

A FEW REMARKS ON ORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS

PAWEŁ J. SZABŁOWSKI

ABSTRACT. Knowing a sequence of moments of a given, infinitely supported, distribution we obtain quickly: coefficients of the power series expansion of monic polynomials $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ that are orthogonal with respect to this distribution, coefficients of expansion of x^n in the series of p_j , $j \leq n$, two sequences of coefficients of the 3-term recurrence of the family of $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, the so called "linearization coefficients" i.e. coefficients of expansion of $p_n p_m$ in the series of p_j , $j \leq m + n$.

Conversely, assuming knowledge of the two sequences of coefficients of the 3-term recurrence of a given family of orthogonal polynomials $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, we express with their help: coefficients of the power series expansion of p_n , coefficients of expansion of x^n in the series of p_j , $j \leq n$, moments of the distribution that makes polynomials $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ orthogonal.

Further having two different families of orthogonal polynomials $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and knowing for each of them sequences of the 3-term recurrences, we give sequence of the so called "connection coefficients" between these two families of polynomials. That is coefficients of the expansions of p_n in the series of q_j , $j \leq n$.

We are able to do all this due to special approach in which we treat vector of orthogonal polynomials $\{p_j(x)\}_{j=0}^n$ as a linear transformation of the vector $\{x^j\}_{j=0}^n$ by some lower triangular $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix $\mathbf{\Pi}_n$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND NOTATION

Let us first make some remarks concerning notation. α, β, \dots will denote positive measures on the real line. We will assume that all of these measures have infinite supports. In order to be able to sometimes use probabilistic notation we will assume that all considered measures are normalized. Integrals of an integrable function f with respect to the measure α will be denoted by either of the following denotations:

$$\int f(x) d\alpha(x), \int f d\alpha, \mathbb{E}f, \mathbb{E}f(Z), \mathbb{E}_\alpha f(Z),$$

depending on the context and the need to specify details. In the above formulae, Z denotes random variable with the distribution α . Probability theory ensures that Z always exist.

Matrices and vectors (always columns) will be generally denoted by the bold type letters. The most important vector and matrix are $\mathbf{X}_n = (1, x, \dots, x^n)^T$

Date: January 2013.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 42C05, 42C10; Secondary 33D45, 60J35.

Key words and phrases. Moment problem, moment matrix, Cholesky decomposition, Hankel matrices, Radon–Nikodym derivative, connection coefficients, linearization coefficients.

The author is grateful to unknown referees whose remarks helped to improve the paper.
Email: pawel.szablowski@gmail.com.

(T -transposition) and

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbf{M}_n(\alpha) = [m_{i+j}(\alpha)]_{j,i=0,\dots,n},$$

where $m_n(\alpha) = \int x^n d\alpha(x)$. In other words $\mathbf{M}_n(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}_\alpha \mathbf{X}_n \mathbf{X}_n^T$. Matrices of this form, that is having the same elements on counter diagonals, are called Hankel matrices.

Definition 1. *We will say that the moment problem is determinate if there exists only one measure α that generates the moment sequence $\{m_n(\alpha)\}_{n \geq 0}$. Otherwise we say that the moment problem is indeterminate.*

Remark 1. *There exist sufficient criteria allowing to check if the moment problem is determinate or not. For example Carleman's criterion states that if $\sum_{n \geq 0} m_{2n}^{1/2n} < \infty$, then the moment problem is indeterminate. Else, if $\int \exp(|x|) d\alpha(x) < \infty$, then the moment problem is determinate.*

In the sequel we will assume generally that our moment problem is determinate.

$(\mathbf{A})_{j,k}$ will denote (j, k) -th entry of the matrix \mathbf{A} .

