

ON THE EXTENSION FOR TOEPLITZ MATRICES OF CERTAIN MARKOV INEQUALITIES

K. CASTILLO AND A. SUZUKI

ABSTRACT. Starting from a doubly infinite sequence of complex numbers, the aim of this paper is to extend certain Markov inequalities for the determinant of Hankel matrices and the zeros of the corresponding orthogonal polynomials on the real line (A. Markov in Notes of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, 74 (Appendix n^o2) (1894) 1-30. English translation, by J. Shohat, Duke Math. J. 7 (1940), 85-96) to the Toeplitz case, where the central role is played by CD kernels and paraorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. In particular, we consider the case in which the starting sequence is a two-sided Pólya frequency sequence.

1. INTRODUCTION

Given an infinite sequence of real numbers $(a_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, define the $(n+1)$ -by- $(n+1)$ Hankel matrices

$$A_{n+1} = (a_{j+k-2})_{j,k=1}^{n+1}.$$

Denote by $A^{(j,k)}$ the submatrix of a matrix A obtained by deleting the row j and the column k . In order to guarantee the existence of a solution of the Stieltjes moment problem, i.e., that the numbers a_j may be represented as

$$a_j = \int_0^\infty x^j d\mu(x),$$

for some nontrivial Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R} , it is necessary and sufficient that the matrices A_{n+1} and their n -by- n submatrices

$$A_{n+1}^{(n+1,1)} = (a_{j+k-1})_{j,k=1}^n,$$

be positive definite for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. (Recall that a matrix is called positive definite if it is Hermitian and its leading principal minors, including the determinant of the matrix itself, are positive.) In addition, the matrices A_{n+1} and $A_{n+1}^{(n+1,1)}$ are positive definite¹ if and only if A_{n+1} is totally positive. (Recall that a totally positive matrix is one in which all the minors are positive definite.) From the above, the interested reader can easily prove that the matrices A_{n+1} and $A_{n+1}^{(n+1,1)}$ are positive definite

Date: June 12, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 30C15, 42C05.

Key words and phrases. Markov's inequalities, Toeplitz matrices, CD kernels, paraorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle, two-sided Pólya frequency sequences.

¹In 1915, Pólya connected these conditions with the Laguerre-Pólya class, see [20, Theorem IV and V, pp.235-236], and, in this case, the sequence $(a_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is called one-sided Pólya frequency sequence.

if and only if there exists a (unique) sequence of monic orthogonal polynomials on the real line (OPRL) with respect to μ , say $(P_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, given by

$$P_0 = 1, \quad P_{n+1}(x) = \frac{1}{\det A_{n+1}} \det \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{n+1} \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \cdots & a_{n+2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_n & a_{n+1} & a_{n+2} & \cdots & a_{2n+1} \\ 1 & x & x^2 & \cdots & x^{n+1} \end{pmatrix},$$

whose zeros are all positive.

The above results, and others, were proven, using the analytic theory of continued fractions, in two articles published in 1894 by two of the most prominent mathematicians of the 19th century (see [17] and [29]): Markov and Stieltjes. Stieltjes' work is his celebrated memoir "Recherches sur les fractions continues", which contains our modern "Stieltjes integral" and also gave rise to the terminology "Problem of Moments", whose first systematic treatment appears in works of Chebyshev, Markov and Stieltjes himself, and, later, Hamburger, Nevanlinna, Riesz, Hausdorff, Carleman, and Stone. However, as far as we know, Markov's work² never went beyond his own results³. His work, written in Russian, only began to appear in literature after being translated into English by Shohat in 1940. In fact, Markov's theorems appear in the monographs on the problem of moments by Shohat and Tamarkin (see [22, p. 114]) and by Krein and Nudel'man (see [15, pp. 210-211, p. 224]), and in the classical book on matrix theory by Gantmacher (see [9, Chapter XV]). The definitive recognition came in 1987, when Kolmogorov and Yushkevich collected Markov's results in their "Mathematics of the 19th Century" (see [14, p. 52]).

Assume that one element of the sequence $(a_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a continuously differentiable real valued function, say $a_k = a_k(t)$, depending on a parameter t varying in a real open interval. Suppose also that $A_{n+1} = A_{n+1}(t)$ and $A_{n+2}^{(n+2,1)} = A_{n+2}^{(n+2,1)}(t)$ are positive definite for all t (i.e., the zeros of the corresponding OPRL are all positive), and

$$(-1)^k \frac{da_k}{dt}(t) < 0.$$

Roughly speaking, under these hypotheses, Markov proved in [17], as he himself wrote, "two remarkable theorems"⁴ (see [17, p. 21]) regarding the monotonicity of the zeros $(x_j(t))_{j=1}^{n+1}$ of $P_{n+1} = P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ and the determinants $\det A_{n+1}(t)$:

$$\frac{dx_j}{dt}(t) > 0, \quad \frac{d \det A_{n+1}}{dt}(t) < 0.$$

²Read at the meeting of the Physics and Mathematics Department on October 13, 1893. The article was printed in March 1894 and at the time was sold for 40 kopecks. On April 1, 1894, the United States Treasury valuation of the ruble was 37.2 cents. There are 100 kopecks in a ruble.

³In his work, implicitly, Markov proved that A_{n+1} and $A^{(n+1,1)}$ are positive definite if and only if A_{n+1} is totally positive. Note, for instance, that the proof that appears in [19, Theorem 4.4] is essentially given by Markov in [17, pp. 18-20].

⁴две замечательные теоремы.

