

ON THE NUMBER OF REAL ZEROES OF A HOMOGENEOUS DIFFERENTIAL POLYNOMIAL AND A GENERALIZATION OF THE HAWAII CONJECTURE

OLGA KATKOVA, MIKHAIL TYAGLOV, AND ANNA VISHNYAKOVA

ABSTRACT. For a given real polynomial p we study the possible number of real roots of a differential polynomial $H_{\varkappa}[p](x) = \varkappa(p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x)$, $\varkappa \in \mathbb{R}$. In the special case when all real zeros of the polynomial p are simple, and all roots of its derivative p' are real and simple, the distribution of zeros of $H_{\varkappa}[p]$ is completely described for each real \varkappa . We also provide counterexamples to two Boris Shapiro's conjectures about the number of zeros of the function $H_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p]$.

1. INTRODUCTION

To our dear teacher and friend Victor Katsnelson, an outstanding mathematician and a bright person, with love and gratitude.

In this paper, we investigate the possible number of real zeros of special homogeneous differential polynomials.

Notation 1.1. Let p be a real polynomial and \varkappa be a complex number. We denote by $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$ the following function *associated with* p

$$Q_{\varkappa}[p](x) = p^{1-\varkappa}(x) \cdot \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{p^{\varkappa}(x)}{p'(x)} \right) = \frac{\varkappa(p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2}. \quad (1.1)$$

By $H_{\varkappa}[p]$ we denote the following function:

$$H_{\varkappa}[p](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varkappa(p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x) = (Q_{\varkappa}[p](x))(p'(x))^2. \quad (1.2)$$

We study the number of real roots of $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$ and $H_{\varkappa}[p]$, and we need the following notation.

Notation 1.2. For a real polynomial p , by $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p)$ we denote the number of non-real zeroes of p counting multiplicities. If f is a real rational function, then $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f)$ will denote the number of real zeroes of f counting multiplicities. Generally, the number of zeroes of a real rational function f on a set $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ counting multiplicities will be denoted by $Z_X(f)$. In particular, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f) = Z_{(-\infty, +\infty)}(f)$.

Date: June 4, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 26C10; 30C15.

Key words and phrases. The Hawaii conjecture, the Laguerre inequality, real-rooted polynomials, hyperbolic polynomials, Rolle's type theorems; Chebyshev polynomials of the first kind.

Our interest is concentrated on bounding the number of real zeroes of $Q_\varkappa[p]$ and $H_\varkappa[p]$, that is on bounding $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ and $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_\varkappa[p])$ for $\varkappa \in \mathbb{R}$.

Note that if a polynomial p doesn't have multiple zeros, then

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_\varkappa[p]). \quad (1.3)$$

The following statement belongs to E. Laguerre.

Theorem A. If a real polynomial p has only real and simple zeros, then $H_1[p](x) = (p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

The Laguerre inequality plays an important role in the study of distribution of zeros of real entire functions and in the understanding the nature of the Riemann ξ -function (see [1], [2], [4]–[8] and the references therein for the generalization of the Laguerre inequality, as well).

The following generalization of the Laguerre inequality is known as the Hawaii conjecture.

Conjecture 1.3 (the Hawaii Conjecture, [3]). If all real roots of a real polynomial p are simple, then

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_1[p]) \leq Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p). \quad (1.4)$$

The Hawaii conjecture was posed by T. Craven, G. Csordas, and W. Smith in [3] in 1987, and was proved by Mikhail Tyaglov in 2011 ([15]).

A different situation when the polynomials $H_\varkappa[p]$ appear was discovered by J.L.W.V. Jensen in [10]. Consider the function

$$\Phi_p(x, y) = |p(x + iy)|^2. \quad (1.5)$$

The function $\Phi_p(x, y)$ is real-analytic non-negative function in (x, y) , whose zeros are zeros of $p(z) = p(x + iy)$. Assume that $\deg p = n$ and expand $\Phi_p(x, y)$ in the variable y . We obtain

$$\Phi_p(x, y) = \sum_{k=0}^n P_k(x) \frac{y^{2k}}{(2k)!}, \quad (1.6)$$

where

$$P_k(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j+k} \binom{2k}{j} p^{(j)}(x) p^{(2k-j)}(x). \quad (1.7)$$

In particular, $P_0(x) = p^2(x)$ and $P_1(x) = (p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x)$. Jensen obtained the following sufficient and necessary conditions for a polynomial to have only real simple roots: *the polynomials $P_k(x)$ are strictly positive for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$* . While studying unpublished notes left after Jensen's death in 1925, G. Pólya discovered a different criterion of real-rootedness.

Theorem B (G. Pólya). A real polynomial p of degree n has only real simple zeros if and only if the polynomials

$$G_k[p](x) = (n - k) (p^{(k)}(x))^2 - (n - k + 1) p^{(k-1)}(x) p^{(k+1)}(x)$$

are strictly positive for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Inspired by the Hawaii conjecture and motivated by these two criteria, Boris Shapiro formulated the following two conjectures.

Conjecture 1.4 (Boris Shapiro, [13]). For any real polynomial p of degree $n \geq 2$ all whose real roots are simple

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(n-1)(p')^2 - npp'' \right] \leq Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p). \quad (1.8)$$

If this fact was true, the Hawaii conjecture would hold for G_1 .

Conjecture 1.5 (Boris Shapiro, [13]). For any real polynomial p of even degree $n \geq 2$,

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(n-1)(p')^2 - npp'' \right] + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) > 0. \quad (1.9)$$

The latter inequality is trivially satisfied for odd degree polynomials.

2. MAIN RESULTS

It was observed in [14] that the value $\varkappa = \frac{n-1}{n}$ is of special significance for functions $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$. Although for polynomials all whose zeroes are real the properties of $Q_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p]$ are close to the ones of $Q_1[p]$, there are polynomials of degree $n \geq 4$ with non-real zeros not satisfying Conjecture 1.4. In [14] there was given the example of such a polynomial of degree 4 having two real and two non-real zeros.

Theorem C (M. Tyaglov, M.J. Atia, [14]). If

$$p(x) = (x^2 + a^2)(x + a^2)(x - 1), \quad a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}, \quad (2.1)$$

then

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(H_{\frac{3}{4}}[p] \right) = 4.$$

It is obvious that $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p) = 2 < 4$. Therefore, Theorem C gives a counterexample to the Conjecture 1.4.

However, the question still remains: whether or not counterexamples given by polynomials of higher degrees exist. In the present paper, for each $n = 5, 6, \dots$, we construct a real polynomial p of degree n that doesn't satisfy the Conjecture 1.4.

Proposition 2.1. *If $n \geq 5$ and*

$$p(x) = (x-1)^n + (x+1)^n, \quad (2.2)$$

then

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(H_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p] \right) = 2n - 4,$$

while

$$Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p) = 2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor < Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(H_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p] \right).$$

It follows from Theorem C and Proposition 2.1 that for $\varkappa = \frac{n-1}{n}$, $n = 4, 5, 6, \dots$, the generalization of the Hawaii conjecture

$$Z_{\mathbb{C}}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) \leq Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) \quad (2.3)$$

is not valid.

There arises a natural question: for which values of \varkappa the Hawaii conjecture continues to be true?

We investigate the number of real zeros of the function $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$, $\varkappa \in \mathbb{R}$, in the case when the derivative p' has *only real simple zeros*. The statement bellow can be considered as a generalization of the Hawaii conjecture in this case.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\varkappa \geq \frac{n-1}{n}$. For any real polynomial p of degree $n \geq 2$ all whose real zeros are simple, and all zeros of whose derivative p' are real and simple,*

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p). \quad (2.4)$$

The following two statements give estimations for the number $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa}[p])$ when $\varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\varkappa \leq 0$. For any real polynomial p of degree $n \geq 2$ all whose real zeros are simple, and all zeros of whose derivative p' are real and simple,*

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = n + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) - 2. \quad (2.5)$$

Theorem 2.4. *Let $0 < \varkappa < 1/2$. For any real polynomial p of degree $n \geq 2$ all whose real zeros are simple, and all zeros of whose derivative p' are real and simple,*

$$Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p) - 2 \leq Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) \leq n + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) - 2. \quad (2.6)$$

We will show that both estimations in Theorem 2.4 are sharp. In particular, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *For each $\varkappa, 0 < \varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$, and each $n \geq 3$ there exists a polynomial p_n of degree n all whose real zeros are simple, and all zeros of whose derivative p' are real and simple, such that*

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa}[p_n]) = n + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p_n) - 2.$$

Since

$$n + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) - 2 \leq Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p) \Leftrightarrow Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) \leq 1,$$

Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.5 say that, in general, the Hawaii conjecture is not valid for $\varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$.

In [14] M. Tyaglov and M.J. Atia found the upper and lower bounds of $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa}[p])$ for all real \varkappa when a polynomial p has only real zeros. Their result can be reformulated as follows.

Theorem D (M. Tyaglov, M.J. Atia, [14]). *Let $\frac{k-1}{k} \leq \varkappa < \frac{k}{k+1}$, $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$. If a real polynomial p of degree $n \geq 2$ has only real and simple zeros, then*

$$2 \leq Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) \leq 2n - 2k. \quad (2.7)$$

We will show that all estimations in Theorem D are sharp.

Analyzing the statements of Theorems 2.2 – 2.5 and TheoremD, one can guess that for any real polynomial p of degree n the Hawaii conjecture (2.3) holds when $\varkappa > \frac{n-1}{n}$. The statement below, which is easy to check by direct calculations, shows that this conjecture is not true.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $n \geq 3$, and*

$$p(x) = x^n + ax^{n-2}, \quad a > 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Then for all $\varkappa \in \left[\frac{n-1}{n}, \frac{(2n-3)^2}{4n(n-2)} \right]$

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = 4. \quad (2.9)$$

Remark 2.7. Note that $\frac{(2n-3)^2}{4n(n-2)} > \frac{n-1}{n}$. So, in general, the number $\frac{n-1}{n}$ cannot serve as the infimum for the set of all real \varkappa for which (2.3) is valid.

Remark 2.8. It is worth noting that the polynomial in the above example has 0 as a root of multiplicity $(n-2)$. Any polynomial of the form $p_{2n,a,C}(x) = x^{2n} + ax^{2n-2} + C$, $C \neq 0$, has either two or zero real roots, and any polynomial $p_{2n+1,a,C}(x) = x^{2n+1} + ax^{2n-1} + C$, $C \neq 0$, has only one real root. So, if $\deg p \geq 5$, even a small shift of the polynomial in Proposition 2.6 gives $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p) \geq 4$, which makes (2.9) consistent with (2.3). Probably, the question about the infimum for the set of all real \varkappa for which (2.3) is valid will make more sense for polynomials, all whose real roots are simple.

Unfortunately, in the general case, if there aren't any restrictions on roots of the derivative p' of a real polynomial p , we could find only a lower bound for the number of real zeroes of the function $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$ for an arbitrary real polynomial p whenever $\varkappa \in \mathbb{R}$.

Notation 2.9. We denote by $\mathring{Z}_X(f)$ the number of zeros of the function f on the set X without counting their multiplicities.

Theorem 2.10. *Let p be a real polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$. The following inequalities hold*

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) \geq \mathring{Z}_{\mathbb{R}}(p') + 1 - \mathring{Z}_{\mathbb{R}}(p), \quad \text{for } \varkappa > \frac{n-1}{n}, \quad (2.10)$$

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) \geq \mathring{Z}_{\mathbb{R}}(p') - 1 - \mathring{Z}_{\mathbb{R}}(p), \quad \text{for } 0 < \varkappa \leq \frac{n-1}{n}. \quad (2.11)$$

If $p(x) \neq (x - \alpha)^n$, then

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) \geq \mathring{Z}_{\mathbb{R}}(p') - 1 + \mathring{Z}_{\mathbb{R}}(p), \quad \text{for } \varkappa \leq 0. \quad (2.12)$$

Now let us return to Boris Shapiro's Conjecture 1.5. In their recent preprint [12], Lande Ma and Zhaokun Ma discussed this conjecture for entire transcendental functions. For any even number $n \geq 4$ we give an example of a real polynomial p of degree n that doesn't satisfy Conjecture 1.5 .

Proposition 2.11. *Let $n \geq 2$, and*

$$p_{2n}(x) = \frac{x^{2n}}{2n} + \frac{x^2}{2} + 1. \quad (2.13)$$

Then

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(2n-1)(p'(x))^2 - 2np(x)p''(x) \right] = 0.$$

The following theorem describes a sufficiently broad class of polynomials satisfying Conjecture 1.5.

