

More on the Mathieu conjecture for $SU(2)$

Michael Mürger* and Lars Tuset†

October 14, 2022

Abstract

We reduce the Mathieu conjecture for $SU(2)$ to a conjecture about moments of Laurent polynomials in two variables with single variable polynomial coefficients. We introduce a generalization of the latter type of conjecture, and show that it implies a Mathieu type conjecture in this case.

1 Introduction

O. Mathieu conjectured [4] that for complex valued regular (=finite type) functions f, g on any connected compact Lie group with Haar integral \int , the vanishing of $\int f^P$ for all positive integers P implies $\int f^P g = 0$ for all large enough P . He then proved that this conjecture implies O.-H. Keller's notorious Jacobian conjecture.¹

By adapting techniques of Dings and Koelink [1] we reduce the Mathieu conjecture for $SU(2)$ to a conjecture of more abelian nature about moments of Laurent polynomials in two variables with single variable polynomial coefficients. Generalized further in the natural fashion, this 'xz-conjecture' says that if $f(x, z) = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} c_{\mathbf{m}}(x)z^{\mathbf{m}}$ is a Laurent polynomial in several z -variables with polynomial coefficients $c_{\mathbf{m}}$ in several x -variables satisfying $\int f^P = 0$ for all positive integer P , where z is integrated over the torus and x over a cube, then $\mathbf{0}$ is not in the convex hull of the set of multi-indices \mathbf{m} for which $c_{\mathbf{m}} \neq 0$. We also show that our xz -conjecture implies a 'Mathieu xz -conjecture'.

In the absence of x -variables, our conjecture reduces to a result proven by Duistermaat and van der Kallen [2] as part of their proof of the the Mathieu conjecture in the abelian case. On the other hand, the xz -conjecture with one x variable and no z 's is known to hold, see [5] and references therein. For the moment, the xz -conjecture remains open already for one z and one x . Towards the end of this paper we explain that the natural inductive approach to proving it in this case fails due to the 'worm problem'. Here we also include a trivial generalization of the approach of Dings and Koelink to any connected compact Lie group, and for readability we have included an appendix with proof of a perhaps not so familiar formula for the Haar integral on $SU(2)$ that we need.

*Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, mueger@math.ru.nl

†Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway, larst@oslomet.no

¹For lack of a better concise name, we will follow [3] in calling integrals like $\int f^P g$ 'moments', since they generalize classical moments of the form $\int_a^b x^n f(x) dx$.

2 The $SU(2)$ -case

Recall that every element of the group $SU(2)$ of special unitary (2×2) -matrices is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & -b^* \\ b & a^* \end{pmatrix}$$

where $a^*a + b^*b = 1$. For notational reasons we sometimes use $*$ for complex conjugation. Using this latter identity, it is easy to see that every regular function f on $SU(2)$ can be written as

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^N (c_j a^{k_j} b^{n_j} b^{*m_j} + c'_j a^{*k'_j} b^{n'_j} b^{*m'_j})$$

for non-negative integers $k_j, n_j, m_j, n'_j, m'_j$, strictly positive integers k'_j and complex numbers c_j, c'_j , where now we think of a and b as the coordinate functions on $SU(2)$ that pick out the entry in the left upper and lower corner, respectively, of the matrix. For academic purposes one can easily show that the monomials appearing in these linear combinations form a linear basis for the unital $*$ -algebra $\mathbb{C}[SU(2)]$ of regular functions on $SU(2)$. As shown in the appendix, the Haar integral on $SU(2)$ is given by $\int a^k b^n b^{*m} = \delta_{k,0} \delta_{n,m} (n+1)^{-1}$, where k is an integer with $a^k \equiv (a^*)^{-k}$ for $k < 0$. Then we get for non-negative integers m, n that

$$\int (1 - bb^*)^n (bb^*)^m = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (-1)^k \int (bb^*)^{k+m} = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \frac{(-1)^k}{k+m+1} = \int_0^1 (1-x)^n x^m dx.$$

In fact, one may check that $\int g(bb^*) = \int_0^1 g(x) dx$ for any continuous function g on $[0, 1]$, noticing that the image of bb^* belongs to $[0, 1]$.