These results are directly related to the sign of the coefficients of certain real polynomials obtained from the OPRL ([17, pp. 15-16]). This is the technical reason why Markov (implicitly) considered OPRL with only positive zeros, which easily allowed to control the sign of their coefficients after having factored $x_j(t)$. While all the above is “easy” for real polynomials with real zeros, it can be a much more delicate question if we are dealing with complex polynomials. The aim of this paper is to extend as far as possible the above Markov results to doubly infinite sequences of complex numbers and the corresponding Toeplitz matrices. In this context, the orthogonal polynomials will be “replaced” by the CD kernels and paraorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle (POPUC), which once again reaffirms that these polynomials are the correct analogue of the OPRL. In particular, we consider the case in which the starting sequence is a two-sided Pólya frequency sequence. It is worth pointing out that POPUC have received significant attention over the last years (see for instance [30, 3, 13, 27, 26, 23, 24, 7, 18, 5, 6] and references therein) and, of course, Pólya frequency sequences and Toeplitz matrices appear in quite a large number of applications. Section 2 contains our the main results and some corollaries. In Section 3 we prove the theorems of Section 2.

2. BASIC DEFINITIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

Denote by $\mathbb{S}_r^1(c)$ the boundary of the open disk $\mathbb{D}_r(c)$ of radius $r > 0$ with center c . Since the unit disk with center at the origin plays a distinguished role, we use the notation $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_1(0)$ and $\mathbb{S}^1 = \mathbb{S}_1^1(0)$. Let us introduce the notation $C_r(c) = \mathbb{D}_r(c) \cap \mathbb{S}^1$, $I_r(c) = \mathbb{D}_r(c) \cap \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathbb{S}_\mp^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{S}^1 : \Re(z) \lessgtr 0\}$. A (doubly infinite) sequence $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of complex numbers is called a two-sided Pólya frequency sequence if the four-way infinite matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ \cdots & c_2 & c_1 & c_0 & c_{-1} & c_{-2} & c_{-3} & c_{-4} & \cdots \\ \cdots & c_3 & c_2 & c_1 & c_0 & c_{-1} & c_{-2} & c_{-3} & \cdots \\ \cdots & c_4 & c_3 & c_2 & c_1 & c_0 & c_{-1} & c_{-2} & \cdots \\ \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

is totally positive (see, for instance, [8, Definition 1] and [12, Chapter 8]). Define the sequence of (monic) orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle (OPUC) from an arbitrary sequence of complex numbers $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ as follows:

$$(1) \quad Q_0 = 1, \quad Q_n(z) = \frac{1}{\det C_n} \det \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & \bar{c}_1 & \bar{c}_2 & \cdots & \bar{c}_n \\ c_1 & c_0 & \bar{c}_1 & \cdots & \bar{c}_{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n-1} & c_{n-2} & c_{n-3} & \cdots & \bar{c}_1 \\ 1 & z & z^2 & \cdots & z^n \end{pmatrix},$$

where $C_n = (c_{l-j})_{j,l=1}^n$, $\bar{c}_j = \overline{c_{-j}}$, with $\det C_n > 0$. Define the normalized OPUC by $q_n(z) = \kappa_n z^n + \cdots$, where $\kappa_n = \|Q_n\|^{-1}$. Of course, here and subsequently,

whenever we consider a sequence of OPUC, we are implicitly assuming that C_{n+1} is positive definite for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The CD kernel is defined (see [28, (2.13.1)]) for $w, z \in \mathbb{C}$ by

$$(2) \quad K_n(w, z) = \sum_{j=0}^n \overline{q_j(w)} q_j(z).$$

Recall that a monic POPUC of degree $n+1$ is defined from a sequence of complex numbers $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ as follows (see [28, p. 115]):

$$(3) \quad P_{n+1}(z, b) = P_{n+1}(z) = zQ_n(z) - \bar{b}Q_n^*(z), \quad b \in \mathbb{S}^1,$$

where $Q_n^*(z) = z^n \overline{Q_n(1/\bar{z})}$. Recall that a Hurwitz polynomial is a polynomial whose zeros are located in the open left half-plane (see [9, p. 195]).

The next theorem is the analogue of Markov's result for determinants of Hankel matrices.

THEOREM 2.1. *Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and let $c_k = c_k(t)$ be a continuously differentiable complex valued function depending on a parameter t varying in a real open interval containing the origin. Let $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}, j \neq \pm k}$ be a sequence of complex numbers. Define, from the elements of the sequence $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, the $(n+1)$ -by- $(n+1)$ parametric Toeplitz matrix*

$$C_{n+1}(t) = (c_{l-j})_{j,l=1}^{n+1}, \quad \bar{c}_j = c_{-j}.$$

If $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a two-sided Pólya frequency sequence for all t , then $\det C_{n+1}(t)$ is a strictly increasing function of t , provided that $(-1)^k c_k(t)$ is a strictly increasing function of t .

When $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is not a two-sided Pólya frequency sequence, the conclusion of Theorem 2.1 remains valid whenever a certain CD kernel is a Hurwitz polynomial.

THEOREM 2.2. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 2.1 with all the elements of the sequence $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ taking real values. If the CD kernel $K_n(1, -z) = K_n(1, -z; t)$ is a Hurwitz polynomial for all t , then $\det C_{n+1}(t)$ is a strictly increasing function of t , provided that $(-1)^k c_k(t)$ is a strictly increasing function of t .*

The next theorem is much more general than Markov's result for zeros of OPRL.

THEOREM 2.3. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 2.1. Let $P_{n+1}(z, b) = P_{n+1}(z, b; t) = P_{n+1}(z; t)$ be defined as in (3) with $Q_n(z) = Q_n(z; t)$ and $b = b(t) \in \mathbb{S}^1$ for all t . Let $K_n(w, z) = K_n(w, z; t)$ be defined as in (2) for all t . Assume that $b(t)$ is a continuously differentiable complex valued function. If $P_{n+1}(\zeta_0; 0) = 0$, then there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, and a unique function, $\zeta : I_\epsilon(0) \rightarrow C_\delta(\zeta_0)$, differentiable on $I_\epsilon(0)$, with $\zeta(0) = \zeta_0$, and such that $P_{n+1}(\zeta(t); t) = 0$ for each $t \in I_\epsilon(0)$. Set $\zeta(t) = e^{i\varphi(t)}$ for all t . If $P_{n+1}(e^{i\varphi(t)}; t) = P_{n+1}(e^{-i\varphi(t)}; t) = 0$ for each $t \in I_\epsilon(0)$, then*

