

# Extended Numerical Computations on the "1/9" Conjecture In Rational Approximation Theory

A. J. Carpenter, A. Ruttan, and R. S. Varga\*

Institute for Computational Mathematics

Kent State University

Kent, Ohio 44242, U.S.A.

Abstract. The behavior of the constants  $\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})$ , denoting the errors of best uniform approximation to  $e^{-x}$  on the interval  $[0, +\infty)$  by real rational functions having numerator and denominator polynomials of degree at most  $n$ , has generated much recent interest in the approximation theory literature. Based on high-precision calculations, we present here the table of constants  $\{\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})\}_{n=0}^{30}$ , rounded to forty significant digits, and we discuss their significance to related conjectures in this area.

## 1. Introduction

It is well-known (cf. [15, Chapter 8]) that rational approximations to  $e^{-x}$  permeate the numerical analysis and approximation theory literature, in that these approximations arise quite naturally in the numerical solution of heat-conduction problems and in the study of numerical methods for ordinary differential equations. Our interest here centers on the following specific problem. If  $\pi_{m,n}$  denotes the class of rational functions  $p_m(x)/q_n(x)$ , where  $p_m(x)$  is a real polynomial of degree at most  $m$  and  $q_n(x)$  is a real polynomial of degree at most  $n$ , then what can be said about the quantities

$$\lambda_{m,n}(e^{-x}) := \min \left\{ \| e^{-x} - r_{m,n} \|_{L_\infty[0,+\infty)} : r_{m,n} \in \pi_{m,n} \right\}, \quad m \leq n \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$\Lambda_1 := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n,n}^{1/n}(e^{-x}); \quad \Lambda_2 := \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n,n}^{1/n}(e^{-x}) \quad ? \quad (1.2)$$

The history of that question has its beginnings in a 1969 paper of Cody, Meinardus, and Varga [4], where they showed that

\* Research supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research and by the Department of Energy.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \left\| e^{-x} - \frac{1}{s_n(x)} \right\|_{L_\infty[0,+\infty)} \right\}^{1/n} = \frac{1}{2} < 1, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $s_n(x) := \sum_{k=0}^n x^k / k!$  is the  $n$ -th partial sum of  $e^x$ . Thus (cf. (1.1)),

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{0,n}^{1/n}(e^{-x}) \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.4)$$

In fact, a slightly better result than (1.3) was established in [4], namely

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{0,n}^{1/n}(e^{-x}) \leq K \doteq \frac{1}{2.298}. \quad (1.5)$$

Since it is obvious from (1.1) that

$$\lambda_{0,n}(e^{-x}) \geq \lambda_{1,n}(e^{-x}) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x}), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (1.6)$$

it is evident that (1.5) implies, with (1.2) and (1.6), that

$$0 \leq \Lambda_1 \leq \Lambda_2 \leq \frac{1}{2.298}, \quad (1.7)$$

so that best rational approximation to  $e^{-x}$  on  $[0, +\infty)$  exhibits *geometric convergence* to zero. It is this geometric convergence which has fascinated so many researchers.

In [4], a tabulation of the computed values  $\{\lambda_{0,n}(e^{-x})\}_{n=0}^9$  and  $\{\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})\}_{n=0}^{14}$  was also given. The numbers in these tabulations exhibited a striking regularity and added to the interest in the problem, despite the relatively low accuracy (about 4 significant digits) of these numbers computed. Two subsequent papers by Schönhage [12] in 1973 and Newman [7] in 1974 added significantly to this interest. First, Schönhage [12] obtained the very precise estimates

$$\frac{1}{6\sqrt{(4n+4)} \log 3 + 2 \log 2} \leq 3^n \lambda_{0,n}(e^{-x}) \leq \sqrt{2}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (1.8)$$

so that in fact

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{0,n}^{1/n} = \frac{1}{3}, \quad (1.9)$$

whence (cf. (1.2) and (1.6))

$$\Lambda_2 \leq \frac{1}{3}. \quad (1.10)$$

Then, Newman [7] showed that the convergence of  $\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})$  to zero was *at most*

geometric, i.e., (cf. (1.2))

$$0 < \frac{1}{1280} \leq \Lambda_1 . \quad (1.11)$$

On the other hand, as the determination of  $\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})$  depends on asymptotically twice as many coefficients (in  $r_{n,n}(x)$  of (1.1)) as does the determination of  $\lambda_{0,n}(e^{-x})$ , one could wildly guess from (1.9) that

$$\lambda_{n,n}^{1/n} \sim \left( \frac{1}{3} \right)^2 = 1/9 . \quad (1.12)$$

But, as the computed values  $\{ \lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x}) \}_{n=0}^{14}$  of [4] indeed seemed to *roughly* agree with (1.12), the following conjecture was born:

Conjecture 1 (cf.[11]).  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n,n}^{1/n}(e^{-x}) = 1/9$ , i.e.,  $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = 1/9$ .

The race was then on to improve upon the bounds for  $\Lambda_1$  of (1.11) and  $\Lambda_2$  of (1.10). We list, in chronological order, the successive refinements for  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$ :

1969	Cody/Meinardus/Varga [4]		$\Lambda_2 \leq \frac{1}{2.298}$
1973	Schönhage [12]		$\Lambda_2 \leq \frac{1}{3}$
1974	Newman [7]	$\frac{1}{1280} \leq \Lambda_1$	
1978	Rahman/Schmeisser [9]	$\frac{1}{380} \leq \Lambda_1$	
1978	Rahman/Schmeisser [10]		$\Lambda_2 < \frac{1}{4.091}$
1980	Blatt/Braess [1]	$\frac{1}{52} < \Lambda_1$	
1981	Németh [6]		$\Lambda_2 < \frac{1}{6.475}$
1982	Schönhage [13]	$\frac{1}{13.928} < \Lambda_1$	
1984	Opitz/Scherer [8]		$\Lambda_2 < \frac{1}{9.037}$

It is clear that this last result of Opitz and Scherer [8] rigorously *disproves* Conjecture 1; the geometrical convergence rate of  $\lambda_{n,n}^{1/n}(e^{-x})$  is actually *better* than  $1/9$ . What is curious is that Schönhage [13] and Trefethen and Gutknecht [14] simultaneously observed (by examining the ratios  $\lambda_{n-1,n-1}(e^{-x}) / \lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})$  of the numbers tabulated in [4]) that

Conjecture 1 was surely *numerically* false, even before this was rigorously established later by Opitz and Scherer [8]. In fact, Schönhage made the following conjecture:

$$\text{Conjecture 2 ([13]): } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n,n}^{1/n} (e^{-x}) = \frac{3}{2} (2 - \sqrt{3})^2 \doteq 1/9.285469 \quad ,$$

while Trefethen and Gutknecht [14] instead conjectured

$$\text{Conjecture 3 ([14]): } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n,n}^{1/n} (e^{-x}) \doteq 1/9.28903 \quad .$$

Obviously, Conjectures 2 and 3 are very close, so close in fact that the tabulation given in [4] is simply not accurate enough to settle either of these conjectures.

## 2. Statement of Numerical Results

The numbers  $\{ \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \}_{n=0}^{14}$  of [4] from 1969 no doubt contributed auxiliary interest to the theoretical problem of either settling Conjecture 1 or determining improved bounds for  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$  of (1.2). But, in the intervening fifteen years since [4] appeared, we knew of no further *direct* computation of the numbers  $\lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x})$  to either *improve* the accuracies of the calculations of [4], or to extend the *length* of the table  $\{ \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \}_{n=0}^{14}$  of [4]. Thus, it was felt that a numerical *up-date* for such calculations was in order! (We note, however, that upper estimates of  $\{ \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \}_{n=0}^{18}$ , based on the Carathéodory-Fejér method, appear in [14].)

Based on calculations done on a VAX-11/780 in the Department of Mathematical Sciences at Kent State University, using Richard Brent's MP (multiple precision) package [2] with 230 decimal digits, the numbers  $\{ \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \}_{n=0}^{30}$  were determined to an accuracy of about 200 decimal digits. These numbers are given below, rounded to forty significant digits.