Theorem 2.12. *Let p be a real polynomial of even degree $n \geq 4$. Assume that there exists $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-2$, such that all the zeros of the derivative $p^{(k)}$ are real. Then*

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(H_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p] \right) + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) > 0. \quad (2.14)$$

The paper has the following structure. In Section 3 we discuss counterexamples to Boris Shapiro's conjectures. In Section 4 we introduce a function $M[p]$, which plays a major role in all our constructions. As an example of applications of $M[p]$, in this Section we prove two theorems: Theorem 2.10 on a lower bound for the number $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_{\varkappa}[p])$, and Theorem 2.12 describing polynomials that satisfy Boris Shapiro's conjecture 1.5. In the rest of our paper we investigate the zero distribution of the functions $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$, where p are real polynomials, all whose real zeros are simple and whose derivative p' has only real and simple roots. Sections 5–9 are devoted to the case $\varkappa > \frac{n-1}{n}$. We develop an idea we found in [9, p.106, Problem 725] and prove that in this case the Hawaii conjecture is true. The result from [9] relates to the case when $\varkappa = 0$ and all roots of p are real and simple. In Section 10 we obtain a result (Lemma 10.2) similar to Rolle's theorem that gives a relation between roots of $H_{\varkappa}[p]$ and $H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']$. This Lemma allows to investigate the zero distribution of the function $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$ in the case $-\infty < \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$ (Sections 11–13). In Section 14 we discuss the accuracy of estimates in Theorem 2.4. Section 15 contains some additional results about the zero distribution of $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$ in the case when $\frac{1}{2} \leq \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$ and all roots of p are real. In Section 16 we describe possible distribution of roots of $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$ when $\frac{1}{2} \leq \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$ in the general case.

3. COUNTEREXAMPLES TO BORIS SHAPIRO'S CONJECTURES: PROOF OF THEOREM C, AND PROPOSITIONS 2.1 AND 2.11

The fact that Conjecture 1.4 is not true for $n = \deg p = 4$ was established in [14]. We provide a proof of Theorem C here for completeness and convenience of readers.

Proof of Theorem C. The polynomial of the fourth degree

$$p(x) = (x^2 + a^2)(x + a^2)(x - 1), \quad a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}, \quad (3.15)$$

has two distinct real zeroes, $-a^2$ and 1, and two non-real zeroes $\pm ia$, so $Z_C(p) = 2$. The function $H_{\frac{3}{4}}[p]$ of this polynomial satisfies the following equality.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4}{3} H_{\frac{3}{4}}[p](x) &= (a^2 - 1)^2 x^4 - 8a^2(a^2 - 1)x^3 - 2a^2(a^4 - 10a^2 + 1)x^2 \\ &\quad + 8a^4(a^2 - 1)x + a^4(a^2 - 1)^2 \\ &= [(a - 1)x - a(a + 1)]^2 \cdot [(a + 1)x + a(a - 1)]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

So, whenever $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-1, 1\}$ it has four real zeroes. Thus,

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(H_{\frac{3}{4}}[p] \right) = 4 > 2 = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p), \quad (3.17)$$

and Conjecture 1.4 fails.

Now we will prove Propositions 2.1 which gives a counterexample to Conjecture 1.4 for each $n = \deg p \geq 5$.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let $n \geq 5$. Consider the polynomial

$$p(x) = (x - 1)^n + (x + 1)^n. \quad (3.18)$$

The numbers $z_k = i \cot \left(\frac{\pi}{2n} + \frac{\pi k}{n} \right)$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$, are the zeros of this polynomial. So, it has exactly $2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor$ pure imaginary zeroes.

For the polynomial $H_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p]$, we have

$$H_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p](x) = -4n(n-1)(x-1)^{n-2}(x+1)^{n-2}. \quad (3.19)$$

So, we have

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(H_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p] \right) = 2n - 4 > 2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p) \quad (3.20)$$

for any $n \geq 5$. Thus, we proved that Conjecture 1.4 is not true for any $n \geq 4$.

At the end of this Section we will prove that the other Boris Shapiro's conjecture 1.5 is not valid. Let us prove Proposition 2.11.

Proof of Proposition 2.11. Let $n \geq 2$, and

$$p_{2n}(x) = \frac{x^{2n}}{2n} + \frac{x^2}{2} + 1.$$

It is obvious that $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) = 0$. For the polynomial p_{2n} we have

$$-2nH_{\frac{2n-1}{2n}}[p](x) = x^{2n}(2n^2 - 5n + 3) + 2n(2n-1)x^{2n-2} - (n-1)x^2 + 2n. \quad (3.21)$$

Let us show that the polynomial (3.21) doesn't have real zeros. First, assume that $|x| \geq 1$. Since $n \geq 2$, in this case $x^{2n-2} \geq x^2$, and the following estimation is true

$$-2nH_{\frac{2n-1}{2n}}[p](x) \geq (n-1)(2n-3)x^{2n} + (2n(2n-1) - (n-1))x^2 + 2n > 0. \quad (3.22)$$

If $|x| < 1$, then $x^2 < 1$, and

$$-2nH_{\frac{2n-1}{2n}}[p](x) \geq (n-1)(2n-3)x^{2n} + 2n(2n-1)x^{2n-2} + n + 1 > 0. \quad (3.23)$$

It follows from (3.22) and (3.23) that

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(H_{\frac{2n-1}{2n}}[p](x) \right) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(H_{\frac{2n-1}{2n}}[p](x) \right) + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) = 0,$$

and Boris Shapiro's conjecture 1.5 is not valid.

4. THE FUNCTION $M[p](x)$. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.10 AND THEOREM 2.12

Without loss of generality we assume that p is a monic polynomial, that is

$$p(x) = x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \dots \quad (4.24)$$

Let us introduce the following function

$$M[p](x) = \frac{p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2}. \quad (4.25)$$

By virtue of (1.1)

$$Q_{\varkappa}[p](x) = \varkappa - M[p](x). \quad (4.26)$$

It is clear that $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_{\varkappa}[p])$ is the same as the number of real roots of the equation

$$M[p](x) = \varkappa. \quad (4.27)$$

Note that if $p'(x)$ doesn't have real roots, all the statements of Theorem 2.10 and Theorem 2.12 are obviously true. Let us denote by

$$\xi_1 < \xi_2 < \dots < \xi_{m-1}, \quad m < n, \quad (4.28)$$

different real poles of the function $M[p]$.

Remark 4.1. Note that if ξ is a root of multiplicity j of the polynomial p , then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi} M[p](x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \xi} \frac{p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2} = \frac{j-1}{j}. \quad (4.29)$$

So, the poles $\{\xi_k\}_{k=1}^{m-1}$ from 4.28 are those zeros of p' that are not roots of p .

By virtue of Rolle's theorem each of the intervals below contains at most one zero of the polynomial p

$$I_1 = (-\infty, \xi_1), \quad I_2 = (\xi_1, \xi_2), \dots, \quad I_m = (\xi_{m-1}, \infty). \quad (4.30)$$

Let us divide all the intervals $(I_k)_{k=1}^m$ into two groups.

Definition 4.2. We will say that an interval

- I_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, is an interval of the **first type** if it contains a root of the polynomial p ;
- I_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, is an interval of the **second type** if it doesn't contain roots of the polynomial p .

Assume that ξ is a root of the derivative p' which is not a root of p . Then

$$p(x) = p(\xi) + \frac{p^{(s)}(\xi)}{s!}(x - \xi)^s + \dots, \quad \text{where } p^{(s)}(\xi) \neq 0. \quad (4.31)$$

If we take up the position that the right behavior of a polynomial p is to have a root in the interval I_k , while not to have a root in the interval is a wrong behavior, we will come to the following classification of the points $\{\xi_k\}_{k=1}^{m-1}$ (see 4.31).

Definition 4.3. Assume that ξ is a pole of $M[p]$ (see (4.25)).

- ξ is a right-hand **right point** if

$$p(\xi)p^{(s)}(\xi)(x - \xi)^s < 0, \text{ when } x \text{ is close to } \xi \text{ and } x > \xi.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi^+} M[p](x) = -\infty. \quad (4.32)$$

- ξ is a left-hand **right point** if

$$p(\xi)p^{(s)}(\xi)(x - \xi)^s < 0, \text{ when } x \text{ is close to } \xi \text{ and } x < \xi.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi^-} M[p](x) = -\infty. \quad (4.33)$$

- ξ is a right-hand **wrong point** if

$$p(\xi)p^{(s)}(\xi)(x - \xi)^s > 0, \text{ when } x \text{ is close to } \xi \text{ and } x > \xi.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi^+} M[p](x) = +\infty. \quad (4.34)$$

- ξ is a left-hand **wrong point** if

$$p(\xi)p^{(s)}(\xi)(x - \xi)^s > 0, \text{ when } x \text{ is close to } \xi \text{ and } x < \xi.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi^-} M[p](x) = +\infty. \quad (4.35)$$

Remark 4.4. The above definition says the following about the end-points of the intervals I_k .

- If a finite interval $I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)$ is an interval of the first type, then ξ_{k-1} is a right-hand right point, and ξ_k is a left-hand right point.
- If a finite interval $I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)$ is an interval of the second type, then either ξ_{k-1} is a right-hand right point, and ξ_k is a left-hand wrong point, or ξ_{k-1} is a right-hand wrong point, and ξ_k is a left-hand right point.
- If an infinite interval $I_1 = (-\infty, \xi_1)$ is an interval of the first type, its finite endpoint ξ_1 is a left-hand right point. If an infinite interval $I_m = (\xi_{m-1}, \infty)$ is an interval of the first type, its finite endpoint ξ_{m-1} is a right-hand right point.
- If an infinite interval $I_1 = (-\infty, \xi_1)$ is an interval of the second type, its finite endpoint ξ_1 is a left-hand wrong point. If an infinite interval $I_m = (\xi_{m-1}, \infty)$ is an interval of the second type, its finite endpoint ξ_{m-1} is a right-hand wrong point.

So, using (4.26), (4.27), (4.32)-(4.35) we come to the following conclusion about the number of real roots of the function $Q_\varkappa[p]$ on finite intervals I_k .

Lemma 4.5. Let p be a real polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$. Then

- If a finite interval I_k is an interval of the first type, then for any real \varkappa the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ is even.
- If a finite interval I_k is an interval of the second type, then for any real \varkappa the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ is odd.

Let us discuss the behavior of the function $M[p]$ at infinity. Note that by (4.25) we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} M[p](x) = \frac{n-1}{n}. \quad (4.36)$$

The statement below follows from (4.36), two last statements of Remark 4.4 and (4.32)-(4.35). It gives an estimation for the number of real roots of the function $Q_\varkappa[p]$ on infinite intervals I_k . As we noted in the beginning of this section, the case when p' doesn't have real roots is trivial for Theorem 2.10 and Theorem 2.12. That's why we do not consider it in the lemma below.

Lemma 4.6. *Let p be a real polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$, and its derivative p' has at least one real root. Then*

- *If an infinite interval I_k , $k = 1$ or m , is an interval of the first type, and $\varkappa \geq \frac{n-1}{n}$, then the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ is even.*
- *If an infinite interval I_k , $k = 1$ or m , is an interval of the first type, and $\varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$, then the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ is odd.*
- *If an infinite interval I_k , $k = 1$ or m , is an interval of the second type, and $\varkappa > \frac{n-1}{n}$, then the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ is odd.*
- *If an infinite interval I_k , $k = 1$ or m , is an interval of the second type, and $\varkappa \leq \frac{n-1}{n}$, then the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p])$ is even.*

Now we can prove Theorem 2.10 on lower bounds for the number of real roots of $Q_\varkappa[p]$. We will use the following standard notation.

Notation 4.7. Let S be a finite set. Then by $\#S$ we will denote the number of elements in the set S .

Proof of Theorem 2.10. Let $\varkappa > \frac{n-1}{n}$. We need to estimate from below $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p])$. By virtue of Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, if we consider a contribution of each $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ into $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ as minimum possible, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p]) &\geq \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is an interval of the second type}\} \\ &= m - \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is an interval of the first type}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that by (4.28), (4.29), (4.30) the number of pairwise unequal roots of the polynomial p' that are not roots of p equals $m-1$. So,

$$m = \mathring{Z}_{\mathbb{R}}(p') + 1 - \#\{\xi \mid \xi \text{ is a multiple root of } p\}. \quad (4.37)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is an interval of the first type}\} &= \\ \mathring{Z}_{\mathbb{R}}(p) - \#\{\xi \mid \xi \text{ is a multiple root of } p\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

The first statement of Theorem 2.10 follows immediately from (4.37) and (4.38).

Now the second statement of Theorem 2.10 is obvious. Counting the number of the intervals of the second type we need just to omit two infinite intervals.

In order to prove the third statement of Theorem 2.10 we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Let p be a real polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$. If I_k is a finite interval of the first type, and $\varkappa \leq 0$, then*

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)) \geq 2. \quad (4.39)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.8. By virtue of Rolle's theorem inside each finite interval I_k there is a root γ of p'' . Thus, by (4.25) if I_k is an interval of the first type, it contains at least two roots of the function $M[p]$. Therefore, taking into account formulas (4.32), (4.33) and (4.26), we obtain

$$Z_{I_k}(\varkappa - M[p](x)) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)) \geq 2.$$

Lemma 4.8 is proved. \square

It follows from Lemma 4.5, Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)) &\geq \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is a finite interval of the second type}\} + \\ &+ 2 \cdot \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is a finite interval of the first type}\} + \\ &\quad \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is an infinite interval of the first type}\} = \\ &\#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is a finite interval}\} + \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is an interval of the first type}\} = \\ &\quad m - 2 + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p). \end{aligned}$$

The third statement of Theorem 2.10 follows from (4.37) and (4.38). \square

Proof of Theorem 2.12. Note that if a polynomial p has real roots, the statement is obvious.