$$\operatorname{sgn} \left(\frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) \right) = -\operatorname{sgn}(\Im(e^{i\varphi(t)})) \operatorname{sgn} \left(\Re \left(\overline{b_k(t)} \frac{dc_k}{dt}(t) \right) \right),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_k(t) &= - \int e^{-ik\theta} \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\theta - \varphi(t)}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\theta + \varphi(t)}{2}\right)} \left| K_n(e^{i\varphi(t)}, e^{i\theta}; t) \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \\ &= - \frac{e^{i\varphi(t)}}{Q_n^2(e^{i\varphi(t)}; t)} \int e^{-ik\theta} K_n(e^{i\varphi(t)}, e^{i\theta}; t) K_n(e^{i\theta}, e^{-i\varphi(t)}; t) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, under the assumption $P_{n+1}(e^{-i\varphi(t)}; t) = 0$ replaced by $P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta_0}; t) = 0$,

$$\operatorname{sgn} \left(\frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) \right) = \operatorname{sgn} \left(\Re \left(\overline{b_k(t)} \frac{dc_k}{dt}(t) \right) \right),$$

where

$$b_k(t) = - \frac{i e^{-i\theta_0} (e^{i\varphi(t)} - e^{i\theta_0})}{Q_n(e^{i\theta_0}; t) Q_n(e^{i\varphi(t)}; t)} \int e^{-ik\theta} K_n(e^{i\varphi(t)}, e^{i\theta}; t) K_n(e^{i\theta}, e^{i\theta_0}; t) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}.$$

Depending on the location of the zeros of the corresponding POPUC, we can give more concrete results on zeros of POPUC from the previous theorem. Below we consider a series of examples in the form of corollaries.

COROLLARY 2.1. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 2.3 with all the elements of the sequence $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ taking real values and $b = 1$. If the CD kernel $K_n(1, -z) = K_n(1, -z; t)$ is a Hurwitz polynomial for all t , then $\zeta(t)$ moves clockwise (respectively, counterclockwise) along \mathbb{S}_+^1 as t increases on $I_c(0)$ provided $\Im(\zeta_0) > 0$ (respectively, $\Im(\zeta_0) < 0$) and $(-1)^k c_k(t)$ is a strictly decreasing function of t .*

Proof. By [28, Proposition 2.14.3 (iii)], the zeros of $P_{n+1}(\cdot, 1; t) = P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ are 1 plus the zeros of $K_n(1, \cdot; t)$. Since all the zeros of $P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ are on \mathbb{S}^1 (see [28, Theorem 2.14.4]), they are indeed on \mathbb{S}_+^1 . By hypothesis, all the coefficients of $P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ are real, and so its nonreal zeros can be arranged in conjugate pairs. Assume that $\Im(\zeta_0) \neq 0$ and write

$$(4) \quad R(z; t) = \frac{P_{n+1}(z; t)}{(z - \zeta(t))(z - \overline{\zeta(t)})} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_j(t) z^j.$$

By hypothesis, $(-1)^{n-1} R(-z; t)$ is a monic Hurwitz polynomial, and so its coefficients are all positive (see [21, Definition 11.4.1 and Proposition 11.4.2]). (Since the zeros of $P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ are simple (see [28, Theorem 2.14.4]) and lie on \mathbb{S}_+^1 , and $(-1)^{n-1} R(-z; t)$ is a monic Hurwitz polynomial, we must have n even.) Hence

$$\operatorname{sgn}(f_j(t)) = (-1)^{j+1}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |R(e^{i\theta}; t)|^2 &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_j(t) e^{ij\theta} \right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \overline{f_j(t)} e^{-ij\theta} \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_j(t) e^{ij\theta} \right) \left(\sum_{j=-n+1}^0 f_{-j}(t) e^{ij\theta} \right) = \sum_{j=-n+1}^{n-1} g_j(t) e^{ij\theta} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g_j(t) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq n-1 \\ j_1 - j_2 = j}} f_{j_1}(t) f_{j_2}(t).$$

Since $\text{sgn}(f_{j_1}(t) f_{j_2}(t)) = (-1)^{j_1+1} (-1)^{j_2+1} = (-1)^j$, we obtain $\text{sgn}(g_j(t)) = (-1)^j$. Write

$$\sum_{j=-n}^n d_j(t) e^{ij\theta} = (e^{-i\theta} - 2\Re(\zeta(t)) + e^{i\theta}) |R(e^{i\theta}; t)|^2.$$

A similar argument to the above implies that $\text{sgn}(d_k(t)) = (-1)^{k+1}$. By [28, Proposition 2.14.3 (i)-(ii)], we have that the zeros of $P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ are the $n+1$ solutions of the equation

$$(5) \quad z \frac{Q_n(z; t)}{Q_n^*(z; t)} = \overline{b(t)}.$$

Since $P_{n+1}(\zeta(t); t) = P_{n+1}(\overline{\zeta(t)}; t) = 0$, the equation (5) yields

$$\overline{b(\zeta(t))} = \zeta(t) \frac{Q_n(\zeta(t); t)}{Q_n^*(\zeta(t); t)} = \overline{b(t)} = \overline{\zeta(t)} \frac{Q_n(\overline{\zeta(t)}; t)}{Q_n^*(\overline{\zeta(t)}; t)} = \overline{b(\overline{\zeta(t)})},$$

and so $P_{n+1}(z, b(\zeta(t)); t) = P_{n+1}(z, b(\overline{\zeta(t)}); t) = P_{n+1}(z, b; t)$. Therefore, by [28, Proposition 2.14.3 (iii)], we get

$$\frac{1}{k_n^2 Q_n(\zeta(t); t)} K_n(\zeta(t), e^{i\theta}; t) = \frac{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}, b; t)}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)}.$$

