

# GENERALIZED STANDARD TRIPLES FOR ALGEBRAIC LINEARIZATIONS OF MATRIX POLYNOMIALS\*

EUNICE Y. S. CHAN<sup>†</sup>, ROBERT M. CORLESS<sup>‡</sup>, AND LEILI RAFIEE SEVYERI<sup>§</sup>

**Abstract.** We define *generalized standard triples*  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$  of regular matrix polynomials  $\mathbf{P}(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}[z]$  in order to use the representation  $\mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$  except if  $z$  is an eigenvalue. This representation can be used in constructing so-called *algebraic linearizations* such as  $\mathbf{H}(z) = z\mathbf{A}(z)\mathbf{B}(z) + \mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}[z]$  from linearizations for  $\mathbf{A}(z)$  and  $\mathbf{B}(z)$ . This can be done even if  $\mathbf{A}(z)$  and  $\mathbf{B}(z)$  are expressed in differing polynomial bases. Our main theorem is that  $\mathbf{X}$  can be expressed using the coefficients of the expression  $1 = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} e_k \phi_k(z)$  in terms of the relevant polynomial basis. For convenience, we tabulate generalized standard triples for orthogonal polynomial bases, the monomial basis, and Newton interpolational bases; for the Bernstein basis; for Lagrange interpolational bases; and for Hermite interpolational bases. We account for the possibility of common similarity transformations. We give explicit proofs using the Schur complement for the less familiar bases. We also give a first explicit proof that algebraic linearizations are linearizations, by constructing unimodular matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  that transform the algebraic linearization to its standard form:  $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{L}(z)\mathbf{F} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}(z), \mathbf{I}, \dots, \mathbf{I})$ .

**Key words.** Standard triple, regular matrix polynomial, polynomial bases, companion matrix, colleague matrix, comrade matrix, algebraic linearization, linearization of matrix polynomials.

**AMS subject classifications.** 65F15, 15A22, 65D05

**1. Introduction.** A *matrix polynomial* is usually defined as follows: “A matrix polynomial  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda) \in F^{m \times n}[\lambda]$  is a polynomial in the variable  $\lambda$  with coefficients that are  $m$  by  $n$  matrices with entries from the field  $F$ .” Typically an expression in the monomial basis  $\phi_k(z) = z^k$  is given for  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda)$ , and often only *regular* matrix polynomials are considered, that is, with  $m = n$  (we will use  $n$  for the dimension) and where  $\det \mathbf{P}(\lambda)$  is not identically zero. Matrix polynomials have many applications and their study is of both classic and ongoing interest. See the classic work [17] and [20] for theory and applications.

In this paper, as is done in [2], we consider the case when *any* polynomial basis  $\phi_k(\lambda)$  is used. We do require that the set  $\{\phi_k(\lambda)\}$  for  $0 \leq k \leq \ell$  forms a basis for polynomials of degree at most  $\ell$ . Thus, we write our regular matrix polynomial as

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbf{P}(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \mathbf{P}_k \phi_k(\lambda),$$

where the matrices  $\mathbf{P}_k \in F^{n \times n}$  are square, and the *degree* of  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda)$  is at most  $\ell$ . The upper bound  $\ell$  on the degree is also called the *grade*. The notion of “grade” is useful even for the monomial basis, but it is especially useful if the basis is an interpolational basis or the Bernstein basis  $\phi_k(z) = B_k^n(z) = \binom{n}{k} z^k (1-z)^{n-k}$ , when the degree of the polynomial may not be clear from the data.

---

\*Received by the editors on Month/Day/Year. Accepted for publication on Month/Day/Year. Handling Editor: Name of Handling Editor. Corresponding Author: Name of Corresponding Author

<sup>†</sup>Centre for Medical Evidence, Decision Integrity and Clinical Impact (MEDICI Centre), Department of Anesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University (echan295@uwo.ca)

<sup>‡</sup>Ontario Research Centre for Computer Algebra, School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, Western University (rcorless@uwo.ca)

<sup>§</sup>Ontario Research Centre for Computer Algebra, School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, Department of Applied Mathematics, Western University (lrafiees@uwo.ca)

For more information, consult [26]. See also [28], [20], and consult the seminal book [19]. Linearizations using different polynomial bases were first systematically studied in [2]. Some recent papers of interest include [5], [27], [11], [15], and [31]; this is a very active area. See also [1]. In that paper, standard triples for structured matrices are studied.

**1.1. Organization of the Paper.** In Section 1.2, we establish notation, give the definitions of algebraic linearization and of generalized standard triples. We define this last in Definition 1.1 with reference to the representation in Equation (1.10). In Section 1.3, we show how to use the generalized standard triple in the construction of algebraic linearizations. We also give a proof, by construction of the necessary unimodular  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$ , that algebraic linearizations truly are linearizations.

In Section 2, we prove our main result, giving a universal expression for the generalized standard triples for the linearizations using the polynomial bases that appear in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. In Section 3, we introduce all the polynomial bases by scalar examples; in that section, we also sneak in a new reversal of the Bernstein linearization and an outline of an apparently new proof that the Hermite interpolation basis linearization is, in fact, a linearization by explicitly constructing unimodular matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  that bring the linearization to  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{P}(z), \mathbf{I}_n, \dots, \mathbf{I}_n)$ . In Section 4, we give the strict equivalence of generalized standard triples for the polynomial bases covered in this paper. We (redundantly) give specific proofs of our generalized standard triples formula, by using the Schur complement, in Section 5. We give matrix polynomial examples in Section 6. We sum up in the final section.

**1.2. Notation and Definitions.** Two matrix polynomials  $\mathbf{P}_1(\lambda)$  and  $\mathbf{P}_2(\lambda)$  are called *unimodularly equivalent* if there exist unimodular matrix polynomials (that is, matrices with constant nonzero determinant)  $\mathbf{E}(\lambda)$  and  $\mathbf{F}(\lambda)$  with  $\mathbf{P}_1(\lambda) = \mathbf{E}(\lambda)\mathbf{P}_2(\lambda)\mathbf{F}(\lambda)$ . A matrix pencil  $\mathbf{L}(\lambda) := \lambda\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$  is called a *linearization* of the matrix polynomial  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda)$  if both  $\mathbf{C}_1$  and  $\mathbf{C}_0$  are of dimension  $N \geq n$  and  $\mathbf{L}(\lambda)$  is unimodularly equivalent to the block diagonal matrix  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{P}(\lambda), \mathbf{I}_{N-n})$ . Two linearizations  $\mathbf{L}_m(\lambda)$  and  $\mathbf{L}_\phi(\lambda)$  are called *strictly equivalent* if the corresponding matrices are equivalent in the following stronger sense:  $\mathbf{C}_{1,m} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{C}_{1,\phi}\mathbf{F}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{0,m} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{C}_{0,\phi}\mathbf{F}$ , with the same constant unimodular matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$ .

Given a potential linearization  $z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$ , it is possible to discover the matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  by computing the *Hermite Form* of the linearization<sup>1</sup>, with respect to the variable  $z$ , for instance by using a modestly sized example and a symbolic computation system such as Maple [32]. For instance, we can quickly find that if

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & h_4 & h_3 & h_2 & h_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -z \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -z & -z^2 \\ 0 & -1 & -z & -z^2 & -z^3 \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $h_5 = a_5$  and  $h_k = a_k + zh_{k+1}$  for  $k = 4, 3, 2, 1$  are the partial Horner evaluations of  $p(z) =$

---

<sup>1</sup>The Smith form, which is related, is also useful here; but we found that the Maple implementation of the Hermite Form gave a simpler answer, although we had to compute the matrix  $\mathbf{F}$  separately ourselves because the Hermite form is upper triangular, not diagonal.

$a_5z^5 + \cdots + a_0$ , and if

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} z^4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ z^3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ z^2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ z & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

then for the second companion form

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbf{L}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} za_5 + a_4 & a_3 & a_2 & a_1 & a_0 \\ -1 & z & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & z & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & z & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & z \end{bmatrix},$$

we have  $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{L}(z)\mathbf{F} = \text{diag}(p(z), 1, 1, 1, 1)$ . Moreover,  $\det \mathbf{E} = \pm 1$  and  $\det \mathbf{F} = \pm 1$ .

This quickly generalizes to matrix polynomials, and to arbitrary degree, establishing (as is well-known) that this form is a linearization.

There is a related idea to linearization, that of “companion pencil”  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ , where the only requirement is that  $\det \mathbf{P}(z) = \det(z\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})$ . A companion pencil, therefore, has the same eigenvalues as the matrix polynomial. Companion pencils that are not linearizations do not necessarily preserve eigenvectors or elementary divisors, and are less useful than linearizations.

The usual reversal<sup>2</sup> of a matrix polynomial of degree at most  $\ell$  is the polynomial  $\text{rev } \mathbf{P}(\lambda) = \lambda^\ell \mathbf{P}(\lambda^{-1})$ . A linearization  $\mathbf{L}(\lambda) = \lambda \mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$  of  $\mathbf{P}$  is called a *strong* linearization if  $\text{rev } \mathbf{L}(\lambda) = \mathbf{C}_1 - \lambda \mathbf{C}_0$  is also a linearization of  $\text{rev } \mathbf{P}(\lambda)$ .

If  $\mathbf{L}(z) = z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}[z]$ —where usually  $N = n\ell$  but not always; for Lagrange and Hermite interpolational bases some constructions use  $N = (n+2)\ell$  and others  $N = (n+1)\ell$ —is a linearization of  $\mathbf{P}(z)$ , then as a necessary consequence  $\det(\mathbf{P}(z)) = \det(\mathbf{L}(z)) = \det(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)$ . The eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{P}$  are thus computable from the generalized eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{L}$ . For instance, this can be done with `eig(C0,C1)` in Matlab, or `Eigenvalues(C[0],C[1])` in Maple if the matrix variables are defined appropriately (and are of complex floating-point type in Maple).

A *standard pair*  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{T})$  for a regular matrix polynomial  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda)$  expressed in the monomial basis with coefficients  $\mathbf{P}_k$  is defined in [19] or in [26] as having the following properties:  $\mathbf{X}$  has dimension  $n \times n\ell$ ,  $\mathbf{T}$

---

<sup>2</sup>This definition, which is standard, is particularly appropriate for the monomial basis. The coefficients of the reversed matrix polynomial in the monomial basis are simply the same matrices in reverse order. The notion of a reversal, however, is independent of the basis used, and indeed reversals can be done differently. In [9] for instance we find a slightly different definition of reversal, appropriate for computation in a Lagrange or Hermite interpolational basis, which maps an arbitrary finite point to infinity; this difference allows for greater numerical stability. We will introduce something similar for the Bernstein linearization in this present paper.

has dimension  $n\ell \times n\ell$ ,

$$(1.5) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{X} \mathbf{T}^k = \mathbf{0},$$

and that the  $n\ell$  by  $n\ell$  matrix

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{X} \mathbf{T} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{X} \mathbf{T}^{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

is nonsingular. We can then define a third matrix

$$(1.7) \quad \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_n \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_n \\ \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

and say that the triple  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y})$  is a *standard triple* for a *monic*  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda)$ . It is pointed out in [26] that monicity of  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda)$  is not required for many of the formulæ to do with standard pairs (but is required for some).

Theorem 12.1.4 of [18] states that if there are matrices  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}$ , and  $\mathbf{Y}$  of dimension  $n \times n\ell$ ,  $n\ell \times n\ell$ , and  $n\ell \times n$  for which

$$(1.8) \quad \mathbf{P}^{-1}(\lambda) = \mathbf{X}(\lambda \mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{T})^{-1} \mathbf{Y}$$

then  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y})$  is a standard triple for  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda)$ . This is also reported in Lemma 2 in [1]. There are two other representations of a matrix polynomial given a standard triple: the right canonical form, and the left canonical form. See Theorem 2.4 in [17]. However, we do not need those representations for algebraic linearization: it is the resolvent form above that we seek to generalize in this paper. The reason is that it is this formula that is used in the proof that algebraic linearizations can be performed when the component matrix polynomials are expressed in different bases.

A polynomial basis  $\{\phi_k(z)\}_{k=0}^{\ell}$  for polynomials of degree at most  $\ell$  (grade  $\ell$ ) is a set of polynomials each of degree at most  $\ell$  for which there is a nonsingular matrix  $\Phi$  relating the polynomials  $\phi_k(z)$  to the monomials  $1, z, \dots, z^{\ell}$ . We can write this as

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{\ell}(z) \\ \phi_{\ell-1}(z) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_0(z) \end{bmatrix} = \Phi \begin{bmatrix} z^{\ell} \\ z^{\ell-1} \\ z^{\ell-2} \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Frequently, we want the  $\ell \times \ell$  matrix that only goes up to degree  $\ell - 1$ . The matrix  $\Phi$  is called the change-of-basis matrix and is usually exponentially ill-conditioned in the dimension. For example, for the Bernstein polynomials  $\phi_j^{\ell}(z) = \binom{\ell}{j} z^j (1-z)^{\ell-j}$  the change-of-basis matrix has entries  $\phi_{i,j} = \binom{j}{i} / \binom{\ell}{j}$  and condition number  $K_1 = K_{\infty} = (\ell+1) \binom{\ell}{s} 2^{\ell-s}$  where  $s = \lceil (\ell-2)/3 \rceil$  (the notation  $\lceil x \rceil$  means the ceiling of  $x$ , the least

integer not smaller than  $x$ ). A short computation shows  $K \sim 3^{\ell+1} \sqrt{\ell/4\pi}$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$  and is thus exponentially growing with the dimension.

