

STABLE POLYNOMIALS AND ADMISSIBLE NUMERATORS IN PRODUCT DOMAINS

KELLY BICKEL, GREG KNESE, JAMES ELDRED PASCOE, AND ALAN SOLA

Dedicated to John E. McCarthy on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday

ABSTRACT. Given a polynomial p with no zeros in the polydisk, or equivalently the poly-upper half-plane, we study the problem of determining the ideal of polynomials q with the property that the rational function q/p is bounded near a boundary zero of p . We give a complete description of this ideal of numerators in the case where the zero set of p is smooth and satisfies a non-degeneracy condition. In three variables, we give a description of the ideal in terms of an integral closure when p has an isolated zero on the distinguished boundary. Constructions of multivariate stable polynomials are presented to illustrate sharpness of our results and necessity of our assumptions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $d \geq 1$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ be a domain. A polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_d]$ is said to be *stable* with respect to Ω if $p(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \Omega$. Stable polynomials have many important applications (see, for instance, the survey [11] and the introduction in [1] and the references provided there); among others, they serve as denominators of rational functions that are holomorphic in Ω . If p is in fact strictly stable, meaning that $p(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \overline{\Omega}$, then q/p is automatically analytic in Ω and smooth on its closure. However, if p is stable but has zeros on $\partial\Omega$, then one is immediately faced with the interesting problem of finding conditions on $q \in \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_d]$ that guarantee that q/p has good properties in Ω in addition to merely being analytic.

In this article we study what we call the *admissible numerator problem* on one of the standard reference domains in \mathbb{C}^d , the unit polydisk

$$\mathbb{D}^d = \{(z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{C}^d : |z_1| < 1, \dots, |z_d| < 1\}.$$

Given a stable p , our task is to determine when a rational function q/p in three or more variables is bounded on \mathbb{D}^d . This is part of a more general program to understand singularities of rational functions on a boundary of a domain and what constraints they force on the resulting function. The papers [1, 8] addressed the two-variable admissible numerator problem on the bidisk, and together gave a full characterization of admissible numerators $q \in \mathbb{C}[z_1, z_2]$ associated to a polynomial stable on the bidisk. This was possible because

Date: June 21, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 13A15, 13B22, 32A40, 32B05.

Key words and phrases. Stable polynomials, bounded rational functions, ideal membership, integral closure.

KB partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2000088.

GK partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2247702.

JEP partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2319010

AS acknowledges support from Ivar Bendixsons stipendiefond för docenter.

of a complete local description of the zero set of a stable polynomial in \mathbb{D}^2 with zeros on the boundary (see [1, Section 2] for details). In dimensions three or higher, such a local description is lacking, and, as we will see, the admissible numerator problem becomes more complicated. For a two-variable L^p version of the problem we consider here, see [7] which also contains an alternative proof of the characterization of the ideal of admissible numerators.

As in [1], we perform conformal maps in order to transfer to the biholomorphically equivalent situation of the poly-upper half-plane

$$\mathbb{H}^{d+1} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_d, z) : \Im x_1, \dots, \Im x_d, \Im z > 0\},$$

where we have singled out a distinguished variable z . When we restrict to the three variable setting, we will use the notation (x, y, z) and the distinguished variable will still be z . In the general setting, given $p, q \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d, z]$ where $p(x_1, \dots, x_d, z) \neq 0$ for $\Im x_j > 0, \Im z > 0$ and $p(0) = 0$, we wish to know when $q(x, z)/p(x, z)$ is bounded on a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{d+1}$ intersected with \mathbb{H}^{d+1} . Working in the specific setting of a product domain gives us several advantages as regards the admissible numerator problem. Given a stable p , it is easy to exhibit at least one non-trivial admissible numerator in the form of the reflection polynomial associated with p , given in the poly-upper half-plane case by $\bar{p}(w) = \overline{p(\bar{w})}$, and so we immediately get existence of admissible numerators other than p when p is not a multiple of \bar{p} . In addition, there are several methods for constructing stable polynomials in the polydisk or poly-upper half-plane with prescribed properties (see for instance [3, 9, 10], and results presented below). As we will see, however, not all admissible numerators can generally be produced from p and \bar{p} , or indeed just two fixed polynomials.

We have singled out a distinguished variable z because in this article we investigate the simplest type of boundary singularity, namely, when $\frac{\partial p}{\partial z}(0) \neq 0$ and the zero set $\mathcal{Z}_p = \{(x, z) : p(x, z) = 0\}$ is parametrized via an analytic function by the implicit function theorem. Geometrically we are assuming the zero set of p is a smooth variety through 0. In particular, by the Weierstrass preparation theorem we can factor

$$(1) \quad p(x, z) = u(x, z) (z + \phi(x))$$

for $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ with $\phi(0) = 0$, and $u(x, z) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d, z\}$ having $u(0, 0) \neq 0$. Here $\mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ and related variations denote rings of power series convergent at 0 in the given variables.

The first step is to give a description of the relevant ϕ .

Proposition 1.1. *Suppose $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$; i.e. is analytic near 0. Assume $\phi(0) = 0$, and $z + \phi(x)$ has no zeros for $z \in \mathbb{H}$ and (small) $x \in \mathbb{H}^d$. Then, $\nabla \phi(0) \in [0, \infty)^d$ and $\Im \phi$ is locally non-negative on \mathbb{R}^d . In addition, either:*

- $\phi \in \mathbb{R}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$; i.e. it has all real coefficients or
- ϕ has the form

$$\phi(x) = \phi_1(x) + \dots + \phi_{2L-1}(x) + \phi_{2L}(x) + \dots$$

where each ϕ_j is a homogeneous polynomial of degree j , $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{2L-1} \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ have real coefficients, and $\Im \phi_{2L} \not\equiv 0$ is non-negative on \mathbb{R}^d .

Furthermore, if $T \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ is the set of components of $\nabla \phi(0)$ that are zero, then $\phi(\sum_{j \in T} x_j e_j) \equiv 0$. (Here e_j are standard basis vectors for \mathbb{C}^d .)