$n$	$\lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x})$
0	5.000 (-01)
1	6.683104216185046347061162382711514726145 (-02)
2	7.358670169580529280012554163080603756745 (-03)
3	7.993806363356878288081190097111961689766 (-04)
4	8.652240695288852348224345825414673525007 (-05)
5	9.345713153026646476753656820792397989609 (-06)
6	1.008454374899670707934528776410002060407 (-06)
7	1.087497491375247960866531307272933478485 (-07)
8	1.172265211633490717795432303938880473511 (-08)
9	1.263292483322314146094932100909728334334 (-09)
10	1.361120523345447749870788161536842376473 (-10)
11	1.466311194937487140668126199557752690348 (-11)
12	1.579456837051238771486756732818381574685 (-12)
13	1.701187076340352966416486549945081533337 (-13)
14	1.832174378254041275155501756513156530559 (-14)
15	1.973138996612803428625665802082299241770 (-15)
16	2.124853710495223748799634436418717809045 (-16)
17	2.288148563247891960405220861269241949472 (-17)
18	2.463915737765169274831082962323228297774 (-18)
19	2.653114658063312766926455034695330543463 (-19)
20	2.856777383549093706690893844930068028830 (-20)
21	3.076014349505790506914421863975308683948 (-21)
22	3.312020500551318690751373710822614146029 (-22)
23	3.566081860636424584769822799765137259724 (-23)
24	3.839582582168132126936486847301189562943 (-24)
25	4.134012517285363006270758055452630197056 (-25)
26	4.450975355730424689793263607279733039512 (-26)
27	4.792197375888904189931419997885520971052 (-27)
28	5.159536858257132654665011291255453036411 (-28)
29	5.554994213751622674642007903879134991028 (-29)
30	5.980722882849695437271427007124798284642 (-30)

Table 1:  $\{ \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \}_{n=0}^{30}$

A short description of how the actual computations for  $\lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x})$  were performed, will be given in §3.

As the ratios  $\lambda_{n-1,n-1} / \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x})$  figured into the formulation of Conjectures 2 and 3 of §1, we next tabulate these ratios below, rounded to twenty digits.

$n$	$\rho_n$
1	7.4815532397221509829 (+00)
2	9.0819455991000169709 (+00)
3	9.2054646248528427538 (+00)
4	9.2390013695637342229 (+00)
5	9.2579780201008948071 (+00)
6	9.2673633886078728002 (+00)
7	9.2731650684028757880 (+00)
8	9.2768895688704833336 (+00)
9	9.2794442071765347804 (+00)
10	9.2812683495309755120 (+00)
11	9.2826170054814049413 (+00)
12	9.2836420758101343366 (+00)
13	9.2844394306651793616 (+00)
14	9.2850718606898552365 (+00)
15	9.2855819149043751996 (+00)
16	9.2859992519340952302 (+00)
17	9.2863450591648612312 (+00)
18	9.2866347991400778935 (+00)
19	9.2868799705918004397 (+00)
20	9.2870892682832631480 (+00)
21	9.2872693653333554026 (+00)
22	9.2874254522088778824 (+00)
23	9.2875616152014957848 (+00)
24	9.2876811067903443961 (+00)
25	9.2877865418013514399 (+00)
26	9.2878800417598657237 (+00)
27	9.2879633425048853224 (+00)
28	9.2880378753756707951 (+00)
29	9.2881048291364217039 (+00)
30	9.2881651976905816378 (+00)

Table 2:  $\{ \rho_n := \lambda_{n-1, n-1}(e^{-x}) / \lambda_{n, n}(e^{-x}) \}_{n=1}^{30}$

Now, as the ratios  $\rho_n := \lambda_{n-1, n-1}(e^{-x}) / \lambda_{n, n}(e^{-x})$  of Table 2, appear to be converging linearly in  $1/n^2$  (an observation already used in [14]), i.e.,

$$\rho_n \doteq \rho + \frac{K_1}{n^2} + \dots, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $K_1$  is independent of  $n$ , we have applied Richardson's extrapolation (cf. Brezinski [3, p.6]), with  $x_n = 1/n^2$ , to the last eleven entries in Table 2, to accelerate the convergence of the entries of Table 2. These are given in Table 3 - 10 below.

---

9.2890264097244993503 (+00)	9.2890254903568100301 (+00)
9.2890262501648177328 (+00)	9.2890254907395748783 (+00)
9.2890261238332083354 (+00)	9.2890254910173236639 (+00)
9.2890260227584489782 (+00)	9.2890254912217618362 (+00)
9.2890259411144138332 (+00)	9.2890254913741950640 (+00)
9.2890258745847956720 (+00)	9.2890254914892118820 (+00)
9.2890258199319277514 (+00)	9.2890254915769523220 (+00)
9.2890257746993546055 (+00)	9.2890254916445664944 (+00)
9.2890257370035920984 (+00)	9.2890254916971628979 (+00)
9.2890257053863190015 (+00)	

Table 3: 1st Richardson's extrapolation.

Table 4: 2nd Richardson's extrapolation.

---

9.2890254919264426247 (+00)	9.2890254919205312241 (+00)
9.2890254919246363634 (+00)	9.2890254919208485672 (+00)
9.2890254919235212362 (+00)	9.2890254919207963074 (+00)
9.2890254919227472919 (+00)	9.2890254919208120946 (+00)
9.2890254919222163736 (+00)	9.2890254919208127682 (+00)
9.2890254919218439885 (+00)	9.2890254919208150150 (+00)
9.2890254919215797099 (+00)	9.2890254919208161591 (+00)
9.2890254919213896706 (+00)	

Table 5: 3rd Richardson's extrapolation.

Table 6: 4th Richardson's extrapolation.

---

---

9.2890254919214127327 (+00)  
 9.2890254919206982369 (+00)  
 9.2890254919208432825 (+00)  
 9.2890254919208141655 (+00)  
 9.2890254919208198985 (+00)  
 9.2890254919208187594 (+00)

Table 7: 5th Richardson's extrapolation.

9.2890254919196627357 (+00);  
 9.2890254919210653837 (+00)  
 9.2890254919207671899 (+00)  
 9.2890254919208296190 (+00)  
 9.2890254919208167344 (+00)

Table 8: 6th Richardson's extrapolation.

---

9.2890254919227707308 (+00)  
 9.2890254919203837979 (+00)  
 9.2890254919209142567 (+00)  
 9.2890254919207983626 (+00)

Table 9: 7th Richardson's extrapolation.

9.2890254919178974094 (+00)  
 9.2890254919214990876 (+00)  
 9.2890254919206635242 (+00)

Table 10: 8th Richardson's extrapolation.

---

It is interesting to see from these Richardson extrapolations that the last 32 entries from Tables 5 - 10 *all* agree, when rounded to twelve digits, to the number  $\rho = 9.28902549192$ . It appears that the best extrapolated value of  $\rho$  of (2.1) comes from Table 6, which thus yields numerically, to fifteen decimals, that

$$1 / \rho = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n,n}^{1/n} (e^{-x}) \doteq \frac{1}{9.289\ 025\ 491\ 920\ 81} \quad (2.2)$$

This would appear, numerically, to *refute* Conjecture 2 of §1. In addition, as the constant in (2.2) is distinctly different from  $1/9.037$ , it also appears that the claim of Opitz and Scherer [8], that their method might produce "optimal" results, is numerically surely false! Despite the general numerical agreement of the extrapolations of Tables 3 - 10 in estimating a common value (2.2) for  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$ , it must be emphasized, however, that we have presented here only numerical results.

As a second method for estimating the quantity  $\rho$  of (2.2), assume that, as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,

$$\lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) = \frac{1}{\rho^n} \left\{ \gamma_0 + \frac{\gamma_1}{n} + \frac{\gamma_2}{n^2} + \dots \right\} + \text{lower order terms} \quad (2.3)$$

so that

$$\left( \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \right)^{1/n} = \frac{1}{\rho} + \frac{c_1}{n} + \frac{c_2}{n^2} + \dots + \text{lower order terms} \quad (2.4)$$



where the constants  $c_j$  of (2.4) depend on  $\rho$  and the  $\gamma_j$ 's. The form of (2.4) suggests that the convergence of  $\left\{ \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \right\}_{n=1}^{1/\rho}$  to  $1/\rho$  can be similarly accelerated by Richardson's extrapolation, now with  $x_n = 1/n$ . The numerical results of this acceleration, applied to  $\left\{ \left( \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \right)^{1/n} \right\}_{n=1}^{30}$ , produced essentially the same value for  $\rho$  as that given in (2.2). (For brevity, we have not included here the analogs of Tables 3 - 10 for these extrapolations.)