We have the following result for the moments of the function f above:

2.1 LEMMA *Let P be a non-negative integer. Then*

$$\int f^P = (2\pi i)^{-2} \int_0^1 \int_C \int_C \tilde{f}(z_1, z_2; x)^P \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} dx,$$

where \tilde{f} is the complex valued function on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1]$ given by

$$\tilde{f}(z_1, z_2; x) = \sum_{j=1}^N (c_j x^{n_j} (1-x)^{k_j} z_1^{n_j-m_j} z_2^{k_j} + c'_j x^{n'_j} z_1^{n'_j-m'_j} z_2^{-k'_j})$$

and where \int_C stands for integration around the unit circle in \mathbb{C} in a counter clockwise direction.

Proof. By the multinomial and binomial formulas, we have

$$\int f^P = \sum_{\sum r_j = P} \binom{P}{r_1, \dots, r_N} \int \prod_{j=1}^N (c_j a^{k_j} b^{n_j} b^{*m_j} + c'_j a^{*k'_j} b^{n'_j} b^{*m'_j})^{r_j}$$

with the r_j -powers in the product equaling

$$\sum_{s_j=0}^{r_j} \binom{r_j}{s_j} c_j^{s_j} (c'_j)^{r_j-s_j} a^{k_j s_j} a^{*k'_j (r_j-s_j)} b^{n_j s_j + n'_j (r_j-s_j)} b^{*(m_j s_j + m'_j (r_j-s_j))},$$

so

$$\int f^P = \sum_{\sum r_j = P} \binom{P}{r_1, \dots, r_N} \sum_{s_1=0}^{r_1} \cdots \sum_{s_N=0}^{r_N} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N \binom{r_j}{s_j} c_j^{s_j} (c'_j)^{r_j - s_j} \right) \times \\ \int a^{\sum k_j s_j} a^{*\sum k'_j (r_j - s_j)} b^{\sum (n_j s_j + n'_j (r_j - s_j))} b^{*\sum (m_j s_j + m'_j (r_j - s_j))}.$$

Letting $t_j = r_j - s_j$ and using the previous formulas for the Haar integral together with obvious properties of the multinomial coefficients and the relation $a^*a + b^*b = 1$, we thus get

$$\int f^P = \sum \binom{P}{s_1, \dots, s_N, t_1, \dots, t_N} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N c_j^{s_j} (c'_j)^{t_j} \right) \int_0^1 x^{\sum (n_j s_j + n'_j t_j)} (1-x)^{\sum k_j s_j} dx,$$

where in the first \sum we sum over the non-negative integers $s_1, \dots, s_N, t_1, \dots, t_N$ such that $\sum (s_j + t_j) = P$ and $\sum k_j s_j = \sum k'_j t_j$ and $\sum (n_j s_j + n'_j t_j) = \sum (m_j s_j + m'_j t_j)$, while in the remaining sums we are summing over j from 1 to N . Using $\delta_{n,0} = \int_0^1 e^{2\pi i n t} dt$ twice, we broaden the first summation to all non-negative integers $s_1, \dots, s_N, t_1, \dots, t_N$ such that $\sum (s_j + t_j) = P$, obtaining

$$\int f^P = \sum \binom{P}{s_1, \dots, s_N, t_1, \dots, t_N} \times \\ \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \prod_{j=1}^N (c_j x^{n_j} (1-x)^{k_j} e^{2\pi i v (n_j - m_j)} e^{2\pi i u k_j})^{s_j} (c'_j x^{n'_j} e^{2\pi i v (n'_j - m'_j)} e^{-2\pi i u k'_j})^{t_j} dv du dx.$$