If ξ is a multiple real root of the polynomial p' , then

$$p(x) = a_0 + a_m(x - \xi)^m q(x), \quad m \geq 3,$$

and whence ξ is a root of $H_{\frac{n-1}{n}}[p](x) = \frac{n-1}{n}(p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x)$. So, in this case theorem is also obvious.

Assume now that p doesn't have real roots, all real roots of p' are simple, and $p(x) = x^n + ax^{n-1} + \dots$. Let us expand p about $-\frac{a}{n}$.

$$p(x) = x^n + ax^{n-1} + \dots = \left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^n + b\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-2} + \dots \quad (4.40)$$

Thus,

$$p'(x) = n\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-1} + b(n-2)\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-3} + \dots \quad (4.41)$$

and

$$p''(x) = n(n-1)\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-2} + b(n-2)(n-3)\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-4} + \dots \quad (4.42)$$

It follows from (4.40), (4.41) and (4.42) that

$$M[p](x) - \frac{n-1}{n} = \frac{2bn\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{2n-4} + \dots}{\left(n\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-1} + b(n-2)\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-3} + \dots\right)^2}. \quad (4.43)$$

It is given that for some $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-2$, all the zeros of the derivative

$$p^{(k)}(x) = \frac{n!}{(n-k)!}\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-k} + b\frac{(n-2)!}{(n-k-2)!}\left(x + \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-k-2} + \dots$$

are real. Therefore, the coefficient b in (4.40) must be negative (see [11, p. 434, Lemma 3]). Since $b < 0$, by (4.43) there exists such a value x_0 that for $|x| > x_0 > 0$ the following is true

$$M[p](x) - \frac{n-1}{n} < 0. \quad (4.44)$$

It means that the graph of the function $y = M[p](x)$ approaches its asymptote $y = \frac{n-1}{n}$ from below.

Therefore, the statement of Theorem 2.12 follows immediately from the last statement of Remark 4.4 and formulas (4.34), (4.35). \square

5. THE FUNCTIONS $\varphi_\lambda(x)$ AND $\Phi_\lambda(x)$

From now on we will assume that all real roots of the polynomial p are simple, and all roots of its derivative p' are real and simple. So, in this case the number of intervals I_k is equal to n . The following six sections are devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.2. First we are going to study the case of $\varkappa > \frac{n-1}{n}$. Put

$$\lambda = \varkappa - 1. \quad (5.45)$$

Consider the function

$$\varphi_\lambda(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p'(x)} + \lambda x. \quad (5.46)$$

Note that

$$\varphi'_\lambda(x) = \frac{(p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2} + \lambda = \frac{\varkappa(p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2} = Q_\varkappa[p](x). \quad (5.47)$$

Therefore,

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)). \quad (5.48)$$

If $(\xi_k, p(\xi_k))$ is a local maximum, then p' changes sign from positive to negative, and if $(\xi_k, p(\xi_k))$ is a local minimum, then p' changes sign from negative to positive as x increases through ξ_k . Therefore, according to definition 4.3 and (5.46), if ξ_k is a right point, then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_k^+} \varphi_\lambda(x) = -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_k^-} \varphi_\lambda(x) = +\infty, \quad (5.49)$$

and if ξ_k is a wrong point, then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_k^+} \varphi_\lambda(x) = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_k^-} \varphi_\lambda(x) = -\infty. \quad (5.50)$$

The formula below describes asymptotic behavior of the function $\varphi_\lambda(x)$ at infinity

$$\varphi_\lambda(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p'(x)} + \lambda x = \left(\frac{1}{n} + \lambda \right) x + o(x), \quad x \rightarrow \pm\infty. \quad (5.51)$$

Given a real number λ , we will evaluate the number of all real roots of the equation

$$\varphi_\lambda(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p'(x)} + \lambda x = \mu \quad (5.52)$$

in each interval I_k for any real value of the parameter μ .

The lemma below follows immediately from (5.49), (5.50), (5.51) and Remark 4.4.

Lemma 5.1. *The following statements are true.*

- (1) For all real values of the parameters μ, λ , and every $k = 2, 3, \dots, n - 1$
 - $Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu)$ is odd if I_k is an interval of the first type.
 - $Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu)$ is even if I_k is an interval of the second type.
- (2) For all real values of the parameter μ , for every $\lambda > -\frac{1}{n}$, and $k = 1$ or $k = n$
 - $Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu)$ is odd if I_k is an interval of the first type.
 - $Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu)$ is even if I_k is an interval of the second type.
- (3) For all real values of the parameter μ , for every $\lambda < -\frac{1}{n}$, and $k = 1$ or $k = n$
 - $Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu)$ is even if I_k is an interval of the first type.

Further we will need the following obvious lemma that describes some properties of a monic polynomial p , all roots of whose derivative p' are real and simple.

Lemma 5.2. *Let p be a real monic polynomial, and all zeros of p' are real and simple. Then*

- (1) $(-1)^{n-k-1}p''(\xi_k) > 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$.
- (2) $(-1)^{n-k}p'(x) > 0$, $x \in I_k$.
- (3) $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} p'(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} (-1)^{n-1}p'(x) = +\infty$.

In order to estimate the number of real roots of (5.52) in intervals I_k we will consider a function

$$\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu) = (\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu)p'(x) = p(x) + \lambda xp'(x) - \mu p'(x), \quad (5.53)$$

and its derivative

$$\Phi'_\lambda(x, \mu) = (1 + \lambda)p'(x) + (\lambda x - \mu)p''(x). \quad (5.54)$$

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2 IN THE PARTIAL CASE OF $\lambda = 0$

Let us prove Theorem 2.2 in the partial case of $\lambda = 0$. In a sense, this is the base case in the proof of this theorem.

If $\lambda = 0$, then (5.46) has the form

$$\varphi_0(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p'(x)}. \quad (6.55)$$

The statement below describes monotonicity of the function φ_0 , provides estimations for the number of real roots of the derivative φ'_0 on the intervals I_k , and as a result gives the proof of Theorem 2.2 in the case of $\lambda = 0$.

Lemma 6.1. *The following statements are true.*

- (1) The function $\varphi_0(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p'(x)}$ is increasing on any interval I_k of the first type.
- (2) $Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_0(x)) = Z_{I_k}((p')^2 - pp'') = 0$ if I_k is an interval of the first type, and
- (3) $Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_0(x)) = Z_{I_k}((p')^2 - pp'') = 1$ if I_k is an interval of the second type.
- (4) $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(\varphi'_0(x)) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}((p')^2 - pp'') = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p)$.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. If $\lambda = 0$, then (5.53) and (5.54) can be rewritten in the form

$$\Phi_0(x, \mu) = (\varphi_0(x) - \mu)p'(x) = p(x) - \mu p'(x), \quad (6.56)$$

and

$$\Phi'_0(x, \mu) = p'(x) - \mu p''(x). \quad (6.57)$$

Since ξ_k is a root of the polynomial p' the following identity is true

$$(-1)^{n-k} \Phi'_0(\xi_k, \mu) = (-1)^{n-k+1} \mu p''(\xi_k), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1. \quad (6.58)$$

It follows from the statement 1 of Lemma 5.2 that

$$(-1)^{n-k} \Phi'_0(\xi_k, \mu) > 0, \quad \text{whenever } \mu > 0, \quad (6.59)$$

and

$$(-1)^{n-k} \Phi'_0(\xi_k, \mu) < 0, \quad \text{whenever } \mu < 0. \quad (6.60)$$

By the statement 3 of Lemma 5.2

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \Phi'_0(x, \mu) = \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \Phi'_0(x, \mu) = +\infty. \quad (6.61)$$

Since $\deg \Phi'_0(x, \mu) = n-1$, it follows from (6.59) and (6.61) that for any $\mu > 0$

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi'_0(x, \mu)) = 1, \quad \text{when } k = 2, 3, \dots, n, \quad (6.62)$$

and from (6.60) and (6.61) that for any $\mu < 0$

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi'_0(x, \mu)) = 1, \quad \text{when } k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1. \quad (6.63)$$

Thus, for any real $\mu \neq 0$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we obtain

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_0(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_0(x) - \mu) \leq 2. \quad (6.64)$$

If $\mu = 0$, then according to (6.56)

$$\Phi_0(x, 0) = \varphi_0(x) = p(x).$$

Hence, by virtue of Rolle's Theorem

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_0(x, 0)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_0(x)) = Z_{I_k}(p(x)) \leq 1,$$

and (6.64) is obviously true.

It follows from (6.64), and the statement 1 of Lemma 5.1 that for any real μ and each interval I_k of the first type we have

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_0(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_0(x) - \mu) = 1. \quad (6.65)$$

According to the Remark 4.4, both endpoints of a finite interval of the first type I_k are right points; and the finite endpoint of an infinite interval of the first type I_k is a right point. So, if I_k is an interval of the first type, the relation (6.65) together with (5.49) in the case of a finite interval I_k , and (5.49), (5.51) in the case of an infinite interval I_k , provide the fact that the function $\varphi_0(x)$ is increasing on each interval I_k of the first type. The statement 1 of Lemma 6.1 is proved.

Since $\varphi_0(x)$ is monotone on each interval I_k of the first type, we have

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_0(x)) = Z_{I_k}((p'(x))^2 - p(x)p''(x)) = 0, \quad (6.66)$$

where I_k is an interval of the first type. It follows from the statement 2 of Lemma 5.1 and (6.64) that for any real μ and each interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_0(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_0(x) - \mu) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (6.67)$$

Using the statements of the Remark 4.4 related to intervals of the second type, taking into account (5.49) and (5.50) in the case of a finite interval I_k , and (5.50)(5.51) in the case of an infinite interval I_k , we obtain that for each interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_0) = Z_{I_k}((p')^2 - pp'') = 1. \quad (6.68)$$

The statement 2 of Lemma 6.1 is proved.

The formulas (6.66) and (6.68) show that the number of real zeros of the polynomial $(p')^2 - pp''$ coincides with the total number of the intervals of the second type, that is

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}((p')^2 - pp'') = n - Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p). \quad (6.69)$$

Lemma 6.1 is proved. \square

7. THE FUNCTION $\Psi_{\alpha}(x, \nu)$

Now we assume that $\lambda \neq 0$. So, we can rewrite (5.54) in the form

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \Phi'_{\lambda}(x, \mu) = \frac{1 + \lambda}{\lambda} p'(x) + \left(x - \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\right) p''(x), \quad (7.70)$$

where μ is any real number.

Denote by

$$\alpha = \frac{1 + \lambda}{\lambda}, \quad (7.71)$$

and by

$$\nu = \frac{\mu}{\lambda}. \quad (7.72)$$

Note that ν takes any real value, while

$$\alpha > 1, \quad \text{when } \lambda > 0, \quad (7.73)$$

and

$$\alpha < -(n - 1), \quad \text{when } 1/n < \lambda < 0. \quad (7.74)$$

We introduce the function

$$\Psi_{\alpha}(x, \nu) =: \alpha p'(x) + (x - \nu) p''(x). \quad (7.75)$$

Obviously,

$$\Psi_{\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}} \left(x, \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\right) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \Phi'_{\lambda}(x, \mu). \quad (7.76)$$

The lemma below describes behavior of the function $\Psi_{\alpha}(x, \nu)$ for several important values of x and at infinity.

Lemma 7.1. *The following statements are true.*

- (1) For all real values of the parameter ν and every $k = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$
 - $(-1)^{n-k} \Psi_{\alpha}(\xi_k, \nu) < 0$, whenever $\xi_k > \nu$.
 - $(-1)^{n-k} \Psi_{\alpha}(\xi_k, \nu) > 0$, whenever $\xi_k < \nu$.
- (2) If $\nu \in I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)$, $k = 2, \dots, n - 1$, then
 - $(-1)^{n-k} \Psi_{\alpha}(\nu, \nu) > 0$, whenever $\alpha > 0$.
 - $(-1)^{n-k} \Psi_{\alpha}(\nu, \nu) < 0$, whenever $\alpha < 0$.
- (3) For all real values of the parameter ν

- $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_\alpha(x, \nu) = \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \Psi_\alpha(x, \nu) = +\infty$, whenever $\alpha > -(n-1)$.
 - $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_\alpha(x, \nu) = \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \Psi_\alpha(x, \nu) = -\infty$, whenever $\alpha < -(n-1)$.
- (4) For all real values of the parameter α and any $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$

$$\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_k) = (x - \xi_k)h(x),$$

where

$$h(\xi_k) = (\alpha + 1)p''(\xi_k).$$

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Since ξ_k is a root of p' , by virtue of (7.75) we have

$$(-1)^{n-k} \Psi_\alpha(\xi_k, \nu) = (-1)^{n-k-1} p''(\xi_k)(\nu - \xi_k). \quad (7.77)$$

Now the first statement of Lemma 7.1 follows immediately from the first statement of Lemma 5.2.