Infinite support assumption ensures that for every n one can always find $n + 1$ linearly independent vectors of the form $(1, x_k, \dots, x_k^n)^T$, where $x_k \in \text{supp } \alpha$. Besides we know that if $\text{supp } \alpha$ is infinite then matrices $\mathbf{M}_n(\alpha)$ are non-singular for every n . Let us remark immediately that the matrix \mathbf{M}_n is the main submatrix of the matrix \mathbf{M}_{n+1} . We also define sequence

$$(1.2) \quad \Delta_n(\alpha) = \det \mathbf{M}_n(\alpha),$$

$n \geq 1$, of determinants of matrices $\mathbf{M}_n(\alpha)$ and let us also introduce vectors consisting of successive moments

$$\mathbf{m}_n^T(\alpha) = (1, \dots, m_n(\alpha)).$$

Vector $\mathbf{m}_n(\alpha)$ is the first column of the matrix $\mathbf{M}_n(\alpha)$.

In order to avoid repetition of assumption we will assume that matrices $\mathbf{M}_n(\alpha)$ exist for all $n \geq 0$. In other words we assume that all moments of the measure α exist. Obviously $(0, 0)$ entry of the matrix \mathbf{M}_n is equal to 1.

We know that given measure α , such that all moments exist, one can define the set of polynomials $\{p_n(x, \alpha)\}_{n \geq -1}$ with $p_{-1}(x, \alpha) = 0$, $p_0(x, \alpha) = 1$, such that p_n is of degree n and satisfying for $n + m \neq -2$ the following relationship:

$$\int p_n(x, \alpha) p_m(x, \alpha) d\alpha(x) = \delta_{n,m},$$

where $\delta_{n,m}$ denotes Kronecker's delta. Moreover if we declare that all leading coefficients of the polynomials $p_n(x, \alpha)$ are positive then the coefficients $\pi_{n,i}(\alpha)$ of the expansion

$$(1.3) \quad p_n(x, \alpha) = \sum_{i=0}^n \pi_{n,i}(\alpha) x^i,$$

are defined uniquely by the measure α . According to our convention, later we will drop dependence on α if the measure α is clearly specified.

Let us define vectors $\mathbf{P}_n(x) = (p_0(x), \dots, p_n(x))^T$ and the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{\Pi}_n$ with entries $\pi_{i,j}$ if $i \geq j$ and 0 otherwise. We obviously have:

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbf{P}_n(x) = \mathbf{\Pi}_n \mathbf{X}_n.$$

To continue introduction of notation, let $\lambda_{n,i}(\alpha)$ denote coefficients in the following expansions:

$$(1.5) \quad x^n = \sum_{i=0}^n \lambda_{n,i}(\alpha) p_i(x, \alpha).$$

Consequently let us introduce lower triangular matrices $\mathbf{\Lambda}_n$ with entries $\lambda_{i,j}$ if $i \geq j$ and 0 otherwise.

We obviously have:

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{P}_n(x), \quad \mathbf{\Pi}_n \mathbf{\Lambda}_n = \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{\Pi}_n = \mathbf{I}_n,$$

where \mathbf{I}_n denotes $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ identity matrix.

As polynomials $\{p_n\}$ are orthonormal, there exist two number sequences $\{a_n\}$, $\{b_n\}$ such that polynomials $\{p_n\}$ satisfy the following 3-term recurrence:

$$(1.7) \quad xp_n(x) = a_{n+1}p_{n+1}(x) + b_n p_n(x) + a_n p_{n-1}(x),$$

with $a_0 = 0$ and $n \geq 0$. We know also that

$$(1.8) \quad a_n = \frac{\pi_{n-1,n-1}}{\pi_{n,n}}, \quad b_n = \int xp_n^2(x) d\alpha(x),$$

consequently that $b_0 = m_1$. For details see e.g. [1] or [12].

Combining (1.7) and (1.3) we get the following set of recursive equations to be satisfied by the coefficients $\pi_{n,j}$.

$$(1.9) \quad a_{n+1}\pi_{n+1,0} + b_n\pi_{n,0} + a_n\pi_{n-1,0} = 0,$$

$$(1.10) \quad a_{n+1}\pi_{n+1,j} + b_n\pi_{n,j} + a_n\pi_{n-1,j} = \pi_{n,j-1},$$

for $n \geq 0$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, with $\pi_{n,j} = 0$ for $j > n$. Further combining (1.7) and (1.5) we get the following set of equations to be satisfied by the coefficients $\lambda_{n,i}$.

$$(1.11) \quad \lambda_{n+1,n+1} = \lambda_{n,n}a_{n+1},$$

$$(1.12) \quad \lambda_{n+1,0} = \lambda_{n,0}b_0 + \lambda_{n,1}a_1,$$

$$(1.13) \quad \lambda_{n+1,i} = \lambda_{n,i-1}a_i + \lambda_{n,i}b_i + \lambda_{n,i+1}a_{i+1},$$

with, $\lambda_{0,0} = 1$, so $\lambda_{n,n} = \prod_{j=1}^n a_j$, $n \geq 1$.

