y]}} \leq \max _{0 \neq Q_{\varepsilon} \in M\left(\Gamma_{n, \varepsilon}\right)} \frac{y\left|Q_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(y)\right|}{\left\|Q_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{[a, y]}} . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $Q_{\varepsilon} \in M\left(\Gamma_{n, \varepsilon}\right)$. Then $Q_{\varepsilon}$ is of the form

$$
Q_{\varepsilon}(x)=x^{-k \varepsilon} R_{\varepsilon}(x), \quad R_{\varepsilon} \in \operatorname{span}\left\{x^{\gamma_{0}+k \varepsilon}, x^{\gamma_{1}+k \varepsilon}, \ldots, x^{\gamma_{n}+k \varepsilon}\right\}
$$

where each $\gamma_{j}+k \varepsilon$ is nonnegative. Hence, using the upper bound of the theorem in the already proved case

$$
\lambda_{0}:=0, y \in\left[(a b)^{1 / 2}, b\right]
$$

we obtain

$$
y\left|R_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(y)\right| \leq\left(11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\gamma_{j, \varepsilon}+k \varepsilon\right)+\frac{128 n^{2}}{\log (b / a)}\right)\left\|R_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{[a, y]} .
$$

Recalling (4.1), and taking the limit when $\varepsilon>0$ tends to 0 , we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max _{0 \neq Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{y\left|Q^{\prime}(y)\right|}{\|Q\|_{[a, y]}} & \leq \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+0 \neq Q_{\varepsilon} \in M\left(\Gamma_{n, \varepsilon}\right)} \max _{\|\varepsilon\|_{[a, y]}} \frac{y\left|Q_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(y)\right|}{\left\|Q_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{0}} \\
& \leq \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} 11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\gamma_{j, \varepsilon}+k \varepsilon\right)+\frac{128 n^{2}}{\log (b / a)} \\
& =11 \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \lambda_{j}+\frac{128 n^{2}}{\log (b / a)} \\
& \leq 11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{128 n^{2}}{\log (b / a)}
\end{aligned}
$$

The proof of the upper bound of the theorem is now finished in Case 1.
Case 2. Let $y \in\left[a,(a b)^{1 / 2}\right]$. Suppose again that

$$
\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}<\lambda_{1}<\cdots<\lambda_{n}\right\}
$$

and $\lambda_{k}=0$ for some $0 \leq k \leq n$. Associated with $P \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$ let $\widetilde{P} \in M\left(\widetilde{\Lambda}_{n}\right)$ be defined by

$$
\begin{gathered}
\widetilde{P}(x):=P(a b / x), \\
\widetilde{\Lambda_{n}}:=\left\{\widetilde{\lambda}_{0}<\widetilde{\lambda}_{1}<\cdots<\widetilde{\lambda}_{n}\right\}:=\left\{-\lambda_{n}<-\lambda_{n-1}<\cdots<-\lambda_{0}\right\} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Using the upper bound of the theorem in the already proved Case 1 with $\widetilde{P} \in M\left(\widetilde{\Lambda}_{n}\right)$ and $\widetilde{y}=a b / y \in\left[(a b)^{1 / 2}, b\right]$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
y\left|P^{\prime}(y)\right| & =\left|\widetilde{P}^{\prime}(\widetilde{y})\right|(a b / y) \leq\left(11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\widetilde{\lambda}_{j}\right|+\frac{128(n+1)^{2}}{\log (b / a)}\right)\|\widetilde{P}\|_{[a, b]} \\
& =\left(11 \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|+\frac{128(n+1)^{2}}{\log (b / a)}\right)\|P\|_{[a, b]}
\end{aligned}
$$

and the proof is finished in Case 2 as well.
Now we show the lower bound of the theorem. Suppose

$$
\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}<\lambda_{1}<\cdots<\lambda_{n}\right\}
$$

and $0 \leq k \leq n$ is chosen so that $\lambda_{j}<0$ for all $j=1,2, \ldots, k$ and $\lambda_{j} \geq 0$ for all $j=k+1, k+2, \ldots, n$. Let

$$
\Lambda_{n}^{-}:=\left\{-\lambda_{k}<-\lambda_{k-1}<\cdots<-\lambda_{0}\right\}
$$

and

$$
\Lambda_{n}^{+}:=\left\{\lambda_{k+1}<\lambda_{k+2}<\cdots<\lambda_{n}\right\}
$$

The lower bound of Theorem 1.1 (combined with a linear scaling, if necessary) shows the existence of a $Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}^{+}\right)$for which

$$
\left|Q^{\prime}(1)\right| \geq \frac{2}{3}\left(\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \lambda_{j}\right)\|Q\|_{[0,1]}
$$