With the assumption of (2.3), it follows that

$$\rho^n \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) = \gamma_0 + \frac{\gamma_1}{n} + \frac{\gamma_2}{n^2} + \dots + \text{lower order terms} , \quad (2.5)$$

which further suggests that the constants  $\gamma_j$  in (2.5) can be successively determined from the known values of  $\lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x})$ , the assumed values of  $\rho$  of (2.2), and Richardson's extrapolations, again with  $x_n = 1/n$ . The resulting estimates for the constants  $\gamma_j$  are given in Table II.

Table II:  
Numerical estimates for the  $\gamma_j$  of (2.5)

j	$\gamma_j$
0	+0.656 213 133 75
1	-0.054 684 427 8
2	+0.029 620 072 8
3	-0.016 012 6
4	+0.008 627 4
5	-0.005 74

The approximation

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{n,n} := \frac{1}{\rho^n} \left\{ \gamma_0 + \frac{\gamma_1}{n} + \dots + \frac{\gamma_5}{n^5} \right\} , \quad (2.6)$$

based on the numbers of (2.2) and Table II, give excellent approximations of

$$\left\{ \lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) \right\}_{n=1}^{30} , \text{ except for very small values of } n ,$$

To round out our discussion of the "1/9" Conjecture, we list, as in [4], the coefficients of the extremal polynomials  $p_n (x)$  and  $q_n (x)$  (with  $q_n (0) = 1$ ) for which

$$\lambda_{n,n} (e^{-x}) = \left\| e^{-x} - \frac{p_n (x)}{q_n (x)} \right\|_{L_\infty[0,+\infty)} , \quad (2.7)$$

for  $n = 1, 2, \dots, 30$ , these coefficients being rounded to twenty places to conserve space. These can be found in §4.

### 3. Description of the Numerical Computations.

Initially, our computations were done on  $[0, +\infty)$  with an essentially standard Remez algorithm (cf. Meinardus [5]) using Brent's MP package [2] to handle the high-precision computations. The values  $\{\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})\}_{n=1}^{13}$  were calculated in this fashion, using 43 decimal-digit arithmetic. However,  $\lambda_{n+1,n+1}(e^{-x})$  had approximately 3 digits *less* accuracy than  $\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})$ , indicating that the method used in these initial computations was *highly* ill-conditioned.

To achieve a better conditioning, our original approximation problem (1.1) was restated in the form

$$\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x}) = \min \left\{ \left\| e^{-c_n(1+t)/(1-t)} - \tilde{r}_{n,n}(t) \right\|_{L_\infty[-1,+1]} : \tilde{r}_{n,n} \in \pi_{n,n} \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

resulting from the change of variables

$$x = c_n \left( \frac{1+t}{1-t} \right), \quad c_n > 0, \quad \text{where } x \in [0, +\infty), \quad t \in [-1, 1]. \quad (3.2)$$

Ideally, the constant  $c_n$  should be chosen so as to distribute the set of  $2n + 2$  alternant points (cf. [5]), associated with the interval  $[-1, +1]$  of (3.1), as uniformly as possible in  $[-1, +1]$ .

The reformulated problem (3.1) was solved by the following implementation of the Remez algorithm:

- 1) Obtain an estimate for the alternants  $\{t_j\}_{j=0}^{2n+1}$  (where  $-1 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{2n+1} = 1$ ), and for a value for the constant  $c_n$  of (3.1), using previous data.
- 2) Find real polynomials  $p_n(t)$  and  $q_n(t)$  (with  $q_n(0) := 1$ ), each of degree  $n$ , and a positive constant  $\lambda$  which satisfy

$$e^{-c_n(1+t_k)/(1-t_k)} - \frac{p_n(t_k)}{q_n(t_k)} - (-1)^k \lambda = 0, \quad (k = 0, 1, \dots, 2n+1), \quad (3.3)$$

on the current alternants  $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{2n+1}$  in  $[-1, +1]$ . A Newton's method, involving  $2n + 2$  parameters consisting of the  $2n + 1$  coefficients of  $p_n(t)$  and  $q_n(t)$  and the constant  $\lambda$ , was used to solve the nonlinear problem of (3.3). To add stability to these calculations, the polynomials  $p_n(t)$  and  $q_n(t)$  were expressed in terms of the Chebyshev polynomial basis  $\{T_k(t)\}_{k=0}^n$ .

- 3) A new estimate of the alternants was then found by finding a set of local extrema, with alternating signs, of the function

$$F(t) := e^{-c_n(1+t)/(1-t)} - p_n(t)/q_n(t), \quad \text{defined on } [-1, +1].$$

If the new alternants were sufficiently close to the old alternants, the algorithm was terminated. Otherwise, step 2) above was repeated, etc.

With a sufficiently good estimate for the constants  $c_n$ , the new algorithm was *significantly* more stable than the standard Remez algorithm applied on  $[0, +\infty)$ : the converged value  $\lambda_{n+1,n+1}(e^{-x})$  of this new algorithm had approximately *one* digit less accuracy than the previous converged value  $\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})$ . This is about as much as can be expected since  $\lambda_{n+1,n+1}(e^{-x})$  is roughly  $1/9.29$  times  $\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})$  with increasing  $n$  (cf. Table 2)!

The most time-consuming computer portion of our modified algorithm occurred in step 2) above. Now, each Newton step in 2) requires solving a  $(2n+2) \times (2n+2)$  matrix equation, and this is clearly compounded by the extra computer time necessary in carrying out all calculations in very high precision. On starting the above algorithm with 20 digit accuracy in the associated parameters and on using 230 digit arithmetic from Brent's MP package, this algorithm only needed at most 8 Newton updates to achieve a final 200 digit accuracy in the associated parameters. But for  $n=30$ , this required, for example, 15 cpu hours on our VAX-11/780 to determine  $\lambda_{30,30}(e^{-x})$ !

We remark that these costly computing times occurred, despite the fact that our initial estimates used in step 1) of the algorithm above were surprisingly good. If  $\{t_j\}_{j=0}^{2n+1}$  denoted the alternants in the interval  $[-1, +1]$  for our problem (3.1) and if  $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^{2n+1}$  were the images, under the transformation in (3.2), of the alternants in the interval  $[0, +\infty)$ , then on choosing  $c_n \cong \sqrt{x_n \cdot x_{n+1}}$ , we found that the associated alternants  $\{t_j\}_{j=0}^{2n+1}$  in  $[-1, +1]$  became *unexpectedly* similar to the extrema  $\{\hat{t}_j := \cos[\pi(1 - \frac{j}{2n+1})]\}_{j=0}^{2n+1}$  of the Chebyshev polynomial  $T_{2n+1}(t)$  on the interval  $[-1, +1]$ . More precisely, the ratios of these alternants,

$$u_j := \frac{t_j}{\hat{t}_j} \quad (j = 0, 1, \dots, 2n+1), \quad (3.4)$$

formed a nearly symmetric inverted bell-shaped curve on  $[0, 2n+1]$ , i.e., these ratios were nearly one for  $j$  small or  $j$  near  $2n+1$ , and these ratios decreased slowly to about 0.76 as  $j$  approached the center point of the interval  $[0, 2n+1]$ . This observation led us to the following estimate

$$\hat{t}_j := \cos \left[ \pi \left( -\frac{j}{2n+1} \right) \right] \left\{ 1 - 3.36 \left( \frac{j}{2n+1} \right)^2 \left( 1 - \frac{j}{2n+1} \right)^2 \right\}, \quad (3.5)$$

$$j = 0, 1, \dots, 2n+1,$$

of the alternants  $\{t_j\}_{j=0}^{2n+1}$  in  $[-1, +1]$ , which numerically achieved a relative deviation of at most 6% from the actual alternants  $\{t_j\}_{j=0}^{2n+1}$ , even when we used the estimates

$$\hat{c}_n := c_{n-1}^2 / c_{n-2} \quad (3.6)$$

Summarizing, using the estimates of (3.5) and (3.6), using the transformed problem of (3.1), and using the Chebyshev polynomial basis  $\{T_k(x)\}_{k=0}^n$ , resulted in a significantly better-conditioned computation for the values of  $\lambda_{n,n}(e^{-x})$ . (We stopped our computations with the case  $n = 30$  from cpu-time considerations, rather than from accuracy considerations!)