Remark 2. As it follows from formula (2.1.6) of [9] coefficients $\pi_{n,i}$ can be expressed as determinants of certain submatrices built of moment matrix \mathbf{M}_n . In particular denoting by $D_n^{(i,j)}$ the determinant of a submatrix obtained by removing row number $i+1$ and column number $j+1$ of the matrix \mathbf{M}_n . We have $\pi_{n,i} = (-1)^{n-i} D_n^{(i,n)} / \sqrt{\Delta_n \Delta_{n-1}}$ the so called Heine representation of orthogonal polynomials (see formula (2.2.6) in [9]).

It should be stressed that the presented above approach of treating first n elements of the sequence $\{p_j(x)\}_{j \geq 0}$ as a $(n+1)$ -vector being the result of multiplication of matrix $\mathbf{\Pi}_n$ by vector \mathbf{X}_n is very fruitful although not original. Traces of it appear in [4] or [6] and can be found even earlier. Its relation to Choleski decomposition of the moment matrix and its inverse are also not original. However such view appears in the literature as 'yet another possibility' of looking on the main result. In this paper this approach is a basic tool to get known results and new ones mostly concerning connection and linearization formulae.

Most of our results concern the so called "truncated moment problem" that is we, in fact, assume that we know finite number (say $2n+1$ including moment or

order 0) of moments of some distribution. That is, in many cases, the assumption that the matrix \mathbf{M}_n exists for all n will not be needed. Then, without using Gram–Schmidt procedure, we derive $n + 1$ polynomials $\{p_i\}_{i=0}^n$ that are mutually orthogonal, we find coefficients of expansion of x^i in terms of these polynomials as well as we derive all of the so called linearization coefficients i.e. coefficients of the expansions $p_i(x)p_j(x)$ in polynomials $\{p_i\}_{i=0}^{i+j}$ for all $i, j \geq 0$.

Given two distributions (say α and δ) and two respective moment sequences we are able to derive the so called "connection coefficients" i.e. coefficients of the expansion of say $p_j(x, \delta)$ in $\{p_i(x, \alpha)\}_{i=0}^j$ and conversely.

Due to very efficient numerical algorithms of Cholesky decomposition and inversion of lower triangular matrices all these calculations can be done within seconds using today's computers.

Of course we present also results that require existence of all moments. These are some limit properties of arithmetic averages of orthogonal polynomials and more importantly results concerning expansions of Radon–Nikodym derivatives of one distribution with respect to the other (see (3.2)).

The paper is organized as follows. In the next Section 2 we present consequences of our approach and derive some known and unknown results of lesser importance. We do this basically to illustrate the usefulness of our approach. By the end of this Section in Subsection 2.1 we relate coefficients of the power series expansion of polynomials $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ to the coefficients of the 3-term recurrence satisfied by these polynomials. More precisely we partially solve systems of equations (1.9), (1.10) and (1.11), (1.12), (1.13). The solution is exact and complete (see (2.15), (2.17) and (2.21)) in the case of symmetric measures α .

We think that particularly interesting and new are results concerning connection coefficients presented in Section 3. We present there not only formula for the connection coefficients between the two sets of orthogonal polynomials related to two different measures but also expansion of the Radon–Nikodym derivative of one measure with respect to the other in a Fourier series of orthogonal polynomials related to one of the measures. We give there two nontrivial examples. Interesting and new seems also Section 4 presenting general formula for the linearization coefficients. Longer and uninteresting proofs are shifted to Section 5.

2. CHOLESKY DECOMPOSITION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Our basic tool in what follows is the so called Cholesky decomposition of the symmetric, positive definite matrix. Below we collect some of the properties of the Cholesky decomposition in the following simple proposition.