The following identity can also be derived from (7.75)

$$(-1)^{n-k} \Psi_\alpha(\nu, \nu) = (-1)^{n-k} \alpha p'(\nu). \quad (7.78)$$

The second statement of Lemma 7.1 is a direct corollary of this identity and the second statement of Lemma 5.2.

Using definition (7.75) of the function Ψ_α and the third statement of Lemma 5.2 we easily obtain the third statement of Lemma 7.1.

Let us prove the fourth statement of Lemma 7.1. Since ξ_k is a root of the polynomial p' , there exists a polynomial g such that

$$p'(x) = (x - \xi_k)g(x), \quad (7.79)$$

and

$$g(\xi_k) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_k} \frac{p'(x) - p'(\xi_k)}{x - \xi_k} = p''(\xi_k). \quad (7.80)$$

It follows from (7.75) with $\nu = \xi_k$ and (7.79) that

$$\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_k) = \alpha p'(x) + (x - \xi_k)p''(x) = (x - \xi_k)(\alpha g(x) + p''(x)) =: (x - \xi_k)h(x), \quad (7.81)$$

where

$$h(\xi_k) = (\alpha + 1)p''(\xi_k). \quad (7.82)$$

Lemma 7.1 is proved. \square

8. ESTIMATIONS FOR $Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu))$

The following Lemma provides the main technical tools for proving Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 8.1. *The following statements are true.*

- (1) If $\alpha \geq 0$, then for all real values of the parameter ν we have
 - $Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) \leq 2$ when $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$.
 - $Z_{I_1}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) \leq 1$ and $Z_{I_n}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) \leq 1$.
- (2) If $\alpha < -(n-1)$, then for all real values of the parameter ν and all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ we have $Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) \leq 1$.

Proof of Lemma 8.1. First, consider the case of $\alpha = 0$. Using (7.75) we obtain

$$\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu) = (x - \nu)p''(x),$$

and the statement 1 of Lemma 8.1 follows from Rolle's theorem.

By definition (7.75) of the function $\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)$, for all real values of the parameter ν and $\alpha \neq -(n-1)$ we have

$$\deg \Psi_\alpha(x, \nu) = n - 1. \quad (8.83)$$

Now assume that $\alpha > 0$. Using the first statement of Lemma 7.1 in the case of a finite interval I_k , and additionally the third statement of Lemma 7.1 in the case of the infinite intervals I_1 and I_n , we conclude that the relations below are valid

$$Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 1, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, n, \quad \text{whenever } \nu > \xi_{n-1}, \quad (8.84)$$

and

$$Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 1, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, \quad \text{whenever } \nu < \xi_1. \quad (8.85)$$

If $\xi_{j-1} < \nu < \xi_j$, then applying the first and the second statements of Lemma 7.1 we obtain the following relations.

$$Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 1, \quad k = 2, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, n-1, \quad (8.86)$$

and

$$Z_{(\xi_{j-1}, \nu)}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = Z_{(\nu, \xi_j)}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 1. \quad (8.87)$$

Therefore,

$$Z_{I_1}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = Z_{I_n}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 0. \quad (8.88)$$

This provides the first statement of Lemma 8.1 in the case when $\nu \neq \xi_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

To investigate the case of $\nu = \xi_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, we will use the fourth statement of Lemma 7.1. According to this statement

$$\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_j) = (x - \xi_j)h(x), \quad (8.89)$$

where

$$h(\xi_j) = (\alpha + 1)p''(\xi_j). \quad (8.90)$$

By the first statement of Lemma 5.2

$$(-1)^{n-j-1}h(\xi_j) = (-1)^{n-j-1}(\alpha + 1)p''(\xi_j) > 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1. \quad (8.91)$$

It follows from (8.89) and (8.91) that there exists a positive number ε such that

$$(-1)^{n-j-1}\Psi_\alpha(\xi_j + \varepsilon, \xi_j) = \varepsilon(-1)^{n-j-1}h(\xi_j) > 0, \quad (8.92)$$

and

$$(-1)^{n-j-1}\Psi_\alpha(\xi_j - \varepsilon, \xi_j) = -\varepsilon(-1)^{n-j-1}h(\xi_j) < 0, \quad (8.93)$$

while

$$\Psi_\alpha(\xi_j, \xi_j) = 0. \quad (8.94)$$

Applying the first statement of Lemma 7.1 we obtain

$$(-1)^{n-k}\Psi_\alpha(\xi_k, \xi_j) < 0, \quad \text{when } k > j, \quad (8.95)$$

and

$$(-1)^{n-k}\Psi_\alpha(\xi_k, \xi_j) > 0, \quad \text{when } k < j. \quad (8.96)$$

In particular,

$$(-1)^{n-j-1}\Psi_\alpha(\xi_{j+1}, \xi_j) < 0, \quad (8.97)$$

and

$$(-1)^{n-j-1}\Psi_\alpha(\xi_{j-1}, \xi_j) > 0. \quad (8.98)$$

Based on (8.92)–(8.98) and (8.83) we conclude that

$$Z_{[\xi_j, \xi_j]}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_j)) = Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_j)) = 1 \quad \text{for any } k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1, \quad (8.99)$$

and

$$Z_{I_1}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_j)) = Z_{I_n}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_j)) = 0. \quad (8.100)$$

Thus, the first statement of Lemma 8.1 is also valid for $\nu = \xi_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Now assume that $\alpha < -(n-1)$. Let $\nu \in I_j = (\xi_{j-1}, \xi_j)$, $j = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$. Applying the first statement of Lemma 7.1 in the case of finite intervals I_k , and additionally the third statement of Lemma 7.1 in the case of infinite intervals I_1 or I_n , taking into account (8.83) we obtain

$$Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 1, \quad k \neq j, \quad (8.101)$$

while

$$Z_{I_j}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 0. \quad (8.102)$$

Using the same idea, in the case of $\nu \geq \xi_{n-1}$ we have

$$Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 1, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, \quad (8.103)$$

while

$$Z_{I_n}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 0; \quad (8.104)$$

and in the case of $\nu \leq \xi_1$

$$Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 1, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, n, \quad (8.105)$$

while

$$Z_{I_1}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 0. \quad (8.106)$$

In the case of $\nu = \xi_j$, $j = 2, 3, \dots, n-2$, we use again the first and third statements of Lemma 7.1 and (8.83). We have

$$Z_{[\xi_j, \xi_j]}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_j)) = Z_{I_k}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \xi_j)) = 1, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, n, \quad (8.107)$$

while

$$Z_{I_j}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = Z_{I_{j+1}}(\Psi_\alpha(x, \nu)) = 0. \quad (8.108)$$

Lemma 8.1 is proved. \square

9. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2 AND BEYOND

As we noticed in the Section 5 (see (5.47)) there is an intimate connection between the functions φ'_λ and $Q_{\neq}[p]$. The following lemma gives fundamental estimations for the proof of Theorem 4.4.

Lemma 9.1. *The following statements are true.*

(1) *If $\lambda > -\frac{1}{n}$, then*

- *For any interval I_k of the second type*

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 1. \quad (9.109)$$

- *For any interval I_k of the first type*

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 0. \quad (9.110)$$

(2) *If $\lambda \leq -1$, then*

- *For any finite interval of the second type I_k*

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 1. \quad (9.111)$$

- *For any infinite interval of the first type I_k*

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 1. \quad (9.112)$$

- *For any infinite interval of the second type I_k*

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 0. \quad (9.113)$$

Proof of Lemma 9.1. By virtue of (7.71) and (7.76) the statement of Lemma 8.1 can be rewritten as follows.

Lemma 9.2. *The following statements are true.*

(1) *If $\lambda > 0$ or $\lambda \leq -1$, then for all real values of the parameter μ we have*

- $Z_{I_k}(\Phi'_\lambda(x, \mu)) \leq 2$ when $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$.
- $Z_{I_1}(\Phi'_\lambda(x, \mu)) \leq 1$ and $Z_{I_n}(\Phi'_\lambda(x, \mu)) \leq 1$.

(2) *If $-\frac{1}{n} < \lambda < 0$, then for all real values of the parameter μ and all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ we have*

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi'_\lambda(x, \mu)) \leq 1.$$

Let us apply Rolle's theorem to the above statements. If $\lambda > 0$ or $\lambda \leq -1$, then for all real values of the parameter μ we have

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) \leq 3, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1, \quad (9.114)$$

and

$$Z_{I_1}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) \leq 2, \quad Z_{I_n}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) \leq 2. \quad (9.115)$$

Assume that $-\frac{1}{n} < \lambda < 0$. Then for all real values of the parameter μ we have

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) \leq 2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (9.116)$$

Formulas (9.114), (9.115), (9.116) together with Lemma 5.1 and (5.53) provide the following facts.

(1) If $\lambda > 0$, and μ is any real number, then

- For any finite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (9.117)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu) = 1. \quad (9.118)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (9.119)$$

(2) If $-\frac{1}{n} < \lambda < 0$, and μ is any real number, then

- For any interval I_k , $k = 1, \dots, n$, of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu) = 1. \quad (9.120)$$

- For any interval I_k , $k = 1, \dots, n$, of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (9.121)$$

(3) If $\lambda \leq -1$, and μ is any real number, then

- For any finite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (9.122)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (9.123)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\Phi_\lambda(x, \mu)) = Z_{I_k}(\varphi_\lambda(x) - \mu) = 1. \quad (9.124)$$

Taking into account (5.49), (5.50), (5.51), and applying the second statement of Lemma 6.1 in the case of $\lambda = 0$, we come to the conclusion.

(1) If $\lambda \geq 0$,

- For any finite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 1. \quad (9.125)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 0. \quad (9.126)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 1. \quad (9.127)$$

(2) If $-\frac{1}{n} < \lambda < 0$,

- For any interval I_k , $k = 1, \dots, n$, of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 0. \quad (9.128)$$

- For any interval I_k , $k = 1, \dots, n$, of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 1. \quad (9.129)$$

(3) If $\lambda \leq -1$,

- For any finite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 1. \quad (9.130)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 1. \quad (9.131)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 0. \quad (9.132)$$

In order to complete the proof of Lemma 9.1 we only have to check (9.110) in the case of $\lambda > 0$. It follows from the first statement of Lemma 6.1 that if $\lambda > 0$, the function

$$\varphi_\lambda(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p'(x)} + \lambda x$$

is increasing on any interval I_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, of the first type. Hence, on any interval I_k of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = 0. \quad (9.133)$$

Lemma 9.1 is proved. \square

Let us prove Theorem 2.2. We have $\varkappa > \frac{n-1}{n}$. According to (5.47)

$$Z_{I_k}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)), \quad (9.134)$$

where by (5.45)

$$\lambda = \varkappa - 1 > -\frac{1}{n}.$$

Now we can rewrite the first statement of Lemma 9.1 as follows. Let $\varkappa > \frac{n-1}{n}$. Then

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 1, \quad \text{if } I_k \text{ is any interval of the second type.} \quad (9.135)$$

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 0 \quad \text{if } I_k \text{ is any interval of the first type.} \quad (9.136)$$

Thus, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ equals to the number of all intervals of the second type, that is

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_\varkappa[p](x)) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}(\varphi'_\lambda(x)) = n - Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p) = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p).$$

Theorem 2.2 is proved. \square

Lemma 9.1 allows to make important conclusions in the case of $\varkappa \leq 0$. If $\varkappa \leq 0$, then $\lambda = \varkappa - 1 \leq -1$. The following lemma follows from (9.130), (9.131) and (9.132).

Lemma 9.3. *If $\varkappa \leq 0$, then*

- For any finite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p](x)) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)) = 1. \quad (9.137)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p](x)) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)) = 1. \quad (9.138)$$

- For any infinite interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p](x)) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p](x)) = 0. \quad (9.139)$$

Remark 9.4. Note that in order to prove Theorem 2.3 we just have to show that for any finite interval I_k of the first type

$$Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{I_k}(\varkappa(p')^2 - p''p) = 2. \quad (9.140)$$

Indeed, if we use the standard notation $\#S$ for the number of elements in any finite set S , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa}[p](x)) &= Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_{\varkappa}[p](x)) = \\ &\#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is a finite interval of the second type}\} + \\ &+ 2 \cdot \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is a finite interval of the first type}\} + \\ &\#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is an infinite interval of the first type}\} \\ &= \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is a finite interval}\} + \#\{I_k \mid I_k \text{ is an interval of the first type}\} = \\ &n - 2 + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(p). \end{aligned}$$

10. RELATIONS BETWEEN ZEROS OF $H_{\varkappa}[p](x)$ AND ZEROS OF $H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'](x)$. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3

Using definition (1.2) of the function $H_{\varkappa}[p]$ we obtain the following formula for the derivative $H'_{\varkappa}[p]$

$$H'_{\varkappa}[p] = (2\varkappa - 1)p'p'' - p'''p, \quad (10.141)$$

and if $\varkappa \neq 0$, then

$$H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'] = \left(2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa}\right) (p'')^2 - p'''p'. \quad (10.142)$$

The lemma below can be easily verified.