Then $R(x):=Q(x / b) \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|x R^{\prime}(x)\right\|_{[a, b]} & \geq b\left|R^{\prime}(b)\right|=\left|Q^{\prime}(1)\right| \geq \frac{2}{3}\left(\sum_{j=k+1}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|\right)\|Q\|_{[0,1]} \\
& \geq \frac{2}{3}\left(\sum_{j=k+1}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|\right)\|R\|_{[a, b]} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, the lower bound of Theorem 1.1 (combined with a linear scaling if necessary) shows the existence of a $Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}^{-}\right)$for which

$$
\left|Q^{\prime}(1)\right| \geq \frac{2}{3}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k}\left(-\lambda_{j}\right)\right)\|Q\|_{[0,1]}
$$

Then $R(x):=Q(a / x) \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|x R^{\prime}(x)\right\|_{[a, b]} & \geq a\left|R^{\prime}(a)\right|=\left|Q^{\prime}(1)\right| \geq \frac{2}{3}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|\right)\|Q\|_{[0,1]} \\
& \geq \frac{2}{3}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k}\left|\lambda_{j}\right|\right)\|R\|_{[a, b]} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The two observations above already give

$$
\frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left|\lambda_{j}\right| \leq \sup _{0 \neq Q \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{\left\|x Q^{\prime}(x)\right\|_{[a, b]}}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}}
$$

To prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{(n-1)^{2}}{4 \log (b / a)} \leq \sup _{0 \neq \in M\left(\Lambda_{n}\right)} \frac{\left\|x Q^{\prime}(x)\right\|_{[a, b]}}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

we argue as follows. Let

$$
Q_{m, \varepsilon}(x):=T_{m}\left(\frac{2 x^{\varepsilon}}{b^{\varepsilon}-a^{\varepsilon}}-\frac{b^{\varepsilon}+a^{\varepsilon}}{b^{\varepsilon}-a^{\varepsilon}}\right) \in \operatorname{span}\left\{1, x^{\varepsilon}, x^{2 \varepsilon}, \ldots, x^{m \varepsilon}\right\}
$$

where $T_{m}(x)=\cos (m \arccos x), x \in[-1,1]$, is the Chebyshev polynomial of degree $m$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{b\left|Q_{m, \varepsilon}^{\prime}(b)\right|}{\left\|Q_{m, \varepsilon}\right\|_{[a, b]}} & =\left|T_{m}^{\prime}(1)\right| \frac{2}{b^{\varepsilon}-a^{\varepsilon}} \varepsilon b^{\varepsilon}  \tag{4.3}\\
& =\frac{2 m^{2}}{\varepsilon^{-1}\left(b^{\varepsilon}-1\right)-\varepsilon^{-1}\left(a^{\varepsilon}-1\right)} b^{\varepsilon} \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} \frac{2 m^{2}}{\log b-\log a}
\end{align*}
$$

Now suppose, as before,

$$
\Lambda_{n}:=\left\{\lambda_{0}<\lambda_{1}<\cdots<\lambda_{n}\right\}
$$

and $0 \leq k \leq n$ is chosen so that $\lambda_{j}<0$ for all $j=1,2, \ldots, k$ and $\lambda_{j} \geq 0$ for all $j=k+1, k+2, \ldots, n$. Using Lemma 3.1 and (4.3), we obtain that for $k \leq n-1$ there is a

$$
Q \in \operatorname{span}\left\{x^{\lambda_{k+1}}, x^{\lambda_{k+2}}, \ldots, x^{\lambda_{n}}\right\}
$$

such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2(n-k-1)^{2}}{\log b-\log a} \leq \frac{b\left|Q^{\prime}(b)\right|}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, using Lemma 3.1 and (4.4), we obtain for $k \geq 0$ that there is an

$$
R \in \operatorname{span}\left\{x^{-\lambda_{0}}, x^{-\lambda_{1}}, \ldots, x^{-\lambda_{k}}\right\}
$$

such that

$$
\frac{2 k^{2}}{\log b-\log a} \leq \frac{b\left|R^{\prime}(b)\right|}{\|R\|_{[a, b]}},
$$

and hence for

$$
Q \in \operatorname{span}\left\{x^{\lambda_{0}}, x^{\lambda_{1}}, \ldots, x^{\lambda_{k}}\right\}
$$

defined by $Q(x):=R(a b / x)$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2 k^{2}}{\log b-\log a}=\frac{2 k^{2}}{\log b-\log a} \leq \frac{a\left|Q^{\prime}(a)\right|}{\|Q\|_{[a, b]}} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now (4.2) follows from (4.4) and (4.5), and the proof of the lower bound of the theorem is finished.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. One can copy the proof in [3] by putting the upper bound of Theorem 1.1 in the appropriate place in the arguments. We omit the details.
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