Proposition 1. *Suppose a positive, normalized measure α has support of infinite cardinality and $\int x^{2N} d\alpha < \infty$ for some $N \geq 0$. Then*

- i) there exists unique real, non-singular lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{L}_N(\alpha)$ such that $\mathbf{M}_N(\alpha) = \mathbf{L}_N(\alpha)\mathbf{L}_N^T(\alpha)$,*
- ii) entries of matrix \mathbf{L}_N can be calculated recursively*

$$(2.1) \quad l_{n,n} = \sqrt{m_{2n} - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} l_{n,j}^2}, \quad l_{n+1,k} = (m_{n+k+1} - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} l_{n+1,j} l_{k,j}) / l_{k,k},$$

with $l_{0,0} = 1$ for $n = 0, \dots, N$. Entries $l_{n,n}$ have the following interpretation:

$$(2.2) \quad l_{n,n}^2 = \frac{\Delta_n}{\Delta_{n-1}},$$

where the sequence $\{\Delta_n\}$ is defined by (1.2). In particular we have:

$$(2.3) \quad l_{1,1} = \sqrt{m_2 - m_1^2}, \quad l_{2,2} = \sqrt{m_4 - m_2^2 - \frac{(m_3 - m_1 m_2)^2}{(m_2 - m_1^2)}},$$

$$(2.4) \quad l_{i,0} = m_i, \quad l_{i,1} = \frac{(m_{i+1} - m_i m_1)}{l_{1,1}},$$

$$(2.5) \quad l_{i,2} = \frac{1}{l_{2,2}} (m_{i+2} - m_i m_2 - \frac{(m_3 - m_2 m_1)(m_{i+1} - m_i m_1)}{(m_2 - m_1^2)}),$$

$i = 1, \dots, N$,

iii) $\forall 0 \leq i, j \leq N$

$$m_{i+j} = \sum_{k=0}^{\min(i,j)} l_{i,k} l_{j,k}.$$

Proof. i) Follows the existence and uniqueness of the Cholesky decomposition (see e.g. Theorem 8.2.1 of [13]) and the fact that if the support of a positive measure is infinite then matrix \mathbf{M}_N exists, is symmetric and positive definite. Besides by the Cauchy Theorem we have $\Delta_n = (\det L_n)^2 = \prod_{i=0}^n l_{i,i}^2$. Since $\Delta_{n-1} = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} l_{j,j}^2$ we get our assertion. ii) Follows one of the algorithms of obtaining Cholesky decomposition (so called Cholesky–Banachiewicz algorithm that can be found in. e.g. [8]). \square

Some, more or less obvious, consequences and observations we collect in the next proposition:

Proposition 2. *Let α be a certain measure. Let $\mathbf{M}_n(\alpha)$ and $\mathbf{M}_n^{-1}(\alpha)$, be respectively n -th moment matrix and its inverse. Denote $\mathbf{M}_n^{-1} = [\mu_{i,j}^{(n)}]_{0 \leq i,j \leq n}$. Let $\mathbf{L}_n \mathbf{L}_n^T = \mathbf{M}_n$ be the Cholesky decomposition of the matrix \mathbf{M}_n , then*

i) $\forall n \geq 0$, $\mathbf{\Pi}_n = \mathbf{L}_n^{-1}$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_n = \mathbf{L}_n$. That is $\mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{\Lambda}_n^T = \mathbf{M}_n$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}_n^T \mathbf{\Pi}_n = \mathbf{M}_n^{-1}$ in particular $\sum_{k=\max(i,j)}^n \pi_{k,i} \pi_{k,j} = \mu_{i,j}^{(n)}$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\min(i,j)} \lambda_{i,k} \lambda_{j,k} = m_{i+j}$.