The constructions and definitions of standard triple discussed above are apparently tied to the monomial basis because of the powers  $\mathbf{T}^k$  in Equation (1.6). We would like to relax this restriction and extend the notion of standard triple to other bases, and also to the non-monic case. In particular, we would like the following extension of Theorem 2.4 in [19] or Theorem 12.1.4 in [18] to be available: If a matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times N}$ , the linearization  $\mathbf{L}(z) = z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}[z]$ , and a matrix  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times n}$  satisfies

$$(1.10) \quad \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z) = \mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$$

for  $z \notin \Lambda(\mathbf{P})$  (the set of polynomial eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{P}$ ), then  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}(z)$ , and  $\mathbf{Y}$  form a *generalized standard triple* for  $\mathbf{P}(\lambda)$ . This obviously requires regularity of  $\mathbf{P}$  because the formula contains  $\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$ .

Indeed, we simply require  $\mathbf{L}(z)$  to be a linearization and take this extension as a *definition*. Such things exist, as we will demonstrate, and are useful, as shown in [7].

**DEFINITION 1.1.** *Matrices  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$ , and  $\mathbf{Y}$  form a generalized standard triple for the regular matrix polynomial  $\mathbf{P}(z)$  if  $\mathbf{L}(z) = z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$  is a linearization of  $\mathbf{P}$  and Equation (1.10) holds.*

Note that the matrices  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  do not depend on  $z$ , but the linearization  $\mathbf{L}(z)$  does, albeit only linearly; we could instead have chosen to use the words “standard quadruple” to mean  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_0, \mathbf{Y})$  where  $z$  does not appear of any of these matrices, but this quibble seems to be a matter of aesthetics only; we may use the term “triple” to refer to  $\mathbf{X}$ , the linearization, and  $\mathbf{Y}$ .

**REMARK 1.2.** *Note also that if  $\mathbf{L}(z)$  is a linearization for  $\mathbf{P}(z)$ , then there exist unimodular matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  with  $\mathbf{F}^{-1}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{E}^{-1} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z), \mathbf{I}, \dots, \mathbf{I})$ . By premultiplying by  $\mathbf{X}_p = [\mathbf{I}, 0, \dots, 0]$  and postmultiplying by  $\mathbf{Y}_p = [\mathbf{I}, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ , we may find  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_p\mathbf{F}^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{E}^{-1}\mathbf{Y}_p$  so that Equation (1.10) holds. Thus, as a referee pointed out, the generalized standard triples may be read off from the proof that  $\mathbf{L}(z)$  is indeed a linearization (with a little work).*

It is not clear that if Equation (1.10) holds then  $\mathbf{L}(z)$  is necessarily a linearization of  $\mathbf{P}(z)$ . We do have, however, the following:

**LEMMA 1.3.** *If a generalized standard triple exists as in Equation (1.10), then the matrix pencil  $z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$  is at least a companion pencil for  $\mathbf{P}(z)$ .*

*Proof.* The norm of the resolvent  $\|\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)\|$  will be large if and only if  $\|(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\|$  is large.  $\spadesuit$

For various reasons, we usually do not wish to invert a “leading coefficient” here; for instance, if the polynomial basis is not degree-graded, e.g. for the Bernstein basis, then in order to even look at the true leading coefficient, we have to form a particular linear combination of the existing coefficients. In floating-point arithmetic, rounding errors can disguise the rank of the resulting matrix, hence our interest in the generalization.

All we will need for the purposes of this paper is that the representation displayed in Equation (1.10) holds. The representation itself is what is useful in the recursive construction of algebraic linearizations.

If  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$ , and  $\mathbf{Y}$  form a generalized standard triple according to our definition, then so do  $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U}$ ,  $\mathbf{U}^{-1}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)\mathbf{V}$ , and  $\mathbf{V}^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$  for any nonsingular matrices  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  of dimension  $N$  by  $N$ .

Several similarities are used very frequently. For convenience, we describe two of the most common explicitly here.

LEMMA 1.4 (Flipping). *Put  $\mathbf{J}$  as the  $N \times N$  “anti-identity”, also called the sip matrix, for standard involutory permutation,  $\mathbf{J}_{i,j} = 0$  unless  $i + j = N + 1$  when  $\mathbf{J}_{i,N+1-i} = 1$ . Then  $\mathbf{J}^2 = \mathbf{I}$  and the “flipped” linearization  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{F}}(z) = \mathbf{J}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)\mathbf{J}$  has in its generalized standard triple the matrices  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{F}} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{J}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{F}} = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{Y}$ .*

*Proof.* Immediate. ▮

REMARK 1.5. *Flipping switches both the order of the equations and the order of the variables. It obviously does not change eigenvalues. Flipping, transposition, and flipping-with-transposition give four common equivalent linearizations [34].*

**1.3. Algebraic Linearizations .** An algebraic linearization  $(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{D}_H)$ , as referred to in the title of this present note, is defined in [7] as a linearization  $(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{D}_H)$  of a matrix polynomial  $\mathbf{h}(\lambda) = \lambda\mathbf{a}(\lambda)\mathbf{d}_0\mathbf{b}(\lambda) + \mathbf{c}$  constructed recursively from linearizations  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{D}_A)$  and  $(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D}_B)$  of the lower-degree component matrix polynomials  $\mathbf{a}(\lambda)$  and  $\mathbf{b}(\lambda)$ , together with constant matrices  $\mathbf{d}_0$  and  $\mathbf{c}$ . The paper [7] did not give an explicit unimodular pair  $(\mathbf{E}_H, \mathbf{F}_H)$  that reduced the linearization to  $\text{diag}(z\mathbf{a}(z)\mathbf{d}_0\mathbf{b}(z) + \mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{I}_n, \dots, \mathbf{I}_n)$ , proving that the construction actually gave a linearization, so we give a method to construct them here. Without loss of generality we take  $\mathbf{d}_0 = \mathbf{I}_n$ .

THEOREM 1.6. *If the  $n$  by  $n$  matrix polynomial  $\mathbf{a}(z)$  has linearization  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{D}_A)$  with unimodular pair  $(\mathbf{E}_A, \mathbf{F}_A)$  and if the  $n$  by  $n$  matrix polynomial  $\mathbf{b}(z)$  has linearization  $(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D}_B)$  with unimodular pair  $(\mathbf{E}_B, \mathbf{F}_B)$  then the pencil  $z\mathbf{D}_H - \mathbf{H}$  is a linearization of  $\mathbf{h}(z) = z\mathbf{a}(z)\mathbf{b}(z) + \mathbf{C}$ , where the matrices  $\mathbf{D}_H$  and  $\mathbf{H}$  are given as follows:*

$$(1.11) \quad \mathbf{D}_H = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_A & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_n & \\ & & \mathbf{D}_B \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(1.12) \quad \mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0}_{N_A, n} & -\mathbf{Y}_A \mathbf{c} \mathbf{X}_B \\ -\mathbf{X}_A & \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{0}_{n, N_B} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N_B, N_A} & -\mathbf{Y}_B & \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here  $\mathbf{X}_A = [\mathbf{I}_n, 0, \dots, 0]\mathbf{F}_A^{-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}_A = \mathbf{E}_A^{-1}[\mathbf{I}_n, 0, \dots, 0]^T$  and likewise  $\mathbf{X}_B = [\mathbf{I}_n, 0, \dots, 0]\mathbf{F}_B^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_B = \mathbf{E}_B^{-1}[\mathbf{I}_n, 0, \dots, 0]^T$  give the elements of the (generalized) standard triples for  $\mathbf{a}(z)$  and  $\mathbf{b}(z)$ .

*Proof.* We first construct

$$(1.13) \quad \mathbf{E}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}_A & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_n & \\ & & \mathbf{E}_B \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(1.14) \quad \mathbf{F}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_A & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_n & \\ & & \mathbf{F}_B \end{bmatrix}.$$

Applying them we get

$$(1.15) \quad E_1(zD_H - H)F_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}(z) & & & E_A Y_A \mathbf{c} X_B F_B & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_{N_A-n} & & & & \\ X_A F_A & & z\mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & & E_B Y_B & \mathbf{b}(z) & & \\ & & & & & \mathbf{I}_{N_B-n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Simplifying and using the definitions of the matrices appearing in the standard triples, we get

$$(1.16) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}(z) & & & \mathbf{c} & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_{N_A-n} & & & & \\ \mathbf{I}_n & & z\mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & & \mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{b}(z) & & \\ & & & & & \mathbf{I}_{N_B-n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Multiplying on the right by  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{I}_{N_A}, \mathbf{b}(z) \cdot \mathbf{b}^{-1}(z), \mathbf{I}_{N_B})$  (which we can do except when  $z$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{b}$ ) we get

$$(1.17) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}(z) & & & \mathbf{c} & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_{N_A-n} & & & & \\ \mathbf{I}_n & & z\mathbf{b}(z) & & & \\ & & \mathbf{b}(z) & \mathbf{b}(z) & & \\ & & & & & \mathbf{I}_{N_B-n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

An elementary block column operation (recorded as the appropriate block elementary matrix multiplication) gets us

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}(z) & & -\mathbf{c} & \mathbf{c} & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_{N_A-n} & & & & \\ \mathbf{I}_n & & z\mathbf{b}(z) & & & \\ & & 0 & \mathbf{b}(z) & & \\ & & & & & \mathbf{I}_{N_B-n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Multiplying the block containing  $z\mathbf{b}(z)$  by  $\mathbf{a}(z)$  and subtracting it from the first block row (recording this operation in a factor on the left) we get

$$(1.19) \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & -z\mathbf{a}(z)\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{c} & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_{N_A-n} & & & & \\ \mathbf{I}_n & & z\mathbf{b}(z) & & & \\ & & 0 & \mathbf{b}(z) & & \\ & & & & & \mathbf{I}_{N_B-n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Interchanging columns and recording it on the right, and finally pulling out a factor  $\mathbf{b}(z)$  by a column multiplication, we arrive at

$$(1.20) \quad \begin{bmatrix} -z\mathbf{a}(z)\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{c} & & & \mathbf{c}\mathbf{b}^{-1}(z) & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_{N_A-n} & & & & \\ z\mathbf{b}(z) & & \mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & & 0 & \mathbf{I}_n & & \\ & & & & & \mathbf{I}_{N_B-n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The blocks  $z\mathbf{b}(z)$  and  $\mathbf{c}\mathbf{b}^{-1}$  can be removed using a block column operation and a block row operation, and we have arrived at the desired form (apart from a sign, which can be absorbed either into the first row of  $\mathbf{E}_H$  or the first column of  $\mathbf{F}_H$ ). All that remains is to check that the constructed factors (recording all our operations)  $\mathbf{E}_H$  and  $\mathbf{F}_H$  are unimodular. This is so because we put both a factor  $\mathbf{b}(z)$  and a factor  $\mathbf{b}^{-1}(z)$  into the matrices on the right and otherwise nothing depending on  $z$ , and on the left only constant-determinant factors. This completes the proof.  $\spadesuit$

REMARK 1.7. *The generalized standard triple for the algebraic linearization has  $\mathbf{X}_H = [0, 0, \mathbf{X}_B]$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_H = [\mathbf{Y}_A^T, 0, 0]^T$ . For these linearizations, there is no notion of expressing 1 as a linear combination of anything, because this formulation is free of polynomial bases.*

Algebraic linearizations offer a new, potentially more numerically stable, class of linearizations. The recursive construction of algebraic linearizations relies on the generalized standard triples of each of the component matrix polynomials, and (as does the unrelated paper [31]) allows different polynomial bases to be used for each component. This present note provides some explicit formulas for generalized standard triples in various bases, for reference. As one reviewer points out, these formulas *could* simply be obtained by reading the proofs that these linearizations are indeed linearizations; one purpose of this paper is simply convenience.

**2. Expressing 1 in the basis gives the triple.** If the  $\phi_k(x)$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$  form a basis, we may express the polynomial 1 in that basis: then  $1 = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} e_k \phi_k(z)$  defines the coefficients  $e_k$  uniquely. Putting

$$(2.21) \quad \mathbf{X} = [e_{\ell-1} \quad e_{\ell-2} \quad \cdots \quad e_1 \quad e_0] \otimes \mathbf{I}$$

for an appropriate choice of basis always gives our generalized standard triple  $\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z) = \mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$  with

$$(2.22) \quad \mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{I}_n \quad \mathbf{0}_n \quad \mathbf{0}_n \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{0}_n]^T.$$

We prove this below for all the elementary linearizations we use in this paper.

THEOREM 2.1. *The generalized standard triple for  $\mathbf{P}(z)$  in the basis  $\Phi$  is given as described above.*

*Proof.* The following proof, which uses an idea of an anonymous referee, is simpler than our original one. For each of the polynomial bases we examine in this paper, the linearization satisfies either

$$(2.23) \quad \mathbf{L}(z) \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{\ell-1}(z)\mathbf{I}_n \\ \phi_{\ell-2}(z)\mathbf{I}_n \\ \vdots \\ \phi_0(z)\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n \\ \mathbf{0}_n \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_n \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}(z),$$

for degree-graded bases, or similar statements for Bernstein bases and Lagrange and Hermite interpolational bases, as follows. For the Bernstein basis, the polynomial elements in the vector on the left are multiples of  $B_j^{\ell-1}(z)$ :  $[\ell/1 \cdot B_{\ell-1}^{\ell-1}(z), \ell/2 \cdot B_{\ell-1}^{\ell-1}(z), \dots, \ell/\ell \cdot B_0^{\ell-1}(z)]^T$ . For the Lagrange basis, the vector on the left is  $[w(z), \ell_0(z), \ell_1(z), \dots, \ell_\ell(z)]^T$ . For the Hermite interpolational basis, it is the same as for the Lagrange but with the Lagrange basis elements replaced with the Hermite interpolational basis elements.