Hence

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{j=-n}^n d_j(t) e^{ij\theta} &= \frac{e^{i\theta} |P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)|^2}{(e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t))(e^{i\theta} - \overline{\zeta(t)})} \\ &= - \left| \frac{K_n(\zeta(t), e^{i\theta}; t)}{k_n^2 Q_n(\zeta(t); t)} \right|^2 \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\theta - \varphi(t)}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\theta + \varphi(t)}{2}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides of the above equation by $e^{-ik\theta}$ and then integrating on \mathbb{S}^1 , we get

$$(7) \quad d_k(t) = \frac{1}{|k_n^2 Q_n(\zeta(t); t)|^2} b_k(t),$$

and the result follows from Theorem 2.3. \square

COROLLARY 2.2. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Corollary 2.1, under the assumption $b = 1$ and the arc \mathbb{S}_+^1 replaced by $b = -1$ and \mathbb{S}_-^1 , respectively. Then $\zeta(t)$ moves clockwise (respectively, counterclockwise) along \mathbb{S}_-^1 as t increases on $I_\epsilon(0)$, provided $\Im(\zeta_0) > 0$ (respectively, $\Im(\zeta_0) < 0$) and $c_k(t)$ is a strictly increasing function of t .*

Proof. The proof follows as the proof of Corollary 2.1. □

COROLLARY 2.3. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 2.3 with $b = 1$ and n even. Suppose that $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a two-sided Pólya frequency sequence for all t . If $\zeta(t)$ is the closest zero to $z = -1$ with $\Im(\zeta_0) > 0$, then $\zeta(t)$ moves clockwise along \mathbb{S}^1 as t increases on $I_\epsilon(0)$, provided $(-1)^k c_k(t)$ is a strictly decreasing function of t .*

Proof. Set

$$Q_j(z; t) = \sum_{l=0}^j a_{j,l}(t) z^l, \quad \alpha_j(t) = (-1)^j \frac{\det C_{j+2}^{(j+2,1)}(t)}{\det C_{j+1}(t)}.$$

We claim that $\operatorname{sgn}(a_{j,l}(t)) = (-1)^{j-l}$. Indeed, by Szegő's recursion (see [25, Theorem 1.5.2 and Theorem 1.5.11]), we have $Q_1(z; t) = z - \alpha_0(t)$, and so $a_{1,0}(t) < 0$ and $a_{1,1}(t) > 0$. The proof of our claim is by induction on j . Assume that $Q_{j-1}(\cdot; t)$ is such that $\operatorname{sgn}(a_{j-1,l}(t)) = (-1)^{j-l-1}$. By Szegő's recursion, we get

$$\begin{aligned} Q_j(z; t) &= zQ_{j-1}(z; t) - \bar{\alpha}_{j-1}(t)Q_{j-1}^*(z; t) \\ &= z^j + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} (a_{j-1,l-1}(t) - \alpha_j(t)a_{j-1,j-l-1}(t))z^l - \alpha_{j-1}(t), \end{aligned}$$

and, hence,

$$a_{j,l} = (1 - \delta_{l,0})a_{j-1,l-1}(t) - (1 - \delta_{l,j})\alpha_{j-1}(t)a_{j-1,j-l-1}(t),$$

from which our claim follows. From (3), it is easily seen that

$$P_{n+1}(z, 1; t) = \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} r_j(t) z^j, \quad r_j(t) = (1 - \delta_{j,0})a_{n,j-1}(t) - (1 - \delta_{j,n+1})a_{n,n-j}(t),$$

and so $\operatorname{sgn}(r_j(t)) = (-1)^{j+1}$. Consequently, all the coefficients of $-P_{n+1}(-z, 1; t)$ are positive. By [2, Theorem 1.1](see also [4, Theorem 2.4.5])⁵, it follows that all the coefficients of

$$\frac{-P_{n+1}(-z, 1; t)}{(z + \zeta(t))(z + \bar{\zeta}(t))}$$

are positive and, hence, $\operatorname{sgn}(f_j(t)) = (-1)^{j+1}$, where $f_j(t)$ is defined in (4). Note that $d_j(t)$, defined in (6), is given by

$$d_j(t) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j_1 \leq n+1, 0 \leq j_2 \leq n-1 \\ -j_1 + j_2 = j-1}} r_{j_1}(t) f_{j_2}(t).$$

Since $\operatorname{sgn}(r_{j_1}(t) f_{j_2}(t)) = (-1)^{-j_1+1} (-1)^{j_2+1} = (-1)^{j+1}$, we have $\operatorname{sgn}(d_j(t)) = (-1)^{j+1}$, and the result follows as the proof of Corollary 2.1.

⁵In particular, this interesting result gives a positive answer to a conjecture posed of B. Conroy. Borwein and Erdelyi wrote in their book that the proof of this result is "surprisingly complicated."

□

REMARK 2.1. In Corollary 2.3 we may replace the assumption that $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a two-sided Pólya frequency sequence for all t by the assumption that $C_{j+2}^{(j+2,1)}(t)$ is a P -matrix (see [11, p. 11]) for all t and $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

REMARK 2.2. Although it is implicitly above, we emphasize that $b_k(t)$ in Theorem 2.3 is, depending on which case we are considering, the coefficient of order k of one of the following Laurent polynomials:

$$k_n^4 |Q_n(\zeta(t); t)|^2 \frac{z |P_{n+1}(z; t)|^2}{(z - \zeta(t))(z - \bar{\zeta}(t))} = \dots + b_k(t)z^k + \dots$$

or

$$i k_n^4 (\zeta(t) - e^{i\theta_0}) \frac{z |P_{n+1}(z; t)|^2}{(z - \zeta(t))(z - e^{i\theta_0})} = \dots + b_k(t)z^k + \dots$$


In other words, in view of Theorem 2.3, if we “perturb” the moment c_k in the sequence $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, all information about the monotonicity of zeros of the corresponding POPUC depends exclusively on the coefficient of order k of one of the above polynomials and on c_k itself.

We end this section with an example which gives readers a final taste of the complexity of the problems we are dealing with.