ii) $\mathbf{P}_n^T(x) \mathbf{P}_n(y) = \sum_{i=0}^n p_i(x) p_i(y) = \mathbf{X}_n^T \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_n$, thus $\mathbf{X}_n^T \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_n$ is the reproducing kernel and $1/\mathbf{X}_n^T \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{X}_n$ is the Christoffel function of the measure α . Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{X}_n^T \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_n| &\leq \frac{1}{\xi_{0,n}} \sqrt{(1 + \dots + x^{2n})(1 + \dots + y^{2n})}, \\ \frac{\xi_{0,n}}{1 + \dots + x^{2n}} &\leq \frac{1}{\mathbf{X}_n^T \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{X}_n} \leq \frac{\xi_{n,n}}{1 + \dots + x^{2n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_{0,n} \leq \xi_{1,n} \leq \dots \leq \xi_{j,n} \leq \dots \leq \xi_{n,n}$ denote eigenvalues of the matrix \mathbf{M}_n in non-decreasing order..

iii) $\int \mathbf{P}_n^T(x) \mathbf{M}_n \mathbf{P}_n(x) d\alpha(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n m_{2i} = \xi_{0,n} + \dots + \xi_{n,n}$.

iv) $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{P}_n(e^{it}) \mathbf{P}_n^T(e^{-it}) dt = \mathbf{\Pi}_n \mathbf{\Pi}_n^T$, consequently $\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=0}^n \int_0^{2\pi} |p_j(e^{it})|^2 dt = \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_n^{-1}) = \sum_{j=0}^n 1/\xi_{j,n}$,

v) $\frac{1}{\xi_{n,n}} \leq \sum_{j \geq 0} |p_j(0)|^2 = \mu_{0,0}^{(n)} \leq \frac{1}{\xi_{0,n}}$,

$$vi) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1} \log^2(n+2)} \sum_{i=0}^n p_i(x, \alpha) \longrightarrow 0, \alpha\text{-a.s. as } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Is shifted to Section 5. \square

Remark 3. Part of assertion i) namely the statement $\mathbf{\Pi}_n^T \mathbf{\Pi}_n = \mathbf{M}_n^{-1}$ and assertion iv) were shown in [3]. We presented these statements for the completeness of the paper.

Remark 4. Assertion vii) of Proposition 2 gives in fact an estimate of the speed of convergence in Law of Large Numbers that sequence of orthogonal polynomials satisfies. Namely this assertion can be written in the form $\frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{\log^2(n+2)} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n p_i(x, \alpha) \longrightarrow 0, \alpha\text{-a.s. as } n \longrightarrow \infty$. This result is in the spirit of [11] and his followers.

As a corollary we have the following observations:

Corollary 1. Coefficients a_n and $b_n : n \geq 0$ defining the 3-term recurrence are related to the moment matrix by the formulae:

$$(2.6) \quad a_n^2 = \frac{\Delta_n \Delta_{n-2}}{\Delta_{n-1}^2}, \quad b_n = \frac{\Delta_{n-1}}{\Delta_n} l_{n+1,n} l_{n,n} - \frac{\Delta_{n-2}}{\Delta_{n-1}} l_{n,n-1} l_{n-1,n-1},$$

for $n \geq 2$ with $a_0 = 0, a_1^2 = \Delta_2 = m_2 - m_1^2$.

Proof. Following (1.8) and Proposition 2 i) we deduce $a_n^2 = \pi_{n-1,n-1}^2 / \pi_{n,n}^2$. Since $\pi_{n,n} = l_{n,n}^{-1}$ we apply (2.2). To get formula for b_n first we observe that $(i, i-1)$ entry of the the inverse of the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{L}_n = [l_{i,j}]_{i=0,\dots,n,j=0,\dots,i}$ is equal to $-\frac{l_{i,i-1}}{l_{i,i} l_{i-1,i-1}}$. Besides dividing both sides of (1.10) with $j = n$ by $\pi_{n,n}$ we get:

$$\frac{\pi_{n+1,n}}{\pi_{n+1,n+1}} + b_n = \frac{\pi_{n,n-1}}{\pi_{n,n}}.$$

Now we have $\frac{\pi_{n+1,n}}{\pi_{n+1,n+1}} = -\frac{l_{n+1,n} l_{n+1,n+1}}{l_{n+1,n+1} l_{n,n}} = -\frac{l_{n+1,n}}{l_{n,n}}$ and similarly $\frac{\pi_{n,n-1}}{\pi_{n,n}} = -\frac{l_{n,n-1}}{l_{n-1,n-1}}$.