Lemma 10.1. *For $\varkappa \neq 0$,*

$$H'_{\varkappa}[p] \cdot p' - H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'] \cdot p = \frac{2\varkappa - 1}{\varkappa} H_{\varkappa}[p] \cdot p'', \quad (10.143)$$

$$H'_{\varkappa}[p] \cdot p'' - \varkappa H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'] \cdot p' = H_{\varkappa}[p] \cdot p'''. \quad (10.144)$$

The statement below can be considered as an analogue of Rolle's Theorem, which provides the relation between zeros of $H_{\varkappa}[p]$ and zeros of $H_{(2-\frac{1}{\varkappa})}[p']$.

Lemma 10.2. *Assume that $\varkappa \neq 0$, and*

- (1) $H_{\varkappa}[p](x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in (a, b)$.
- (2) $H_{\varkappa}[p](a) = H_{\varkappa}[p](b) = 0$.

Then

- (1) *Let $p'(x) \neq 0$ and $p(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. There exists $y \in (a, b)$ such that*

$$H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'](y) = 0.$$

- (2) *Let $p'(x) \neq 0$ and $p''(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. There exists $y \in (a, b)$ such that*

$$H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'](y) = 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 10.2 Let us prove the first statement of Lemma 10.2. Assume that $p(x) \neq 0$ and $p'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in (a, b)$. Let a be a root of multiplicity m and b be a root of multiplicity k of the function $H_{\varkappa}[p]$. It means that there are polynomials q_1 and q_2 as well as constants $c \neq 0$ and $d \neq 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\varkappa}[p](x) &= (x - a)^m(c + (x - a)q_1(x)), \quad \text{and} \\ H_{\varkappa}[p](x) &= (x - b)^k(d + (x - b)q_2(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (10.145)$$

Because $H_{\varkappa}[p](x) \neq 0$ in (a, b) , we have

$$(-1)^k c \cdot d > 0. \quad (10.146)$$

Since $p(x) \neq 0$ and $p'(x) \neq 0$ it follows from (10.143), (10.144) that a is a root of multiplicity at least $m - 1$ and b is a root of multiplicity at least $k - 1$ of the function $H_{(2-\frac{1}{\varkappa})}[p']$. So, there are polynomials T_1 and T_2 such that

$$H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'](x) = (x - a)^{m-1}T_1(x) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'](x) = (x - b)^{k-1}T_2(x). \quad (10.147)$$

Using (10.143), (10.145) and (10.147) we obtain

$$T_1(a) = \frac{p'(a)}{p(a)}mc, \quad (10.148)$$

$$T_2(b) = \frac{p'(b)}{p(b)}kd. \quad (10.149)$$

Because $p'(x) \neq 0$ and $p(x) \neq 0$ on the interval $[a, b]$, the following is true

$$\frac{p'(a)}{p(a)} \cdot \frac{p'(b)}{p(b)} > 0. \quad (10.150)$$

Therefore, by (10.146)

$$(-1)^k T_1(a)T_2(b) > 0.$$

Since the functions $T_1(x)$ and $T_2(x)$ are continuous, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(-1)^k T_1(a + \varepsilon)T_2(b - \varepsilon) > 0, \quad (10.151)$$

and by (10.147)

$$H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'](a + \varepsilon) \cdot H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'](b - \varepsilon) = (\varepsilon)^{m+k-2}(-1)^{k-1}T_1(a + \varepsilon)T_2(b - \varepsilon) < 0. \quad (10.152)$$

We obtain the first statement of Lemma 10.2.

The second statement of Lemma 10.2 can be derived from (10.144) in the similar way. Lemma 10.2 is proved. \square

The following estimation for the number $Z_{(a,b)}(H_{\varkappa}[p])$ through $Z_{(a,b)}\left(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']\right)$ is derived from Lemma 10.2 in the same way as similar facts about relations between the number of zeros of a function f and the number of zeros of its derivative f' are usually obtained from the original Rolle's theorem.

Corollary 10.3. *Assume that $\varkappa \neq 0$. Let either $p'(x) \neq 0$ and $p(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in [a, b]$, or $p''(x) \neq 0$ and $p'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. Then*

$$Z_{(a,b)}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq Z_{(a,b)}\left(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']\right) + 1. \quad (10.153)$$

Denote by $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \dots < \gamma_{n-2}$ the roots of p'' . Since the roots $\xi_1 < \xi_2 < \dots < \xi_{n-1}$ of the polynomial p' are real and simple, we have

$$-\infty < \xi_1 < \gamma_1 < \xi_2 < \gamma_2 < \xi_3 < \dots < \gamma_{n-2} < \xi_{n-1} < \infty. \quad (10.154)$$

We will consider the intervals

$$\begin{aligned} J_{2k-1} &= (\xi_k, \gamma_k), \quad J_{2k} = (\gamma_k, \xi_{k+1}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n-2; \\ J_0 &= I_1 = (-\infty, \xi_1), \quad J_{2n-3} = (\xi_{n-1}, \infty). \end{aligned} \quad (10.155)$$

Remark 10.4. Both p' and p'' do not vanish on each of the intervals J_k , $k = 0, 1, \dots, 2n-3$.

The following fact about the number of zeros of the function $H_\varkappa[p]$ on the intervals J_k is true.

Lemma 10.5. *Let $\varkappa < 0$. Then*

$$Z_{J_m}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq 1 \quad (10.156)$$

for any $m = 0, 1, \dots, 2n-3$.

Proof of Lemma 10.5 Given $\varkappa < 0$, we have $2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa} > 2$. Since all roots of p' are real and simple, all roots of its derivative p'' are also real and simple. Therefore, we can apply Theorem 2.2 to the polynomial p' . We have

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']\right) = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p') = 0. \quad (10.157)$$

Let us fix any interval J_m , $m = 0, 1, \dots, 2n-3$. Because by Remark 10.4 both p' and p'' do not vanish on J_m , we can apply Corollary 10.3 and obtain the statement of Lemma 10.5. Lemma 10.5 is proved. \square

The following lemma is the key to the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Lemma 10.6. *Let $\varkappa \leq 0$. Then*

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq 2 \quad (10.158)$$

for any $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$, and

$$Z_{I_1}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq 1, \quad Z_{I_n}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq 1. \quad (10.159)$$

Proof of Lemma 10.6. By (10.154) and (10.155)

$$I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k) = (\xi_{k-1}, \gamma_{k-1}) \cup \{\gamma_{k-1}\} \cup (\gamma_{k-1}, \xi_k) = J_{2k-3} \cup \{\gamma_{k-1}\} \cup J_{2k-2}.$$

Note that

$$H_\varkappa[p](\gamma_k) \neq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n-2. \quad (10.160)$$

Indeed, suppose that $H_\varkappa[p](\gamma_k) = 0$. Since γ_k is a root of p'' , it follows from the definition (1.2) of the function $H_\varkappa[p]$ that in this case $p'(\gamma_k) = 0$. This fact contradicts to the assumption of Theorem 2.3 that p' doesn't have multiple roots.

If $\varkappa < 0$ the statement of lemma follows immediately from (10.156) and (10.160). Note that for $\varkappa = 0$ we have

$$H_{\varkappa}[p](x) = -p(x)p''(x).$$

Since all roots of p' are real and simple, there is exactly one root of p'' inside each finite interval I_k . If I_k is an interval of the first type, it also contains one root of p , while if it is of the second type it doesn't have roots of p . So,

$$Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 2, \quad \text{if } I_k \text{ is a finite interval of the first type,} \quad (10.161)$$

and

$$Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 1, \quad \text{if } I_k \text{ is a finite interval of the second type.} \quad (10.162)$$

If I_k is an infinite interval, there is no roots of p'' in I_k . Thus,

$$Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 1, \quad \text{if } I_k \text{ is an infinite interval of the first type,} \quad (10.163)$$

and

$$Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 0, \quad \text{if } I_k \text{ is an infinite interval of the second type.} \quad (10.164)$$

Lemma 10.6 is proved. \square

Since p doesn't have real multiple roots, and all roots of p' are real and simple,

$$H_{\varkappa}[p](x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow Q_{\varkappa}[p](x) = 0. \quad (10.165)$$

So, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and any real \varkappa we have

$$Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]). \quad (10.166)$$

Now for each $\varkappa \leq 0$ formula (9.140) follows from Lemma 10.6 and Lemma 4.8, that is

$$Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 2, \quad \text{if } I_k \text{ is a finite interval of the first type.} \quad (10.167)$$

By virtue of Remark 9.4 this completes the proof of Theorem 2.3.

11. SOME PROPERTIES OF $M[p]$

Assume that I_k is a finite interval of the first type. According to (10.167) for each $\varkappa \leq 0$ there are exactly two roots of $Q_{\varkappa}[p](x)$ inside I_k . The statement below gives an idea about the zero distribution of the function $Q_{\varkappa}[p](x)$ inside a finite interval I_k of the first type for $\varkappa < 0$.

Lemma 11.1. *Let $\varkappa < 0$. Suppose that $I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)$ is a finite interval of the first type, and $\alpha \in I_k$ is the only zero of p inside the interval I_k . Then*

$$Z_{(\xi_{k-1}, \alpha)}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{(\alpha, \xi_k)}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = 1. \quad (11.168)$$

Proof of Lemma 11.1 Note that by the definition (4.25) of the function $M[p]$ we have

$$M[p](\alpha) = 0,$$

and by (4.26) for any $\varkappa < 0$ we have

$$Q_{\varkappa}[p](\alpha) = \varkappa - M[p](\alpha) < 0. \quad (11.169)$$

Using (4.32) and (4.33) we obtain

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_{k-1}^+} Q_{\varkappa}[p](x) = \varkappa - \lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_{k-1}^+} M[p](x) > 0, \quad (11.170)$$

and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_k^-} Q_{\varkappa}[p](x) = \varkappa - \lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_k^-} M[p](x) > 0. \quad (11.171)$$

It follows from (11.170), (11.171) and (11.169) that both numbers $Z_{(\xi_{k-1}, \alpha)}(Q_{\varkappa}[p])$ and $Z_{(\alpha, \xi_k)}(Q_{\varkappa}[p])$ are odd. By virtue of (10.167) it is possible only if the statement of Lemma 11.1 is true. \square

Remark 11.2. Let $I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)$ be a finite interval of the first type, and $\gamma_{k-1} \in I_k$ be the only zero of p'' inside the interval I_k . In the same way as above, using (11.170), (11.171), (10.167), (10.156), and (10.160) we can prove that

$$Z_{(\xi_{k-1}, \gamma)}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{(\gamma, \xi_k)}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = 1. \quad (11.172)$$

Remark 11.3. The relations (11.168) and (11.172) give an idea how the graph of the function $M[p](x)$ should look on finite intervals of the first type. It follows from (4.25) that the function $M[p]$ has exactly two roots in the interval I_k : a root α of p and a root γ of p'' . Let us denote these roots of $M[p]$ by z_1 and z_2 , where $z_1 \leq z_2$. By virtue of (4.26) the relations (11.168) and (11.172) mean that for each $\varkappa \leq 0$ the equation (4.27)

$$M[p](x) = \varkappa$$

has the unique solution in the interval (ξ_{k-1}, z_1) and the unique solution in the interval (z_2, ξ_k) . Taking into account (4.32) and (4.33) we can conclude that

$$M[p](x) < 0 \quad \text{and is increasing on the interval } (\xi_{k-1}, z_1). \quad (11.173)$$

$$M[p](x) < 0 \quad \text{and is decreasing on the interval } (z_2, \xi_k). \quad (11.174)$$

If additionally we use (9.136), we can state that

$$M[p](x) > 0, \quad x \in (z_1, z_2),$$

and

$$\max_{x \in [z_1, z_2]} M[p](x) < \frac{n-1}{n}.$$

12. THE CASE OF $0 < \varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$

In this section we will prove the following statement. Theorem 2.4 is a direct corollary from this result.

Theorem 12.1. *Let $0 \leq \varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$. Then*

- (1) $Z_{I_k}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 1$, if I_k is a finite interval of the second type.
- (2) $Z_{I_k}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 0$ or 2 , if I_k is a finite interval of the first type.
- (3) $Z_{I_k}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 0$, if I_k is an infinite interval of the second type.
- (4) $Z_{I_k}(Q_{\varkappa}[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 1$, if I_k is an infinite interval of the first type.

Proof of Theorem 12.1 If $\varkappa = 0$, then $Q_\varkappa[p] = M[p]$ and by definition (4.25) of the function $M[p]$ all statements of theorem are obvious.