Substituting $z_1 = e^{2\pi i v}$ and $z_2 = e^{2\pi i u}$ we have $dv = dz_1 / 2\pi i z_1$ and $du = dz_2 / 2\pi i z_2$, and applying the multinomial formula in the opposite direction, we have the desired result. \blacksquare

Consider the left- and right actions on $SU(2)$ of the maximal torus in $SU(2)$ given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{z} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & -b^* \\ b & a^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} za & -zb^* \\ \bar{z}b & \bar{z}a^* \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & -b^* \\ b & a^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{z} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} za & -\bar{z}b^* \\ zb & \bar{z}a^* \end{pmatrix}$$

for z in the unit circle \mathbb{T} . Now suppose $\int f^P \neq 0$ for some P . From the proof above this means that at least one of the integrals, say

$$\int a^{\sum k_j s_j} a^{*\sum k'_j (r_j - s_j)} b^{\sum (n_j s_j + n'_j (r_j - s_j))} b^{*\sum (m_j s_j + m'_j (r_j - s_j))}$$

must be non-zero. But the Haar integral is both left- and right invariant, so this non-zero number must be unaltered under the above actions, which is only possible if

$$\sum_j ((k_j - n_j + m_j)s_j + (-k'_j - n'_j + m'_j)t_j) = 0 = \sum_j ((k_j + n_j - m_j)s_j + (-k'_j + n'_j - m'_j)t_j)$$

for s_j, t_j with $\sum (s_j + t_j) = P$. By adding respectively subtracting these two sums, we see that this is equivalent to the requirement $\sum (k_j s_j - k'_j t_j) = 0 = \sum ((n_j - m_j)s_j + (n'_j - m'_j)t_j)$, or

$$(0, 0) = \sum (s_j(n_j - m_j, k_j) + t_j(n'_j - m'_j, -k'_j)).$$

Hence $(0, 0)$ belongs to the convex hull of the finite set

$$\{(n_j - m_j, k_j), (n'_j - m'_j, -k'_j) \mid j = 1, \dots, N \text{ with } c_j c'_j \neq 0\}.$$

Put differently, if $(0,0)$ does not belong to this convex hull, then $\int f^P = 0$ for all P . We conjecture that we have an equivalence here, namely, that if $(0,0)$ belongs to the convex hull, then not all $\int f^P$ vanish. We will soon see that this conjecture implies the Mathieu conjecture for $SU(2)$.

In view of the expression for \tilde{f} in the previous lemma, consider a complex valued function h on $\mathbb{T}^k \times [0,1]^l$ of the form $h(z_1, \dots, z_k; x_1, \dots, x_l) = \sum c_{\mathbf{m}}(x) z^{\mathbf{m}}$, where \mathbf{m} is a multi-index (m_1, \dots, m_k) of integers and each $c_{\mathbf{m}}$ is a complex polynomial in the x_j 's. So h is a Laurent polynomial in the z_j 's with coefficients that are polynomials in the x_j 's. Such functions h will be called *admissible*. We denote the collection of \mathbf{m} 's with $c_{\mathbf{m}} \neq 0$ associated to h by $\text{Sp}(h)$.

Note that \tilde{f} from above is admissible, and that if $\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} \tilde{f}^P \neq 0$ for some P , then we have seen that $(0,0)$ is in the convex hull of $\text{Sp}(\tilde{f})$. Based on this we make the following

2.2 CONJECTURE (XZ-CONJECTURE) *If h is an admissible function h whose moments $\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} h^P$ vanish for all P then $\mathbf{0}$ is not in the convex hull of $\text{Sp}(h)$.*

Equivalently, the conjecture says that if $\mathbf{0}$ is in the convex hull of $\text{Sp}(h)$, then $\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} h^P \neq 0$ for some P . The conjecture is known to be true for $f(x_1, \dots, x_m, z_1, \dots, z_n)$ in the cases $m = 0$ by [2] and for $m = 1, n = 0$ by [3, 5]. (Actually, in these cases we have the stronger conclusion that infinitely many moments are non-zero.) Already in the more general case $n = 0$, little is known, cf. [3]. For a failed attempt at proving the case $m = n = 1$ see Remark 2.6.