When we write $\Im\phi$ we are referring to the analytic function obtained by extracting the imaginary parts of the coefficients of ϕ , namely

$$(\Im\phi)(x) := \frac{1}{2i}(\phi(x) - \overline{\phi(\bar{x})})$$

which does equal $\Im(\phi(x))$ when $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that $\nabla\phi(0) = 0$ implies $\phi \equiv 0$. Note also, if ϕ has an isolated zero at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ then necessarily $\nabla\phi(0) \in (0, \infty)^d$.

From here we wish to describe the following *ideal of admissible numerators*

$$\mathcal{I}_p^\infty = \{q(x, z) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d, z\} : q/p \text{ is bounded on } \mathbb{H}^{d+1} \cap \mathbb{D}_\epsilon^{d+1} \text{ for some } \epsilon > 0\}$$

in as simple terms as possible. Here $\mathbb{D}_\epsilon = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < \epsilon\}$. Because we are working in a small neighborhood of the origin, most all inequalities to follow will only be proven/stated for inputs sufficiently close to the origin. We shall use the common notations

$$f(x) \gtrsim g(x), \quad f(x) \lesssim g(x), \quad f(x) \asymp g(x)$$

to denote inequalities of the form

$$f(x) \geq Cg(x), \quad f(x) \leq Cg(x), \quad cf(x) \leq g(x) \leq Cg(x)$$

near 0 for positive constants $c, C > 0$ whose values are of no importance. When $\phi \in \mathbb{R}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ in Proposition 1.1 then the ideal \mathcal{I}_p^∞ is the principal ideal (p) since all numerators will vanish on the smooth variety $z + \phi(x) = 0$.

Outside of this case, the simplest polynomials to consider are those where $\Im\phi_{2L}(x)$ is positive definite on \mathbb{R}^d in the sense that $\Im\phi_{2L}(x)$ is strictly positive on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| = 1\}$ or equivalently $\Im\phi_{2L}(x) \asymp |x|^{2L}$. In this case, the zero set of $z + \phi(x)$ on \mathbb{R}^d is automatically isolated at 0.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume $p(x_1, \dots, x_d, z) \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d, z]$ has no zeros in \mathbb{H}^{d+1} , $p(0) = 0$, and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial z}(0) \neq 0$. Parametrize the zero set of p near 0 as in (1) and Proposition 1.1, i.e. as $z + \phi(x) = 0$. If $\phi(x) \notin \mathbb{R}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ and the first homogeneous term ϕ_{2L} with non-trivial imaginary part satisfies the condition that $\Im\phi_{2L}$ is positive definite, then the ideal of admissible numerators for $p(x, z)$ is given by*

$$\mathcal{I}_p^\infty = (z + q(x), (x)^{2L})$$

where $q(x) = \sum_{j < 2L} \phi_j(x)$ and $(x)^{2L}$ is the ideal generated by powers x^α for $|\alpha| = 2L$.

This result already covers many natural examples such as the \mathbb{D}^d -stable polynomial $d - \sum_{j=1}^d z_j$. We present the details for $d = 3$, using the variables (x, y, z) to lighten notation.

Example 1.3. Consider the tridisk example $3 - z_1 - z_2 - z_3$ which converts to the tri-upper-half-plane stable polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, y, z) &= x + y + z - 2i(xy + xz + yz) - 3xyz \\ &= (1 - 2i(x + y) - 3xy) \left(z + \underbrace{\frac{x + y - 2ixy}{1 - 2i(x + y) - 3xy}}_{=: \phi(x, y)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi(x, y) = x + y + 2i(x^2 + xy + y^2) + \text{higher order terms.}$$

We have $\Im\phi_2(x, y) = 2(x^2 + xy + y^2)$ which is positive definite. Therefore, the set of functions $q(x, y, z)$ analytic at $(0, 0, 0)$ such that

$$\frac{q(x, y, z)}{p(x, y, z)}$$

is locally bounded near $(0, 0, 0)$ in \mathbb{R}^3 is exactly the ideal

$$(x + y + z, x^2, xy, y^2)$$

within the ring of convergent power series. This is simply the functions with first order term given by a multiple of $x + y + z$.

Converting back to \mathbb{D}^3 and the polynomial $3 - z_1 - z_2 - z_3$ we have that the ideal of numerators $q(z_1, z_2, z_3)$ such that $q(z_1, z_2, z_3)/(3 - z_1 - z_2 - z_3)$ is bounded on \mathbb{D}^3 is generated by

$$(3 - z_1 - z_2 - z_3, (1 - z_1)^2, (1 - z_1)(1 - z_2), (1 - z_2)^2). \quad \diamond$$

The description of \mathcal{I}_p^∞ in Theorem 1.2 is reminiscent of the case of order one vanishing in two variables, see [1, Theorem 5.4], where the corresponding ideal is generated by a pair of elements of the form $z + q(x_1)$ and x_1^{2L} , $L \in \mathbb{N}$ with $L \geq 1$. Before we move on to a discussion of whether this similarity persists in the absence of the positivity condition imposed in Theorem 1.2, we note that while Example 1.3 exhibits the simplest situation $L = 1$ it is of interest to know if higher order vanishing of $\Im\phi$ is possible. Namely, does the global constraint of p having no zeros on \mathbb{H}^d force any special behavior (as happens with $\nabla\phi(0)$)? The next result discussed below shows that any degree $2L \in \mathbb{N}$ can occur in Theorem 1.2.

First, it is worth noting that the rest of the material we wish to present is formulated in the three-variable case. This is for notational convenience when constructing and examining examples below, but in the case of the final theorem presented below, our proof is restricted to dimension three. (That said, we do have a general result below, Proposition 3.4, that leaves room for generalizing to d variables.) Again in three variables, it is convenient to simply use (x, y, z) as variables with z still acting as our distinguished variable.