Now assume that $\varkappa \neq 0$. Let I_k be a finite interval of the first type. Note that one of the numbers z_1 and z_2 , described in Remark 11.174, is a root γ_{k-1} of the polynomial p'' . Hence,

$$(z_1, z_2) \subset (\xi_{k-1}, \gamma_{k-1}) = J_{2k-3} \quad \text{or} \quad (z_1, z_2) \subset (\gamma_{k-1}, \xi_k) = J_{2k-2}. \quad (12.175)$$

It follows from Remark 11.174 that the equation (4.27) doesn't have solutions in the intervals (ξ_{k-1}, z_1) and (z_2, ξ_k) . Let us choose the interval from J_{2k-3} and J_{2k-2} that contains (z_1, z_2) , and denote it by J . We have

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{(z_1, z_2)}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_J(Q_\varkappa[p]), \quad (12.176)$$

if I_k is a finite interval of the first type.

If $I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)$ is a finite interval of the second type, it contains only one root of the function $M[p]$: the root γ_{k-1} of the polynomial p'' . Let us choose the interval from $(\xi_{k-1}, \gamma_{k-1})$ and (γ_{k-1}, ξ_k) , where $M[p](x) > 0$. Now denote this interval by J . If $0 < \varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$, and the equation $M[p](x) = \varkappa$ has a solution in I_k , it must belong to J . So,

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_J(Q_\varkappa[p]), \quad (12.177)$$

if I_k is a finite interval of the second type.

If $0 < \varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$, then $-\infty < 2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa} < 0$. Since all roots $(\xi_k)_{k=1}^{n-1}$ of p' are real and simple, all roots $(\gamma_k)_{k=1}^{n-2}$ of p'' are also real and simple. So, p' satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 2.3. The intervals

$$(-\infty, \gamma_1), (\gamma_1, \gamma_2), \dots, (\gamma_{n-3}, \gamma_{n-2}), (\gamma_{n-2}, \infty)$$

are intervals (4.30) for p' . All of them are of the first type. Because we denote by ξ with indices the roots of p' and γ_{k-1} is the root of p'' , the interval J in both (12.176) and (12.177) plays exactly the same role for p' as the intervals (ξ_{k-1}, α) and (α, ξ_k) for p in Lemma 11.1. Applying Lemma 11.1 to p' on the interval J we obtain

$$Z_J(Q_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) = Z_J(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) = 1. \quad (12.178)$$

Note that $p'(x) \neq 0$ and $p''(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in J$. So, we can apply Corollary 10.3 from Lemma 10.2 and obtain

$$Z_J(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_J(Q_\varkappa[p]) \leq 2. \quad (12.179)$$

Therefore, by (12.176) and (12.177) for any finite interval I_k we have

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) \leq 2. \quad (12.180)$$

According to Lemma 4.5 the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ is even if I_k is a finite interval of the first type, and it is odd if I_k is a finite interval of the second type. We obtain first two statements of Theorem 12.1.

Now consider the infinite intervals $I_1 = (-\infty, \xi_1)$ and $I_n = (\xi_{n-1}, \infty)$. First, assume that an infinite interval I is an interval of the first type. Because all root of p' are real and simple,

$$I_1 \subset (-\infty, \gamma_1), \quad \text{and} \quad I_{n-1} \subset (\gamma_{n-2}, \infty).$$

Since $-\infty < 2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa} < 0$, using the above remark by (10.159) we obtain

$$Z_I \left(H_{2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'] \right) \leq 1.$$

The infinite intervals I contain neither roots of p' nor roots of p'' . We apply again Corollary 10.3 from Lemma 10.2 and obtain

$$Z_I(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_I(Q_\varkappa[p]) \leq 2.$$

Since $\varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$, by virtue of Lemma 4.6 if I is an infinite interval of the first type, the number $Z_I(Q_\varkappa[p])$ is odd. We conclude that

$$Z_I(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_I(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 1. \quad (12.181)$$

Let I be an infinite interval of the second type. According to (4.25)

$$M[p'](x) = \frac{p'''(x)p'(x)}{(p''(x))^2}. \quad (12.182)$$

Because all roots of p' are real and simple, it is clear that ξ_{n-1} is the only root of $M[p']$ on $[\xi_{n-1}, +\infty)$, and ξ_1 is its only root on the interval $(-\infty, \xi_1]$. Since

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} M[p'](x) = \frac{n-2}{n-1} > 0,$$

we see that

$$M[p'](x) > 0, \quad \text{when } x \in (-\infty, \xi_1) \cup (\xi_{n-1}, +\infty). \quad (12.183)$$

Since $2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa} < 0$, the equation

$$M[p'](x) = 2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa}$$

doesn't have solutions on infinite intervals of the second type. Thus, if I is an infinite interval of the second type, then

$$Z_I \left(Q_{2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'] \right) = Z_I \left(H_{2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa}}(p') \right) = 0. \quad (12.184)$$

Let us apply again Corollary 10.3 from Lemma 10.2. We have

$$Z_I(Q_\varkappa[p']) = Z_I(H_\varkappa(p')) \leq 1. \quad (12.185)$$

According to Lemma 4.6 if I is an infinite interval of the second type, the number $Z_I(Q_\varkappa[p'])$ is even. Therefore,

$$Z_I(H_\varkappa[p']) = Z_I(Q_\varkappa[p']) = 0. \quad (12.186)$$

Theorem 12.1 is proved. \square

13. SOME REMARKS ABOUT THE INTERVALS I_k OF THE FIRST TYPE

Because all roots of p' are real and simple, the case of intervals of the first type is of the great interest for us. The following more general result can be obtained in the same way as the second statement of Theorem 12.1.

Theorem 13.1. *Let $0 \leq \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$. Then for any finite interval of the first type I_k the following is true*

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (13.187)$$

This statement is equivalent to the following fact.

Lemma 13.2. *For every $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, and*

$$\frac{j-1}{j} \leq \varkappa < \frac{j}{j+1},$$

on any finite interval I_k of the first type the following estimation holds

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (13.188)$$

Proof of Lemma 13.2. In order to prove Lemma 13.2 we use induction on $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

The second statement of Theorem 12.1 provides the base of induction for $j = 1$.

$$\text{If } \frac{j-1}{j} \leq \varkappa < \frac{j}{j+1}, \text{ then } \frac{j-2}{j-1} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa} < \frac{j-1}{j}.$$

Since all roots $(\xi_k)_{k=1}^{n-1}$ of p' are real and simple, all roots $(\gamma_k)_{k=1}^{n-2}$ of p'' are also real and simple, and all the intervals (γ_{k-1}, γ_k) , $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-2$, are intervals of the first type for the polynomial p' . Thus, by the induction hypothesis

$$Z_{(\gamma_{k-1}, \gamma_k)} \left(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'] \right) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (13.189)$$

Let us fix an interval $I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)$ of the first type. Denote by α the only root of the polynomial p inside I_k . Note that γ_{k-1} is the only root of p'' inside I_k . Without loss of generality we assume that

$$\xi_{k-1} < \gamma_{k-1} < \alpha < \xi_k$$

(the case when $\xi_{k-1} < \alpha < \gamma_{k-1} < \xi_k$ can be considered in the same way). Obviously, we have the following inclusion

$$(\gamma_{k-1}, \alpha) \subset (\gamma_{k-1}, \xi_k) \subset (\gamma_{k-1}, \gamma_k). \quad (13.190)$$

It follows from (13.189) that

$$Z_{(\gamma_{k-1}, \xi_k)} \left(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p'] \right) \leq 2. \quad (13.191)$$

Let us apply Corollary 10.3 from Lemma 10.2. We obtain

$$Z_{(\gamma_{k-1}, \xi_k)}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq 3. \quad (13.192)$$

As we showed in Remark 11.174

$$Z_{(\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{(\gamma_{k-1}, \alpha)}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{(\gamma_{k-1}, \xi_k)}(H_\varkappa[p]). \quad (13.193)$$

Therefore,

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq 3. \quad (13.194)$$

According to Lemma 4.5, the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p])$ is even if I_k is a finite interval of the first type. Thus, for $\frac{j-1}{j} \leq \varkappa < \frac{j}{j+1}$ we obtain

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \quad (13.195)$$

We obtain the conclusion of Lemma 13.2. \square

Remark 13.3. Lemma 13.2 allows to refine Remark 11.174 about the behavior of the function $M[p]$ on a finite interval of the first type $I_k = (\xi_{k-1}, \xi_k)$: *there exists $x_{max} \in I_k$ such that*

$$M[p](x) \text{ is increasing on } (\xi_{k-1}, x_{max}), \quad (13.196)$$

$$M[p](x) \text{ is decreasing on } [x_{max}, \xi_k), \quad (13.197)$$

and

$$M[p](x_{max}) < \frac{n-1}{n}. \quad (13.198)$$

The following statement gives the estimation for the number of real zeros of the function $H_\varkappa[p]$ on infinite intervals I_k of the first type.

Theorem 13.4. *If $0 \leq \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$, then for any infinite interval I_k of the first type*

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 1. \quad (13.199)$$

Theorem 13.4 follows from the lemma below.

Lemma 13.5. *For each $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, and for every*

$$\frac{j-1}{j} \leq \varkappa < \frac{j}{j+1}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1,$$

on any infinite interval of the first type I_k the following estimation is true

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 1. \quad (13.200)$$

Proof of Lemma 13.5. We will use induction on j . The fourth statement of Theorem 12.1 gives the base of induction for $j = 1$.

$$\text{If } \frac{j-1}{j} \leq \varkappa < \frac{j}{j+1}, \quad \text{then } \frac{j-2}{j-1} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa} < \frac{j-1}{j}.$$

Given that p' has only real and simple zeros, the induction hypothesis provides

$$Z_{(-\infty, \gamma_1)}(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) = Z_{(\gamma_{n-2}, \infty)}(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) = 1,$$

where $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \dots < \gamma_{n-2}$ are zeros of p'' . Since

$$\xi_1 < \gamma_1 < \xi_2 < \gamma_2 < \dots < \xi_{n-2} < \gamma_{n-2} < \xi_{n-1},$$

we have

$$Z_{(-\infty, \xi_1)}(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) \leq 1, \quad Z_{(\xi_{n-1}, \infty)}(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) \leq 1. \quad (13.201)$$

If we apply Corollary 10.3 from Lemma 10.2, we obtain

$$Z_{(-\infty, \xi_1)}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) \leq 2, \quad Z_{(\xi_{n-1}, \infty)}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) \leq 2. \quad (13.202)$$

According to Lemma 4.5, the number $Z_{I_k}(Q_{\varkappa}[p])$ is odd if I_k is an infinite interval of the first type. Thus, for $\frac{j-1}{j} \leq \varkappa < \frac{j}{j+1}$ we obtain

$$Z_{I_1}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 1, \quad Z_{I_n}(H_{\varkappa}[p]) = 1. \quad (13.203)$$

Lemma 13.5 is proved. \square

Remark 13.6. It follows from (9.138), Theorem 12.1, and Lemma 13.5 that the function $M[p]$ decreases on the interval $(-\infty, \xi_1)$ from $\frac{n-1}{n}$ to $-\infty$, and increases on the interval (ξ_{n-1}, ∞) from $-\infty$ to $\frac{n-1}{n}$.

14. ACCURACY OF ESTIMATES IN THEOREM 2.4

Now we are going to discuss accuracy of estimates in Theorem 2.4. The following fact could be derived from the first and the third statements of Theorem 12.1 immediately. This theorem provides accuracy of the estimation from below in Theorem 2.4.

Corollary 14.1. *Let $0 < \varkappa < 1/2$. Assume that $p_{2n}(x) = x^{2n} + \dots$ is a polynomial having no real roots, and all roots of its derivative p'_{2n} are real and simple. Then*

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(\varkappa(p'_{2n})^2 - p_{2n}p''_{2n}) = 2n - 2.$$

Denote by $T_n(x) = \cos(n \arccos(x))$ the Chebyshev polynomial of the first kind of degree n . The fact that the bound from above cannot be improved is a corollary of the statement below.

Theorem 14.2. *Let $0 < \varkappa < 1/2$. For every $n = 1, 2, \dots$, and each $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ there exists a constant $C = C(\varepsilon, n)$, $-1 < C < 0$, such that for every $0 < \varkappa \leq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$ the following is true*

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}(\varkappa - M[T_{2n} + C]) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(\varkappa - \frac{(T_{2n}(x) + C)T''_{2n}(x)}{(T'_{2n}(x))^2}\right) = 4n - 2. \quad (14.204)$$

Proof of Theorem 14.2. First, consider the case of $n = 1$, that is of $T_2(x) + C = 2x^2 - 1 + C$. If $|C| < 1$, both roots of the polynomial are real and simple. Since $(T_2(x) + C)' = 4x$, this polynomial generates two intervals I_k : $I_1 = (-\infty, 0)$ and $I_2 = (0, +\infty)$. Both intervals are intervals of the first type. Thus, the statement of Theorem 14.2 follows immediately from Remark 13.6.