Finally we use (2.2). \square

2.1. Coefficients of the 3-term recurrence. In this subsection we will formulate a sequence of observations concerning the two systems of equations (1.9)-(1.13) which relate coefficients of the 3-term recurrence to the coefficients $\pi_{n,i}$ and $\lambda_{n,j}$.

Proposition 3. i) $\forall n \geq 0 : a_n > 0$.

ii) Let us denote $\eta_{n,i} = \pi_{n,i} \prod_{j=1}^n a_j, \tau_{n,i} = \lambda_{n,i} / \prod_{j=1}^i a_j = \lambda_{n,i} / \lambda_{i,i}$ and by $\tilde{p}_n(x)$ let us denote the monic version of a polynomial $p_n(x)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_n(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^n \eta_{n,k} x^k, \\ x^n &= \sum_{k=0}^n \tau_{n,k} \tilde{p}_k(x). \end{aligned}$$

Coefficients $\{\eta_{n,j}, \tau_{n,j}\}_{n \geq 0, 0 \leq j \leq n}$ satisfy the following system of equations:

$$(2.7) \quad \eta_{n+1,0} = -b_n \eta_{n,0} - a_n^2 \eta_{n-1,0},$$

$$(2.8) \quad \eta_{n+1,j} = \eta_{n,j-1} - b_n \eta_{n,j} - a_n^2 \eta_{n-1,j},$$

$$(2.9) \quad \tau_{n+1,0} = b_0 \tau_{n,0} + \tau_{n,1} a_1^2,$$

$$(2.10) \quad \tau_{n+1,j} = \tau_{n,j-1} + b_j \tau_{n,j} + a_{j+1}^2 \tau_{n,j+1},$$

$n \geq 0, j \leq n$, with $\eta_{0,0} = \eta_{n,n} = 1$, and $\tau_{0,0} = \tau_{n,n} = 1$ for $n \geq 0$.

$$iii) \forall i > j : \sum_{k=i}^j \eta_{j,k} \tau_{k,i} = 0 = \sum_{k=i}^j \tau_{j,k} \eta_{k,i}.$$

Proof. Is shifted to Section 5. \square

Proposition 4. Let us consider 4 auxiliary number sequences $\left\{ \xi_{n,j}^{(i)} \right\}_{n,j \geq 0}$, $\left\{ \zeta_{n,j}^{(i)} \right\}_{n,j \geq 0}$, $i = 1, 2$ satisfying the following systems of recurrences for $n \geq 0$,

$$(2.11) \quad \xi_{n+1,0}^{(1)} = -a_n^2 \xi_{n-1,0}^{(1)}, \quad \xi_{n+1,0}^{(2)} = -b_n \xi_{n,0}^{(2)},$$

$$(2.12) \quad \xi_{n+1,j}^{(1)} = \xi_{n,j-1}^{(1)} - a_n^2 \xi_{n-1,j}^{(1)}, \quad \xi_{n+1,j}^{(2)} = \xi_{n,j-1}^{(2)} - b_n \xi_{n,j}^{(2)},$$

$$(2.13) \quad \zeta_{n+1,0}^{(1)} = a_1^2 \zeta_{n,1}^{(1)}, \quad \zeta_{n+1,0}^{(2)} = b_0 \zeta_{n,0}^{(2)},$$

$$(2.14) \quad \zeta_{n+1,j}^{(1)} = \zeta_{n,j-1}^{(1)} + a_{j+1}^2 \zeta_{n,j+1}^{(1)}, \quad \zeta_{n+1,j}^{(2)} = \zeta_{n,j-1}^{(2)} + b_j \zeta_{n,j}^{(2)}.$$

with $\xi_{n,j}^{(i)} = 0$ when $j > n$, for $i = 1, 2$ and $\xi_{0,0}^{(1)} = \xi_{n,n}^{(1)} = \zeta_{0,0}^{(2)} = \zeta_{n,n}^{(2)} = 1$. Then for $j \geq 1$

$$(2.15) \quad \xi_{n+j,n}^{(1)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j = 2k+1 \\ (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_k \leq n+j-1 \\ j_{m+1} - j_m \geq 2, m=1, \dots, k-1}} \prod_{m=1}^k a_{j_m}^2 & \text{if } j = 2k \end{cases},$$