Proposition 1.4. *For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a polynomial $p(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ with no zeros in \mathbb{H}^3 , its sole zero in $\overline{\mathbb{H}^3}$ at $(0, 0, 0)$, $\frac{\partial p}{\partial z}(0) \neq 0$, and the associated ϕ having $\Im\phi$ vanishing to order $2L$ with $\Im\phi_{2L}$ positive definite.*

The next natural questions are if it is possible for $\Im\phi_{2L}$ to fail to be positive definite for an isolated zero, and what happens in this case.

We have a construction for producing a family of examples with degenerate $\Im\phi_{2L}$. The construction is easier in the setting of the tridisk where we start with a polynomial $p_0(x, z)$ with no zeros in \mathbb{D}^2 but a zero at $(1, 1)$ and consider

$$p_1(x, y, z) = p_0((x + y)/2, z).$$

The upper half-plane version of this simply looks more complicated. First, let $\beta = i(1 - z)/(1 + z)$ be a standard conformal map from \mathbb{D} to \mathbb{H} and note that

$$\beta \left(\frac{\beta^{-1}(x) + \beta^{-1}(y)}{2} \right) = \frac{i(x + y) + 2xy}{2i + x + y}.$$

Then, we have the following. We make reference to a property of a two-variable stable polynomial called *contact order* that we define later; it essentially measures the rate that the polynomial's zero set approaches \mathbb{R}^2 .

Proposition 1.5. *Let $q(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ have no zeros in \mathbb{H}^2 , bidegree (m, n) , finitely many zeros on \mathbb{R}^2 , and $q(0, 0) = 0$. Assume $\frac{\partial q}{\partial y}(0) \neq 0$, and that q has contact order $K > 2$ at $(0, 0)$. Set*

$$p(x, y, z) = (2i + x + y)^m q\left(\frac{i(x + y) + 2xy}{2i + x + y}, z\right).$$

Then, $p(x, y, z) \neq 0$ for $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{H}^3$ and p has finitely many zeros on \mathbb{R}^3 . Furthermore, there is a parametrization of \mathcal{Z}_p near 0 of the form $z + \phi(x, y) = 0$ such that $\mathfrak{S}\phi_2(x, y) \not\equiv 0$ and $\mathfrak{S}\phi_k(x, y) = 0$ when $x = y$ for $k < K$.

There are known constructions that give polynomials q as described in Proposition 1.5. For example, at the end of [9], Pascoe constructs a family of rational functions of degree $(n, 1)$ with prescribed regularity at a boundary point. As described in Section 3.4 in [1], this boundary regularity condition actually translates to a statement about contact order and so, Pascoe's construction yields stable polynomials of degree $(n, 1)$ with prescribed contact order K at $(0, 0)$ and finitely many zeros in \mathbb{R}^2 . Combined with Proposition 1.5, this gives us a degenerate example for each possible K . Another construction of general K -contact order polynomials with a prescribed number of zeros is given by Sola in [10, Corollary 6].

In the general case of degenerate $\mathfrak{S}\phi_{2L}$ but also when p has an isolated zero on \mathbb{R}^3 it is possible to reduce the description of \mathcal{I}_p^∞ to an ideal described entirely with polynomials. The first step is showing that if $\mathfrak{S}\phi(x, y) > 0$ near $(0, 0)$ but $\phi(0, 0) = 0$, then $\mathfrak{S}\phi$ is comparable to a polynomial.

Lemma 1.6. *Suppose $f \in \mathbb{R}\{x, y\}$, $f(0, 0) = 0$, and $f(x, y) > 0$ for small $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$. Then, there exist a positive integer K and a polynomial $g(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}[x, y]$ such that near $(0, 0)$*

$$g(x, y) \asymp f(x, y)$$

and $f(x, y) \gtrsim |(x, y)|^K$.

Once we have this lemma in place, we can prove the following.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $p(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ have no zeros in \mathbb{H}^3 , $p(0, 0, 0) = 0$, $\frac{\partial p}{\partial z}(0, 0, 0) \neq 0$, and assume the zero $(0, 0, 0)$ of p is isolated with respect to \mathbb{R}^3 .*

Then, there exist $g(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}[x, y]$ and $H(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}[x, y]$ such that the ideal of admissible numerators for $p(x, y, z)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_p^\infty = (z + H(x, y), \text{IC}(g(x, y)))$$

where

$$\text{IC}(g(x, y)) = \{q(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} : |q(x, y)| \lesssim g(x, y) \text{ near } (0, 0)\}.$$

This transfers the problem of determining the full ideal of admissible numerators to the real algebraic geometry problem of determining $\text{IC}(g(x, y))$. The notation here stands for *integral closure*, see [8] for details and references.

The remainder of our paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we give an example of Theorem 1.7 in action to exactly determine an admissible numerator ideal in the absence of the positive definite condition in Theorem 1.1. Section 3 contains proofs of the first four of

our stated results. In Section 4, we present the proofs of Lemma 1.6 and Theorem 1.7. Along the way, we examine several examples that illustrate the results obtained in this paper.

2. A MORE COMPLICATED EXAMPLE

Before we turn to the proofs of our results, we examine a more involved example. The goal is to get a feeling for what Theorem 1.7 says in practice, and to see what computations look like when we are faced with a non-definite first imaginary homogeneous term at an isolated zero at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Example 2.1. We start with the polynomial with no zeros in \mathbb{D}^2 given by

$$p_0(x, y) = x^2 - xy - 3x - y + 4.$$

Then, consider

$$p_1(x, y, z) = p_0((x + y)/2, z) = \frac{1}{4}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}xy + \frac{1}{4}y^2 - \frac{1}{2}xz - \frac{1}{2}yz - \frac{3}{2}x - \frac{3}{2}y - z + 4.$$

If we convert this to a polynomial with no zeros on \mathbb{H}^3 but with a zero at 0 we get