The following result is an adaptation of a result by Dings and Koelink [1]:

2.3 PROPOSITION *The xz -conjecture with one x and two z 's implies the Mathieu conjecture for $SU(2)$.*

Proof. Say we have a regular function f on $SU(2)$ such that $\int f^P = 0$ for all P . Then

$$\int_0^1 \int_C \int_C \tilde{f}(z_1, z_2; x)^P \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} dx = 0$$

for all P by the previous lemma, so that $(0,0)$ is not in the convex hull of $\text{Sp}(\tilde{f})$ by the assumed xz -conjecture. Suppose for a regular function g on $SU(2)$, that $\int f^P g$ fails to vanish for all large enough P . Whenever this integral is non-zero for some P , then by looking at the proof of the previous lemma, we see that for some $g = a^k b^n b^{*m}$ or $g = a^{*k} b^n b^{*m}$ at least one integral

$$\int a^{k+\sum k_j s_j} a^{*\sum k'_j (r_j - s_j)} b^{n+\sum (n_j s_j + n'_j (r_j - s_j))} b^{*(m+\sum (m_j s_j + m'_j (r_j - s_j)))}$$

must be non-zero. Again, invoking the two actions of the torus, we conclude in the first case that

$$k - n + m + \sum_j ((k_j - n_j + m_j) s_j + (-k'_j - n'_j + m'_j) t_j) = 0$$

and

$$k + n - m + \sum_j ((k_j + n_j - m_j) s_j + (-k'_j + n'_j - m'_j) t_j) = 0,$$

and as above, we get

$$((m - n)/P, -k/P) = \sum (s_j P^{-1} (n_j - m_j, k_j) + t_j P^{-1} (n'_j - m'_j, -k'_j)).$$

As such P 's can be arbitrarily large, the left hand side converges to $(0,0)$, whereas the right hand side by definition belongs to the (closed) convex hull of $\text{Sp}(\tilde{f})$, leading to the absurdity that also $(0,0)$ must belong there. A similar argument for $g = a^{*k} b^n b^{*m}$ again leads to a contradiction. ■

We shall see that the the xz -conjecture implies the following

2.4 CONJECTURE (MATHIEU XZ-CONJECTURE) Let g, h be admissible functions. If $\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} h^P = 0$ for all P , then $\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} h^P g = 0$ for all large enough P .

Much as above we get the following result:

2.5 PROPOSITION *The converse of the implication in the xz -conjecture holds, and the xz -conjecture implies the Mathieu xz -conjecture.*

Proof. For $h = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j(x)z^{\mathbf{m}_j}$, the multinomial formula yields

$$\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} h^P = \sum_{\sum r_j = P} \binom{P}{r_1, \dots, r_N} \int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} \prod_{j=1}^N (c_j(x)z^{\mathbf{m}_j})^{r_j},$$

which shows that at least one term $\int_{[0,1]^l} (\prod_{j=1}^N c_j(x)^{r_j}) \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} z^{\sum_{j=1}^N r_j \mathbf{m}_j} \neq 0$ if $\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} h^P \neq 0$. The torus actions from $SU(2)$ also acts here, but now on the torus \mathbb{T}^k itself, and they coincide here as the torus is abelian. Invariance of the Haar measure on \mathbb{T}^k thus gives $\mathbf{0} = \sum_{j=1}^N r_j \mathbf{m}_j$, so $\mathbf{0}$ belongs to the convex hull of $\text{Sp}(h)$, which settles the converse of the xz -conjecture.