EXAMPLE 2.1. Let r be a continuously differentiable real function depending on a parameter varying in a real open interval containing the origin. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and let $c_{\pm k} = c_{\pm k}(t) = (-1)^k r(t)^{k^2/2}$. Set $q = r(0) \in (0, 1)$ and define $c_j = (-1)^j q^{j^2/2}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{-k, k\}$. For $t = 0$, $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the sequence of moments of the rotated Rogers-Szegő polynomials (see [25, p. 87]), and so $C_{n+1}(0)$ is positive definite for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $C_{n+1}(t) = (c_{l-j})_{j,l=1}^{n+1}$. Consequently, for t small enough, $C_{n+1}(t)$ is positive definite and the corresponding OPUC have positive coefficients. Let $Q_n = Q_n(\cdot; t)$ be the OPUC defined as in (1) and let $P_{n+1}(\cdot, -1) = P_{n+1}(\cdot, -1; t)$ be the POPUC defined as in (3) with $b = -1$. Let $\zeta(t)$ denote one of the closest zeros to $z = 1$ of $P_n(\cdot, -1; t)$. Since the coefficients of $P_n(\cdot, -1; t)$ are positive, by [2, Theorem 1.1], all the coefficients of the Laurent polynomial

$$\overline{z P_{n+1}(z, -1; t)} \frac{P_{n+1}(z, -1; t)}{(z - \zeta(t))(z - \bar{\zeta}(t))}$$

are positive for n even. Thus, from the proof of Corollary 2.1 (see also Remark 2.2), it is easily seen, for n even, that $\zeta(t)$ moves clockwise (respectively, counterclockwise) on \mathbb{S}^1 as t strictly increases, provided $\Im(\zeta(0)) > 0$ (respectively, $\Im(\zeta(0)) < 0$) and $c_k(t)$ is a strictly increasing function of t . We conjecture that this is true for all the zeros in the upper half plane.

FIGURE 1. The zeros of $P_{n+1}(z; -1)$ for n odd.

Note that when n is odd, $P_{n+1}(z; -1)$ has a zero in $z = 1$. In Figure 1 we illustrate this situation, where the black dots represent the zeros of $P_{n+1}(\cdot, -1)$. From [2, Theorem 1.1], we know that since the coefficients of $P_{n+1}(\cdot, -1)$ are positive, the coefficients of the monic polynomial whose zeros are all the black points to the left of the vertical dashed line are also positive. However, in this case, the information about the monotonicity of $\zeta(t)$ has to be extracted from a certain polynomial with positive coefficients multiplied by the linear factor $z - 1$, and controlling the sign of a given coefficient of such a polynomial is not an easy task.

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

We now proceed to prove our main results.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. By Jacobi's formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d \det C_{n+1}}{dt}(t) &= \operatorname{tr} \left(\operatorname{adj} C_{n+1}(t) \frac{d \det C_{n+1}}{dt}(t) \right) \\
 &= \sum_{j,l=1}^{n+1} (-1)^{l+j} \det C_{n+1}^{(l,j)}(t) \frac{dc_{l-j}}{dt}(t) \\
 (8) \qquad &= \sum_{\substack{j,l=1 \\ |l-j|=k}}^{n+1} (-1)^k \det C_{n+1}^{(l,j)}(t) \frac{dc_k}{dt}(t),
 \end{aligned}$$

and, since $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a two-sided Pólya frequency sequence for all t , the result follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2. By Carathéodory-Toeplitz's theorem (see [25, p. 27]), there exists, for each t , a nontrivial positive Borel measure σ on \mathbb{S}^1 parametrized by

$z = e^{i\theta}$ such that

$$c_j(d\sigma) = c_j = \int e^{-ij\theta} d\sigma(\theta; t)$$

if and only if the matrices $C_{n+1}(t)$ are positive definite for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Heine's formula (see [25, Theorem 1.5.11]), $(Q_n(\cdot; t))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined in (1) is the corresponding sequence of (monic) OPUC, and, consequently, $(P_n(\cdot, 1; t))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, defined as in (3) with $b = 1$, is a sequence of POPUC associated with the sequence $(Q_n(\cdot; t))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (see [28, p. 115]). To shorten notation, we omit the dependency on t . By [28, Proposition 2.14.3 (iii)], the zeros of P_{n+1} are 1 plus the zeros of $K_n(1, \cdot)$. Since all the zeros of P_{n+1} are on \mathbb{S}^1 (see [28, Theorem 2.14.4]), they are indeed on \mathbb{S}_+^1 . Denote the zeros of P_{n+1} by $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n+1}$. By the mechanical quadrature on \mathbb{S}^1 (see [25, Theorem 2.2.12]), there exist positive weights $\lambda_n(\zeta_1), \dots, \lambda_n(\zeta_{n+1})$ such that

$$c_j = c_j(d\sigma) = \int e^{ij\theta} d\lambda^{n+1}(\theta),$$

for each $j \in \{0, \pm 1, \dots, \pm n\}$, $\lambda^{n+1}(\theta)$ being a measure on \mathbb{S}^1 given by

$$\lambda^{n+1}(\theta) = \sum_{m=1}^{n+1} \lambda_n(\zeta_m) \delta_{\zeta_m},$$

where δ_{ζ_m} is a point of mass at ζ_m . Writing $\lambda_m = \lambda_n(\zeta_m)$, we get

$$c_j = \sum_{m=1}^{n+1} \lambda_m \bar{\zeta}_m^j.$$

Hence, an arbitrary minor of order n of C_{n+1} can be written as

$$(9) \quad D = \det \left(\sum_{m=1}^{n+1} \lambda_m \bar{\zeta}_m^{\alpha_j - \beta_l} \right)_{j,l=1}^n,$$

where $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n \leq n$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\beta_1 < \dots < \beta_n \leq n$, $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{N}$. We can rewrite (9) as

$$D = \det \left(\left(\begin{array}{ccc} \lambda_1 \bar{\zeta}_1^{\alpha_1} & \cdots & \lambda_{n+1} \bar{\zeta}_{n+1}^{\alpha_1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_1 \bar{\zeta}_1^{\alpha_n} & \cdots & \lambda_{n+1} \bar{\zeta}_{n+1}^{\alpha_n} \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \zeta_1^{\beta_1} & \cdots & \zeta_1^{\beta_n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \zeta_{n+1}^{\beta_1} & \cdots & \zeta_{n+1}^{\beta_n} \end{array} \right) \right).$$