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, y, z) &= 2x^2y^2z + 2ix^2y^2 + 3ix^2yz \\ &\quad + 3ixy^2z - \frac{5}{2}x^2y - \frac{5}{2}xy^2 - \frac{5}{4}x^2z \\ &\quad - \frac{9}{2}xyz - \frac{5}{4}y^2z - \frac{3}{4}ix^2 - \frac{5}{2}ixy \\ &\quad - \frac{3}{4}iy^2 - 2ixz - 2iyz + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}y + z. \end{aligned}$$

We can directly solve for a parametrization of the zero set in the form $z + \phi(x, y)$ and see that ϕ has the initial power series expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x, y) &= \frac{1}{2}(x + y) \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{4}(x - y)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8}(x^3 + 7x^2y + 7xy^2 + y^3) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{16}i(9x^2 - 2xy + 9y^2)(x + y)^2 + \text{higher order terms.} \end{aligned}$$

Here $\Im\phi_2(x, y) = \frac{1}{4}(x - y)^2$ is evidently not positive definite. This is compensated by the term $\Im\phi_4(x, y) = \frac{1}{16}(9x^2 - 2xy + 9y^2)(x + y)^2$, which though it is not positive definite either, the sum of the terms will be positive except at 0.

One can show

$$\Im\phi(x, y) \asymp (x - y)^2 + (x^2 + y^2)(x + y)^2$$

for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ close to 0. Indeed, this follows from

$$\Im\phi(x, y) = \frac{1}{4}(x - y)^2 + \frac{1}{16}(9x^2 - 2xy + 9y^2)(x + y)^2 + O(|(x, y)|^5)$$

as well as

$$(9x^2 - 2xy + 9y^2) \asymp x^2 + y^2$$

and

$$|(x, y)|^4 \lesssim (x - y)^2 + (x^2 + y^2)(x + y)^2.$$

Next, let $g(x, y) = (x - y)^2 + (x^2 + y^2)(x + y)^2$.

Claim 2.2. The ideal $\text{IC}(g(x, y))$ of $q(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ satisfying $|q(x, y)| \lesssim g(x, y)$ for x, y small is given by

$$\text{IC}(g(x, y)) = ((x - y)^2, (x - y)(x + y)^2, (x, y)^4).$$

Proof. We shall change variables to $u = x - y, v = x + y$ and consider $G(u, v) = u^2 + (u^2 + v^2)v^2 = u^2 + u^2v^2 + v^4$. The ideal of polynomials satisfying $|q(u, v)| \lesssim G(u, v)$ evidently contains

$$u^2, u^2v^2, uv^3, v^4.$$

It also includes uv^2 because

$$|u|v^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(u^2 + v^4).$$

The ideal contains all fourth degree monomials. The only third degree monomial that it does not contain is v^3 . The only second degree monomial it does contain is u^2 . Indeed, we cannot have

$$|uv| \lesssim (u^2 + u^2v^2 + v^4)$$

because if we set $u = v^2$ we get $v^3 \lesssim v^4$. Also, v^2 is ruled out by setting $u = 0$.

The ideal therefore contains

$$I_0 = (u^2, u^3, u^2v, uv^2, (u, v)^4).$$

(Elements u^3, u^2v are written for emphasis.) To prove this is all we take a polynomial $q(u, v)$ bounded above by $u^2 + u^2v^2 + v^4$ and reduce modulo I_0 . We can write

$$q(u, v) = a + bu + cv + duv + ev^2 + gv^3.$$

We assume $|q(u, v)| \lesssim (u^2 + u^2v^2 + v^4)$ for u, v small. Evidently, $a = 0$. Setting $v = 0$ yields $b = 0$. Setting $u = 0$ yields $c = 0$ then $e = g = 0$. Finally, uv is not in the ideal so $d = 0$. \square

Now we can apply Theorem 1.7 to write down the ideal of admissible numerators of p . Using the notation of Lemma 1.6, we have $K = 4$ for $\Im\phi$. Then the proof of Theorem 1.7 implies that H is the third-order Taylor polynomial of $\Re\phi$. Specifically,

$$H(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(x + y) + \frac{1}{8}(x^3 + 7x^2y + 7xy^2 + y^3).$$

Theorem 1.7 immediately implies that the ideal is

$$\mathcal{I}_p^\infty = (z + H(x, y), (x - y)^2, (x - y)(x + y)^2, (x, y)^4). \quad \diamond$$

3. PROOFS, PART I: GENERAL DIMENSIONS AND EXAMPLE CONSTRUCTIONS

The following is a straightforward exercise using a local description of analytic functions in one variable so we omit the proof.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $f(x) \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ maps elements of \mathbb{H} to $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ and $f(0) = 0$. If $f \not\equiv 0$ then $f'(0) > 0$.*

Proof of Proposition 1.1. We may assume $\phi \not\equiv 0$. Locally, ϕ maps \mathbb{H}^d to $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$; so evidently $\Im\phi \geq 0$ on \mathbb{R}^d . For any $v \in [0, \infty)^d \setminus \{0\}$, $t \mapsto \phi(tv)$ maps \mathbb{H} to $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ (locally). By Lemma 3.1, either this map is identically zero or $\nabla\phi(0) \cdot v > 0$. If $\nabla\phi(0) = 0$, then we would have ϕ equal to zero on an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d implying $\phi \equiv 0$. Thus, $\nabla\phi(0) \in [0, \infty)^d \setminus \{0\}$.

Suppose ϕ does not have all real coefficients. Then, we may write a homogeneous expansion where ϕ_M is the first term with complex and non-real coefficients

$$\phi(x) = \phi_1(x) + \cdots + \phi_{M-1}(x) + \phi_M(x) + \cdots .$$

Since $\Im\phi(x) \geq 0$ for small $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{t \searrow 0} \Im\phi(tx)/t^M = \Im\phi_M(x) \geq 0.$$

We necessarily have that M is even for otherwise $\Im\phi_M(-x) = -\Im\phi_M(x) \geq 0$ would imply $\Im\phi_M$ is identically zero.