Premultiplying by  $\mathbf{L}^{-1}(z)$  and post-multiplying by  $\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$ , we have

$$(2.24) \quad \mathbf{L}^{-1}(z) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n \\ \mathbf{0}_n \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{\ell-1}(z)\mathbf{I}_n \\ \phi_{\ell-2}(z)\mathbf{I}_n \\ \vdots \\ \phi_0(z)\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z).$$

If  $1 = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} e_k \phi_k(z)$  is the expression of 1 in that basis, then premultiplying both sides by

$$\mathbf{X} = [e_{\ell-1}\mathbf{I}_n \quad e_{\ell-2}\mathbf{I}_n \quad \dots \quad e_0\mathbf{I}_n]$$

gives the theorem. Compare also Remark 1.2 which gives another formula for  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ .

Note that in the Bernstein, Lagrange, and Hermite interpolational cases, 1 can be expressed as a linear combination of the elements given; for Lagrange and Hermite the coefficient of  $w(z)$  is 0. These differences between this and the non degree-graded bases will be brought out in the examples, and the individual proofs. See in particular Equation (4.79) and Equation (4.80) for Bernstein and Lagrange forms, respectively. The Hermite interpolational case is very much like the Lagrange case. In all cases, expressing 1 as a linear combination of elements proves to be crucial.  $\spadesuit$

REMARK 2.2. *There are linearizations not explicitly considered in this paper; for instance, a referee has pointed out that when a matrix polynomial is expressed in a basis where the elements satisfy a linear recurrence, then there is an automatic way to build what is called a CORK linearization. See [20] and [35] for details.*

In what follows we examine specific cases in detail and supply specific proofs for each basis. Indeed, much of the utility of this paper is simply writing down those details, which will allow easier programming for the uses of these generalized standard triples.

**3. Scalar examples of generalized standard triples.** In this section, we tabulate generalized standard triples for four classes of linearizations. We do so by scalar examples, leaving the matrix polynomial case to Section 6. In contrast, in Section 5 where we gave proofs, we do so in full generality.

In the special case  $n = 1$  and when the monomial basis is used, a linearization is usually simplified by dividing by the leading coefficient, making the result monic and the second matrix of the pair just becomes the identity. The remaining matrix is called a “companion matrix” or Frobenius companion<sup>3</sup>. Thus finding roots of a scalar polynomial can be done by finding eigenvalues of the companion matrix. Kublanovskaya calls these “accompanying pencils” in [24]. For bases other than the monomial, the unfortunate nomenclature “colleague matrix” or “comrade matrix” is also used. This nomenclature hinders citation search and we prefer “generalized companion”, if a distinction is needed. See [28].

Construction of a linearization from a companion matrix is, when possible at all, a simple matter of the Kronecker (tensor) product: given  $\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , take  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 = \mathbf{C}_1 \otimes \mathbf{I}_n$  and then replace each block  $p_k \mathbf{I}_n$  with the corresponding matrix coefficient  $\mathbf{P}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$  (the first  $p_k$ , in  $p_k \mathbf{I}_n$ , is the symbolic coefficient from  $p(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} p_k \phi_k(z)$ ; the matrix coefficient  $\mathbf{P}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$  is from  $\mathbf{P}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \mathbf{P}_k \phi_k(z)$ .) This will be clearer by example.

<sup>3</sup>The *Frobenius form* of a matrix is related, but different: see for instance [33].

$\phi_k(z)$	Name	$\alpha_k$	$\beta_k$	$\gamma_k$	$\phi_0$	$\phi_1$
$z^k$	monomial	1	0	0	1	$z$
$(z - a)^k$	shifted monomial	1	$a$	0	1	$z - a$
$(z - a)^k/k!$	Taylor	$n + 1$	$a$	0	1	$z - a$
$\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} (z - \tau_j)$	Newton interpolational	1	$\tau_n$	0	1	$z - \tau_0$
$T_k(z) = \cos(k \cos^{-1}(z))$	Chebyshev	$1/2$	0	$1/2$	1	$z$
$P_k(z)$	Legendre	$(k + 1)/(2k + 1)$	0	$k/(2k + 1)$	1	$z$

TABLE 1

A short list of three-term recurrence relations for some important polynomial bases discussed in Section 3.1. For a more comprehensive list, see *The Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. These relations and others are coded in Walter Gautschi's packages *OPQ* and *SOPQ* [16] and in the *MatrixPolynomialObject* implementation package in Maple (see [21]).

**3.1. Bases with three-term recurrence relations.** The monomial basis, the shifted monomial basis, the Taylor basis, the Newton interpolational bases, and many common orthogonal polynomial bases all have three-term recurrence relations that, except for initial cases, can be written

$$(3.25) \quad z\phi_k(z) = \alpha_k\phi_{k+1}(z) + \beta_k\phi_k(z) + \gamma_k\phi_{k-1}(z).$$

In all cases, we have  $\alpha_k \neq 0$ . For instance, the Chebyshev polynomial recurrence is usually written  $T_{n+1}(z) = 2zT_n(z) - T_{n-1}(z)$  but is easily rewritten in the above form by isolating  $zT_n(z)$ , and all Chebyshev  $\alpha_k = 1/2$  for  $k > 1$ . We give a selection in Table 1, and refer the reader to section 18.9 of the Digital Library of Mathematical Functions ([dlmf.nist.gov](http://dlmf.nist.gov)) for more. See also [16].

For all such bases, we have the linearization<sup>4</sup>

$$(3.26) \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \left[ \begin{array}{c|cccc} \frac{p_5}{\alpha_4} & & & & \\ \hline & 1 & & & \\ & & 1 & & \\ & & & 1 & \\ & & & & 1 \end{array} \right],$$

$$(3.27) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \left[ \begin{array}{c|ccccc} -p_4 + \frac{\beta_4}{\alpha_4}p_5 & -p_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{\alpha_4}p_5 & -p_2 & -p_1 & -p_0 \\ \hline \alpha_3 & \beta_3 & \gamma_3 & & \\ & \alpha_2 & \beta_2 & \gamma_2 & \\ & & \alpha_1 & \beta_1 & \gamma_1 \\ & & & \alpha_0 & \beta_0 \end{array} \right],$$

(remember that  $\alpha_k \neq 0$ ) and

$$(3.28) \quad \mathbf{X} = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1],$$

$$(3.29) \quad \mathbf{Y} = [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]^T.$$

<sup>4</sup>For exposition, we follow Peter Lancaster's dictum, namely that the  $5 \times 5$  case almost always gives the idea.

For instance, a *flipped and transposed* linearization of this class for the Chebyshev case is<sup>5</sup>

$$(3.30) \quad \mathbf{L}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} z & -\frac{1}{2} & & & p_0 \\ -1 & z & -\frac{1}{2} & & p_1 \\ & -\frac{1}{2} & z & -\frac{1}{2} & p_2 \\ & & -\frac{1}{2} & z & p_3 + p_5 \\ & & & -\frac{1}{2} & 2zp_5 + p_4 \end{bmatrix}$$

has flipped and transposed  $\mathbf{X} = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1]$ ,  $\mathbf{Y} = [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]^\top$ . As another instance, a Newton interpolational basis on the nodes  $\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_5$  has a linearization

$$(3.31) \quad z \begin{bmatrix} p_5 & & & & \\ & 1 & & & \\ & & 1 & & \\ & & & 1 & \\ & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} -p_4 + \tau_4 p_5 & -p_3 & -p_2 & -p_1 & -p_0 \\ & 1 & \tau_3 & & \\ & & 1 & \tau_2 & \\ & & & 1 & \tau_1 \\ & & & & 1 & \tau_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The corresponding linearization for matrix polynomials of this grade is

$$(3.32) \quad z \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}_5 & & & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & & \mathbf{I}_n & & \\ & & & \mathbf{I}_n & \\ & & & & \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{P}_4 + \tau_4 \mathbf{P}_5 & -\mathbf{P}_3 & -\mathbf{P}_2 & -\mathbf{P}_1 & -\mathbf{P}_0 \\ & \mathbf{I}_n & \tau_3 \mathbf{I}_n & & \\ & & \mathbf{I}_n & \tau_2 \mathbf{I}_n & \\ & & & \mathbf{I}_n & \tau_1 \mathbf{I}_n \\ & & & & \mathbf{I}_n & \tau_0 \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

**3.2. The Bernstein basis.** The set of polynomials  $\{B_k^\ell(z)\}_{k=0}^\ell = \binom{\ell}{k} z^k (1-z)^{\ell-k}$  is a set of  $\ell + 1$  polynomials each of exact degree  $\ell$  that together forms a basis for polynomials of degree at most  $\ell$  (grade  $\ell$ ). Bernstein polynomials have many applications, for example in Computer Aided Geometric Design (CAGD), and many important properties including that of optimal condition number over all bases positive on  $[0, 1]$ . They do not satisfy a simple three term recurrence relation of the form discussed in Section 3.1, although they satisfy an interesting and useful “degree-elevation” recurrence, namely

$$(3.33) \quad (j+1)B_{j+1}^n(z) + (n-j)B_j^n(z) = nB_j^{n-1}(z),$$

which specifically demonstrates that a sum of Bernstein polynomials of degree  $n$  might actually have degree strictly less than  $n$ . See [12], [13], and [14] for more details of Bernstein bases.

---

<sup>5</sup>For the matrix polynomial case, each  $\mathbf{P}_k$  would be transposed. If we had started with  $\mathbf{P}^T(z)$  then by flipping and transposing we get back to a linearization for  $\mathbf{P}$ .

A Bernstein linearization for  $p_5(z) = \sum_{k=0}^5 p_k B_k^5(z)$  is

$$(3.34) \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -p_4 + \frac{1}{5}p_5 & -p_3 & -p_2 & -p_1 & -p_0 \\ 1 & \frac{2}{4} & & & \\ & 1 & \frac{3}{3} & & \\ & & 1 & \frac{4}{2} & \\ & & & 1 & \frac{5}{1} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(3.35) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -p_4 & -p_3 & -p_2 & -p_1 & -p_0 \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & & \\ & & 1 & 0 & \\ & & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(3.36) \quad \mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{5}{5} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(3.37) \quad \mathbf{Y} = [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]^T.$$

For a construction of the  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  that show this is a linearization, see [2]. This is a *strong* linearization, as we will explicitly see shortly. We have  $p^{-1}(z) = \mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$  if  $p(z) \neq 0$ . This linearization was first analyzed in [22] and [23] and has been further studied and generalized in [29]. One of the present authors independently invented and implemented a version of this linearization in Maple (except using  $\mathbf{P}^T(z)$ , and flipped from the above form) in about 2004. For a review of Bernstein linearizations, see the aforementioned [29]. For a proof of their numerical stability, see the original thesis [22]. The standard triple is, we believe, new to this paper.

**3.2.1. A new reversal.** As a further novelty, we here advocate a slightly different *reversal*, namely  $\text{rev } p(z) = (z+1)^n p(1/(z+1))$  of a polynomial of degree at most  $n$  expressed in a Bernstein basis, instead of the standard reversal  $z^n p(1/z)$ . This new reversal has a slight numerical advantage if all the coefficients of  $p(z)$  are the same sign. We also give a proof that the linearization of this reversal is the corresponding reversal of the linearization, thus giving a new independent proof that the linearization is a strong one.

A short computation shows that if

$$(3.38) \quad p(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n c_k B_k^n(z)$$

then

$$(3.39) \quad \text{rev } p(z) = (z+1)^n p\left(\frac{1}{z+1}\right) = \sum_{k=0}^n d_k B_k^n(z)$$

where

$$(3.40) \quad d_k = \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j}_{12} c_{n-j},$$

whereas the coefficients of the standard reversal are, in contrast,

$$(3.41) \quad e_k = \sum_{m=0}^{n-k} (-1)^m \binom{n-k}{m} c_{n-m-k}$$

which has introduced sign changes, which may fail to preserve numerical stability if all the  $c_k$  are of one sign. A further observation is that the coefficient  $d_0$  only involves  $c_n$ , while  $e_0$  involves all  $c_k$ ;  $d_1$  involves  $c_n$  and  $c_{n-1}$  while  $e_1$  involves all but  $c_0$ , and so on; in that sense, this new reversal has a more analogous behaviour to the monomial basis reversal, which simply reverses the list of coefficients.

For interest, we note that if  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$  is a linearization for  $p(z)$  so that  $p(z) = \det(z\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})$ , then reversing the linearization by this transformation is not a matter of simply interchanging  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$ :

$$(3.42) \quad \begin{aligned} (z+1)^n p\left(\frac{1}{z+1}\right) &= (z+1)^n \det\left(\frac{1}{z+1}\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}\right) \\ &= \det(\mathbf{B} - (z+1)\mathbf{A}) \\ &= \det(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} - z\mathbf{A}) \end{aligned}$$

and so the corresponding reversed linearization is  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})$ . The sign change is of no importance.