4. Coefficients of  $p_n(x)$  and  $q_n(x)$ .

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
n = 1		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0668310421618504635 (+00)
1	1.7271172505820169235 (+00)	-1.1542504579210602494 (-01)
n = 2		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.9264132983041947072 (-01)
1	6.6930154271087127186 (-01)	-1.8833350198927415815 (-01)
2	5.7224957904836489341 (-01)	4.2109959068982177855 (-03)
n = 3		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0007993806363356878 (+00)
1	7.9829357089752213329 (-01)	-2.2365742718351887787 (-01)
2	2.2040971161511489626 (-01)	1.2499601545398984435 (-02)
3	1.2485918642725863159 (-01)	-9.9810015898578281854 (-05)
n = 4		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.9991347759304711148 (-01)
1	7.5668306888329708214 (-01)	-2.4025402432545953884 (-01)
2	2.9175397633746512345 (-01)	1.8400562307678039215 (-02)
3	4.5750548404322635677 (-02)	-4.4981502907081176448 (-04)
4	1.9376829538777680730 (-02)	1.6765299308108737248 (-06)
n = 5		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000093457131530266 (+00)
1	7.5017443629508826484 (-01)	-2.5023100706418111745 (-01)
2	2.6991013134417674897 (-01)	2.2480613306965212876 (-02)
3	6.7668626041566587102 (-02)	-8.3363085734239059333 (-04)
4	6.9346135560032124409 (-03)	1.0779810679092561383 (-05)
5	2.3446790106210413736 (-03)	-2.1912697469186570498 (-08)
n = 6		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.9999899154562510033 (-01)
1	7.4317310793725353126 (-01)	-2.5677508985594545088 (-01)
2	2.6898234032991615456 (-01)	2.5389670322537157467 (-02)
3	6.1593026160813895476 (-02)	-1.1769059339745022305 (-03)
4	1.1364907743793030262 (-02)	2.4820964613817624866 (-05)
5	8.2567981485296730024 (-04)	-1.9070014316258941354 (-07)
6	2.3230231175265367241 (-04)	2.3426628258627078732 (-10)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
$n = 7$		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000001087497491375 (+00)
1	7.3860755265403652073 (-01)	-2.6139890245157325374 (-01)
2	2.6609542167331571699 (-01)	2.7548737236512233353 (-02)
3	6.2210380540681505225 (-02)	-1.4675743675443654044 (-03)
4	1.0229633036518400366 (-02)	4.0604885270256007598 (-05)
5	1.4878817819751908909 (-03)	-5.3705891418335754085 (-07)
6	8.0883914233407339765 (-05)	2.6538677816935889717 (-09)
7	1.9484208914619273525 (-05)	-2.1189028316079702843 (-12)
$n = 8$		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.9999998827734788367 (-01)
1	7.3516490200874711006 (-01)	-2.6483430847822992853 (-01)
2	2.6438044169339228008 (-01)	2.9207044273505478870 (-02)
3	6.1718734777325241574 (-02)	-1.7107715899069427972 (-03)
4	1.0520815163731983883 (-02)	5.6307821021754562350 (-05)
5	1.3283453064064323585 (-03)	-1.0147775758029899384 (-06)
6	1.5910254290684040602 (-04)	9.0013440975771190466 (-09)
7	6.7271456842176719503 (-06)	-3.0312488609110424332 (-11)
8	1.4167507178008938403 (-06)	1.6608075800347647028 (-14)
$n = 9$		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000000012632924833 (+00)
1	7.3251419564078598353 (-01)	-2.6748589953942883104 (-01)
2	2.6303062535807977162 (-01)	3.0517580603500653821 (-02)
3	6.1530784916685721148 (-02)	-1.9147812452801917483 (-03)
4	1.0492608831391450658 (-02)	7.1103869037310644849 (-05)
5	1.3950029476562314910 (-03)	-1.5678080149581536439 (-06)
6	1.4116049483486023948 (-04)	1.9535758505225041515 (-08)
7	1.4351266620345007596 (-05)	-1.2209626369889029705 (-10)
8	4.8597568414012272418 (-07)	2.9287304416715685077 (-13)
9	9.0914553514881083438 (-08)	-1.1485167207995354803 (-16)
$n = 10$		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.9999999986388794767 (-01)
1	7.3040628740509415862 (-01)	-2.6959370125162598429 (-01)
2	2.6198433793450755661 (-01)	3.1577898264638956869 (-02)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
3	6.1359835762604515656 (-02)	-2.0872336141098597946 (-03)
4	1.0522214938304485349 (-02)	8.4694800522056656479 (-05)
5	1.4004400136031827693 (-03)	-2.1529632009223805112 (-06)
6	1.5162908445438365994 (-04)	3.3595495648065426068 (-08)
7	1.2670597578885658604 (-05)	-3.0243887922221152380 (-10)
8	1.1179771406674077683 (-06)	1.3835175675810288679 (-12)
9	3.1024563729347710543 (-08)	-2.4479596835781524301 (-15)
10	5.2207134645030587538 (-09)	7.1060202430410289851 (-19)
n = 11		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.000000000146631119 (+00)
1	7.2869093514903338347 (-01)	-2.7130906619020039085 (-01)
2	2.6114358806002462135 (-01)	3.2452672671798064591 (-02)
3	6.1230547379183840216 (-02)	-2.2343529914673730280 (-03)
4	1.0537271208026105008 (-02)	9.7033279144419487693 (-05)
5	1.4150097974152344401 (-03)	-2.7417852073123794696 (-06)
6	1.5333091232704136771 (-04)	5.0236657702890298313 (-08)
7	1.3934767796316549369 (-05)	-5.7755502193955032327 (-10)
8	9.8315547981894275422 (-07)	3.8862322897518799981 (-12)
9	7.6575875007520006935 (-08)	-1.3413459199227922075 (-14)
10	1.7740700295278932878 (-09)	1.8010050564587997692 (-17)
11	2.7127219457634251348 (-10)	-3.9776945578255130913 (-21)
n = 12		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.999999999842054316 (-01)
1	7.2726794442587404691 (-01)	-2.7273205541723861212 (-01)
2	2.6045423235897757189 (-01)	3.3186285409181941015 (-02)
3	6.1125881342176750711 (-02)	-2.3610296684603661423 (-03)
4	1.0551656317596859800 (-02)	1.0818210684852625702 (-04)
5	1.4248371121782907054 (-03)	-3.3170690870773473397 (-06)
6	1.5627772051583776268 (-04)	6.8564050007593925822 (-08)
7	1.4198481758017543395 (-05)	-9.4025623763914245637 (-10)
8	1.1076204551770729043 (-06)	8.2159261557706839823 (-12)
9	6.7122345531815556515 (-08)	-4.2460559325998987934 (-14)
10	4.6772292551801273223 (-09)	1.1335755380226379804 (-16)
11	9.1859907864599662598 (-11)	-1.1824226782945190429 (-19)
12	1.2870807304176959932 (-11)	2.0328884594951322377 (-23)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
n = 13		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.000000000001701187 (+00)
1	7.2606856648187456846 (-01)	-2.7393143353638373887 (-01)
2	2.5987868966049413531 (-01)	3.3810123496675834027 (-02)
3	6.1040005208020200371 (-02)	-2.4710700386539540993 (-03)
4	1.0563659959887015315 (-02)	1.1824617529896343260 (-04)
5	1.4333960951724789950 (-03)	-3.8691771493804491498 (-06)
6	1.5836802154851644352 (-04)	8.7846766808947538873 (-08)
7	1.4609445035018602359 (-05)	-1.3766793766013695399 (-09)
8	1.1372692221789108095 (-06)	1.4546096489288275848 (-11)
9	7.7482794810543576337 (-08)	-9.9041130338816606894 (-14)
10	4.0886476353685167018 (-09)	4.0201482804353265611 (-16)
11	2.5766613699837803265 (-10)	-8.4753849754741511891 (-19)
12	4.3455473513268560364 (-12)	7.0050690177811160395 (-22)
13	5.6184959576874667073 (-13)	-9.5581127116884329757 (-26)
n = 14		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.999999999998167826 (-01)
1	7.2504400105794982801 (-01)	-2.7495599893993723129 (-01)
2	2.5939097352682523362 (-01)	3.4346972429252957162 (-02)
3	6.0968196803506752125 (-02)	-2.5674425707902795730 (-03)
4	1.0574051936471402715 (-02)	1.2734060684477834084 (-04)
5	1.4405532019175131023 (-03)	-4.3932761847806353276 (-06)
6	1.6019218139205361453 (-04)	1.0753187241762202746 (-07)
7	1.4908242237501135777 (-05)	-1.8710223403465319988 (-09)
8	1.1820298688854366697 (-06)	2.2849466635625509298 (-11)
9	8.0164052804759260531 (-08)	-1.9038591551025381666 (-13)
10	4.8361843519832766389 (-09)	1.0310120249635897805 (-15)
11	2.2472046467801857194 (-10)	-3.3490171642170337489 (-18)
12	1.2922822504467751142 (-11)	5.6743670690330211959 (-21)
13	1.8921825619816040160 (-13)	-3.7794532322670955969 (-24)
14	2.2710727625899900737 (-14)	4.1610013267680029528 (-28)
n = 15		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.00000000000019731 (+00)
1	7.2415866907620477911 (-01)	-2.7584133092403855215 (-01)



Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-z}$		
i	q	p
2	2.5897242355314705843 (-01)	3.4813754481829550920 (-02)
3	6.0907277733570110800 (-02)	-2.6524779865394277857 (-03)
4	1.0583087170044096379 (-02)	1.3557652521034370441 (-04)
5	1.4466872665940473451 (-03)	-4.8874813823443484833 (-06)
6	1.6173222871264890572 (-04)	1.2722046758585241530 (-07)
7	1.5171907890884190088 (-05)	-2.4081661405899631864 (-09)
8	1.2151064697266154881 (-06)	3.2966530346210070367 (-11)
9	8.4196487972429069905 (-08)	-3.2068470095050508776 (-13)
10	5.0409480029770692861 (-09)	2.1476966393883189321 (-15)
11	2.7233683230693980458 (-10)	-9.4109689260605595636 (-18)
12	1.1248069393139919485 (-11)	2.4856294581031545360 (-20)
13	5.9468225157795131984 (-13)	-3.4361705671901568590 (-23)
14	7.6317957265269706634 (-15)	1.8714400301425160987 (-26)
15	8.5472063683108394376 (-16)	-1.6864826197411413312 (-30)
n = 16		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.9999999999999978751 (-01)
1	7.2338602292194837605 (-01)	-2.7661397707802372040 (-01)
2	2.5860931332113989163 (-01)	3.5223290398593890975 (-02)
3	6.0854946127264699182 (-02)	-2.7280223945541603972 (-03)
4	1.0591015301175281646 (-02)	1.4305532540830578363 (-04)
5	1.4519917779283776247 (-03)	-5.3516653691319551221 (-06)
6	1.6306180422515751551 (-04)	1.4663511678787708208 (-07)
7	1.5396764745302603497 (-05)	-2.9748521541610146711 (-09)
8	1.2446986743617001063 (-06)	4.4667074036373546096 (-11)
9	8.7213007002183174707 (-08)	-4.9124750188063887407 (-13)
10	5.3517844906526438896 (-09)	3.8755282930914110147 (-15)
11	2.8593027098738583509 (-10)	-2.1199503237701174494 (-17)
12	1.3963572572460278486 (-11)	7.6277421016130829045 (-20)
13	5.1671893800279173586 (-13)	-1.6607979818792513091 (-22)
14	2.5276802007963606269 (-14)	1.8979708477544314608 (-25)
15	2.8667698160212141620 (-16)	-8.5606377701670908334 (-29)
16	3.0093104224231407541 (-17)	6.3943444171177598099 (-33)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
$n = 17$		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000000000000000229 (+00)
1	7.2270585462136953087 (-01)	-2.7729414537863365694 (-01)
2	2.5829131995630046565 (-01)	3.5585465335003458111 (-02)
3	6.0809507390072969545 (-02)	-2.7955519228564120076 (-03)
4	1.0598023489381217368 (-02)	1.4986697693060245133 (-04)
5	1.4566258090943959608 (-03)	-5.7867107664997448463 (-06)
6	1.6421910387421514909 (-04)	1.6558969231502529775 (-07)
7	1.5592669068294270482 (-05)	-3.5600331752523462572 (-09)
8	1.2701896118955897646 (-06)	5.7694610687453000688 (-11)
9	8.9952033533504590178 (-08)	-7.0111135292795387525 (-13)
10	5.5866285320057224635 (-09)	6.3018857979045448319 (-15)
11	3.0690410653109898959 (-10)	-4.0934546068922329038 (-17)
12	1.4763544085912781412 (-11)	1.8540997178336935538 (-19)
13	6.5692146982166977577 (-13)	-5.5478662451290864179 (-22)
14	2.1929711332561360156 (-14)	1.0077964568000473113 (-24)
15	9.9803140529347369232 (-16)	-9.6311299616434657123 (-28)
16	1.0076443559489818370 (-17)	3.6381008264169349244 (-31)
17	9.9533336444995010637 (-19)	-2.2774706078188437603 (-35)
$n = 18$		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.999999999999999754 (-01)
1	7.2210251162213760760 (-01)	-2.7789748837786202942 (-01)
2	2.5801053189666607896 (-01)	3.5908020274519729805 (-02)
3	6.0769684666293474499 (-02)	-2.8562580858878249220 (-03)
4	1.0604260828765657181 (-02)	1.5609017337127136364 (-04)
5	1.4607084457312575111 (-03)	-6.1940471597288549472 (-06)
6	1.6523598870223731736 (-04)	1.8396482187296904295 (-07)
7	1.5764526871377682191 (-05)	-4.1548085790428176917 (-09)
8	1.2926132501100778041 (-06)	7.1794537028167480115 (-11)
9	9.2334736432550722847 (-08)	-9.4773868843647724074 (-13)
10	5.8031481469953154253 (-09)	9.4758123475451790323 (-15)
11	3.2288400362818480622 (-10)	-7.0617684389507100553 (-17)
12	1.6023022340045240158 (-11)	3.8258499143063765432 (-19)
13	6.9925714572325997863 (-13)	-1.4520088830640599985 (-21)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
14	2.8542945098191319824 (-14)	3.6534688613148991179 (-24)
15	8.6471483697462350423 (-16)	-5.5958102671944549554 (-27)
16	3.6787450097487522068 (-17)	4.5177277417421400742 (-30)
17	3.3278408185195843503 (-19)	-1.4434969618996796174 (-33)
18	3.1040251435758619580 (-20)	7.6480564016753553998 (-38)
n = 19		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000000000000000003 (+00)
1	7.2156368259201663937 (-01)	-2.7843631740798340183 (-01)
2	2.5776078409791612555 (-01)	3.6197101505900533482 (-02)
3	6.0734497954567183445 (-02)	-2.9111115140177481016 (-03)
4	1.0609846263465004573 (-02)	1.6179325924143951781 (-04)
5	1.4643324939311864714 (-03)	-6.5753674125082918706 (-06)
6	1.6613650526094958487 (-04)	2.0168905169819757417 (-07)
7	1.5916587025359119477 (-05)	-4.7521805561279600593 (-09)
8	1.3124457578828000080 (-06)	8.6730006775887139868 (-11)
9	9.4451373237383608747 (-08)	-1.2276354018264591744 (-12)
10	5.9933092623793340401 (-09)	1.3411822822603597433 (-14)
11	3.3784614979453334011 (-10)	-1.1186004966950956669 (-16)
12	1.6989658352357050158 (-11)	6.9970429220569463847 (-19)
13	7.6742363437140323820 (-13)	-3.1972725111092105805 (-21)
14	3.0580043687699495419 (-14)	1.0273733186333559896 (-23)
15	1.1518577416976816152 (-15)	-2.1951396392431808895 (-26)
16	3.1835397068991986730 (-17)	2.8615408787772833807 (-29)
17	1.2713653178005351833 (-18)	-1.9694708209381382654 (-32)
18	1.0364344279541674044 (-20)	5.3703307695262059488 (-36)
19	9.1570582958910789228 (-22)	-2.4294725589568881359 (-40)
n = 20		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	9.99999999999999997 (-01)
1	7.2107955165146436895 (-01)	-2.7892044834853562639 (-01)
2	2.5753720158407837071 (-01)	3.6457649932613876971 (-02)
3	6.0703182600751914030 (-02)	-2.9609098242596261130 (-03)
4	1.0614875834295449959 (-02)	1.6703541699804974713 (-04)
5	1.4675710228275782849 (-03)	-6.9324562692610725077 (-06)
6	1.6693957290448895787 (-04)	2.1872483964129629603 (-07)
7	1.6052079646727331527 (-05)	-5.3467565092977333192 (-09)
8	1.3301225337360296890 (-06)	1.0228954715465658016 (-10)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
9	9.6338964603806016053 (-08)	-1.5368313511438283042 (-12)
10	6.1639056613443707964 (-09)	1.8096461988824864400 (-14)
11	3.5110926854287101220 (-10)	-1.6580745736734816354 (-16)
12	1.7908832457629530219 (-11)	1.1672198605029734819 (-18)
13	8.2008117841834923615 (-13)	-6.1936889537571481080 (-21)
14	3.3938864156618761186 (-14)	2.4105681922839642535 (-23)
15	1.2417688637946327705 (-15)	-6.6185196281694492006 (-26)
16	4.3385159620628243371 (-17)	1.2113724541256915285 (-28)
17	1.0990484330810003653 (-18)	-1.3552946153009542146 (-31)
18	4.1354019630164880823 (-20)	8.0169605314221382434 (-35)
19	3.0538918819268542585 (-22)	-1.8805470199361703461 (-38)
20	2.5628928552136086178 (-23)	7.3216143452337990707 (-43)
$n = 21$		
0	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.2064219697569183005 (-01)	-2.7935780302430817048 (-01)
2	2.5733587895330020783 (-01)	3.6693681977608392584 (-02)
3	6.0675133266582940643 (-02)	-3.0063138655381823795 (-03)
4	1.0619427824397480596 (-02)	1.7186787185029200536 (-04)
5	1.4704823869739844457 (-03)	-7.2670890316381390456 (-06)
6	1.6766020704056002618 (-04)	2.3505832195838590627 (-07)
7	1.6173579847685692566 (-05)	-5.9344580351910059567 (-09)
8	1.3459762326494999013 (-06)	1.1828954830323715653 (-10)
9	9.8033984897602339980 (-08)	-1.8712232943943080645 (-12)
10	6.3173038544853450718 (-09)	2.3495449807922150045 (-14)
11	3.6312508159412913565 (-10)	-2.3313838537000271146 (-16)
12	1.8730981404230082919 (-11)	1.8118842180441427473 (-18)
13	8.7093081612820652481 (-13)	-1.0875663018513674485 (-20)
14	3.6548676757025251170 (-14)	4.9414360113574654171 (-23)
15	1.3936848498319246143 (-15)	-1.6523102799180557777 (-25)
16	4.7051616127896484209 (-17)	3.9082049594935053126 (-28)
17	1.5317669769113303944 (-18)	-6.1754498246162749622 (-31)
18	3.5714624755160836554 (-20)	5.9746919108510846444 (-34)
19	1.2703379067912114642 (-21)	-3.0598920596277695902 (-37)
20	8.5380603270749883481 (-24)	6.2192394025759794712 (-41)