The final claim follows from restricting ϕ to the components corresponding to zero components of $\nabla\phi(0)$ and repeating the argument just given. \square

Remark 3.2. Assuming the setup of Proposition 1.1 with $\phi \notin \mathbb{R}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$, $z + \phi(x)$ has an isolated zero at 0 with respect to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} if and only if $\Im\phi(x)$ has an isolated zero at 0 with respect to \mathbb{R}^d . Indeed $z + \phi(x) = 0$ if and only if $z = -\Re\phi(x)$ and $\Im\phi(x) = 0$.

Note that if $\nabla\phi(0)$ has a zero component, say the first, then $\phi(x_1, 0, \dots, 0) \equiv 0$ and $\Im\phi(x)$ does not have an isolated zero. So we obtain the conclusion that if $\Im\phi(x)$ has an isolated zero then $\nabla\phi(0)$ has all positive entries; i.e. the imaginary part is putting constraints on the real part of ϕ .

Finally, note that if $\Im\phi_{2L}(x)$ is positive definite then $\Im\phi(x) = \Im\phi_{2L}(x) + O(|x|^{2L+1}) \asymp |x|^{2L}$ has an isolated zero which by the above implies $\nabla\phi(0)$ has all positive entries. \diamond

The condition that none of the components of $\nabla\phi(0)$ vanishes gives us local control over $\Im(\phi(x))$ in \mathbb{H}^d .

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$, $\phi(0) = 0$, and $\Im\phi(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume $\nabla\phi(0) \in (0, \infty)^d$.*

Then, for $x = u + iv \in \overline{\mathbb{H}}^d$ close to 0 we have

$$\Im(\phi(x)) \gtrsim ((\Im\phi(u)) + |v|) \gtrsim (|\Im\phi(x)| + |v|).$$

where $(\Im\phi)(x) = \frac{1}{2i}(\phi(x) - \overline{\phi(\bar{x})})$ while $\Im(\phi(x))$ is the pointwise imaginary part of $\phi(x)$.

Proof. Let us write $\phi(x) = A(x) + iB(x)$ where $A = \Re\phi$ and $B = \Im\phi$.

We claim first that

$$\begin{aligned} \Im(A(u + iv)) &= \nabla\phi(0) \cdot v + o(v) \\ B(u + iv) &= B(u) + o(v), \end{aligned}$$

where little-o is taken as $(u + iv) \rightarrow 0$.

To show this note that if some $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ vanishes to order 2 at 0 then we have for small $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $v \in [0, \infty)^d$

$$f(u + iv) = f(u) + o(v).$$

This follows from

$$f(u + iv) - f(u) = \int_0^1 \nabla f(u + itv) \cdot iv dt$$

using $|\nabla f(u + iv)| = O(|u + iv|)$.

Now consider $A(u + iv) := A(u + iv) - \nabla\phi(0) \cdot (u + iv)$ which vanishes to order 2 and has real coefficients. By the above

$$\tilde{A}(u + iv) = \tilde{A}(u) + o(v)$$

and taking imaginary parts we have

$$\Im(A(u + iv)) - \nabla\phi(0) \cdot v = o(v)$$

since $\nabla\phi(0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tilde{A}(u) \in \mathbb{R}$. For the other estimate, note that B vanishes to order 2 already so the claim $B(u + iv) = B(u) + o(v)$ is immediate.

Therefore, since $\nabla\phi(0)$ has all positive entries and $v \in [0, \infty)^d$

$$\Im(\phi(x)) \geq \nabla\phi(0) \cdot v + B(u) + o(v) \gtrsim |v| + B(u) \gtrsim |v| + |B(u + iv)|.$$

□

Proposition 3.4. *Assume $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$, $\phi(0) = 0$, $\nabla\phi(0) \in (0, \infty)^d$, and $\Im\phi(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for $q(x, z) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d, z\}$,*

$$\frac{q(x, z)}{z + \phi(x)}$$

is bounded on $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^{d+1} \cap \mathbb{D}_\epsilon^{d+1}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ if and only if q belongs to the ideal

$$(z + (\Re\phi)(x), \text{IC}((\Im\phi)(x)))$$

where

$$\text{IC}((\Im\phi)(x)) = \{f(x) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\} : |f(x)| \lesssim (\Im\phi)(x) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ near } 0\}.$$

In particular, we need only examine $q(x, z)$ on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} to determine local boundedness.

Proof. Again we write $\phi(x) = A(x) + iB(x)$. By Proposition 3.3, for $x = u + iv \in \mathbb{H}^d$

$$|z + \phi(x)| \geq \Im(z) + \Im(\phi(x)) \gtrsim \Im(z) + |B(x)| + |v|$$

so we see that

$$\frac{B(x)}{z + \phi(x)}$$

is locally bounded in \mathbb{H}^{d+1} . This implies

$$\frac{z + A(x)}{z + \phi(x)}$$

has the same property.

Next we show that if $|f(u)| \lesssim B(u)$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ near 0, then $\frac{f}{z+\phi}$ is locally bounded in \mathbb{H}^{d+1} . We have $f(u + iv) = f(u) + O(v)$ so that $|f(u + iv)| \lesssim B(u) + |v| \lesssim \Im(\phi(x))$ by Proposition 3.3. This implies $\frac{f}{z+\phi}$ is locally bounded in \mathbb{H}^{d+1} . Therefore, everything in the ideal

$$(z + A(x), \text{IC}(B(x)))$$

yields a numerator for a locally bounded function.

Conversely, suppose $q \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d, z\}$ and $\frac{q}{z+\phi}$ is locally bounded in \mathbb{H}^{d+1} . We can write

$$q(x, z) = q_0(x) + (z + A(x))q_1(x, z)$$

for $q_0(x) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$, $q_1(x, z) \in \mathbb{C}\{x_1, \dots, x_d, z\}$. As $z + A(x)$ already belongs to the ideal, we need only show $q_0(x)$ belongs to the ideal in question. We have $|q(x, z)| \lesssim |z + \phi(x)|$ by assumption locally in \mathbb{H}^{d+1} so that by continuity this extends to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} near 0. Setting $z = -A(x)$ we have $|q_0(x)| \lesssim |B(x)|$ for small $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which means $q_0(x) \in \text{IC}(B(x))$.