Suppose that the Bernstein linearization of  $p(z)$  is  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$  and that the Bernstein linearization of  $\text{rev } p(z)$  is  $(\mathbf{A}_R, \mathbf{B}_R)$ . That is, the matrices  $\mathbf{A}_R$  and  $\mathbf{B}_R$  have the same form as that of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ , but where  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$  contains  $c_k$ s the matrices  $(\mathbf{A}_R, \mathbf{B}_R)$  contains  $d_k$ s. To give a new proof that the Bernstein linearization is actually a strong linearization, then, we must find a pair of unimodular matrices  $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$  which have  $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}_R\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{B}_R\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{A}$ , valid for all choices of coefficients  $c_k$  (which determine the corresponding reversed coefficients  $d_k$  by the formula above).

Strictly speaking, such a proof is not necessary because the strength of this linearization has been proved elsewhere already, but for surety and because this reversal is unusual here is an outline of the proof.

First, it simplifies matters not to deal with  $\mathbf{V}$  but rather with  $\mathbf{V}^{-1}$ . Then, our defining conditions become

$$(3.43) \quad \mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}_R = (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{V}^{-1}$$

$$(3.44) \quad \mathbf{U}\mathbf{B}_R = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}^{-1},$$

which are linear in the unknowns (the entries of  $\mathbf{U}$  and of  $\mathbf{V}^{-1}$ ). By inspection of the first few dimensions, we find that  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}^{-1}$  have the following form (using the six-by-six case, for variation, to demonstrate). The anti-diagonal of the general  $\mathbf{U}$  has entries  $-(n-i+1)/i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

$$(3.45) \quad \mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{5}{2} & u_{2,6} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{4}{3} & u_{3,5} & u_{3,6} \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{3}{1\frac{1}{2}} & u_{4,4} & u_{4,5} & u_{4,6} \\ 0 & -\frac{2}{5} & u_{5,3} & u_{5,4} & u_{5,5} & u_{5,6} \\ -\frac{1}{6} & u_{6,2} & u_{6,3} & u_{6,4} & u_{6,5} & u_{6,6} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(3.46) \quad \mathbf{V}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Lambda_{1,5} & \Lambda_{1,6} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Lambda_{2,4} & \Lambda_{2,5} & \Lambda_{2,6} \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda_{3,3} & \Lambda_{3,4} & \Lambda_{3,5} & \Lambda_{3,6} \\ 0 & \Lambda_{4,2} & \Lambda_{4,3} & \Lambda_{4,4} & \Lambda_{4,5} & \Lambda_{4,6} \\ \Lambda_{5,1} & \Lambda_{5,2} & \Lambda_{5,3} & \Lambda_{5,4} & \Lambda_{5,5} & \Lambda_{5,6} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

It is an interesting exercise to derive the explicit general formulae

$$(3.47) \quad u_{i,j} = - \left( \frac{n-i+1}{i} \right) \binom{i}{n+1-j} \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n$$

$$(3.48) \quad \Lambda_{i,j} = - \left( \frac{n-i}{j} \right) \binom{i}{n-j} \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$$

$$(3.49) \quad \Lambda_{i,n} = d_i - \frac{n-i}{n} c_n,$$

and to prove that these are not only *necessary* for the equations above, but also *sufficient*. As a quick sketch of how to do it, the matrix  $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}$  is diagonal and gives a direct relationship between the triangular block in  $\mathbf{V}^{-1}$  and a corresponding portion of  $\mathbf{U}$ ; the other equation gives a recurrence relation for the entries of  $\mathbf{U}$ . Comparison of the final columns of the products gives an explicit formula for the final column of  $\mathbf{V}^{-1}$  and an explicit formula for the entries of  $\mathbf{U}$  by comparison of the coefficients of the symbols  $c_k$ ; this formula can be seen to verify the recurrence relation found earlier, closing the circle and establishing sufficiency. Both matrices  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  have determinant  $\pm 1$ :  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  row-permutations brings  $\mathbf{U}$  to upper triangular form and the determinant  $(-1)^n$  (times  $(-1)^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ ) can be read off as the product of the formerly anti-diagonal elements, and similarly for the upper block of  $\mathbf{V}^{-1}$  which has one dimension less giving  $(-1)^{n-1+\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor}$ .

Expansion to the matrix polynomial case merely requires the appropriate tensor product.

**3.3. The Lagrange interpolational basis.** There are by now several Lagrange basis linearizations. The use of barycentric forms means that Lagrange interpolation is efficient and numerically stable and is increasing in popularity [4]. Here is the definition of the first barycentric form for interpolation of polynomials of degree at most  $\ell$  on the  $\ell + 1$  distinct nodes  $\tau_k \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq \ell$ . Take the partial fraction decomposition of the reciprocal of the node polynomial

$$(3.50) \quad w(z) = \prod_{k=0}^{\ell} (z - \tau_k),$$

namely

$$(3.51) \quad \frac{1}{w(z)} = \sum_{k \neq 0}^{\ell} \frac{\beta_k}{z - \tau_k}$$

where the coefficients  $\beta_k$  occurring in the partial fraction decomposition are called the *barycentric weights*. A well-known explicit formula for the  $\beta_k$  is

$$(3.52) \quad \beta_k = \prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq k}}^{\ell} (\tau_k - \tau_j)^{-1}.$$

The Lagrange basis polynomials are normally written

$$(3.53) \quad \ell_k(z) = \beta_k \prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq k}}^{\ell} (z - \tau_j).$$

For many sets of nodes (Chebyshev nodes on  $[-1, 1]$ , or roots of unity on the unit disk), the resulting interpolant is also well-conditioned, and can even be “better than optimal” [10], see also [6]. The linearization we use here is “too large” and has (numerically harmless in our experience) spurious roots at infinity<sup>6</sup>; for alternative formulations, see [35], [30]. Then, the linearization is  $z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$  where

$$(3.54) \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & \\ & & & 1 & & \\ & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(3.55) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\rho_0 & -\rho_1 & -\rho_2 & -\rho_3 & -\rho_4 \\ \beta_0 & \tau_0 & & & & \\ \beta_1 & & \tau_1 & & & \\ \beta_2 & & & \tau_2 & & \\ \beta_3 & & & & \tau_3 & \\ \beta_4 & & & & & \tau_4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  demonstrating that this is indeed a linearization can be found in [2] but because we will need them for the Hermite interpolational linearization shortly, we introduce some here:

$$(3.56) \quad \mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n & -\rho \mathbf{D}^{-1} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I}_{N-n} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(3.57) \quad \mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} w(z)\mathbf{I}_n & 0 \\ \phi(z) \otimes \mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{D}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here  $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(z - \tau_0, z - \tau_1, \dots, z - \tau_\ell)$ ,  $\phi(z) = [\ell_0(z), \ell_1(z), \dots, \ell_\ell(z)]^T$  which is also (in the Lagrange case) related to  $w(z)$  and the  $\beta_k$  by  $\ell_k(z) = \beta_k w(z)/(z - \tau_k)$ . Thus,  $\det \mathbf{E} = 1$  and  $\det \mathbf{F} = 1$  (except

---

<sup>6</sup>This numerical harmlessness needs some explanation. In brief, Lagrange basis matrix polynomial eigenvalues will be well-conditioned only in a compact region determined by the interpolation nodes, and are increasingly ill-conditioned towards infinity; in practice this means only small changes in the data are needed to perturb large finite ill-conditioned eigenvalues out to infinity. Any eigenvalues produced numerically that are well outside the region determined by the interpolation nodes are likely easily perturbed all the way to infinity, and can be safely ignored.

at nodes  $z = \tau_k$ , but we recover the constant by continuity). Multiplying out, we have  $\mathbf{E}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)\mathbf{F} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}(z), \mathbf{I}_n, \dots, \mathbf{I}_n)$ . It is amusing that  $\mathbf{P}(z)$  comes out exactly in the first barycentric form,  $\mathbf{P}(z) = w(z) \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \beta_k \rho_k / (z - \tau_k)$ .

Then,  $\det(\tau_k \mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0) = \det(\rho_k) = \rho_k$ , where  $0 \leq k \leq 4$  and  $\deg(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0) \leq 4$ . Thus,  $p(z) = \det(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)$  interpolates the given data, assuming the  $\tau_k$  are distinct. The  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  for the standard triple are

$$(3.58) \quad \mathbf{X} = [0 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1] ,$$

$$(3.59) \quad \mathbf{Y} = [1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0]^T .$$

Notice in this case that for the linearization  $N = (\ell + 2)n$  while  $\deg p \leq \ell$ , and therefore, there are at least  $2n$  eigenvalues at infinity. This can be inconvenient if  $n$  is at all large.

**3.4. Hermite interpolational basis.** The Lagrange linearization of the previous section has been extended to Hermite interpolational bases, where some of the nodes have “flowed together”, collapsing to fewer distinct nodes<sup>7</sup>.

We suppose that at each remaining distinct node  $\tau_i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq N - 1$ , say, there are now  $s_i \geq 1$  consecutive pieces of information known, namely  $\mathbf{P}(\tau_i)$ ,  $\mathbf{P}'(\tau_i)/1!$ ,  $\mathbf{P}''(\tau_i)/2!$ , and so on up to the last one, the value of the  $s_i - 1$ -th derivative at  $z = \tau_i$ , namely  $\mathbf{P}^{(s_i-1)}(\tau_i)/(s_i - 1)!$ . The integer  $s_i$  is called the *confluency* of the node. The known pieces of information are the local Taylor coefficients of the polynomial fitting the data:

$$(3.60) \quad \rho_{i,j} = \frac{f^{(j)}(\tau_i)}{j!} , \quad 0 \leq j \leq s_i - 1 .$$

This gives  $1 + \ell = \sum s_i$  pieces of information, determining a polynomial of degree at most  $\ell$ . The barycentric weights, this time doubly indexed as  $\beta_{i,j}$ , are again computed from the partial fraction decomposition of the reciprocal of the node polynomial

$$(3.61) \quad \frac{1}{w(z)} = \frac{1}{\prod_{i=0}^{N-1} (z - \tau_i)^{s_i}} = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{s_i-1} \frac{\beta_{i,j}}{(z - \tau_i)^{j+1}} .$$

For evaluation of the interpolating polynomial, one should use the first or second barycentric form; see [8] for details. For theoretical work with the Hermite interpolational bases, however, we can define

$$(3.62) \quad H_{i,j}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{s_i-1-j} \beta_{i,j+k} w(z) (z - \tau_i)^{-k-1} .$$

These polynomials, each of degree at most  $\ell$ , form a basis (a Hermite interpolational basis, to distinguish from the Hermite orthogonal polynomials) for polynomials of degree at most  $\ell$ ; moreover, they generalize the Lagrange property in that only one Taylor coefficient at only one node is 1 and all the rest are zero.

Note that the derivative  $\mathbf{P}'(z)$  of a matrix polynomial is a straightforward extension to matrices of the ordinary derivative. It is isomorphic to the matrix with entries that are the ordinary derivatives of the original matrix.

<sup>7</sup>A formal definition can be found in [8], for instance. The essential idea is that given two distinct pieces of data  $(\tau_k, p(\tau_k))$  and  $(\tau_{k+1}, p(\tau_{k+1}))$ , we also know the forward difference  $(p_{k+1} - p_k)/(\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k)$ . In the limit as one node approaches (flows towards) the other, we still know two pieces of information:  $p(\tau_k)$  and  $p'(\tau_k)$ . Hermite interpolation captures this idea.

The linearization of the previous section changes to the following elegant form. The matrix  $\mathbf{C}_1$  is unchanged,

$$(3.63) \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ & 1 & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & \\ & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

being  $(\ell + 2)$  by  $(\ell + 2)$  as before. The matrix  $\mathbf{C}_0$  changes, picking up transposed Jordan-like blocks for each distinct node. For instance, suppose we have two distinct nodes,  $\tau_0$  and  $\tau_1$ . Suppose further that  $\tau_0$  has confluency  $s_0 = 3$  while  $\tau_1$  has confluency  $s_1 = 2$ . This means that we know  $f(\tau_0)$ ,  $f'(\tau_0)/1!$ ,  $f''(\tau_0)/2!$ ,  $f(\tau_1)$  and  $f'(\tau_1)/1!$ . Then,

$$(3.64) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -f''(\tau_0)/2! & -f'(\tau_0)/1! & -f(\tau_0) & -f'(\tau_1)/1! & -f(\tau_1) \\ \beta_{02} & \tau_0 & & & & \\ \beta_{01} & 1 & \tau_0 & & & \\ \beta_{00} & & 1 & \tau_0 & & \\ \beta_{11} & & & & \tau_1 & \\ \beta_{10} & & & & 1 & \tau_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note the reverse ordering of the derivative values in this formulation.

The matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  demonstrating that this is indeed a linearization have, so far as we know, not been noted in the literature. They are exactly the same as for the Lagrange basis, Equations (3.56) and (3.57), with appropriately modified meanings for  $\phi$  and  $\mathbf{D}$ . The new  $\phi$  contains the Hermite interpolational bases in Equation (3.62), and now  $\mathbf{D}$  is not diagonal, but rather block diagonal with the transposed Jordan-like blocks above. Both matrices are still unimodular. Again we have  $\mathbf{E}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)\mathbf{F} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}(z), \mathbf{I}_n, \dots, \mathbf{I}_n)$ .