Let $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n+1}\}$ be pairwise distinct and let $\gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_n \leq n$, $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \in \mathbb{N}$. Writing the generalized Vandermonde matrix as

$$(10) \quad V_{(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = (z_j^{\gamma_l})_{j,l=1}^n,$$

we have, by Cauchy-Binet's formula,

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} D &= \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n \det V_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)}(\bar{\zeta}_1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_n) \det V_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \\ &\quad + \cdots + \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_{n+1} \det V_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)}(\bar{\zeta}_2, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_{n+1}) \det V_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)}(\zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that each product of determinants on the right-hand side of (11) has positive real part. Indeed, considering the product

$$(12) \quad \det V_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)}(\bar{\zeta}_1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_n) \det V_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n),$$

we write

$$(13) \quad R(z) = \frac{P_{n+1}(z)}{z - \zeta_{n+1}} = \sum_{j=0}^n d_j z^j.$$

By Heineman's theorem (see [10, Theorem I]), we have

$$(14) \quad \frac{\det V_{(0,1,\dots,n-r-1,n-r+1,\dots,n)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)}{\det V_{(0,1,\dots,n-1)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)} = (-1)^r d_{n-r},$$

for $r = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Hence,

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \det V_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)}(\bar{\zeta}_1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_n) \det V_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \\ &= (-1)^{j_1+j_2} \bar{d}_{n-j_1} d_{n-j_2} \left| \det V_{(0,1,\dots,n-1)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

for some $j_1, j_2 \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. Since $b = 1$ and all the elements of the sequence $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are real, the coefficients of P_{n+1} are also real. Consequently, the nonreal zeros of P_{n+1} occur in conjugate pairs. If $\zeta_{n+1} = 1$, then⁶

$$\operatorname{sgn}(d_{n-j}) = (-1)^j,$$

for each $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Consequently, $(-1)^j d_{n-j} > 0$ and, by (15),

$$(16) \quad \det V_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)}(\bar{\zeta}_1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_n) \det V_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) > 0.$$

On the other hand, if $\zeta_{n+1} \neq 1$, then we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P_{n+1}(z)}{z - \zeta_{n+1}} &= (z - \bar{\zeta}_{n+1}) \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} f_l z^l \\ &= z^n + \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n-1} (f_{l-1} - f_l \bar{\zeta}_{n+1}) z^l \right) - f_0 \bar{\zeta}_{n+1}, \quad f_l \in \mathbb{R}, \quad f_{n-1} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$d_j = (1 - \delta_{j,0}) f_{j-1} - (1 - \delta_{j,n}) f_j \bar{\zeta}_{n+1},$$

for each $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Using a similar argument as in the previous case, we obtain $\operatorname{sgn}(f_{n-j}) = (-1)^{j+1}$ for each $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$, and so

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} & (-1)^j \Re(d_{n-j}) > 0, \\ & (-1)^j \operatorname{sgn}(\Im(d_{n-j})) = (\delta_{n-j,n} - 1) \operatorname{sgn}(\Im(\zeta_{n+1})). \end{aligned}$$

From (15), we have

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \operatorname{sgn}(\Re(\det V_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)}(\bar{\zeta}_1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_n) \det V_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n))) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn}(\Re((-1)^{j_1} \bar{d}_{n-j_1} (-1)^{j_2} d_{n-j_2})). \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (17), we obtain

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \Re((-1)^{j_1} \bar{d}_{n-j_1} (-1)^{j_2} d_{n-j_2}) \\ &= (-1)^{j_1} \Re(d_{n-j_1}) (-1)^{j_2} \Re(d_{n-j_2}) + (-1)^{j_1} \Im(d_{n-j_1}) (-1)^{j_2} \Im(d_{n-j_2}) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

⁶Note that $(-1)^n R(-z)$ is a monic Hurwitz polynomial.

Consequently, the right-hand side of (18) is positive. Hence, from (16) and (18), the real part of (12) is positive. The positivity of the real part of the other products of determinants on right-hand side of (18) can be obtained in the same way and our claim follows. Thus, since D is real, we conclude that it is positive and the result follows from (8). \square

Proof of Theorem 2.3. By definition, the coefficients of $P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ are rational functions of the elements of the sequence $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $b(t)$, and so they are differentiable functions for each t . Since $P_{n+1}(\zeta_0; 0) = 0$, by simplicity of the zeros of $P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ (see [28, Theorem 2.14.4]), we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial z}(z; t) \right|_{z=\zeta_0, t=0} \neq 0,$$

and the first part of the theorem follows from the implicit function theorem (see [1, Theorem 2.4] and its remark). Moreover,

$$(20) \quad \frac{d\zeta}{dt}(t) = - \frac{\frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial t}(\zeta(t); t)}{\frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial z}(\zeta(t); t)}$$

for each $t \in I_\epsilon(0)$. From the definition of $P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ and the orthogonality of $Q_n(\cdot; t)$ with respect to σ , it is easy to see that

$$(21) \quad \int P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t) \overline{g(e^{i\theta})} d\sigma(\theta; t) = 0,$$

for any polynomial g of degree at most n vanishing at $z = 0$. An easy computation (see [6, (5)]) also shows that

$$(22) \quad \int \frac{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} \overline{h(e^{i\theta})} d\sigma(\theta; t) = \overline{h(\zeta(t))} \int \frac{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} d\sigma(\theta; t),$$

for any polynomial h of degree at most n . We claim that⁷

$$(23) \quad \int \frac{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} d\sigma(\theta; t) \neq 0.$$