This last argument proves that a given $q(x, z)$ belongs to \mathcal{I}_p^∞ if and only if $q(x, -A(x)) \in \text{IC}(B(x))$. \square

While our focus is on an isolated singularity at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, Proposition 3.4 does allow us to calculate the ideal of admissible numerators in specific examples with non-isolated singularities.

Example 3.5. Consider $2 - xy - z$ which is non-vanishing on \mathbb{D}^3 ; this converts to the \mathbb{H}^3 -stable polynomial

$$p(x, y, z) = x + y + z - 2i(xz + yz) - xyz.$$

Note $p(x, -x, 0) \equiv 0$. The zero set through $(0, 0, 0)$ is parametrized by $z + \phi(x, y) = 0$ for

$$\phi(x, y) = \frac{x + y}{1 - 2i(x + y) - xy}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Im\phi(x, y) &= \frac{2(x + y)^2}{(1 - xy)^2 + 4(x + y)^2} \\ \Re\phi(x, y) &= \frac{(1 - xy)(x + y)}{(1 - xy)^2 + 4(x + y)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Im\phi(x, y) \asymp (x + y)^2$ we can reduce $\Re\phi(x, y) \pmod{(x + y)^2}$ to obtain

$$\frac{x + y}{1 - xy}.$$

We conclude that the ideal of admissible numerators is given by

$$\left(z + \frac{x + y}{1 - xy}, (x + y)^2 \right) = (x + y + z - xyz, (x + y)^2)$$

since $(1 - xy)$ is a unit. Note that the minimal number of generators here is similar to the two variable case and is smaller compared to the ideals associated with p having an isolated zero at 0. \diamond

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Remark 3.2, $\nabla\phi(0)$ has all positive entries when $\Im\phi_{2L}$ is positive definite. Theorem 1.2 now follows from Proposition 3.4 because $\Im\phi(x) \asymp |x|^{2L}$ on \mathbb{R}^d and we can reduce $\Re\phi(x) \pmod{(x)^{2L}}$ to reduce to just the Taylor polynomial of $\Re\phi(x)$ of degree less than $2L$. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.4. Example 1.3 shows that $L = 1$ is possible.

Now let $L \geq 2$ be an integer. Let p be from Example 1.3. Define the reflection polynomial

$$\bar{p}(x_1, x_2, z) = x_1 + x_2 + z + 2i(x_1x_2 + x_1z + x_2z) - 3x_1x_2z,$$

and set

$$g(x_1, x_2, z) = i \frac{p(x_1, x_2, z) + \bar{p}(x_1, x_2, z)}{p(x_1, x_2, z) - \bar{p}(x_1, x_2, z)}.$$

Then g is analytic in \mathbb{H}^3 , maps \mathbb{H}^3 to \mathbb{H} , and has $g(x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{R}$ for $(x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. In other words, g is a real rational Pick function [3, Section 6].

For $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ fixed, set

$$g_x(z) = g(x_1, x_2, z), \quad z \in \mathbb{H}.$$

For each $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the function $g_\xi(z)$ is either constant, or a rational self-map of the upper half-plane to itself, hence a Möbius transformation. Letting $g^1 = g$, we now set $g^2(x, z) = g(x, g_x(z))$, and similarly define $g^L = g^{L-1}(x, g_x(z)) : \mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ for $L = 3, 4, \dots$. Then each g^L has the property that $z \mapsto g^L(\xi, z)$ maps \mathbb{H} to itself for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$, or else is constant.

Consider the function $\beta(w) = \frac{1+iw}{1-iw}$, which conformally maps \mathbb{H} to \mathbb{D} with $\beta(0) = 1$. Let $f^L = \beta \circ g^L$ and $\phi^L = \beta \circ g^L \circ \beta^{-1}$, where β^{-1} is applied to each input of g^L separately. One can easily check that each ϕ^L equals the rational inner function ϕ_d^N studied in Example 8 in [10] for $N = L$ and $d = 3$. Now the conclusions of that example can be applied directly. Specifically, one can write $\phi^L = \frac{q_L}{r_L}$, where the polynomials q_L, r_L have no common terms, vanish at $(1, 1, 1)$, and have degree 1 in the third variable. The conclusions in Example 8 in [10] immediately imply that for $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ near 0,

$$(2) \quad \{1 - |z_3| : q_L(e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2}, z_3) = 0\} \asymp (\theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2)^L.$$

To translate this to f^L , note that $f^L = \phi^L \circ \beta$. Then the discussion in [1, Section 2.1] about changing domains from \mathbb{D}^d to \mathbb{H}^d implies that $f_L = q \frac{\bar{p}_L}{p_L}$, where q is a two-variable unit near $(0, 0)$ and p_L is a stable polynomial in \mathbb{H}^3 with degree 1 in z . The properties of β allow one to translate (2) to the following statement about p_L for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ near 0:

$$(3) \quad \{|\Im(z)| : p_L(x_1, x_2, z) = 0\} = \{\Im(z) : \bar{p}_L(x_1, x_2, z) = 0\} \asymp (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^L.$$

(While we omit the change-of-variables computation from (2) to (3) here, the interested reader could see [2]; the details of a very similar conversion are given in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 3.3.) Then (3) implies that p_L has an associated $\phi_{2L} \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2]$ with $(\Im \phi_{2L})(x_1, x_2) \asymp (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^L$, which completes the proof. \square

Example 3.6. Applying the construction from the proof of Proposition 1.4 with $L = 2$ to the polynomial in Example 1.3 produces

$$(4) \quad p_2(x, y, z) = x + y + 2i((x + y)^2 - 2x^2y^2) - 2(x^2y + xy^2) \\ + (1 + 2i(x + y - 2x^2y - 2xy^2) - 2(x + y)^2)z.$$