For the standard triple, take in the scalar case

$$(3.65) \quad \mathbf{Y} = [1 \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0]^T$$

but for  $\mathbf{X}$  take the coefficients of the expansion of the polynomial 1 in this particular Hermite interpolational basis: it is equal to 1 at each node but has all derivatives zero at each node. That is, put

$$(3.66) \quad \begin{cases} \rho_{ij} = 1 & \text{if } j = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and sort them in order:

$$(3.67) \quad \mathbf{X} = [0 \quad \rho_{0,s_0-1} \quad \rho_{0,s_0-2} \quad \dots \quad \rho_{0,0} \quad \rho_{1,s_1-1} \quad \dots \quad \rho_{n,0}].$$

For the earlier instance (two nodes, of confluency 3 and 2, respectively),

$$(3.68) \quad \mathbf{X} = [0 \quad \underbrace{0 \quad 0 \quad 1}_{\text{for } \tau_0} \quad \underbrace{0 \quad 1}_{\text{for } \tau_1}].$$

Then,

$$(3.69) \quad p^{-1}(z) = \mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y}.$$

REMARK 3.1. We may re-order the nodes in any fashion we like, and each ordering generates its own linearization (both Hermite and Lagrange). We may also find a linearization where the confluent data is ordered  $p(\tau_i)$ ,  $p'(\tau_i)/1!$ ,  $p''(\tau_i)/2!$ , etc., although we have not done so.

If there is just one node of confluency  $\ell$ , we recover the standard Frobenius companion (plus two infinite roots):

$$(3.70) \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & 1 & & \\ & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -p_{\ell-1} & -p_{\ell-2} & \cdots & -p_1 & -p_0 \\ 1 & \tau_0 & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & \tau_0 & & & \\ 0 & & 1 & \ddots & & \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \tau_0 & \\ 0 & & & & 1 & \tau_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here,  $p_k = p^{(k)}(\tau_0)/k!$  is the ordinary coefficient in the expansion  $p(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} p_k(z - \tau_0)^k$ . The numerical stability of these Hermite interpolational linearization has been studied briefly [25] but much remains unknown. We confine ourselves in this paper to the study of the standard triple.

To make a linearization for matrix polynomials out of these scalar linearizations, take the Kronecker tensor product with  $\mathbf{I}_n$ , and insert the appropriate matrix polynomial values and derivative values.

REMARK 3.2. The modified linearizations of [35] also have standard triples that can be used for algebraic linearization, and arguably should be tabled here as well. They have the advantage of including fewer eigenvalues at infinity, or no spurious eigenvalues at infinity, which may lead to better algebraic linearizations. However, they are more involved, and we have less numerical experience with them. In particular, we do not understand their dependence on the ordering of the nodes, and so we leave their analysis to a future study.

#### 4. Strict Equivalence of Generalized Standard Triples.

THEOREM 4.1. If  $\phi_k(z)$  for  $0 \leq k \leq \ell$  is one of the degree-graded polynomial bases (e.g. Chebyshev, Newton, Jacobi) then the linearization for a polynomial  $p(z)$  expressed in that basis is strictly equivalent to the second linearization for the same polynomial expressed in the monomial basis. That is, there exist unimodular matrices  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  for which  $\mathbf{C}_{1,m} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{C}_{1,\phi}\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{0,m} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{C}_{0,\phi}\mathbf{V}$ . The matrix  $\mathbf{U}$  will depend on the given polynomial  $p(z)$ . Here the subscript  $m$  is short for “monomial”.

*Proof.* Denote the change-of-bases matrix for polynomials up to degree  $\ell - 1$  by  $\Phi$ . This matrix is  $\ell$  by  $\ell$ . Then we have

$$(4.71) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{\ell-1}(z) \\ \phi_{\ell-2}(z) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_1(z) \\ \phi_0(z) \end{bmatrix} = \Phi \begin{bmatrix} z^{\ell-1} \\ \vdots \\ z^2 \\ z \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In all cases considered here, the linearization for a polynomial  $p(z)$  of exact degree  $\ell$  has null vectors of the

form

$$(4.72) \quad \mathbf{N} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{\ell-1}(\lambda) \\ \phi_{\ell-2}(\lambda) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_1(\lambda) \\ \phi_0(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $\lambda$  is a root of  $p(z)$ . That is,

$$(4.73) \quad (\lambda \mathbf{C}_{1,\phi} - \mathbf{C}_{0,\phi}) \mathbf{N} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Using the  $\Phi$  formula above, we have  $\mathbf{V} = \Phi$ . By direct computation, we find that  $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{C}_{0,m} \Phi^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{0,\phi}^{-1}$  necessarily giving  $\mathbf{U} \mathbf{C}_{0,\phi} \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{C}_{0,m}$ . Since  $\mathbf{V} = \Phi$  is unimodular, all that remains is to show that  $\mathbf{U}$  is unimodular, and that it satisfies  $\mathbf{U} \mathbf{C}_{1,\phi} \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{C}_{1,m}$  as well. Since  $\mathbf{C}_{1,m}$  (which corresponds to the monomial basis) is the identity matrix except for the 1, 1 entry which is  $a_\ell \neq 0$ , the leading coefficient of the polynomial, this last is straightforward. Indeed, the action of premultiplying by  $\mathbf{C}_{0,m}$  and postmultiplying by  $\mathbf{C}_{0,\phi}^{-1}$  cancels the coefficient  $a_\ell$  in the 1, 1 entry of  $\mathbf{U}$ , and thus by continuity this construction works even if  $a_\ell = 0$ , that is for polynomials of grade  $\ell$ . Then since  $\Phi$  is upper triangular for degree-graded matrices and lower triangular for Bernstein matrices, and  $\mathbf{U}$  has in that case zeros in the first column below the diagonal entry,  $\mathbf{U}$  is unimodular.

To make this work for regular matrix polynomials of dimension  $n$ , we must use the tensor product  $\Phi \otimes \mathbf{I}_n$ .

We illustrate this proof with a four by four example in the Bernstein basis, which has somewhat contrasting behaviour. If  $p(z) = a_0 B_0^4(z) + a_1 B_1^4(z) + a_2 B_2^4(z) + a_3 B_3^4(z) + a_4 B_4^4(z)$ , then

$$(4.74) \quad \mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{4} a_0 - a_1 + \frac{3}{2} a_2 & -\frac{1}{6} a_0 + \frac{2}{3} a_1 & \frac{1}{4} a_0 \\ 0 & 1/4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/4 & 1/6 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/4 & 1/3 & 1/4 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(4.75) \quad \mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -6 & 6 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & -8 & 4 & 0 \\ -1 & 3 & -3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Direct computation shows that both matrices are nonsingular irrespective of the values of the  $a_k$ , and that these transform the Bernstein linearization

$$(4.76) \quad \mathbf{C}_{0,\text{Bernstein}} = \begin{bmatrix} -a_3 & -a_2 & -a_1 & -a_0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(4.77) \quad \mathbf{C}_{1,\text{Bernstein}} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{a_4}{4} - a_3 & -a_2 & -a_1 & -a_0 \\ 1 & 2/3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 3/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$$

to

$$(4.78) \quad \mathbf{C}_{0,\text{monomial}} = \begin{bmatrix} -b_3 & -b_2 & -b_1 & -b_0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

with  $-b_3 = 4a_0 - 12a_1 + 12a_2 - 4a_3$ ,  $-b_2 = -6a_0 + 12a_1 - 6a_2$ ,  $-b_1 = 4a_0 - 4a_1$ , and  $-b_0 = -a_0$ . Also,  $\mathbf{UC}_{1,\text{Bernstein}}\mathbf{V}$  becomes the identity matrix except the 1, 1 entry is  $b_4 = a_0 - 4a_1 + 6a_2 - 4a_3 + a_4$ . These are the correct coefficients of the same polynomial expressed in the monomial basis.

Now, the vector  $\mathbf{N}$  used in the second proof of Theorem 2.1 is not here composed of Bernstein basis elements up to the index  $\ell - 1$ , but rather is composed of *multiples* of Bernstein basis elements of order  $\ell - 1$ , which happen to be some of the Bernstein basis elements of order  $\ell$ , divided by  $1 - z$ . Here, where the Bernstein basis of order three gives elements  $z^3$ ,  $3z^2(1 - z)$ ,  $3z(1 - z)^2$ ,  $(1 - z)^3$ ,

$$(4.79) \quad \mathbf{N} = \begin{bmatrix} 4z^3 \\ 6z^2(1 - z) \\ 4z(1 - z)^2 \\ (1 - z)^3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The ratios of these to the lower-degree Bernstein basis are  $4/1$ ,  $4/2$ ,  $4/3$ , and  $4/4$ . This gives the detail needed for the proof of our general main theorem, Theorem 2.1, in the case of Bernstein bases.

**4.1. The Lagrange interpolational case.** As is usual, we denote a Lagrange basis element on the distinct nodes  $[\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_\ell]$  by  $\ell_k(z) = \beta_k \prod_{j \neq k} (z - \tau_j)$ . The use of the symbol  $\ell$  by itself denotes an integer, namely the grade of the polynomial; the distinction is that  $\ell$  with a subscript and a variable  $\ell_j(z)$  denotes a Lagrange basis polynomial. This should not cause confusion.

REMARK 4.2. *Many people think of “interpolation” as meaning the construction of a monomial basis polynomial  $p(z) = a_\ell z^\ell + \dots + a_0$  that fits the given data  $p(\tau_k) = \rho_k$  for  $0 \leq k \leq \ell$ . This is naive. Interpolation truly means constructing a polynomial in any basis that we may use to evaluate  $p(z)$  for  $z$  different to the values at the nodes. A very stable and convenient way to do this is by the barycentric form of Lagrange interpolants [4]. Constructing an interpolant in a Newton basis by using divided differences or the monomial basis by using a Vandermonde matrix is changing the basis. Changing bases can have condition number exponential in the degree, and is usually a bad idea. In practice, we use the barycentric form [4]. For the purposes of proof of equivalence, we here occasionally use the Vandermonde matrix, and we think about the explicit construction of the monomial basis. This is not used in numerical practice.*

**THEOREM 4.3.** *If  $\phi_k(z)$  for  $0 \leq k \leq \ell$  is a Lagrange basis on distinct nodes  $\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_\ell$ , then the  $\ell + 2$  by  $\ell + 2$  linearization for a polynomial  $p(z)$  expressed in that basis is strictly equivalent to what is called the second standard linearization in [17] for same polynomial expressed in the monomial basis but regarded as having grade  $\ell + 2$  (i.e. with zero coefficients padding the terms  $z^{\ell+2}$  and  $z^{\ell+1}$ ). That is, there exist unimodular matrices  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  for which  $\mathbf{C}_{1,\phi} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{C}_{1,m}\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{0,\phi} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{C}_{0,m}\mathbf{V}$ , where now the matrices in the second standard linearization have dimension larger by two than needed for the exact degree. The matrix  $\mathbf{U}$  will depend on the given polynomial  $p(z)$ .*

*Proof.* For the Lagrange basis linearization, the right null vector is not of the form indicated in the proof of Theorem 2.1, but rather of the form

$$(4.80) \quad \mathbf{N} = \begin{bmatrix} w(\lambda) \\ \ell_0(\lambda) \\ \ell_1(\lambda) \\ \vdots \\ \ell_\ell(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here,  $w(z) = \prod_{k=0}^{\ell} (z - \tau_k)$  is of degree  $\ell + 1$  and all the other entries, being elements of the Lagrange basis on  $\ell + 1$  nodes, are of degree  $\ell$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{\Phi}$  is dimension  $\ell + 2$  by  $\ell + 2$  and has first column  $e_1$ ; that is, 1 in the first entry and zeros below it. The rest of the first row contains the coefficients of  $w(z)$  expanded in the monomial basis. The remaining rows of  $\mathbf{\Phi}$  contain the coefficients of the monomial expansions of the Lagrange basis polynomial; that is, the inverse of the transposed Vandermonde matrix, which relates the Lagrange interpolation basis to the monomial basis. Call that block  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}$ . Explicitly,

$$(4.81) \quad \hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_0^\ell & \tau_1^\ell & \cdots & \tau_\ell^\ell \\ \tau_0^{\ell-1} & \tau_1^{\ell-1} & \cdots & \tau_\ell^{\ell-1} \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ \tau_0 & \tau_1 & \cdots & \tau_\ell \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then  $\mathbf{U}$  is straightforwardly seen to be  $\text{diag}(1, \hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{-1})$  and as in the degree-graded case  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Phi}$ . Further,  $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{C}_{0,\phi}\mathbf{V}$  has as its first row  $[0, -\rho\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}]$ . But  $\rho\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}$  is by the Vandermonde matrix simply the negative of the vector of monomial coefficients,  $-[0, a_{\ell-1}, a_{\ell-2}, \dots, a_0]$ . More, the block underneath, namely  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{-1}\text{diag}(\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_\ell)\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}$  turns out to be simple because

$$(4.82) \quad \hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{-1}\text{diag}(\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_\ell) = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_0^{\ell+1} & \tau_1^{\ell+1} & \cdots & \tau_\ell^{\ell+1} \\ \tau_0^\ell & \tau_1^\ell & \cdots & \tau_\ell^\ell \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ \tau_0^2 & \tau_1^2 & \cdots & \tau_\ell^2 \\ \tau_0 & \tau_1 & \cdots & \tau_\ell \end{bmatrix}$$

Multiplying this by  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}$  shifts the identity matrix down one diagonal, giving the correct form for the second standard linearization matrix  $\mathbf{C}_{0,m}$ .