Assume that $\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} h^P = 0$ for all P . Since we assume that the xz -conjecture holds, $\mathbf{0}$ is not in the convex hull of $\text{Sp}(h)$. Suppose for an admissible function g , that $\int_{[0,1]^l} \int_{\mathbb{T}^k} h^P g \neq 0$ for infinitely many large P . We may by linearity assume that $g = c(x)z^{\mathbf{m}'}$, and use the multinomial formula. Then again by invoking the torus action, we get $\mathbf{m}' + \sum_{j=1}^N r_j \mathbf{m}_j = \mathbf{0}$, which shows that $-P^{-1}\mathbf{m}' = \sum_{j=1}^N r_j P^{-1}\mathbf{m}_j$. As such P 's tend to infinity, the left hand side converges to $\mathbf{0}$, while the right hand side remains in the (closed) convex hull of $\text{Sp}(h)$, and this is a contradiction. \blacksquare

2.6 REMARK We briefly report on a failed attempt to prove the xz -conjecture for one x and one z by adapting the approach to Laurent polynomials in one variable z pursued by Duistermaat and van der Kallen. Namely for $f = f(z; x)$ with 0 in the convex hull of $\text{Sp}(f)$, consider the generating function

$$F(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t^{n-1} \int_0^1 dx \int_{\mathbb{T}} f^n = (2\pi i)^{-1} \int_0^1 dx \int_C \frac{f(z; x)}{1 - t f(z; x)} \frac{dz}{z},$$

which defines a holomorphic function for $|t|$ small. In analogy to [2], as $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} f(z) = \infty$, the residue theorem and L'Hopital's rule tell us that for such t , we have

$$F(t) = -\frac{1}{t} - \sum_j \frac{1}{t^2} \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{f'(\zeta_j; x)\zeta_j},$$

where $\zeta_j(z)$ are the x -dependent solutions of $f(\zeta_j; x) = \tau$ with $|\zeta_j| < 1$. Of course this requires that $\tau = 1/t$ is not a critical value of f , so that we don't get zero in the denominators. One would like then to analytically extend these ζ_j 's along some curve C' that avoids the critical values of f , and arguing that the functions under the latter integrals are bounded, conclude that the corresponding F extends analytically to a function that is not identically zero by looking at its behavior as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. In the final round one needs then to carefully discuss the contributions to the integrals of the various cases $\zeta_j(\tau)$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ having in mind that $\zeta_j(\tau)$ might well converge to critical points of f . The hope then is that $-1/t$ will be the dominating term in F in the limit, whence $F \neq 0$, showing that the moments of f cannot all vanish.

But here the problem arises that we don't have C' even for simple f 's. Indeed, the critical values of $f(z; x) = c_{-1}(x)z^{-1} + c_0(x) + c_1(x)z$ are given by $\tau_{\pm}(x) = c_0(x) \pm 2\sqrt{c_{-1}(x)c_1(x)}$, and

the specific choice of polynomials $c_j(x)$ given by $c_1(x) = c_{-1}(x) = 2x - 1 + i(1 - (2x - 1)^2)$ and $c_0(x) = 2x - 1 - i(1 - (2x - 1)^2)$ produces curves or ‘worms’ $\tau_{\pm}([0, 1])$ that enclose the origin completely, thus preventing any curve to reach the origin from infinity.

3 The Dings-Koelink approach

Let G be a connected compact Lie group with maximal torus T , say of dimension r . Let \hat{G} be the set of equivalence classes of irreducible unitary representations of G , and let V_{σ} be the G -module of $\sigma \in \hat{G}$. Decompose $V_{\sigma} = \bigoplus_{m \in \hat{T}} V_{\sigma, m}$ as a module over T . Let f be a regular function on G . Then by definition we may write

$$f = \sum_{\sigma \in \hat{G}} \text{Tr}_{V_{\sigma}}(A_{\sigma} \pi_{\sigma}(\cdot)) = \sum_{\sigma \in \hat{G}} \sum_{m, m' \in \hat{T}} \text{Tr}_{V_{\sigma}}(A_{\sigma, m, m'} \pi_{\sigma, m, m'}(\cdot))$$

for only finitely many non-zero complex quadratic matrices A_{σ} each of size $\dim(V_{\sigma})$. Consider the ‘spectrum’ of f to be

$$X_f = \{(m, m') \in \hat{T} \times \hat{T} \mid A_{\sigma, m, m'} \neq 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^r.$$