For p_2 , we compute that

$$\phi(x_1, x_2) = x + y + 2(x^3 + 2x^2y + 2xy^2 + y^3) + 4i(x^4 + 2x^3y + 3x^2y^2 + 2xy^3 + y^4) + \text{higher order}.$$

For this example, one can actually check directly (viz. [4, p.1155]) that $\Im \phi_4(x, y) \asymp (x^2 + y^2)^2$ as guaranteed by Proposition 1.4. Setting

$$H(x, y) = x + y + 2(x^3 + 2x^2y + 2xy^2 + y^3),$$

we thus have

$$\mathcal{I}_{p_2}^\infty = (z + H(x, y), (x^2 + y^2)^2). \quad \diamond$$

Now we consider Proposition 1.5. In what follows, K is the contact order of the two-variable polynomial q at $(0, 0)$. This means that K a positive even integer that measures how the zero set of q approaches $(0, 0)$ in the following sense:

$$\inf \{|\Im(y)| : q(x, y) = 0\} \asymp |x|^K,$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ sufficiently close to 0. See ‘‘Theorem (Puiseux Factorizations)’’ in the introduction of [1] and the later proof of that result for more information about contact order in the case of a pure stable polynomial with a single, irreducible, degree 1 Weierstrass polynomial.

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Since $\frac{\partial q}{\partial y}(0) \neq 0$, we can factor

$$q(x, y) = u(x, y) (y + \psi(x))$$

for $\psi(x) \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ with $\psi(0) = 0$, and $u(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ with $u(0, 0) \neq 0$. Writing $\psi(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k x^k$ we can apply Proposition 1.1 to see $a_1 > 0$ and there exists an even natural number \tilde{K} such that $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$ for $j < \tilde{K}$ and $\Im a_{\tilde{K}} > 0$. Thus for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q(x, y) = 0$,

$$|\Im y| = |\Im(a_{\tilde{K}} x^{\tilde{K}} + O(x^{\tilde{K}+1}))| \asymp |x|^{\tilde{K}}.$$

By definition of contact order we must have $K = \tilde{K}$.

Define p as in the statement of Proposition 1.5. Then, by the properties of $\beta = i(1 - z)/(1 + z)$ and β^{-1} , p is a stable polynomial on \mathbb{H}^3 and has finitely many zeros on \mathbb{R}^3 . Furthermore, its zero set \mathcal{Z}_p near 0 is parameterized by $z + \phi(x, y) = 0$, where

$$\phi(x, y) = \psi \left(\frac{i(x + y) + 2xy}{2i + x + y} \right).$$

One can check that

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2}(0, 0) = \frac{1}{4} \psi''(0) + \frac{i}{2} \psi'(0).$$

Since $K > 2$, we know $\Im \psi''(0) = 2\Im a_2 = 0$. Thus, using the notation of Proposition 1.1, $\Im \phi_2(x, y)$ includes the term $\frac{a_1}{4} x^2$ and so $\Im \phi_2(x, y) \neq 0$. However, restricting to $y = x$ gives

$$\phi(x, x) = \psi(x)$$

and so $\Im \phi_k(x, x) = 0$ for $k < K$. □

4. PROOFS PART II: GENERAL ISOLATED POINTS IN 3 VARIABLES

First, we prove Theorem 1.7 assuming Lemma 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. The zeros of p near $(0, 0, 0)$ on \mathbb{R}^3 are given by $z + \phi(x, y) = 0$. Since we assume the zero at $(0, 0, 0)$ is isolated with respect to \mathbb{R}^3 , by Remark 3.2 we see that $\Im \phi(x, y) > 0$ for (x, y) near by not equal to $(0, 0)$. Applying Lemma 1.6 to $f(x, y) = \Im \phi(x, y)$, there exists a polynomial $g(x, y) \asymp f(x, y)$ and a natural number K such that $f(x, y) \gtrsim |(x, y)|^K$.

Since p has an isolated zero at $(0, 0, 0)$ in \mathbb{R}^3 we necessarily have $\nabla \phi(0)$ with all positive entries by Proposition 1.1. We can then apply Proposition 3.4 to see

$$\mathcal{I}_p^\infty = (z + \Re \phi(x, y), \text{IC}(\Im \phi(x, y))).$$

We can replace $\Im \phi(x, y) = f(x, y)$ with $g(x, y)$. Since $g(x, y) \gtrsim |(x, y)|^K$, the ideal $(x, y)^K$ is contained in the admissible numerator ideal and we can reduce $\Re \phi(x, y) \pmod{(x, y)^K}$ without changing the ideal. Now, $\Re \phi(x, y)$ is equivalent to its $K - 1$ -th order Taylor polynomial, call it $H(x, y)$.

We arrive at the following representation of the admissible numerator ideal

$$\mathcal{I}_p^\infty = (z + H(x, y), \text{IC}(g(x, y))).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 1.6. First, by the Weierstrass preparation theorem we can write

$$f(x, y) = u(x, y) \prod_{j=1}^k f_j(x, y)$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}\{x, y\}$ is a unit, and each $f_j \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}[y]$ is an irreducible Weierstrass polynomial with no zeros in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. Since f has real coefficients, each f_j either has real coefficients or comes with a conjugate pair $\bar{f}_j \in \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$.

Claim 4.1. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ there exists a Weierstrass polynomial $g_{N,j}(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ (which we emphasize has *polynomial* coefficients) whose coefficient polynomials agree with those of $f_j(x, y)$ to arbitrarily high order for N large enough and which satisfies an estimate $|g_{N,j}(x, y)| \gtrsim |(x, y)|^{K_j}$. Also, if f_j has a conjugate $f_i = \bar{f}_j$ then $g_{N,i} = \bar{g}_{N,j}$.