As in the previous theorem, to construct  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  for  $n$ -dimensional regular matrix polynomials, we must take the tensor product  $\mathbf{\Phi} \otimes \mathbf{I}$ . ‡

Again, we illustrate this proof with an example, this time of interpolation at the four points  $[-1, -1/2, 1/2, 1]$ . This will give rise to a polynomial of degree at most 3. If the values this polynomial takes at these four points are  $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2$ , and  $\rho_3$ , then the equivalent polynomial expressed in the monomial basis has coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_0 &= -1/6 \rho_0 + 2/3 \rho_1 + 2/3 \rho_2 - 1/6 \rho_3 \\
 a_1 &= 1/6 \rho_0 - 4/3 \rho_1 + 4/3 \rho_2 - 1/6 \rho_3 \\
 a_2 &= 2/3 \rho_0 - 2/3 \rho_1 - 2/3 \rho_2 + 2/3 \rho_3 \\
 a_3 &= 2/3 \rho_3 - 4/3 \rho_2 + 4/3 \rho_1 - 2/3 \rho_0 .
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.83}$$

Expressing this as a polynomial of grade 5, that is  $p(z) = 0 \cdot z^5 + 0 \cdot z^4 + a_3 z^3 + a_2 z^2 + a_1 z + a_0$ , we get the second standard linearization

$$\mathbf{C}_{0,\text{monomial}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -a_3 & -a_2 & -a_1 & -a_0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
 \tag{4.84}$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}_{1,\text{monomial}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} .
 \tag{4.85}$$

The Lagrange basis linearization of [10], which admittedly has two extra infinite eigenvalues, is

$$\mathbf{C}_{0,\text{Lagrange}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\rho_3 & -\rho_2 & -\rho_1 & -\rho_0 \\ 2/3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -4/3 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 4/3 & 0 & 0 & -1/2 & 0 \\ -2/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}
 \tag{4.86}$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}_{1,\text{Lagrange}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} .
 \tag{4.87}$$

For these interpolation nodes, direct computation shows

$$(4.88) \quad \mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1/8 & -1/8 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1/4 & 1/4 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1/2 & -1/2 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(4.89) \quad \mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -5/4 & 0 & 1/4 \\ 0 & 2/3 & 2/3 & -1/6 & -1/6 \\ 0 & -4/3 & -2/3 & 4/3 & 2/3 \\ 0 & 4/3 & -2/3 & -4/3 & 2/3 \\ 0 & -2/3 & 2/3 & 1/6 & -1/6 \end{bmatrix}.$$

**5. Schur complement-based proofs.** In Section 2, we gave two short universal proofs of all the theorems in this section. Each individual proof in this section is therefore redundant. We include them here both for surety (thus giving a third proof of each theorem) and because they give insight and may be relevant to any numerical analysis. We will use the Schur complement, in the following form: assuming a matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  is partitioned into

$$(5.90) \quad \mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ ,  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times (N-r)}$ ,  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{C}^{(N-r) \times r}$  and  $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{C}^{(N-r) \times (N-r)}$  is assumed invertible, then

$$(5.91) \quad \mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{BD}^{-1} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BD}^{-1}\mathbf{C} & 0 \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If further the Schur complement  $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BD}^{-1}\mathbf{C}$  is invertible, then

$$(5.92) \quad \mathbf{R}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BD}^{-1}\mathbf{C})^{-1} & -(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BD}^{-1}\mathbf{C})^{-1}\mathbf{BD}^{-1} \\ -\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BD}^{-1}\mathbf{C})^{-1} & \mathbf{D}^{-1} + \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BD}^{-1}\mathbf{C})^{-1}\mathbf{BD}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

as can be verified by block multiplication by  $\mathbf{R}$ . We will use  $\mathbf{S}$  for the Schur complement  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BD}^{-1}\mathbf{C}$ . We will take  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{L}(z) = z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$ . We may already use this to establish for each of the four classes of linearizations that

$$(5.93) \quad \det \mathbf{R} = \det(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0) = \det(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BD}^{-1}\mathbf{C}) \det \mathbf{D} = \det \mathbf{P}(z).$$

Notice that the coefficients of  $\mathbf{P}$  do not appear in the  $\mathbf{D}$  block (in any of our linearizations). Thus, the Schur complement carries all the information particular to  $\mathbf{P}(z)$ . The computations verifying (5.93) are not obvious but in each case  $\mathbf{D}^{-1}$  plays an important role. We will see that generically  $\mathbf{D}^{-1}$  exists, except for isolated values of  $z$ , which we can safely ignore and recover later by continuity. We take each case in turn.

THEOREM 5.1. If  $\mathbf{C}_1 = \text{diag} \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \mathbf{P}_\ell \quad \mathbf{I}_n \quad \mathbf{I}_n \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{I}_n \right]$  and

$$(5.94) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \left[ \begin{array}{c|cccc} \frac{\beta_{\ell-1}}{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \mathbf{P}_\ell - \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1} & \frac{\gamma_{\ell-1}}{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \mathbf{P}_\ell - \mathbf{P}_{\ell-2} & -\mathbf{P}_{\ell-1} & \cdots & -\mathbf{P}_0 \\ \alpha_{\ell-2} \mathbf{I}_\ell & \beta_{\ell-2} \mathbf{I}_n & \gamma_{\ell-2} \mathbf{I}_n & & \\ & \alpha_{\ell-3} \mathbf{I}_n & \beta_{\ell-3} \mathbf{I}_n & \gamma_{\ell-3} \mathbf{I}_n & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \gamma_1 \mathbf{I}_n \\ & & & \alpha_0 \mathbf{I}_n & \beta_0 \mathbf{I}_n \end{array} \right]$$

and  $\mathbf{X} = [0 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ \mathbf{I}_n]$  and  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{I}_n \ 0 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0]$  then  $\mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$  where  $\mathbf{P}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \mathbf{P}_k \phi_k(z)$  except for such  $z$  that  $\det \mathbf{P}(z) = 0$ . As in Section 3.1 the polynomials  $\phi_k(z)$  satisfy  $z\phi_k = \alpha_k \phi_{k+1} + \beta_k \phi_k + \gamma_k \phi_{k-1}$ ,  $\phi_{-1} = 0$ ,  $\phi_0 = 1$ ,  $\phi_1 = (z - \beta_0)/\alpha_0$ . In this theorem,  $\ell \geq 2$  and  $N = \ell n$ , and if  $\mathbf{P}_\ell \neq 0_n$  then  $\deg \mathbf{P} = \ell$ .

This is a linearization is well-known; see e.g. [3]. We only prove  $\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z) = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$ , here.

*Proof.* We use the first block column of Schur complement inverse formula

$$(5.95) \quad \mathbf{R}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}^{-1} & * \\ -\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{S}^{-1} & * \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here,

$$(5.96) \quad \mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} (z - \beta_{\ell-2})\mathbf{I}_n & -\gamma_{\ell-2}\mathbf{I}_n & & & & \\ -\alpha_{\ell-3}\mathbf{I}_n & (z - \beta_{\ell-3})\mathbf{I}_n & -\gamma_{\ell-3}\mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & -\alpha_{\ell-4}\mathbf{I}_n & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & & \ddots & -\gamma_1\mathbf{I}_n \\ & & & & -\alpha_0\mathbf{I}_n & (z - \beta_0)\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

is block tridiagonal, and

$$(5.97) \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha_{\ell-2}\mathbf{I}_n \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By inspection,  $\mathbf{V} = -\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}$  is

$$(5.98) \quad \mathbf{V} = q \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{\ell-2}(z)\mathbf{I}_n \\ \vdots \\ \phi_2(z)\mathbf{I}_n \\ \phi_1(z)\mathbf{I}_n \\ \phi_0(z)\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

for some constant  $q$  because

$$(5.99) \quad -\alpha_k \phi_{k+1}(z) + (z - \beta_k) \phi_k(z) - \gamma_k \phi_{k-1}(z) = 0$$

for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, \ell - 3$ . The constant  $q$  is obtained from

$$(5.100) \quad q \cdot (z - \beta_{\ell-2})\phi_{\ell-2}(z) - q \cdot \gamma_{\ell-2}\phi_{\ell-3}(z) = +\alpha_{\ell-2}$$

or

$$(5.101) \quad q \cdot [\phi_{\ell-1}(z)] = +1.$$

So

$$(5.102) \quad q = \frac{+1}{\phi_{\ell-1}(z)}.$$

It follows that

$$(5.103) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{S} &= \frac{z - \beta_{\ell-1}}{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \mathbf{P}_\ell + \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1} + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{-\gamma_{\ell-1}}{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \mathbf{P}_\ell + \mathbf{P}_{\ell-2} & \mathbf{P}_{\ell-3} & \cdots & \mathbf{P}_0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{\ell-2}(z) \\ \phi_{\ell-3}(z) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_0(z) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \frac{1}{\phi_{\ell-1}(z)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{z - \beta_{\ell-1}}{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \phi_{\ell-1}(z) \mathbf{P}_\ell + \phi_{\ell-1}(z) \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1} - \frac{\gamma_{\ell-1}}{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \phi_{\ell-2}(z) \mathbf{P}_\ell + \phi_{\ell-2}(z) \mathbf{P}_{\ell-2} + \cdots + \phi_0(z) \mathbf{P}_0}{\phi_{\ell-1}(z)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \phi_k(z) \mathbf{P}_k}{\phi_{\ell-1}(z)} = \frac{\mathbf{P}(z)}{\phi_{\ell-1}(z)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(5.104) \quad -D^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{S}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{\ell-2}(z) \mathbf{I}_n \\ \vdots \\ \phi_0(z) \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$$

because  $\frac{1}{\phi_{\ell-1}(z)} \mathbf{S}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$ . Finally,  $\phi_0(z) = 1$ , so the bottom block is  $\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$ , establishing that

$$(5.105) \quad \mathbf{X} = [0 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ \mathbf{I}_n]$$

$$(5.106) \quad \mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{I}_n \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ 0]^T$$

will produce  $\mathbf{X} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$ . \(\clubsuit\)

THEOREM 5.2. Put

$$(5.107) \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathbf{P}_\ell - \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1} & -\mathbf{P}_{\ell-2} & \cdots & -\mathbf{P}_1 & -\mathbf{P}_0 \\ \mathbf{I}_n & \frac{2}{\ell-1} \mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_n & \frac{3}{\ell-2} \mathbf{I}_n & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{I}_n & \frac{\ell}{1} \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(5.108) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{P}_{\ell-1} & -\mathbf{P}_{\ell-2} & \cdots & -\mathbf{P}_1 & -\mathbf{P}_0 \\ \mathbf{I}_n & 0 & & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_n & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{I}_n & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{I}_n \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ 0]^T$  with  $\mathbf{X} = \left[ \frac{1}{\ell} \mathbf{I}_n \ \frac{2}{\ell} \mathbf{I}_n \ \frac{3}{\ell} \mathbf{I}_n \ \cdots \ \frac{\ell}{\ell} \mathbf{I}_n \right]$ . Then  $\mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$ , unless  $z \in \Lambda(\mathbf{P})$ , and  $\det \mathbf{P}(z) = \det \mathbf{R}(z) = \det(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)$ .

*Proof.* This linearization is proved e.g. in [29], but for convenience we supply one here as well. The Schur factoring is

$$(5.109) \quad \mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^{-1} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I}_{N-r} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S} & 0 \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}$  is the Schur complement. Here,

$$(5.110) \quad \mathbf{A} = \frac{z}{\ell} \mathbf{P}_\ell + (1-z)\mathbf{P}_{\ell-1},$$

$$(5.111) \quad \mathbf{B} = [(1-z)\mathbf{P}_{\ell-2} \ (1-z)\mathbf{P}_{\ell-3} \ \cdots \ (1-z)\mathbf{P}_0],$$

$$(5.112) \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} (z-1)\mathbf{I}_n \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$(5.113) \quad \mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{\ell-1}z\mathbf{I}_n & & & & \\ (z-1)\mathbf{I}_n & \frac{3}{\ell-2}z\mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & (z-1)\mathbf{I}_n & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & (z-1)\mathbf{I}_n & \frac{\ell}{1}z\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

Therefore,  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}$  satisfies

$$(5.114) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{\ell-1}z\mathbf{I}_n & & & & \\ (z-1)\mathbf{I}_n & \frac{3}{\ell-2}z\mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & (z-1)\mathbf{I}_n & \frac{4}{\ell-3}z\mathbf{I}_n & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & (z-1)\mathbf{I}_n & \frac{\ell}{1}z\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{v}_{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (z-1)\mathbf{I}_n \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