21	6.8232509117901788034 (-25)	-2.0988417714945058814 (-45)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
n = 22		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.2024515522426885778 (-01)	-2.7975484477573114216 (-01)
2	2.5715365085971926369 (-01)	3.6908495635450404166 (-02)
3	6.0649864512193881866 (-02)	-3.0478754020575993647 (-03)
4	1.0623566628151799912 (-02)	1.7633500843928321830 (-04)
5	1.4731137404802299197 (-03)	-7.5809738495069090674 (-06)
6	1.6831048917843324445 (-04)	2.5069191557238854811 (-07)
7	1.6283152234777024234 (-05)	-6.5122619757180812495 (-09)
8	1.3602761130470247007 (-06)	1.3457379364976452568 (-10)
9	9.9564343590539204149 (-08)	-2.2268026983155948583 (-12)
10	6.4560913902503564972 (-09)	2.9560245331729836665 (-14)
11	3.7401859742633337134 (-10)	-3.1410724352013750719 (-16)
12	1.9483106529080606242 (-11)	2.6553887718291344662 (-18)
13	9.1680999305772174791 (-13)	-1.7676644378244532847 (-20)
14	3.9107766743159333128 (-14)	9.1278680283845964971 (-23)
15	1.5123507567108144027 (-15)	-3.5805166566755439172 (-25)
16	5.3401899140075195528 (-17)	1.0365955917689346517 (-27)
17	1.6707425727208528640 (-18)	-2.1277784397335996581 (-30)
18	5.0886706159921823345 (-20)	2.9231399336791845047 (-33)
19	1.0961475446293379047 (-21)	-2.4623396257008074572 (-36)
20	3.6965545855001175030 (-23)	1.0991176527978871486 (-39)
21	2.2708806892898350258 (-25)	-1.9484008877459215375 (-43)
22	1.7320983079796653153 (-26)	5.7367451049989032790 (-48)
n = 23		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.1988310082459591732 (-01)	-2.8011689917540408269 (-01)
2	2.5698792471734873844 (-01)	3.7104823892752821325 (-02)
3	6.0626982524584947958 (-02)	-3.0860584471325009762 (-03)
4	1.0627345664071083966 (-02)	1.8047536072786826345 (-04)
5	1.4755035992707838480 (-03)	-7.8757210411818256606 (-06)
6	1.6890024843251790692 (-04)	2.6563900673673161074 (-07)
7	1.6382473993464912301 (-05)	-7.0779812242602691625 (-09)
8	1.3732404247572612432 (-06)	1.5101143424472028548 (-10)
9	1.0095302286038609121 (-07)	-2.5997957789837943232 (-12)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
10	6.5822413182372985325 (-09)	3.6233532714776076309 (-14)
11	3.8394889629746827515 (-10)	-4.0861034248600722572 (-16)
12	2.0170542366772364610 (-11)	3.7137851529683374768 (-18)
13	9.5918906854811887872 (-13)	-2.7001985390889146513 (-20)
14	4.1436204320974462060 (-14)	1.5528939801402053295 (-22)
15	1.6304901228232053668 (-15)	-6.9530886094237998157 (-25)
16	5.8386383707137038815 (-17)	2.3720625335812422216 (-27)
17	1.9175029935153725110 (-18)	-5.9872927305549306726 (-30)
18	5.5808542257176158674 (-20)	1.0736346677944520471 (-32)
19	1.5960495536735968784 (-21)	-1.2905749729715581657 (-35)
20	3.1871496109206449820 (-23)	9.5241140961329381142 (-39)
21	1.0217421583117155147 (-24)	-3.7278671871533691988 (-42)
22	5.7595314217244562516 (-27)	5.7982136100082272330 (-46)
23	4.2015926344320482739 (-28)	-1.4983223279431735600 (-50)
$n = 24$		
0	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.1955160628060490012 (-01)	-2.8044839371939509988 (-01)
2	2.5683655680548874312 (-01)	3.7284950524883842970 (-02)
3	6.0606164481744409458 (-02)	-3.1212558501085499598 (-03)
4	1.0630809594431807553 (-02)	1.8432246866428426565 (-04)
5	1.4776837304194045942 (-03)	-8.1528290297762335410 (-06)
6	1.6943756353916543523 (-04)	2.7992015745235962935 (-07)
7	1.6472921423980865550 (-05)	-7.6300845409641694341 (-09)
8	1.3850483386300453833 (-06)	1.6749426980810398258 (-10)
9	1.0221886364132138740 (-07)	-2.9867405776081327288 (-12)
10	6.6974106945354655796 (-09)	4.3453522989129354348 (-14)
11	3.9303598949948647010 (-10)	-5.1625886299634749395 (-16)
12	2.0801904728762698738 (-11)	4.9974970771678653853 (-18)
13	9.9823495547390858172 (-13)	-3.9209132343147921877 (-20)
14	4.3607684640656254187 (-14)	2.4722281164775052693 (-22)
15	1.7388589608575720948 (-15)	-1.2376529579577131695 (-24)
16	6.3423901723117428381 (-17)	4.8389987731625314556 (-27)
17	2.1120571959754931088 (-18)	-1.4452601356069529738 (-29)
18	6.4766664595094796687 (-20)	3.2004921170130934113 (-32)
19	1.7596348598140616683 (-21)	-5.0438750863387113193 (-35)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
20	4.7406321676460227043 (-23)	5.3360424355118835887 (-38)
21	8.8030256384366476434 (-25)	-3.4694587438114214128 (-41)
22	2.6892325986479079123 (-26)	1.1974216241920071748 (-44)
23	1.3959597685006867882 (-28)	-1.6430816452663319539 (-48)
24	9.7582905119403701973 (-30)	3.7467762281382790571 (-53)
$n = 25$		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.1924696060030549152 (-01)	-2.8075303939969450848 (-01)
2	2.5669775918887669273 (-01)	3.7450798588571201206 (-02)
3	6.0587143251270532876 (-02)	-3.1538023041200807920 (-03)
4	1.0633996033260288963 (-02)	1.8790560971052078695 (-04)
5	1.4796805670782497197 (-03)	-8.4136803468272165599 (-06)
6	1.6992913597947736280 (-04)	2.9356040915848232932 (-07)
7	1.6555634671491244526 (-05)	-8.1675511125608142608 (-09)
8	1.3958482728461237761 (-06)	1.8393384178735986993 (-10)
9	1.0337750836440238611 (-07)	-3.3845209609800166958 (-12)
10	6.8029738899716716771 (-09)	5.1157161639534070020 (-14)
11	4.0138303634825116937 (-10)	-6.3644923388319778193 (-16)
12	2.1383556797380942966 (-11)	6.5117237108438679018 (-18)
13	1.0343638215272956605 (-12)	-5.4595347139888024431 (-20)
14	4.5624243518361710181 (-14)	3.7273813754702834958 (-22)
15	1.8408841519514984572 (-15)	-2.0530724455614180911 (-24)
16	6.8081267555534785131 (-17)	9.0077109606214317012 (-27)
17	2.3116269500240241604 (-18)	-3.0948366861501914604 (-29)
18	7.1858776322636732020 (-20)	8.1407882328111744921 (-32)
19	2.0647764426693640793 (-21)	-1.5906727254440811555 (-34)
20	5.2528760787303468994 (-23)	2.2153039233678690245 (-37)
21	1.3370915947538380277 (-24)	-2.0736074544841591910 (-40)
22	2.3154233915482175675 (-26)	1.1940545565030128827 (-43)
23	6.7551774268161192942 (-28)	-3.6523509679158950883 (-47)
24	3.2397074059310773266 (-30)	4.4437519314004684085 (-51)
25	2.1738952552926457167 (-31)	-8.9869101966470571763 (-56)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-z}$		
i	q	p
n = 26		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.1896603004635407628 (-01)	-2.8103396995364592372 (-01)
2	2.5657002887003749352 (-01)	3.7603998823683417241 (-02)
3	6.0569695881738960595 (-02)	-3.1839846317881614457 (-03)
4	1.0636936873433653069 (-02)	1.9125041898775982050 (-04)
5	1.4815162820564590937 (-03)	-8.6595435825426075478 (-06)
6	1.7038057158576408119 (-04)	3.0658737713813768797 (-07)
7	1.6631566345893463369 (-05)	-8.6897545335970724597 (-09)
8	1.4057642432742099133 (-06)	2.0025861713950916330 (-10)
9	1.0444204490518077866 (-07)	-3.7903724436935358376 (-12)
10	6.9000857608018811274 (-09)	5.9282411666625107531 (-14)
11	4.0907662030930223269 (-10)	-7.6842585097056414965 (-16)
12	2.1921125846523355118 (-11)	8.2570666493171204585 (-18)
13	1.0678718214314360999 (-12)	-7.3392007703057431530 (-20)
14	4.7503981805777539255 (-14)	5.3712708293521833434 (-22)
15	1.9363701772525106571 (-15)	-3.2137958886540163074 (-24)
16	7.2507250514592475300 (-17)	1.5565082769644566430 (-26)
17	2.4975442158093370662 (-18)	-6.0214447480232786212 (-29)
18	7.9241460923961745271 (-20)	1.8284175028861242452 (-31)
19	2.3072848547429883203 (-21)	-4.2589594095915223042 (-34)
20	6.2318770493623148075 (-23)	7.3811490698898474272 (-37)
21	1.4887308305062634160 (-24)	-9.1298836604138566248 (-40)
22	3.5900145501058512309 (-26)	7.5983415064438853460 (-43)
23	5.8126365856240802587 (-28)	-3.8935547750075112746 (-46)
24	1.6227799580300107200 (-29)	1.0604684624677904373 (-49)
25	7.2122228957098244519 (-32)	-1.1493650186177443495 (-53)
26	4.6529920015189527423 (-33)	2.0710352729171641461 (-58)
n = 27		
0	1.000000000000000000 (+00)	1.000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.1870615013494964452 (-01)	-2.8129384986505035548 (-01)
2	2.5645209321774275677 (-01)	3.7745943082793112249 (-02)
3	6.0553634833924406861 (-02)	-3.2120499830101943170 (-03)
4	1.0639659327332069240 (-02)	1.9437941312076668187 (-04)
5	1.4832096123430519539 (-03)	-8.8915786943714812065 (-06)



Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
6	1.7079659574127093742 (-04)	3.1902991377590222703 (-07)
7	1.6701518602605391310 (-05)	-9.1963709811680089503 (-09)
8	1.4149006878178168423 (-06)	2.1641140277115697685 (-10)
9	1.0542351021349550139 (-07)	-4.2018705007566813448 (-12)
10	6.9897228455967626327 (-09)	6.7769798099866907653 (-14)
11	4.1619044516026066335 (-10)	-9.1133406626101867879 (-16)
12	2.2419392381250479060 (-11)	1.0230254833623119193 (-17)
13	1.0990305718118410865 (-12)	-9.5764061479699012137 (-20)
14	4.9259005778171551594 (-14)	7.4512740901471078481 (-22)
15	2.0260314782637897578 (-15)	-4.7931707838444243896 (-24)
16	7.6681358771735639629 (-17)	2.5293126309095483331 (-26)
17	2.6758680762905260877 (-18)	-1.0834661026569340573 (-28)
18	8.6169847303890952011 (-20)	3.7161403305502155654 (-31)
19	2.5634235918361219624 (-21)	-1.0024877187066737147 (-33)
20	7.0127193297565789436 (-23)	2.0780918351231215531 (-36)
21	1.7855742180920933932 (-24)	-3.2097160980790598559 (-39)
22	4.0156816304849403139 (-26)	3.5424654128735486313 (-42)
23	9.1964363393424183436 (-28)	-2.6331524240973874715 (-45)
24	1.3955671627874349543 (-29)	1.2060058776911720646 (-48)
25	3.7352134986647930254 (-31)	-2.9375861296063709736 (-52)
26	1.5427084484811426672 (-33)	2.8484004094090161063 (-56)
27	9.5834724343683731142 (-35)	-4.5925891451883766222 (-61)
$n = 28$		
0	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.1846504099977450858 (-01)	-2.8153495900022549142 (-01)
2	2.5634286747132473766 (-01)	3.7877826471550229077 (-02)
3	6.0538801220168057895 (-02)	-3.2382124179360921395 (-03)
4	1.0642186749988000749 (-02)	1.9731243218656025214 (-04)
5	1.4847764994109842628 (-03)	-9.1108440565059548173 (-06)
6	1.7118121976301399562 (-04)	3.3091718065250326410 (-07)
7	1.6766171748975058231 (-05)	-9.6873069289091329257 (-09)
8	1.4233461897756964635 (-06)	2.3234704839756243162 (-10)
9	1.0633127738462594514 (-07)	-4.6169087559105242168 (-12)
10	7.0727167212993401677 (-09)	7.6563385687590018588 (-14)
11	4.2278753905749988235 (-10)	-1.0642631862580357359 (-15)
12	2.2882484070110947837 (-11)	1.2424881652802987399 (-17)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
13	1.1280736630891817950 (-12)	-1.2181315591198636789 (-19)
14	5.0900982136752396390 (-14)	1.0008004746340252594 (-21)
15	2.1102989402066160773 (-15)	-6.8628244877211120581 (-24)
16	8.0629352903914881994 (-17)	3.9041630685993974915 (-26)
17	2.8453127951750166544 (-18)	-1.8273116597117645173 (-28)
18	9.2876348488845996777 (-20)	6.9600084535166773350 (-31)
19	2.8055162407493957644 (-21)	-2.1270994500225483862 (-33)
20	7.8493728999571373376 (-23)	5.1221768334261579751 (-36)
21	2.0231282677112118888 (-24)	-9.4924644132126223194 (-39)
22	4.8688630300634044605 (-26)	1.3124217192547875882 (-41)
23	1.0332584543810187690 (-27)	-1.2979704782618576593 (-44)
24	2.2522930190976109514 (-29)	8.6529029938315506542 (-48)
25	3.2105491540280196138 (-31)	-3.5567748438917412531 (-51)
26	8.2519544489273895218 (-33)	7.7792379820555470653 (-55)
27	3.1755253582770512366 (-35)	-6.7753365272078992201 (-59)
28	1.9020809159366749124 (-36)	9.8138565931627609198 (-64)
n = 29		
0	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.1824074043079310993 (-01)	-2.8175925956920689007 (-01)
2	2.5624142131497740435 (-01)	3.8000680884184294416 (-02)
3	6.0525059535231118368 (-02)	-3.2626582310163976817 (-03)
4	1.0644539295547595500 (-02)	2.0006701267299431847 (-04)
5	1.4862305915618925334 (-03)	-9.3183042499982610991 (-06)
6	1.7153787091780660524 (-04)	3.4227801419691581593 (-07)
7	1.6826106556886635018 (-05)	-1.0162642462709301594 (-08)
8	1.4311763809427150035 (-06)	2.4803044888644507226 (-10)
9	1.0717335838264462378 (-07)	-5.0336720080283779322 (-12)
10	7.1497799310138340033 (-09)	8.5611335339544449737 (-14)
11	4.2892213438580353073 (-10)	-1.2262802013924015446 (-15)
12	2.3313973576581319597 (-11)	1.4832100877490882467 (-17)
13	1.1552060390438050984 (-12)	-1.5158313990467185641 (-19)
14	5.2440069076448366312 (-14)	1.3074657548508829771 (-21)
15	2.1896191080064318492 (-15)	-9.4902885995221209857 (-24)
16	8.4364220579657309921 (-17)	5.7698403519637535860 (-26)
17	3.0067321387130736625 (-18)	-2.9188924120576619426 (-28)
18	9.9296151586572481448 (-20)	1.2179775468499820477 (-30)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
19	3.0419849906975770270 (-21)	-4.1449405346182376688 (-33)
20	8.6456065781235580902 (-23)	1.1339292479243459054 (-35)
21	2.2812963979843922853 (-24)	-2.4481138035452179148 (-38)
22	5.5537857813866255467 (-26)	4.0730588289709086731 (-41)
23	1.2663351963339644273 (-27)	-5.0614377161525805088 (-44)
24	2.5413421113019371806 (-29)	4.5033487174180149912 (-47)
25	5.2836220838809921666 (-31)	-2.7029531453596257962 (-50)
26	7.0894030065454535655 (-33)	1.0000296137524799591 (-53)
27	1.7525818103023344647 (-34)	-1.9731092335931916942 (-57)
28	6.2991336260625001585 (-37)	1.5493207620467243315 (-61)
29	3.6427133054769394938 (-38)	-2.0235251334280446010 (-66)
$n = 30$		
0	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)	1.0000000000000000000 (+00)
1	7.1803155042772127612 (-01)	-2.8196844957227872388 (-01)
2	2.5614695234169101695 (-01)	3.8115401913969740830 (-02)
3	6.0512293508462864581 (-02)	-3.2855502860341809776 (-03)
4	1.0646734444855619090 (-02)	2.0265870261805029904 (-04)
5	1.4875836417649791494 (-03)	-9.5148379859906376412 (-06)
6	1.7186949502113754284 (-04)	3.5314050182780261684 (-07)
7	1.6881821841067465703 (-05)	-1.0622586963885646562 (-08)
8	1.4384562284711296335 (-06)	2.6343483216755972319 (-10)
9	1.0795664283018752186 (-07)	-5.4506073294691798165 (-12)
10	7.2215265693946799983 (-09)	9.4866156508756075292 (-14)
11	4.3464114384271304094 (-10)	-1.3964554205647248956 (-15)
12	2.3716969565318967420 (-11)	1.7441252036441660423 (-17)
13	1.1806074393066802850 (-12)	-1.8506688650091489877 (-19)
14	5.3885346845345913909 (-14)	1.6676820706603970154 (-21)
15	2.2643856170276607118 (-15)	-1.2737164571814720528 (-23)
16	8.7901123390735385090 (-17)	8.2159993047662503208 (-26)
17	3.1604309408297432480 (-18)	-4.4525490040349927562 (-28)
18	1.0545543403758406495 (-19)	2.0130724366066200126 (-30)
19	3.2699924326595110152 (-21)	-7.5239822024090788005 (-33)
20	9.4303280463436687932 (-23)	2.2978810217829931996 (-35)
21	2.5286339977569998853 (-24)	-5.6508242227847947169 (-38)
22	6.3086412701711342899 (-26)	1.0982155012464389275 (-40)