Assuming the claim temporarily we define

$$g_N(x, y) := \prod_{j=1}^k g_{N,j}(x, y).$$

Note that g_N has real coefficients because the Puiseux branches of f are either real or occur in conjugate pairs. Also, g_N satisfies

$$g_N(x, y) \gtrsim |(x, y)|^K,$$

for $K = \sum_{j=1}^k K_j$ and agrees with

$$W(x, y) := \prod_{j=1}^k f_j(x, y)$$

up to arbitrarily high order as we increase N . Since both $W(x, y)$ and $g_N(x, y)$ are monic in y we can choose N so that

$$|g_N(x, y) - W(x, y)| \lesssim |x|^{K+1}$$

where we absorb contributions from y into the implicit constant.

Then,

$$\left| 1 - \frac{W(x, y)}{g_N(x, y)} \right| \lesssim \frac{|x|^{K+1}}{|(x, y)|^K} < 1/2$$

for x sufficiently small. Then,

$$W(x, y) \asymp g_N(x, y).$$

This proves

$$f(x, y) \asymp g_N(x, y)$$

and we have an appropriate bound below on both $f(x, y)$ and $g_N(x, y)$.

Now we prove Claim 4.1. We fix $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and factor f_j into

$$\prod_{n=1}^r (y - \psi(\mu^n x^{1/r}))$$

where $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu = \exp(2\pi i/r)$, and $\psi \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ by the Newton-Puiseux theorem (see [5, Chapters 6-7] for details). For $f_j(x, y)$ to be non-vanishing for $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$ we must have that $\psi(\mu^n x^{1/r}) \notin \mathbb{R}$ whenever $x \neq 0$. We can discuss this with the fixed choice of branches—i.e. $x^{1/r} > 0$ for $x > 0$ and $x^{1/r} = |x|^{1/r} \exp(i\pi/r)$ for $x < 0$ —since as we vary over n we cover all of the branches.

Writing out the power series $\psi(t) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \psi_m t^m$ for $x > 0$ we have

$$\psi(\mu^n x^{1/r}) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \psi_m \mu^{nm} x^{m/r}$$

and there must exist a first coefficient say $m = M_n^+$ such that $\psi_m \mu_j^{nm} \notin \mathbb{R}$ and for $x < 0$

$$\psi(\mu^n x^{1/r}) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \psi_m \mu^{nm} \exp(i\pi m/r) |x|^{m/r}$$

there must exist a first coefficient say $m = M_n^-$ such that $\psi_m \mu^{nm} \exp(i\pi m/r) \notin \mathbb{R}$. In particular, for $M_n = \max\{M_n^+, M_n^-\}$

$$|\Im \psi(\mu^n x^{1/r})| \gtrsim |x|^{M_n/r}.$$

Also, (since $|A|^N \lesssim_N |A - B|^N + |B|^N$)

$$|y - \Re \psi(\mu^n x^{1/r})| \gtrsim |y - \Re \psi(\mu^n x^{1/r})|^{M_n+1} \gtrsim |y|^{M_n+1} - |x|^{(M_n+1)/r}$$

for x, y small enough. Therefore,

$$(5) \quad |y - \psi(\mu^n x^{1/r})| \gtrsim |y|^{M_n+1} + |x|^{M_n/r} \gtrsim |(x, y)|^{M_n+1}$$

Let $M = \max\{M_n : n = 1, \dots, r\}$ and $N > M$. Define

$$\psi^{[N]}(t) = \sum_{m=1}^N \psi_m t^m \in \mathbb{C}[t]$$

and

$$g_{N,j}(x, y) = \prod_{n=1}^r (y - \psi^{[N]}(\mu^n x^{1/r})).$$

Now, $g_{N,j}$ is necessarily a polynomial since we have an expression symmetric over all branches of $x^{1/r}$. For $N > M$, the estimate (5) holds for $\psi^{[N]}$ in place of ψ since $N > M$ implies that we capture all of the coefficients that contribute to the estimate (5).

Therefore by (5) applied to $\psi^{[N]}$, $|g_{N,j}(x, y)| \gtrsim |(x, y)|^{K_j}$ for $K_j := \sum_{n=1}^r (M_n + 1)$. As we increase N , the coefficients of $g_{N,j}(x, \cdot)$ match those of $f_j(x, \cdot)$ to arbitrarily high order in x . Also, note that our construction respects conjugate pairs. This proves Claim 4.1 as well as the lemma. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank János Kollár for helpful correspondence concerning higher-dimensional aspects of the work in [8].

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Bickel, G. Knese, J.E. Pascoe, and A. Sola, Local theory of stable polynomials and bounded rational functions of several variables, preprint, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.07507>
- [2] K. Bickel, J.E. Pascoe, and A. Sola, Derivatives of rational inner functions: geometry of singularities and integrability at the boundary. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **116** (2018), no.2, 281–329.
- [3] K. Bickel, J.E. Pascoe, and A. Sola, Level curve portraits of rational inner functions, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa* **21** (2020), 449-494.
- [4] K. Bickel, J.E. Pascoe, and A. Sola, Singularities of rational inner functions in higher dimensions, *Amer. J. Math.* **144** (2022), 1115-1157.
- [5] G. Fisher, *Plane algebraic curves*, Student Mathematical Library 15, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001.
- [6] G. Knese, Integrability and regularity of rational functions, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **111** (2015), 1261-1306.
- [7] G. Knese, Boundary local integrability of rational functions in two variables, preprint, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.05042>
- [8] J. Kollár, Bounded meromorphic functions on the complex 2-disc, *Period. Math. Hungar.* **88** (2024), 1-7.
- [9] J.E. Pascoe, An inductive Julia-Carathéodory theorem for Pick functions in two variables, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* **61** (2018), 647-660.
- [10] A. Sola, A note on polydegree $(n, 1)$ rational inner functions, slice matrices, and singularities, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **120** (2023), 171-181.
- [11] D.G. Wagner, Multivariate stable polynomials: theory and applications, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **48** (2011), 53-84.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, LEWISBURG, PA 17837, USA

Email address: `kelly.bickel@bucknell.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST LOUIS, ST LOUIS, MO 63130, USA

Email address: `geknese@wustl.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DREXEL UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104, USA

Email address: `jep362@drexel.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STOCKHOLM UNIVERSITY, 10691 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

Email address: `sola@math.su.se`