$$(2.16) \quad \xi_{n+j,n}^{(2)} = (-1)^j \sum_{0 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_j \leq n+j-1} \prod_{m=1}^j b_{k_m},$$

$$(2.17) \quad \zeta_{n+l,n}^{(1)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } l = 2k+1 \\ \sum_{j_1=1}^{n+1} a_{j_1}^2 \sum_{j_2=1}^{j_1+1} a_{j_2}^2 \dots \sum_{j_k=1}^{j_{k-1}+1} a_{j_k}^2 & \text{if } l = 2k \end{cases},$$

$$(2.18) \quad \zeta_{n+j,n}^{(2)} = \sum_{k_1=0}^n b_{k_1} \sum_{k_2=k_1}^n b_{k_2} \dots \sum_{k_j=k_{j-1}}^n b_{k_j}.$$

Proof. Is shifted to Section 5 \square

Proposition 5. *i)* Let us denote $\hat{\eta}_{n,k} = \eta_{n,k} - \xi_{n,k}^{(1)} - \xi_{n,k}^{(2)}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{n,k} = \tau_{n,k} - \zeta_{n,k}^{(1)} - \zeta_{n,k}^{(2)}$, for $n \geq k \geq 0$. We have:

$$(2.19) \quad \hat{\eta}_{n+1,k} = \hat{\eta}_{n,k-1} - b_n \hat{\eta}_{n,k} - a_n^2 \hat{\eta}_{n-1,k} - b_n \xi_{n,k}^{(1)} - a_n^2 \xi_{n-1,k}^{(2)},$$

$$(2.20) \quad \hat{\tau}_{n+1,k} = \hat{\tau}_{n,k-1} + b_k \hat{\tau}_{n,k} + a_{k+1}^2 \hat{\tau}_{n,k+1} + a_{k+1}^2 \zeta_{n,k+1}^{(2)} + b_k \zeta_{n,k}^{(1)},$$

with $\hat{\eta}_{0,0} = \hat{\eta}_{n,n} = \hat{\tau}_{0,0} = \hat{\tau}_{n,n} = -1$. In particular we have:

$$ii) \eta_{n+1,n} = \xi_{n+1,n}^{(2)} = -\tau_{n+1,n} \text{ for } n \geq 0,$$

$$iii) \eta_{n+2,n} = \tau_{n+2,n} = \xi_{n+2,n}^{(2)} + \xi_{n+2,n}^{(1)}, \text{ for } n \geq 0,$$

$$iv) \tau_{n+3,n} = \zeta_{n+3,n}^{(2)} + \zeta_{n+2,n}^{(1)} \zeta_{n+1,n}^{(2)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} a_j^2 (b_{j-1} + b_j),$$

$$\eta_{n+3,n} = \xi_{n+3,3}^{(2)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n+2} a_j^2 \sum_{k=0, k \neq j, j-1}^{n+2} b_k,$$

$$\eta_{n+4,n} = \xi_{n+4,n}^{(1)} + \xi_{n+4,n}^{(2)} + \sum_{k=1}^{n+3} a_k^2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n+3, i, j \neq k, k-1} b_i b_j,$$

$$\tau_{n+4,n} = -\eta_{n+4,n} - \eta_{n+4,n+1} \tau_{n+1,n} - \eta_{n+4,n+2} \tau_{n+2,n} - \eta_{n+4,n+3} \tau_{n+3,n}.$$

Assume that $\forall n \geq 0 : b_i = 0$, then:

$$v) \eta_{n,0} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 2k-1 \\ (-1)^k \prod_{j=1}^k a_{2j-1}^2 & \text{if } n = 2k \end{cases}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

$$(2.21) \quad \eta_{n+l,n} = \xi_{n+l,n}^{(1)}, \quad \tau_{n+l,n} = \zeta_{n+l,n}^{(1)},$$

for $l, n \geq 0$.