Indeed, replacing $h = h(\cdot; t) = Q_n(\cdot; t)$ into (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \frac{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} d\sigma(\theta; t) \\ &= \frac{1}{Q_n(\zeta(t); t)} \int \frac{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} \overline{Q_n(e^{i\theta}; t)} d\sigma(\theta; t) \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $Q_n(\cdot; t)$ is orthogonal with respect to σ and, by Fejér's theorem (see [25, Theorem 1.7.19]), the zeros of this polynomial are in \mathbb{D} . Since the leading coefficient of $P_{n+1}(\cdot; t)$ does not depend on t , replacing

$$h(z; t) = \frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial t}(z; t)$$

⁷An alternative proof can be given using Christoffel-Darboux's formula as in the proof of [16, Lemma 4.4].

into (22) and using (23), we obtain

$$(24) \quad \frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial t}(\zeta(t); t) = \frac{\int \frac{\overline{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} \frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial t}(e^{i\theta}; t) d\sigma(\theta; t)}{\int \frac{\overline{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} d\sigma(\theta; t)}.$$

Moreover, one can check that

$$\frac{z}{(z - \zeta(t))^2} \left(P_{n+1}(z; t) - (z - \zeta(t)) \frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial z}(\zeta(t); t) \right)$$

is a nonzero polynomial of degree n vanishing at $z = 0$. Hence, by (21),

$$(25) \quad \frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial z}(\zeta(t); t) = \frac{h_\zeta(t)}{\int \frac{\overline{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} d\sigma(\theta; t)},$$

where

$$h_\zeta(t) = \int \left| \frac{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} \right|^2 d\sigma(\theta; t) > 0.$$

Substituting (24) and (25) into (20), and multiplying the result by $-i\overline{\zeta(t)}$, we obtain

$$(26) \quad h_\zeta(t) \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) = \int \frac{i\overline{\zeta(t)}}{e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t)} \overline{P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)} \frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial t}(e^{i\theta}; t) d\sigma(\theta; t).$$

Assuming that $P_{n+1}(\overline{\zeta(t)}; t) = 0$, the equation (26) yields

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} & (h_\zeta(t) + h_{\overline{\zeta}(t)}) \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) \\ &= 2 \Im(\zeta(t)) \int \frac{e^{i\theta} P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}{(e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t))(e^{i\theta} - \overline{\zeta(t)})} \overline{\frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial t}(e^{i\theta}; t)} d\sigma(\theta; t). \end{aligned}$$

We first prove the theorem for the case where

$$(28) \quad (c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_1.$$

In this case, combining the Radon-Nikodym and Lebesgue decomposition theorems, we can write the measure in the form

$$d\sigma(\theta; t) = \omega(\theta; t) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} + d\sigma_s(t),$$

where σ_s is singular relative to the Lebesgue measure and $\omega \in L^1(\mathbb{S}^1, \sigma)$. Of course, $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell_1$ gives that σ is absolutely continuous with continuous density ω , which equals

$$\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} c_j e^{ij\theta}$$

in this case and obeys $\min_\theta \omega(\theta; t) > 0$. Since the set $\{(\theta; t) : \theta \in [\theta_0, \theta_0 + 2\pi], t \in I_\epsilon(0)\}$ is closed and bounded,

$$(29) \quad \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t}(\theta; t) = (2 - \delta_{k,0}) \Re \left(\frac{dc_k}{dt}(t) e^{ik\theta} \right),$$

and the range of integration is finite, we can take the partial derivative of (21) with respect to t , which gives

$$(30) \quad \int \frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial t}(e^{i\theta}; t) \overline{g(e^{i\theta})} \omega(\theta; t) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = - \int P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t) \overline{g(e^{i\theta})} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t}(\theta; t) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}.$$

Since

$$\frac{z P_{n+1}(z; t)}{(z - \zeta(t))(z - \overline{\zeta(t)})}$$

is a nonzero polynomial of degree n vanishing at $z = 0$, the equation (30) yields

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int \frac{e^{i\theta} P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)}{(e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t))(e^{i\theta} - \overline{\zeta(t)})} \overline{\frac{\partial P_{n+1}}{\partial t}(e^{i\theta}; t) \omega(\theta; t)} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \\ &= - \int \frac{e^{i\theta} |P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)|^2}{(e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t))(e^{i\theta} - \overline{\zeta(t)})} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t}(\theta; t) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (31) and (27), we can assert that

$$(32) \quad (h_\zeta(t) + h_{\overline{\zeta}(t)}) \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) = -2 \Im(\zeta(t)) \int \frac{e^{i\theta} |P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)|^2}{(e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t))(e^{i\theta} - \overline{\zeta(t)})} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t}(\theta; t) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}.$$

Write

$$(33) \quad \frac{e^{i\theta} |P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)|^2}{(e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t))(e^{i\theta} - \overline{\zeta(t)})} = \sum_{j=-n}^n d_j(t) e^{ij\theta}.$$

We claim that $d_{-k}(t) = \overline{d_k(t)}$. Indeed, multiplying both sides of (33) by $e^{-ik\theta}$ and then integrating on \mathbb{S}^1 yields

$$(34) \quad d_k(t) = \int \frac{e^{-i(k-1)\theta}}{(e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t))(e^{i\theta} - \overline{\zeta(t)})} |P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}; t)|^2 \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}.$$

Since

$$\frac{e^{-i(k-1)\theta}}{(e^{i\theta} - \zeta(t))(e^{i\theta} - \overline{\zeta(t)})} = \frac{e^{-ik\theta}}{\cos \theta - \cos \varphi(t)},$$

our claim follows from (34). Substituting (29) and (33) into (32), we obtain

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} & (h_\zeta(t) + h_{\overline{\zeta}(t)}) \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) \\ &= -2(2 - \delta_{k,0}) \Im(\zeta(t)) \int \sum_{j=-n}^n d_j(t) e^{ij\theta} \Re \left(\frac{dc_k}{dt}(t) e^{ik\theta} \right) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \\ &= -2(2 - \delta_{k,0}) \Im(\zeta(t)) \Re \left(\overline{d_k(t)} \frac{dc_k}{dt}(t) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now note that the assumption (28) can be suppressed. Indeed, by Bernstein-Szegő's approximation (see [25, Theorem 1.7.8]), $(Q_j(\cdot; t))_{j=0}^n$ are OPUC for any fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$d\sigma_m(\theta; t) = \frac{1}{|q_m(e^{i\theta}; t)|^2} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad m \geq n.$$