Now, for any $n = 2, 3, \dots$, we consider the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} P_{2n}(x) &= T_{2n}(x) - 1 = 2^{2n-1} \prod_{k=0}^{2n-1} \left(x - \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{2n}\right)\right) \\ &= 2^{2n-1}(x^2 - 1) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(x - \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (14.205)$$

By (4.29) for any $k = 1, \dots, n-1$ we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)} M[P_{2n}](x) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let us fix any $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. There are numbers $\delta_k = \delta_k(\varepsilon)$ such that for all x , $|x - \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)| < \delta_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, the following is true

$$\left| M[P_{2n}](x) - \frac{1}{2} \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \quad (14.206)$$

Consider the family of polynomials $\{P_{2n}(x) + B, 0 < B < 1\}$ on the compact set

$$K = \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(\left[\cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) - \frac{\delta_k}{2}, \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) - \frac{\delta_k}{4} \right] \cup \left[\cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) + \frac{\delta_k}{4}, \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) + \frac{\delta_k}{2} \right] \right).$$

Obviously, on K we have

$$M[P_{2n} + B](x) = \frac{(P_{2n}(x) + B)P_{2n}''(x)}{(P_{2n}(x))^2} \rightrightarrows M[P_{2n}](x), \quad B \rightarrow 0. \quad (14.207)$$

Therefore, there exists $B_0 = B_0(\varepsilon)$, $0 < B_0 < 1/2$, such that for all $0 < B < B_0$ and for all $x \in K$ the inequality is true

$$|M[P_{2n} + B](x) - M[P_{2n}](x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \quad (14.208)$$

It follows from (14.206) and (14.208) that for all $0 < B < B_0$ and for all $x \in K$ we have

$$\left| M[P_{2n} + B](x) - \frac{1}{2} \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (14.209)$$

Thus, for all $0 < B < B_0$ and for all $x \in K$ we obtain the estimation

$$M[P_{2n} + B](x) = \frac{(P_{2n}(x) + B)P_{2n}''(x)}{(P_{2n}(x))^2} > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 0. \quad (14.210)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{2n}(x) + B)' &= (T_{2n}(x) - 1 + B)' = T_{2n}'(x) = \\ &= 2n \frac{\sin(2n \arccos x)}{\sin(\arccos x)} = 2^{2n} n \prod_{k=1}^{2n-1} \left(x - \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{2n}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < B < \frac{1}{2}$, the roots of $P_{2n}(x) + B = T_{2n}(x) - 1 + B$ are all real and simple. Therefore, all the intervals I_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$, are intervals of the first type, where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \left(-\infty, \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2n}\right) \right), \quad I_{2n} = \left(\cos\left(\frac{(2n-1)\pi}{2n}\right), \infty \right), \\ I_k &= \left(\cos\left(\frac{(k-1)\pi}{2n}\right), \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{2n}\right) \right), \quad k = 2, \dots, 2n-1. \end{aligned} \quad (14.211)$$

Making if necessary the values of δ_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, smaller we can assume that

$$\left[\cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) - \frac{\delta_k}{2}, \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) - \frac{\delta_k}{4} \right] \subset I_{2k},$$

$$\left[\cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) + \frac{\delta_k}{4}, \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) + \frac{\delta_k}{2} \right] \subset I_{2k+1}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1.$$

It follows from the second statements of Theorem 12.1 and (14.210), that for each $0 < \varkappa \leq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$ on any finite interval I_k , $k = 2, 3, \dots, 2n-1$, the following is true

$$Z_{I_k} \left(\varkappa - \frac{(P_{2n}(x) + B)P_{2n}''(x)}{(P_{2n}(x))^2} \right) = 2. \quad (14.212)$$

Because all roots of $P_{2n}(x) + B$ are real and simple, by virtue of the fourth statement of Theorem 12.1 for each $0 < \varkappa < \frac{1}{2}$ on each of the infinite intervals I_k we have

$$Z_{I_k} \left(\varkappa - \frac{(P_{2n}(x) + B)P_{2n}''(x)}{(P_{2n}(x))^2} \right) = 1. \quad (14.213)$$

Finally we obtain

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\varkappa - \frac{(P_{2n}(x) + B)P_{2n}''(x)}{(P_{2n}(x))^2} \right) = 2(2n-2) + 2 = 4n-2. \quad (14.214)$$

Theorem 14.2 is proved. \square

15. POLYNOMIALS WITH ONLY REAL ZEROS

As we mentioned in the introductory part of this paper, in their paper [14] M. Tyaglov and M.J. Atia found the upper and lower bounds for $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(H_{\varkappa})[p]$ for all real \varkappa when all roots of a polynomial p are real. In Theorem D we described their result. In this section, we are going to refine their result in the following way. We discuss how the roots of the corresponding function $Q_{\varkappa}[p]$ can be distributed among the finite intervals I_k .

Lemma 15.1. *For all $a_1 \geq 0, a_2 \geq 0, \dots, a_m \geq 0$ the following inequalities are valid*

$$2 \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} a_j a_k \leq (m-1) \sum_{k=1}^m a_k^2, \quad (15.215)$$

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^m a_k \right)^2 \leq m \sum_{k=1}^m a_k^2, \quad (15.216)$$

$$(a_1 + \dots + a_s - a_{s+1} - \dots - a_m)^2 \leq \max(s, m-s) \sum_{k=1}^m a_k^2, \quad 1 \leq s \leq m-1, \quad (15.217)$$

and, if all a_j are nonzero numbers for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, then

$$(a_1 + \dots + a_s - a_{s+1} - \dots - a_m)^2 < \max(s, m-s) \sum_{k=1}^m a_k^2, \quad 1 \leq s \leq m-1. \quad (15.218)$$

Proof of Lemma 15.1. The inequality (15.216) is equivalent to the inequality (15.215), because

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^m a_k \right)^2 = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} a_j a_k.$$

Let us prove (15.215)

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} a_j a_k &= \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=j+1}^m (2a_j a_k) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=j+1}^m (a_j^2 + a_k^2) = \sum_{j=1}^m \left((m-j)a_j^2 + \sum_{k=j+1}^m a_k^2 \right) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^m (m-j)a_j^2 + \sum_{k=2}^m \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_k^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m (m-j)a_j^2 + \sum_{k=2}^m (k-1)a_k^2 \\
&= (m-1)a_1^2 + \sum_{k=2}^m ((m-k)a_k^2 + (k-1)a_k^2) = (m-1) \sum_{k=1}^m a_k^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The inequalities (15.215) and (15.216) are proved.

Let us fix $1 \leq s \leq m-1$ and prove (15.217). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{k=1}^s a_k - \sum_{k=s+1}^m a_k \right)^2 &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^s a_k \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{k=s+1}^m a_k \right)^2 - 2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^s a_k \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{k=s+1}^m a_k \right) \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{k=1}^s a_k \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{k=s+1}^m a_k \right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality sign is strict if all numbers are nonzero. Applying (15.216) to each of the terms in the right-hand side of the above inequality we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^s a_k - \sum_{k=s+1}^m a_k \right)^2 \leq s \sum_{k=1}^s a_k^2 + (m-s) \sum_{k=s+1}^m a_k^2 \leq \max(s, m-s) \sum_{k=1}^m a_k^2.$$

Lemma 15.1 is proved. \square

The following statement about maximum values of the function $M[p]$ on a finite interval I_k in the case when all intervals I_k are intervals of the first type, will be obtained as a corollary of the above lemma.

Theorem 15.2. *Assume that a polynomial p has only real and simple zeros. Then for all $x \in I_s \cup I_{n-s+1} = (\xi_{s-1}, \xi_s) \cup (\xi_{n-s}, \xi_{n-s+1})$, $s = 2, 3, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$, the following estimation is valid*

$$M[p](x) = \frac{p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2} < \frac{n-s}{n-s+1}. \quad (15.219)$$

Proof of Theorem 15.2. Suppose that $p(x) = (x-x_1)(x-x_2)\cdots(x-x_n)$. We will assume that $x \neq x_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Since all roots of the polynomial p are simple, if $x = x_k$, then $M_p(x_k) = 0$. In this case the estimation (15.219) is obvious.

Let $x \neq x_k$. We have

$$\frac{p(x)}{p'(x)} = \left(\frac{p'(x)}{p(x)} \right)^{-1} = \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{x-x_k} \right)^{-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\left(\frac{p(x)}{p'(x)}\right)' = 1 - \frac{p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{x-x_k}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{x-x_k}\right)^2}. \quad (15.220)$$

As before we will denote by ξ with indices the roots of the derivative p' . Since all roots of p and p' are real and simple, we have

$$x_1 < \xi_1 < x_2 < \xi_2 < \dots < \xi_{n-1} < x_n. \quad (15.221)$$

So, if $x \in I_s$, $s = 2, 3, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$, then

$$x_{s-1} < \xi_{s-1} < x < \xi_s < x_{s+1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} x - x_k &> 0, \quad \text{when } k = 1, 2, \dots, s-1, \quad \text{and} \\ x - x_k &< 0, \quad \text{when } k = s+1, s+2, \dots, n, \end{aligned} \quad (15.222)$$

for all $x \in I_s$. Similar if $x \in I_{n-s+1}$, $s = 2, 3, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$, then

$$x_{n-s} < \xi_{n-s} < x < \xi_{n-s+1} < x_{n-s+2}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} x - x_k &> 0, \quad \text{when } k = 1, 2, \dots, n-s, \quad \text{and} \\ x - x_k &< 0, \quad \text{when } k = n-s+2, \dots, n, \end{aligned} \quad (15.223)$$

for all $x \in I_{n-s+1}$. Note that for $s < \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$ we have $s \leq n-s+1$. Applying (15.218) to (15.220), we obtain

$$1 - \frac{p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{x-x_k}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{x-x_k}\right)^2} > \frac{1}{n-s+1}. \quad (15.224)$$

The statement (15.219) of Theorem 15.2 follows from the last inequality. Theorem 15.2 is proved. \square

Corollary 15.3. *Assume that a polynomial p has only real and simple zeros. If*

$$\frac{n-2}{n-1} \leq \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n},$$

then for all finite intervals I_k the following is true

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 0. \quad (15.225)$$

The more general statement below contains Corollary 15.3 as a partial case.

Corollary 15.4. *Assume that a polynomial p has only real and simple zeros. Let for some $j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1, \dots, n-1$, the inequality*

$$\frac{j-1}{j} \leq \varkappa < \frac{j}{j+1}$$

holds. Then for any interval I_k , $k = n - j + 1, \dots, j$, the following is true

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 0. \quad (15.226)$$

The theorem below follows from Theorem 13.1 and Corollary 15.4.

Theorem 15.5. *Assume that a polynomial p has only real and simple zeros. Let for some $j = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ the inequality*

$$\frac{j-1}{j} \leq \varkappa < \frac{j}{j+1}$$

holds. Then

(1) *If $j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1, \dots, n - 1$, then*

- *For any finite interval I_k , where $k = n - j + 1, \dots, j$, the estimation is valid*

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 0.$$

- *For any finite interval I_k , where $k = 2, \dots, n - j$, or $k = j + 1, \dots, n - 1$, the estimation is valid*

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 0 \text{ or } 2.$$

(2) *If $j = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$, then for any finite interval I_k the estimation is valid*

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 0 \text{ or } 2.$$

The following result shows that Theorem 15.5 cannot be improved.

Theorem 15.6. *For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a polynomial*

$$p_\varepsilon(x) = (x - x_1(\varepsilon))(x - x_2(\varepsilon)) \cdots (x - x_n(\varepsilon)), \quad (15.227)$$

and a system of $n - 2$ points $y_k(\varepsilon) \in I_k$, $k = 2, 3, \dots, n - 1$, such that

$$p_\varepsilon(y_k(\varepsilon)) > \frac{k-1}{k} - \varepsilon. \quad (15.228)$$

Proof of Theorem 15.6. We will construct the polynomial p_ε using inductive process. We start with the polynomial

$$p_0(x) = x^{n-1}(x-1). \quad (15.229)$$

Its derivative has the form

$$p'_0(x) = nx^{n-2} \left(x - \frac{n-1}{n} \right). \quad (15.230)$$

By virtue of (4.29) and definition (4.25) of the function $M[p]$ we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} M[p_0](x) = \frac{n-2}{n-1}. \quad (15.231)$$

Let us fix any (small enough) $\varepsilon > 0$. It follows from (15.231) that there is $0 < \delta_1 < 1$ such that

$$M[p_0](x) > \frac{n-2}{n-1} - \frac{\varepsilon}{n}, \quad \text{whenever } |x| < \delta_1. \quad (15.232)$$

Denote by

$$p_1(x) = x^{n-2}(x - x_{n-1})(x - 1), \quad (15.233)$$

where $0 < x_{n-1} < 1$ will be chosen later. The derivative of the above polynomial will have the form

$$p'_1(x) = x^{n-3}(x - \xi_{n-2}^1)(x - \xi_{n-1}^1), \quad (15.234)$$

where $0 < \xi_{n-2}^1 < x_1 < \xi_{n-1}^1 < 1$. Note that on the compact set $\frac{\delta_1}{4} \leq x \leq \frac{\delta_1}{2}$ the following is true

$$M[p_1](x) \rightrightarrows M[p_0](x), \quad \text{when } x_{n-1} \rightarrow 0, \quad (15.235)$$

and

$$\xi_{n-2}^1 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_{n-1}^1 \rightarrow \frac{n-1}{n}, \quad \text{when } x_{n-1} \rightarrow 0. \quad (15.236)$$

Thus, we can find a number $x_{n-1} = x_{n-1}(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\xi_{n-2}^1 < \frac{\delta_1}{4} < \frac{\delta_1}{2} < \xi_{n-1}^1, \quad (15.237)$$

and for all $x \in [\frac{\delta_1}{4}, \frac{\delta_1}{2}]$ we have

$$M[p_1](x) > M[p_0](x) - \frac{\varepsilon}{n}, \quad (15.238)$$

where

$$p_1(x) = x^{n-2}(x - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon))(x - 1). \quad (15.239)$$

Let us fix in (15.239) $x_{n-1} = x_{n-1}(\varepsilon)$ that provides (15.237) and (15.238). It follows from (15.232) and (15.238) that

$$M[p_1](x) > \frac{n-2}{n-1} - \frac{2\varepsilon}{n}, \quad (15.240)$$

for all $x \in [\frac{\delta_1}{4}, \frac{\delta_1}{2}]$.