So

$$(5.115) \quad \mathbf{v}_1 = \frac{\ell-1}{2} \left( \frac{z-1}{z} \right) \mathbf{I}_n = -\frac{\ell-1}{2} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right) \mathbf{I}_n$$

$$(5.116) \quad \mathbf{v}_2 = -\frac{\ell-2}{3} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 = -\frac{\ell-2}{3} \cdot \frac{\ell-1}{2} \cdot \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^2 \mathbf{I}_n$$

$$(5.117) \quad \mathbf{v}_3 = -\frac{\ell-3}{4} \cdot \frac{\ell-2}{3} \cdot \frac{\ell-1}{2} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^3 \mathbf{I}_n$$

and so on; by inspection, confirmed by a formal induction not given here,

$$(5.118) \quad \mathbf{v}_k = -\frac{(\ell-1)!}{(\ell-k-1)!(k+1)!} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^k \mathbf{I}_n = -\frac{1}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{k+1} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^k \mathbf{I}_n$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, \ell-1$ . Thus

$$(5.119) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{S} &= \frac{z}{\ell} \mathbf{P}_\ell + (1-z) \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1} + (1-z) [\mathbf{P}_{\ell-2} \quad \mathbf{P}_{\ell-3} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{P}_0] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{2} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right) \mathbf{I}_n \\ \frac{1}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{3} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^2 \mathbf{I}_n \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{\ell} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^{\ell-1} \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell z^{\ell-1}} \cdot \left[ z^\ell \mathbf{P}_\ell + \ell z^{\ell-1} (1-z) \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1} + \binom{\ell}{2} z^{\ell-2} (1-z)^2 \mathbf{P}_{\ell-2} + \dots + \binom{\ell}{\ell} (1-z)^\ell \mathbf{P}_0 \right] \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{P}(z)}{\ell z^{\ell-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$(5.120) \quad \mathbf{S}^{-1} = \ell z^{\ell-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$$

and the first column of  $\mathbf{R}^{-1}$  is

$$(5.121) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \\ -\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \ell z^{\ell-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \\ \ell z^{\ell-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{2} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right) \mathbf{P}^{-1} \\ \ell z^{\ell-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{3} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^2 \mathbf{P}^{-1} \\ \ell z^{\ell-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{4} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^3 \mathbf{P}^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ \ell z^{\ell-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{\ell} \left( \frac{1-z}{z} \right)^{\ell-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n z^{n-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \\ \binom{\ell}{2} z^{\ell-2} (1-z) \mathbf{P}^{-1} \\ \binom{\ell}{3} z^{\ell-3} (1-z)^2 \mathbf{P}^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ \binom{\ell}{\ell} z^0 (1-z)^{\ell-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

We now notice that 1, expressed as a linear combination of

$$(5.122) \quad \binom{\ell}{1} z^{\ell-1}, \binom{\ell}{2} z^{\ell-2} (1-z), \dots, \binom{\ell}{\ell} z^0 (1-z)^{\ell-1}$$

(these are the elements of the null vector used in the proof of Theorem 2.1) is

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= \frac{1}{\ell} \cdot \binom{\ell}{1} z^{\ell-1} + \frac{2}{\ell} \cdot \binom{\ell}{2} z^{\ell-2}(1-z) + \cdots + \frac{\ell}{\ell} \cdot \binom{\ell}{\ell} z^0(1-z)^{\ell-1} \\
&= \binom{\ell-1}{0} z^{\ell-1}(1-z)^0 + \binom{\ell-1}{1} z^{\ell-2}(1-z)^1 + \cdots + \binom{\ell-1}{\ell-1} z^0(1-z)^{\ell-1} \\
(5.123) \quad &= (z+1-z)^{\ell-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed we use a degree-reduced Bernstein bases here,  $\binom{\ell-1}{k} z^k(1-z)^{\ell-1-k}$ , to express 1.

In any case, the coefficients of 1 give us our  $\mathbf{X}$  vector:  $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$ .  $\spadesuit$

**THEOREM 5.3 (Lagrange Basis).** *If  $\mathbf{P}(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is of degree at most  $\ell$ , and takes the values  $\boldsymbol{\rho}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  at the  $\ell+1$  distinct nodes  $z = \tau_k$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq \ell$ , i.e  $\mathbf{P}(\tau_k) = \boldsymbol{\rho}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , and the reciprocal of the node polynomial  $w(z) = \prod_{k=0}^{\ell} (z - \tau_k)$  has partial fraction expansion*

$$(5.124) \quad \frac{1}{w(z)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \frac{\beta_k}{z - \tau_k}$$

then a linearization for  $\mathbf{P}(z)$  is  $z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0$  where  $\mathbf{C}_1 = \text{diag}(\mathbf{0}_n, \mathbf{I}_n, \mathbf{I}_n, \dots, \mathbf{I}_n)$  with  $\ell+2$  diagonal blocks, so  $N = (\ell+2)r$ , and

$$(5.125) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \left[ \begin{array}{c|cccc} 0 & -\boldsymbol{\rho}_0 & -\boldsymbol{\rho}_1 & -\boldsymbol{\rho}_2 & \cdots & -\boldsymbol{\rho}_\ell \\ \beta_0 \mathbf{I}_n & \tau_0 \mathbf{I}_n & & & & \\ \beta_1 \mathbf{I}_n & & \tau_1 \mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ \beta_2 \mathbf{I}_n & & & \tau_2 \mathbf{I}_n & & \\ \vdots & & & & \ddots & \\ \beta_\ell \mathbf{I}_n & & & & & \tau_\ell \mathbf{I}_n \end{array} \right].$$

Moreover, if  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{I}_n \ 0 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0]^T$  and  $\mathbf{X} = [0_n \ \mathbf{I}_n \ \mathbf{I}_n \ \cdots \ \mathbf{I}_n]$  then  $\mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$  where  $z \in \Lambda(\mathbf{P})$ .

*Proof.* Again we use the Schur complement:  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}$  where here,

$$(5.126) \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}_n$$

$$(5.127) \quad \mathbf{B} = -[\boldsymbol{\rho}_0 \ \boldsymbol{\rho}_1 \ \cdots \ \boldsymbol{\rho}_\ell]$$

$$(5.128) \quad \mathbf{D}^{-1} = \text{diag} \left( \frac{1}{z - \tau_0} \mathbf{I}_n, \frac{1}{z - \tau_1} \mathbf{I}_n, \dots, \frac{1}{z - \tau_\ell} \mathbf{I}_n \right)$$

$$(5.129) \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \mathbf{I}_n \\ \beta_1 \mathbf{I}_n \\ \vdots \\ \beta_\ell \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix},$$

So,

$$(5.130) \quad \mathbf{S} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \frac{\beta_k}{z - \tau_k} \boldsymbol{\rho}_k = w(z)^{-1} \mathbf{P}(z)$$

from the first barycentric formula [4].

Note the first column of  $\mathbf{R}^{-1}(z)$  is  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \\ -\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{S}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$  or

$$(5.131) \quad \begin{bmatrix} w(z)\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z) \\ \left(\frac{\beta_0}{z-\tau_0}\right)w(z)\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z) \\ \left(\frac{\beta_1}{z-\tau_1}\right)w(z)\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z) \\ \vdots \\ \left(\frac{\beta_\ell}{z-\tau_\ell}\right)w(z)\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z) \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that  $\sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \frac{\beta_k}{z-\tau_k} = \frac{1}{w(z)}$ , so

$$(5.132) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{R}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \frac{\beta_k}{z-\tau_k} \right) w(z)\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z) = \mathbf{P}^{-1}(z). \quad \spadesuit$$

**THEOREM 5.4.** *In the Hermite interpolational bases on  $m+1$  nodes each with coefficient  $s_i$ , so the degree  $\ell$  is at most  $\ell = -1 + \sum_{k=0}^m s_k$ , the barycentric weights are*

$$(5.133) \quad \frac{1}{w(z)} = \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^{s_i-1} \frac{\beta_{ij}}{(z-\tau_i)^{j+1}}.$$

As in the Lagrange case,  $\mathbf{C}_1 = \text{diag}(0, \mathbf{I}_n, \dots, \mathbf{I}_n)$ .  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is as below:

$$(5.134) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \left[ \begin{array}{c|ccc} 0 & -\hat{\rho}_0 & -\hat{\rho}_1 & \cdots & -\hat{\rho}_m \\ \beta_{0,s_0-1}\mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{J}_0^T & & & \\ \beta_{0,s_0-2}\mathbf{I}_n & & \mathbf{J}_1^T & & \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \\ \beta_{m,s_m-1} & & & & \mathbf{J}_m^T \end{array} \right],$$

where each block per node of data is collected in the  $n \times m\ell$  block matrix

$$(5.135) \quad \hat{\rho}_i = [\rho_{i,s_i-1} \quad \rho_{i,s_i-2} \quad \cdots \quad \rho_{i,0}].$$

Each diagonal node block is a tensor product of a transposed Jordan block:

$$(5.136) \quad \mathbf{J}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_i \mathbf{I}_n & & & & \\ \mathbf{I}_n & \tau_i \mathbf{I}_n & & & \\ & \mathbf{I}_n & \tau_i \mathbf{I}_n & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{I}_n & \tau_i \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}.$$



Since these computations are done exactly, the result will exactly equal the identity matrix. For the Lagrange basis example, since we construct our linearizations using  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  instead of the matrix polynomial itself,  $\mathbf{P}(z)$  is constructed using the barycentric Lagrange interpolation formula, which can be derived from Equation (5.130). The Hermite interpolational basis examples are handled similarly to the Lagrange case, where  $\mathbf{P}(z)$  is the Hermite interpolation polynomial, which can be derived from Equation (5.138).

### 6.1. Bases with three-term recurrence relations.

EXAMPLE 6.1 (Chebyshev basis of the first kind).

$$(6.141) \quad \mathbf{P}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 1/5 & 7/100 \\ -93/200 & -29/200 \end{bmatrix} T_0(z) + \begin{bmatrix} 53/300 & 7/60 \\ 2/25 & 3/50 \end{bmatrix} T_1(z) \\ + \begin{bmatrix} -9/80 & -13/80 \\ 57/400 & -47/400 \end{bmatrix} T_2(z) + \begin{bmatrix} -3/250 & -31/500 \\ -77/500 & 27/250 \end{bmatrix} T_3(z).$$

The standard triple for Equation (6.141) is

$$\mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -21/200 & -29/400 & -107/750 & -17/50 & -73/200 & 1/25 \\ -13/400 & -1/400 & -49/300 & -283/750 & -27/200 & 9/25 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -33/250 & -9/25 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3/25 & -37/250 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{X} (z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{P}(z) = \mathbf{I}_2,$$

which indicates that the standard triple is correct.

EXAMPLE 6.2 (Newton Interpolational Basis).

$$(6.142) \quad \tau = \left[ \text{seq} \left( \cos \left( \frac{\pi \cdot k}{3} \right), k = 0..3 \right) \right] = [1, 1/2, -1/2, -1]$$

$$(6.143) \quad \mathbf{P}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 6 & 25 \\ -1 & 5 \end{bmatrix} \prod_{j=0}^0 (z - \tau_j) + \begin{bmatrix} -80/3 & 25/3 \\ 43/3 & 94/3 \end{bmatrix} \prod_{j=0}^1 (z - \tau_j) \\ + \begin{bmatrix} 77/4 & 31/4 \\ 9/4 & -25/2 \end{bmatrix} \prod_{j=0}^2 (z - \tau_j) + \begin{bmatrix} 86/5 & -61/5 \\ 4 & -48/5 \end{bmatrix} \prod_{j=0}^3 (z - \tau_j)$$

The standard triple for Equation (6.143) is

$$\mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -557/20 & -33/20 & 80/3 & -25/3 & -6 & -25 \\ -17/4 & 173/10 & -43/3 & -94/3 & 1 & -5 \\ 1 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{86}{5} & -\frac{61}{5} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & -\frac{48}{5} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

## 6.2. Bernstein Basis.

EXAMPLE 6.3 (Non-singular leading coefficient case).

$$(6.144) \quad \mathbf{P}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 4/25 & 99/100 \\ 9/100 & 3/5 \end{bmatrix} B_0^3(z) + \begin{bmatrix} -17/25 & 11/50 \\ -67/100 & 7/50 \end{bmatrix} B_1^3(z) \\ + \begin{bmatrix} -59/100 & -31/50 \\ 3/25 & -33/100 \end{bmatrix} B_2^3(z) + \begin{bmatrix} 41/50 & 21/50 \\ 18/25 & 9/50 \end{bmatrix} B_3^3(z).$$

The standard triple for Equation (6.144) is

$$\mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 59/100 & 31/50 & 17/25 & -11/50 & -4/25 & -99/100 \\ -3/25 & 33/100 & 67/100 & -7/50 & -9/100 & -3/5 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 259/300 & 19/25 & 17/25 & -11/50 & -4/25 & -99/100 \\ 3/25 & 39/100 & 67/100 & -7/50 & -9/100 & -3/5 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{P}(z) = \mathbf{I}_2.$$

EXAMPLE 6.4 (Singular leading coefficient case).

$$(6.145) \quad \mathbf{P}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 29/100 & -8/25 \\ 7/10 & -1/100 \end{bmatrix} B_0^3(z) + \begin{bmatrix} -41/50 & 41/100 \\ -7/10 & 91/100 \end{bmatrix} B_1^3(z) \\ + \begin{bmatrix} 9/10 & 19/100 \\ 4/5 & 22/25 \end{bmatrix} B_2^3(z) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 9851/1980 & 0 \end{bmatrix} B_3^3(z).$$

Expressing Equation (6.145) into the monomial basis, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 29/100 & -8/25 \\ 7/10 & -1/100 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 29/100 & -8/25 \\ 7/10 & -1/100 \end{bmatrix} z + \begin{bmatrix} 849/100 & -57/20 \\ 87/10 & -57/20 \end{bmatrix} z^2 + \begin{bmatrix} -89/20 & 99/50 \\ -89/396 & 1/10 \end{bmatrix} z^3.$$