Consequently, $Q_j(\cdot; t)$ and $P_{j+1}(\cdot; t)$ are OPUC and POPUC, respectively, for both $d\sigma$ and $d\sigma_m$. Combining Geronimus' theorem (see [25, Theorem 1.7.5]) and Baxter's theorem (see [25, Theorem 5.2.1]) gives

$$(c_j(d\sigma_m))_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_1.$$

Taking into account the notation fixed in (6) and (7), the second part of the theorem for conjugate zeros follows from (35). Similar arguments apply under the assumption $P_{n+1}(e^{-i\varphi(t)}; t) = 0$ replaced by $P_{n+1}(e^{i\theta_0}; t) = 0$. The details are left to the reader, as an exercise. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is partially supported by the Centre for Mathematics of the University of Coimbra (funded by the Portuguese Government through FCT/MCTES, DOI 10.54499/UIDB/00324/2020). The first author is supported by FCT through DOI 10.54499/2022.00143.CEECIND/CP1714/CT0002. The second author is supported by FCT grant 2021.05089.BD.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. S. Ashbaugh and E. M. Harrell II. Perturbation theory for shape resonances and large barrier potentials. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 83:151–170, 1982.
- [2] R. W. Barnard, W. Dayawansa, K. Pearce, and D. Weinberg. Polynomials with nonnegative coefficients. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 113:77–85, 1991.
- [3] B. Bohnhorst. *Beiträge zur numerischen Behandlung des unitären Eigenwertproblems*. PhD thesis, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany, 1993.
- [4] P. Borwein and T. Erdélyi. *Polynomials and Polynomial Inequalities*, volume 161 of *Grad. Texts in Math.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [5] K. Castillo. On monotonicity of zeros of paraorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 580:475–490, 2019.
- [6] K. Castillo. Markov's theorem for weight functions on the unit circle. *Constr. Approx.*, 55:605–627, 2023.
- [7] K. Castillo and J. Petronilho. Refined interlacing properties for zeros of paraorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 146:3285–3294, 2018.
- [8] A. Edrei. On the generation function of a doubly infinite, totally positive sequence. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 74:367–383, 1953.
- [9] F. R. Gantmacher. *The theory of matrices. Vol. 2*. Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1959. Translated by K. A. Hirsch.
- [10] E. R. Heineman. Generalized Vandermonde determinants. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 31:464–476, 1929.
- [11] C. R. Johnson, R. L. Smith, and M. J. Tsatsomeros. *Matrix positivity*, volume 221 of *Cambridge Tracts in Math.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020.
- [12] S. Karlin. *Total positivity*, volume I. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 1968.
- [13] R. Killip and I. Nenciu. CMV: The unitary analogue of Jacobi matrices. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, LX:1148–1188, 2007.
- [14] A. N. Kolmogorov and A. P. Yushkevich, editors. *Mathematics of the 19th century*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1998. Function theory according to Chebyshev, ordinary differential equations, calculus of variations, theory of finite differences, Translated from the 1987 Russian original by Roger Cooke.
- [15] M. G. Krein and A. A. Nudel'man. *The Markov moment problem and extremal problems*, volume 50 of *Transl. Math. Monogr.* American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1977. Ideas and problems of P. L. Čebyšev and A. A. Markov and their further development. Translated from the Russian by D. Louvish.
- [16] D. S. Lubinsky. Local asymptotics for orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle via universality. *J. Anal. Math.*, 141:285–304, 2020.

- [17] A. Markoff. Functions generated by developing power series in continued fractions. *Notes of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg*, 74(Appendix n^o2):1–30, 1894. English translation, by J. Shohat, *Duke Math. J.* 7 (1940), 85–96.
- [18] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, B. Simanek, and B. Simon. Poncelet’s theorem, paraorthogonal polynomials and the numerical range of compressed multiplication operators. *Adv. Math.*, 349:992–1035, 2019.
- [19] A. Pinkus. *Totally positive matrices*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2010.
- [20] G. Pólya. Algebraische untersuchungen über ganze Funktionen vom Geschlechte Null und Eins. *J. für Reine Angew. Math.*, 145:224–249, 1915.
- [21] Q. I. Rahman and G. Schmeisser. *Analytic theory of polynomials*. London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, vol. 26. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
- [22] J. A. Shohat and J. D. Tamarkin. *The Problem of Moments*. American Mathematical Society Mathematical Surveys, Vol. I. American Mathematical Society, New York, 1943.
- [23] B. Simanek. Zeros of non-Baxter paraorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. *Constr. Approx.*, 35:107–121, 2012.
- [24] B. Simanek. An electrostatic interpretation of the zeros of paraorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 48:2250–2268, 2016.
- [25] B. Simon. *Orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. Part I. Classical Theory*, volume 54 of *Amer. Math. Soc. Coll. Publ.* Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [26] B. Simon. CMV matrices: Five years after. *J. Comp. Appl. Math.*, 208:120–154, 2007.
- [27] B. Simon. Rank one perturbations and the zeros of paraorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 329:376–382, 2007.
- [28] B. Simon. *Szegő’s theorem and its descendants: Spectral theory for L^2 perturbations of orthogonal polynomials*. M. B. Porter Lectures. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2011.
- [29] T. J. Stieltjes. Recherches sur les fractions continues. *Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse pour les Sciences Mathématiques et les Sciences Physiques*, 8(4):J1–J122, 1894.
- [30] D. S. Watkins. Some perspectives on the eigenvalue problem. *SIAM Rev.*, 35(3):430–471, 1993.

CMUC, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA, 3000-143 COIMBRA, PORTUGAL

Email address: kenier@mat.uc.pt

CMUC, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA, 3000-143 COIMBRA, PORTUGAL

Email address: asuzuki@uc.pt