For the next step we consider (15.239) as the initial polynomial. Its derivative has the form (15.234). By virtue of (4.29)

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} M[p_1](x) = \frac{n-3}{n-2}. \quad (15.241)$$

By (15.241) there is $0 < \delta_2 < \frac{\delta_1}{2}$ such that

$$M[p_1](x) > \frac{n-3}{n-2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{n}, \quad \text{whenever } |x| < \delta_2. \quad (15.242)$$

Denote by

$$p_2(x) = x^{n-3}(x - x_{n-2})(x - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon))(x - 1), \quad (15.243)$$

where $0 < x_{n-2} < x_{n-1}(\varepsilon)$ will be chosen later. The derivative of the above polynomial will have the form

$$p'_2(x) = x^{n-4}(x - \xi_{n-3}^2)(x - \xi_{n-2}^2)(x - \xi_{n-1}^2), \quad (15.244)$$

where $0 < \xi_{n-3}^2 < x_{n-2} < \xi_{n-2}^2 < x_{n-1}(\varepsilon) < \xi_{n-1}^2 < 1$. Note that on the compact set $[\frac{\delta_2}{4}, \frac{\delta_2}{2}] \cup [\frac{\delta_1}{4}, \frac{\delta_1}{2}]$ the following is true

$$M[p_2](x) \rightrightarrows M[p_1](x), \quad \text{when } x_{n-2} \rightarrow 0, \quad (15.245)$$

and

$$\xi_{n-3}^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \xi_{n-2}^2 \rightarrow \xi_{n-2}^1, \quad \xi_{n-1}^2 \rightarrow \xi_{n-1}^1, \quad \text{when } x_{n-2} \rightarrow 0. \quad (15.246)$$

Taking into account (15.237) and the fact that $0 < \delta_2 < \frac{\delta_1}{2}$, we can find a number $x_{n-2} = x_{n-2}(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\xi_{n-3}^2 < \frac{\delta_2}{4} < \frac{\delta_2}{2} < \xi_{n-2}^2 < \frac{\delta_1}{4} < \frac{\delta_1}{2} < \xi_{n-1}^2, \quad (15.247)$$

and such that for all $x \in [\frac{\delta_2}{4}, \frac{\delta_2}{2}] \cup [\frac{\delta_1}{4}, \frac{\delta_1}{2}]$ we have

$$M[p_2](x) > M[p_1](x) - \frac{\varepsilon}{n}, \quad (15.248)$$

where

$$p_2(x) = x^{n-3}(x - x_{n-2}(\varepsilon))(x - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon))(x - 1). \quad (15.249)$$

It follows from (15.242) and (15.248) that

$$M[p_2](x) > \frac{n-3}{n-2} - \frac{2\varepsilon}{n}, \quad (15.250)$$

for all $x \in [\frac{\delta_2}{4}, \frac{\delta_2}{2}]$, and from (15.240) and (15.248) that

$$M[p_2](x) > \frac{n-2}{n-1} - \frac{3\varepsilon}{n}, \quad (15.251)$$

for all $x \in [\frac{\delta_1}{4}, \frac{\delta_1}{2}]$.

If we continue this process, finally we will obtain a polynomial

$$p_\varepsilon(x) = (x - x_1(\varepsilon))(x - x_2(\varepsilon)) \cdot \dots \cdot (x - x_n(\varepsilon)),$$

and the system of intervals

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^{n-2} \left[\frac{\delta_k}{4}, \frac{\delta_k}{2} \right],$$

where

$$\left[\frac{\delta_k}{4}, \frac{\delta_k}{2} \right] \subset I_{n-k}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n-2, \quad (15.252)$$

such that for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-2$, the inequalities are true

$$M[p_\varepsilon](x) > \frac{n-k-1}{n-k} - \frac{(n-k+1)\varepsilon}{n}, \quad x \in \left[\frac{\delta_k}{4}, \frac{\delta_k}{2} \right]. \quad (15.253)$$

The statement of Theorem 15.6 follows from (15.252) and (15.253). Theorem 15.6 is proved.

16. INTERVALS I_k OF THE SECOND TYPE

Return now to the general case. The statement below gives an estimation for the number of real zeros of a polynomial $H_\varkappa[p]$ on infinite intervals I_k of the second type.

Lemma 16.1. *Assume that I_k is an infinite interval of the second type for a polynomial p whose derivative p' has only real and simple zeros. Then there exists a number*

$$C = \min_{x \in I_k} \frac{p(x)p''(x)}{(p'(x))^2}, \quad \frac{1}{2} < C < \frac{n-1}{n},$$

such that

- For every $C \leq \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$ the following estimation is valid

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 2. \tag{16.254}$$

- For every $\frac{1}{2} \leq \varkappa < C$ the following estimation is valid

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 0. \tag{16.255}$$

Proof of Lemma 16.1. If $\frac{1}{2} \leq \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$, then $0 \leq 2 - \frac{1}{\varkappa} < \frac{n-2}{n-1}$. Since all roots of p' are real and simple, the intervals $(-\infty, \gamma_1)$, $(\gamma_{n-2}, +\infty)$, where γ_1 and γ_{n-2} are the smallest and the biggest roots of the polynomial p'' , are intervals of the first type for the polynomial p' , and by Theorem 13.4.

$$Z_{(-\infty, \gamma_1)}(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) = Z_{(\gamma_{n-2}, +\infty)}(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) = 1.$$

Since $\xi_1 < \gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_{n-2} < \xi_{n-1}$, we have

$$Z_{(-\infty, \xi_1)}(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) \leq 1, \quad Z_{(\xi_{n-1}, +\infty)}(H_{2-\frac{1}{\varkappa}}[p']) \leq 1.$$

By virtue of Corollary 10.3 from Lemma 10.2, if I_k is an infinite interval of the second type, then

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq 2.$$

Taking into account the fourth statement of Lemma 4.6, finally we obtain

$$Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa(p)) = 0 \text{ or } 2. \tag{16.256}$$

Since all roots of the polynomial p' are real, the polynomial p satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.12. In the same way as in Theorem 2.12 we can show that (4.44) is true, that is there exists such a value x_0 that for $|x| > x_0 > 0$

$$M[p](x) - \frac{n-1}{n} < 0.$$

So, the graph of the function $y = M[p](x)$ approaches its asymptote $y = \frac{n-1}{n}$ from below.

If I_k is an infinite interval of the second type, then its finite endpoint is a wrong point (Remark 4.4). We will denote it just by ξ without indices. By (4.34) and (4.35),

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi} M[p](x) = +\infty. \tag{16.257}$$

Denote by

$$C = \min_{x \in I_1 \cup I_n} M[p](x). \tag{16.258}$$

It follows from (16.257) and (4.44) that

$$C < \frac{n-1}{n}, \quad (16.259)$$

and from the third statement of Theorem 12.1 that

$$C > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (16.260)$$

Lemma 16.1 is proved. \square

Let I_k be a finite interval of the second type. As we noticed in Remark 4.4, one of the endpoints of I_k is right while the other is wrong. It follows from (4.32) – (4.35) that for any real \varkappa the equation (4.27)

$$M[p](x) = \varkappa$$

has solutions in each finite interval I_k of the second type. Putting together (9.135), (9.137), and the first statement of Theorem 12.1, we conclude that the equation (4.27) has the unique solution for all $\varkappa \in (-\infty, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{n-1}{n}, \infty)$. It means that on corresponding intervals inside I_k the function $M[p]$ is monotone.

There may be an assumption that the function $M[p]$ is monotone on any finite interval I_k of the second type. If we use Corollary 10.3 from Lemma 10.2, in the same way as above, we can easily obtain that for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \varkappa < \frac{n-1}{n}$ on each interval I_k of the second type

$$Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = Z_{I_k}(H_\varkappa[p]) \leq 3. \quad (16.261)$$

The following example shows that the estimation (16.261) cannot be improved, that is there is a polynomial p all whose real roots are simple, and the roots of its derivative p' are real and simple, such that $Z_{I_k}(Q_\varkappa[p]) = 3$ on some of the finite intervals I_k of the second type.

Example 16.2. Consider a polynomial $p(x) = x^2(x-1)(x-2)(x+10) + 0.1$. Its derivative $p'(x) = 5x^4 + 28x^3 - 84x^2 + 40x$ has four real roots

$$\xi_1 \approx -7.865, \quad \xi_2 = 0, \quad \xi_3 \approx 0.617, \quad \xi_4 \approx 1.648.$$

The equation

$$M[p](x) = \frac{2}{3}$$

has three solutions in the interval $(\xi_1, 0)$.

Indeed, it is easy to check that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^-} M[p](x) = +\infty, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \xi_1^+} M[p](x) = -\infty,$$

$$M[p](-0.275) \approx 0.642, \quad M[p](-1.35) \approx 0.684.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] T. CRAVEN, G. CSORDAS, Jensen polynomials and the Turán and Laguerre inequalities, *Pacific J. Math.*, **136**, no. 2, 1989, pp. 241–260.
- [2] T. CRAVEN, G. CSORDAS, Iterated Laguerre and Turán inequalities, *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, **3**, no. 3, 2002, art. 39, 14 pp. (electronic).
- [3] T. CRAVEN, G. CSORDAS, AND W. SMITH, The zeros of derivatives of entire functions and the Pólya-Wiman conjecture, *Ann. of Math.*, **125**, no. 2, 1987, pp. 405–431.
- [4] G. CSORDAS, AND A. ESCASSUT, The Laguerre inequalities and the distribution of zeros of entire functions, *Ann. Math. Blaise Pascal*, **12**, no. 2, 2005, pp. 331–345.
- [5] G. CSORDAS, A. RUTTAN, AND R. VARGA, Level sets of real entire functions and the Laguerre inequalities, *Analysis*, **12**, no. 3-4, 19921, pp. 377–402.
- [6] G. CSORDAS, W. SMITH, AND R. VARGA, The Laguerre inequalities with applications to a problem associated with the Riemann hypothesis, *Numer. Algorithms*, **1**, no. 3-4, 1991, pp. 305–329.
- [7] G. CSORDAS, AND R. VARGA, Necessary and sufficient conditions and the Riemann hypothesis, *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, **11**, no. 3, 1990, pp. 328–357.
- [8] G. CSORDAS, AND A. VISHNYAKOVA, The generalized Laguerre inequalities and functions in the Laguerre-Pólya class, *Cent. Eur. J. Math*, **11**, no. 9, 2013, pp. 1643–1650.
- [9] D.K. FADDEEV, I.S. SOMONSKII, *Problem book on higher algebra*, Moscow, Nauka, 1972. (in Russian)
- [10] J.L.W.V. JENSEN, *Recherches sur la théorie des équations.*, *Acta Math.* **36**, 1913, pp. 181-195.
- [11] B.JA. LEVIN, *Distribution of zeros of entire functions*, Trans. Math. Monographs, vol. **5**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1964.
- [12] LANDE MA AND ZHAOKUN MA, *The critical points of entire fractions and B.Shapiro's 12th conjecture of entire functions*, preprint, 2023
- [13] B. SHAPIRO, Problems around polynomials: the good, the bad, and the ugly..., *Arnold Math. J.*, **1**, no. 1, 2015, pp. 91–99.
- [14] M. TYAGLOV AND M.J. ATIA, *Journal of Math. Ann. Appl.*, **494**, no. 2, 2021, Article number: 124652
- [15] M. TYAGLOV, On the number of critical points of logarithmic derivatives and the Hawaii conjecture, *J. Anal. Math.*, **114**, 2011, pp. 1–62.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS BOSTON
Email address: Olga.Katkova@umb.edu

MOSCOW CENTER FOR FUNDAMENTAL AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, 119991, MOSCOW, RUSSIA

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND MOE-LSC, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY
Email address: tyaglov@gmail.com, tyaglov@sjtu.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HOLON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, HOLON, ISRAEL
Email address: annalyticity@gmail.com