Tables of coefficients for best approximants to $e^{-x}$		
i	q	p
23	1.4540002113970188434 (-27)	-1.6467595005222406689 (-43)
24	3.1480227761306722217 (-29)	1.8462045089123337587 (-46)
25	5.9861194489977205340 (-31)	-1.4832272593982169255 (-49)
26	1.1893082101510933116 (-32)	8.0441303745414552340 (-53)
27	1.5049933964043840759 (-34)	-2.6930919888571651980 (-56)
28	3.5836255739795333870 (-36)	4.8015689571472672268 (-60)
29	1.2057358269368541653 (-38)	-3.4109451463472630706 (-64)
30	6.7397798848782102402 (-40)	4.0308755782861197983 (-69)

#### Acknowledgement

We wish to thank Stephen Friedl and Craig Mohrman of Kent State University for their considerable help in producing the displays of the paper. In addition, we are indebted to Ava D. Logsdon for the considerable effort she expended in preparing this manuscript.

#### References

1. H.-P. Blatt and D. Braess, "Zur rationalen Approximation von  $e^{-x}$  auf  $[0, \infty)$ ", *J. Approximation Theory* **30**(1980), 169 - 172.
2. Richard Brent, "A FORTRAN multiple-precision arithmetic package", *Assoc. Comput. Mach. Trans. Math. Software* **4**(1978), 57 - 70.
3. C. Brezinski, Algorithmes d'Accélération de la Convergence, Éditions Technip, Paris, 1978.
4. W. J. Cody, G. Meinardus, and R. S. Varga, "Chebyshev rational approximation to  $e^{-x}$  in  $[0, +\infty)$  and applications to heat-conduction problems", *J. Approximation Theory* **2**(1969), 50 - 65.
5. G. Meinardus, Approximation of Functions: Theory and Numerical Methods, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1967.
6. G. Németh, "Notes on generalized Padé approximation", in Approximation and Function Spaces (Z. Ciesielski, ed.), pp. 484 - 508, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1981.
7. D. J. Newman, "Rational approximation to  $e^{-x}$ ", *J. Approximation Theory* **10**(1974), 301 - 303.

8. H.-U. Opitz and K. Scherer, "On the rational approximation of  $e^{-x}$  on  $[0, \infty)$ ", *Constructive Approximation* (to appear).
9. Q. I. Rahman and G. Schmeisser, "Rational approximation to  $e^{-x}$ ", *J. Approximation Theory* **23**(1978), 146 - 154.
10. Q. I. Rahman and G. Schmeisser, "Rational approximation to  $e^{-x}$ . II", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **235**(1978), 395 - 402.
11. E. B. Saff and R. S. Varga, "Some open questions concerning polynomials and rational functions", in Padé and Rational Approximation (E. B. Saff and R. S. Varga, eds.), pp. 483 - 488, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1977.
12. A. Schönhage, "Zur rationalen Approximierbarkeit von  $e^{-x}$  über  $[0, \infty)$ ", *J. Approximation Theory* **7**(1973), 395 - 398.
13. A. Schönhage, "Rational approximation to  $e^{-x}$  and related  $L^2$ - problems", *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **19**(1982), 1067 - 1082.
14. L. N. Trefethen and M. H. Gutknecht, "The Carathéodory-Fejér method for real rational approximation", *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **20**(1983), 420 - 436.
15. R. S. Varga, Matrix Iterative Analysis, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962.