Dings and Koelink then showed by using the multinomial formula and left- and right actions of T on G , that if $(0, 0)$ is not in the convex hull of X_f , then the moments $\int_G f^P(s) ds$ vanish for all non-negative integers P , where ds is the Haar measure on G . By using the same trick once more, they also showed that if the converse (their Conjecture 4.1) of the previous statement holds for G , then the Mathieu conjecture holds for G . Thus it remains to show their conjecture:

If all the moments of f vanish, then $(0, 0)$ is not in the convex hull of X_f .

One might of course ask what the relation between X_f and $\text{Sp}(f)$ is when $G = SU(2)$, but we won’t discuss that here.

4 Appendix

Lacking a convenient reference for the formula $\int a^k b^n b^{*m} = \delta_{k,0} \delta_{n,m} (n+1)^{-1}$ of the normalized Haar integral on $SU(2)$, we supply here a short proof. Using the torus actions, invariance of the Haar measure immediately shows that $\int a^k b^n b^{*m}$ can only be non-zero when $k = 0$ and $n = m$. For the remaining part we have the following result:

4.1 LEMMA *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have $\int (b^* b)^n = \frac{1}{n+1}$.*

Proof. Like Dings and Koelink [1], we use the following classical integration formula for $SU(2)$:

$$\int f = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\pi} \int_{-2\pi}^{2\pi} F(\phi, \theta, \psi) \sin \theta d\psi d\theta d\phi,$$

where $F(\phi, \theta, \psi) = f(k(\phi)a(\theta)k(\psi))$ with $k(\phi) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\phi/2} \end{pmatrix}$ and $a(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & i \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \\ i \sin \frac{\theta}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}$.

We are interested in $(b^* b)^n = |b|^{2n}$, where b is the lower left matrix element. The matrices $k(\phi)$ and $k(\psi)$ can be ignored since they only contribute with phases to this matrix element. Thus in terms of the parameters ϕ, θ, ψ we have $|b^* b|^{2n}(\phi, \theta, \psi) = (\sin \frac{\theta}{2})^{2n}$, which is independent of ϕ and

ψ . Taking into account the factor $8\pi^2$ coming from integration over ϕ and ψ , we are left with computing

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi \sin^{2n} \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta \, d\theta.$$

With the substitution $\alpha = \theta/2$ and using $\sin 2\alpha = 2 \sin \alpha \cdot \cos \alpha$ this becomes $2 \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^{2n+1} \alpha \cos \alpha \, d\alpha$. Substituting $x = \sin \alpha$ with $dx = \cos \alpha \, d\alpha$ this turns into $2 \int_0^1 x^{2n+1} \, dx = \frac{2}{2n+2} = \frac{1}{n+1}$. ■

Acknowledgment. M. M. thanks L. T. and OsloMet for hospitality during two months spent there in 2019. His expenses were shared by OsloMet and Radboud University.

References

- [1] T. Dings, E. Koelink: On the Mathieu conjecture for $SU(2)$. *Indag. Math.* **26**, 219-224 (2015).
- [2] J. J. Duistermaat, W. van der Kallen: Constant terms in powers of a Laurent polynomial. *Indag. Math.* **9**, 221-231 (1998).
- [3] J.P. Francoise, F. Pakovich, Y. Yomdin, W. Zhao: Moment vanishing problem and positivity: Some examples. *Bull. Sci. math.* **135**, 10-32 (2011).
- [4] O. Mathieu: Some conjectures about invariant theory and their applications. pp. 263-279 *in*: J. Alev, G. Cauchon (eds.): *Algèbre non commutative, groupes quantiques et invariants*. (Proceedings of the 7th Franco-Belgian Conference, Reims, June 26-30, 1995.). Soc. Math. France, 1997.
- [5] M. Müger, L. Tuset: On the moments of a polynomial in one variable. *Indag. Math.* **31**, 147-151 (2020).