Taking the determinant of the leading coefficient

$$\det \left( \begin{bmatrix} -89/20 & 99/50 \\ -89/396 & 1/10 \end{bmatrix} \right) = (-89/20)(1/10) - (99/50)(-89/396) = 0,$$

we can observe that leading coefficient is singular, and thus, this matrix polynomial is non-monic. The standard triple for Equation (6.145) is

$$\mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -9/10 & -19/100 & 41/50 & -41/100 & -29/100 & 8/25 \\ -4/5 & -22/25 & 7/10 & -91/100 & -7/10 & 1/100 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -17/30 & 43/300 & 41/50 & -41/100 & -29/100 & 8/25 \\ 5099/5940 & -22/25 & 7/10 & -91/100 & -7/10 & 1/100 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{X} (z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{P}(z) = \mathbf{I}_2.$$

### 6.3. Lagrange Basis.

EXAMPLE 6.5.

$$(6.146) \quad \tau = \left[ \text{seq} \left( \cos \left( \frac{\pi \cdot k}{2} \right), k = 0..2 \right) \right] = [1, 0, -1]$$

$$\rho = [\mathbf{I}_2, \mathbf{I}_2, \mathbf{I}_2] = \left[ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right]$$

$$\mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using the barycentric Lagrange interpolation formula, we construct our matrix polynomial

$$\mathbf{P}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} (z-1)z(z+1) \left( \frac{1}{2(z-1)} - \frac{1}{z} + \frac{1}{2(z+1)} \right) & 0 \\ 0 & (z-1)z(z+1) \left( \frac{1}{2(z-1)} - \frac{1}{z} + \frac{1}{2(z+1)} \right) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

that corresponds to the given  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  from Equation (6.146). Therefore,  $\mathbf{P}^{-1}(z)$

$$\mathbf{X}(z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{I}_2$$

#### 6.4. Hermite Interpolational Basis.

EXAMPLE 6.6 (Polynomial case). *Let*

$$(6.147) \quad \tau = \left[ -1, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right]$$

and

$z$	$P(z)$	$P'(z)$	$P''(z)$
$\tau_0 = -1$	1	0	0
$\tau_1 = -\frac{1}{2}$	1		
$\tau_2 = \frac{1}{2}$	1		
$\tau_3 = 1$	1	0	

Note that this polynomial is identically 1: its values at all nodes are 1, and all derivatives at all nodes are 0. This demonstrates explicitly that the degree of the polynomial is not necessarily revealed by the grade, which

here is  $\ell = 5$ . The standard triple is then

$$\mathbf{C}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1/6 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -25/36 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 32/27 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -32/9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 11/9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 331/108 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{X} = [0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1] \quad \mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using the first barycentric representation, the Hermite interpolation polynomial of the given data is

$$P(z) = (z+1)^3 \left(z + \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(z - \frac{1}{2}\right) (z-1)^2 \cdot \left( \frac{331}{108z+108} + \frac{11}{9(z+1)^2} + \frac{1}{3}(z+1)^{-3} - \frac{32}{9z+\frac{9}{2}} + \frac{32}{27z-\frac{27}{2}} - \frac{25}{36z-36} + \frac{1}{6}(z-1)^{-2} \right) = 1,$$

as discussed. Therefore, the linearization has no finite eigenvalues, in exact arithmetic. Numerically, it can be expected to have eigenvalues around  $O(1/\mu)^{1/7}$  where  $\mu$  is the unit roundoff; here the exponent is 7, two more than the grade even though two of the spurious eigenvalues at infinity are detected and removed precisely [25]. Indeed that is what occurs (calculations not shown here). Returning to the example, calculating the resolvent form gives

$$\mathbf{X} (z\mathbf{C}_1 - \mathbf{C}_0)^{-1} \mathbf{Y} = 1,$$

and therefore (due to multiplying this by  $P(z) = 1$ ), this shows that the standard triple for the Hermite interpolating basis is correct.

EXAMPLE 6.7 (Matrix polynomial case). Let

$$\tau = [0, 1]$$

and

$z$	$\mathbf{P}(z)$	$\mathbf{P}'(z)$
$\tau_0 = 0$	$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	
$\tau_1 = 1$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3\mathfrak{I} \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$

Then, the standard triple is

$$\begin{aligned}
C_0 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & C_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\
X &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & Y &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

The Hermite interpolating polynomial is

$$P(z) = \begin{bmatrix} z - 1 & -2z^2 + 3z \\ -3z^2 + 5z - 1 & 2z^2 - 4z + 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and the resolvent form is

$$X (zC_1 - C_0)^{-1} Y = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{-2z^2 + 4z - 1}{6z^4 - 21z^3 + 23z^2 - 8z + 1} & \frac{-2z^2 + 3z}{6z^4 - 21z^3 + 23z^2 - 8z + 1} \\ \frac{-3z^2 + 5z - 1}{6z^4 - 21z^3 + 23z^2 - 8z + 1} & \frac{-z + 1}{6z^4 - 21z^3 + 23z^2 - 8z + 1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$X (zC_1 - C_0)^{-1} Y P(z) = I_2,$$

which indicates that the standard triples is correct.

**7. Concluding remarks.** The generalized standard triple (or standard quadruple, if you prefer) that we propose in this paper for convenience in algebraic linearization may have other uses. As pointed out on p. 28 of [19] many of the properties stated in that work for monic polynomials are valid for non-monic polynomials with the appropriate changes made. Some caution with the results of this paper are thus mandated.

We have here *defined* these generalized standard triples simply by the resolvent representation for the matrix polynomial Equation (1.10), and only for linearizations, which is all we need for algebraic linearization.

The main theorem of the paper, namely Theorem 2.1, gives a universal way to construct this generalized standard triple in any polynomial basis. We also gave explicit instructions for this construction using any of several polynomial bases, for convenience, together with separate proofs using the Schur complement, which may give insight for further work in this area.

We have also recorded a number of smaller results. In Section 3.2.1 we give a new reversal for the Bernstein linearization, one which may have slightly superior numerical qualities. We there showed strict equivalence of the appropriate matrices, giving a new proof that the Bernstein linearization is a strong one. In Section 1.3, we have sketched an explicit construction for matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  showing that algebraic linearizations are, in fact, linearizations, with  $\mathbf{E}(z\mathbf{D}_H - \mathbf{H})\mathbf{F} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}(z), \mathbf{I}, \dots, \mathbf{I})$ . We have also given new constructions for matrices  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  which likewise show that the companions for the Lagrange and Hermite interpolational bases are, in fact, linearizations (of matrix polynomials of higher grade). A proof for Lagrange interpolational bases was given already in [2], where indeed the linearization was proved to be strong, but the result for Hermite interpolational bases is new to this paper. We also used Hermite Form computations to give a new (to us) pair  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  for the ordinary monomial basis.

**Acknowledgments.** We acknowledge the support of Western University, The National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada, the Ontario Graduate Scholarship (OGS) program, the University of Alcalá, the Ontario Research Centre of Computer Algebra, and the Rotman Institute of Philosophy. Part of this work was developed while RMC was visiting the University of Alcalá, in the frame of the project Giner de los Rios. The authors would also like to thank Peter Lancaster for teaching RMC long ago the value of the  $5 \times 5$  example. Similarly we thank John C. Butcher for the proper usage of the word “interpolational”. We thank Françoise Tisseur for her thorough comments on an earlier version of this paper. Finally, we thank an anonymous referee for the idea of the proof of Theorem 2.1.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Maha Al-Ammari and Françoise Tisseur. Standard triples of structured matrix polynomials. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 437(3):817–834, 2012.
- [2] Amir Amiraslani, Robert M. Corless, and Peter Lancaster. Linearization of matrix polynomials expressed in polynomial bases. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 29(1):141–157, 2008.
- [3] Stephen Barnett. Some applications of the comrade matrix. *International Journal of Control*, 21(5):849–855, 1975.
- [4] Jean-Paul Berrut and Lloyd N. Trefethen. Barycentric Lagrange interpolation. *SIAM Review*, 46(3):501–517, 2004.
- [5] Timo Betcke, Nicholas J. Higham, Volker Mehrmann, Christian Schröder, and Françoise Tisseur. NLEVP: A collection of nonlinear eigenvalue problems. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 39(2):7, 2013.
- [6] J. M. Carnicer, Y. Khia, and J. M. Peña. Optimal stability of the Lagrange formula and conditioning of the Newton formula. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 2017.
- [7] Eunice Y. S. Chan, Robert M. Corless, Laureano Gonzalez-Vega, J. Rafael Sendra, and Juana Sendra. Algebraic linearizations for matrix polynomials. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 563:373–399, 2019.
- [8] Robert M. Corless and Nicolas Fillion. Polynomial and rational interpolation. In *A Graduate Introduction to Numerical Methods*, pages 331–401. Springer, 2013.
- [9] Robert M Corless, Nargol Rezvani, and Amirhossein Amiraslani. Pseudospectra of matrix polynomials that are expressed in alternative bases. *Mathematics in Computer Science*, 1(2):353–374, 2007.
- [10] Robert M. Corless and Stephen M. Watt. Bernstein bases are optimal, but, sometimes, Lagrange bases are better. In *Proceedings of SYNASC, Timisoara*, pages 141–153. MIRTON Press, 2004.
- [11] Froilán M Dopico, Piers W. Lawrence, Javier Pérez, and Paul Van Dooren. Block Kronecker linearizations of matrix polynomials and their backward errors. *Numerische Mathematik*, 140(2):373–426, 2018.
- [12] Rida T. Farouki. The Bernstein polynomial basis: A centennial retrospective. *Computer Aided Geometric Design*, 29(6):379–419, 2012.
- [13] Rida T. Farouki and T. Goodman. On the optimal stability of the Bernstein basis. *Mathematics of Computation of the American Mathematical Society*, 65(216):1553–1566, 1996.
- [14] Rida T. Farouki and V. T. Rajan. On the numerical condition of polynomials in Bernstein form. *Computer Aided Geometric Design*, 4(3):191–216, 1987.
- [15] Heike Fakbender and Philip Saltenberger. On vector spaces of linearizations for matrix polynomials in orthogonal bases. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 525:59–83, 2017.
- [16] Walter Gautschi. *Orthogonal polynomials in MATLAB: Exercises and Solutions*, volume 26. SIAM, 2016.

- [17] Israel Gohberg, Peter Lancaster, and Leiba Rodman. *Matrix polynomials*. Academic Press, New York, 1982.
- [18] Israel Gohberg, Peter Lancaster, and Leiba Rodman. *Indefinite Linear Algebra and Applications*. Springer, 2005.
- [19] Israel Gohberg, Peter Lancaster, and Leiba Rodman. *Matrix Polynomials*. SIAM Classics in Applied Mathematics, 2009.
- [20] Stefan Güttel and Françoise Tisseur. The nonlinear eigenvalue problem. *Acta Numerica*, 26:1–94, 2017.
- [21] David J. Jeffrey and Robert M. Corless. Linear algebra in Maple. In Leslie Hogben, editor, *Handbook of Linear Algebra*, chapter 89. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2013.
- [22] Guðbjörn F. Jónsson. *Eigenvalue methods for accurate solution of polynomial equations*. PhD thesis, Center for Applied Mathematics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 2001.
- [23] Guðbjörn F. Jónsson and Stephen Vavasis. Solving polynomials with small leading coefficients. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 26(2):400–414, 2004.
- [24] V. N. Kublanovskaya. Methods and algorithms of solving spectral problems for polynomial and rational matrices. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 96(3):3085–3287, 1999.
- [25] Piers W. Lawrence and Robert M. Corless. Numerical stability of barycentric Hermite root-finding. In *Proceedings of the 2011 International Workshop on Symbolic-Numeric Computation*, pages 147–148. ACM, 2012.
- [26] Jörg Liesen and Christian Mehl. Matrix polynomials. In Leslie Hogben, editor, *Handbook of Linear Algebra*, chapter 18. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2013.
- [27] D. Steven Mackey, Niloufer Mackey, Christian Mehl, and Volker Mehrmann. Vector spaces of linearizations for matrix polynomials. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 28(4):971–1004, 2006.
- [28] D. Steven Mackey, Niloufer Mackey, and Françoise Tisseur. Polynomial eigenvalue problems: Theory, computation, and structure. In *Numerical Algebra, Matrix Theory, Differential-Algebraic Equations and Control Theory*, pages 319–348. Springer, 2015.
- [29] D. Steven Mackey and Vasilije Perović. Linearizations of matrix polynomials in Bernstein bases. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 501:162–197, 2016.
- [30] Yuji Nakatsukasa, Vanni Noferini, and Alex Townsend. Vector spaces of linearizations for matrix polynomials: a bivariate polynomial approach. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 38(1):1–29, 2017.
- [31] Leonardo Robol, Raf Vandebril, and Paul Van Dooren. A framework for structured linearizations of matrix polynomials in various bases. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 38(1):188–216, 2017.
- [32] Arne Storjohann. *Computation of Hermite and Smith normal forms of matrices*. PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, 1994.
- [33] Arne Storjohann. An  $O(n^3)$  algorithm for the Frobenius normal form. In *Proceedings of the 1998 international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation*, pages 101–105. ACM, 1998.
- [34] Olga Taussky and Hans Zassenhaus. On the similarity transformation between a matrix and its transpose. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 9(3):893–896, 1959.
- [35] Roel Van Beeumen, Wim Michiels, and Karl Meerbergen. Linearization of Lagrange and Hermite interpolating matrix polynomials. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 35(2):909–930, 2015.