Proof. Is shifted to Section 5 □

Remark 5. As pointed out in Proposition 3, ii) coefficients $\eta_{i,j}$ are the power coefficients of monic orthogonal polynomials i.e. orthogonal polynomials with the leading coefficient equal to 1. The similar formula to (2.21) for orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle was proved by in [7]. Formulae given in assertion ii) and iii) were given in [6] (Thm. 4.2 (d) and ibidem Exercise 4.1, p. 24). We present them for completeness of the paper.

Remark 6. Notice that $(-1)^k \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_k \leq n-1 \\ j_{m+1} - j_m \geq 2, m=1, \dots, k-1}} \prod_{m=1}^k a_{j_m}^2$ can also be written as

$$(-1)^k \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-2k+1} a_{j_1}^2 \sum_{j_2=j_1+2}^{n-2k+3} a_{j_2}^2 \dots \sum_{j_k=j_{k-1}+2}^{n-1} a_{j_k}^2.$$

As a corollary we get the following recursive formula expressing moments in terms of the coefficients a_n and b_n of the 3-term recurrence.

Proposition 6. i) $m_j = -\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \eta_{j-1, k-1} m_k$,

If we assume that all coefficients $b_n = 0$ $n \geq 0$, then we have simplified version of the previous statement:

ii) $m_{2k-1} = 0$ $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $m_4 = a_1^2(a_1^2 + a_2^2)$, $m_{2k} = (\sum_{j=1}^{2k-2} a_j^2) m_{2k-2} - \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} \eta_{2k-1, 2k-1-2j} m_{2k-2j}$, $k \geq 3$.

Proof. i) We use the (1.6) and (2.4) which leads to the identity $\forall j \geq 1$

$$\sum_{k=0}^j \eta_{j,k} m_k = 0.$$

Consequently $m_j = -\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \eta_{j,k} m_k$. Now we utilize (2.8) and get:

$$\begin{aligned} m_j &= -\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (-b_{j-1} \eta_{j-1, k} - a_{j-1}^2 \eta_{j-2, k} + \eta_{j-1, k-1}) m_k \\ &= b_{j-1} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \eta_{j-1, k} m_k + a_{j-1}^2 \sum_{k=0}^{j-2} \eta_{j-2, k} m_k - \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \eta_{j-1, k-1} m_k \\ &= -\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \eta_{j-1, k-1} m_k. \end{aligned}$$

ii) By i) we have $m_{2j} = -\sum_{k=1}^{2j-1} \eta_{2j-1, k-1} m_k = -\sum_{n=1}^{j-1} \eta_{2j-1, 2n-1} m_{2n}$ since m_j with odd j are equal to zero. Now we recall that $\eta_{2j-1, 2j-3} = -\sum_{i=1}^{2j-2} a_i^2$ by Proposition 3, iv). □

3. CONNECTION COEFFICIENTS AND RADON-NIKODYM DERIVATIVES.

In this subsection we will express the so called connection coefficients between two different sets of N -orthogonal polynomials. Hence let us assume that we have two moment matrices $\mathbf{M}_N(\alpha)$ and $\mathbf{M}_N(\delta)$. Let $\mathbf{L}_N(\alpha)$ and $\mathbf{L}_N(\delta)$ be their Cholesky decomposition matrices and $\{\mathbf{P}_N(x, \alpha)\}$ and $\{\mathbf{P}_N(x, \delta)\}$ respective sets of N -orthogonal polynomials. Then we have

Lemma 1. *We have*

$$\mathbf{P}_N(x, \delta) = \mathbf{L}_N^{-1}(\delta) \mathbf{L}_N(\alpha) \mathbf{P}_N(x, \alpha),$$

or more precisely for all $n = 1, \dots, N$:

$$p_n(x, \delta) = \sum_{k=0}^n \gamma_{n,k}(\delta, \alpha) p_k(x, \alpha),$$

where

$$(3.1) \quad \gamma_{n,k}(\delta, \alpha) = \sum_{j=k}^n \pi_{n,j}(\delta) \lambda_{j,k}(\alpha).$$

Moreover, if we assume that polynomials $\{\tilde{p}_n(x, \delta), \tilde{p}_n(x, \alpha)\}_{n \geq 0}^N$ are assumed to be monic then we have the same formula with coefficients π replaced by η and λ by τ both defined in Proposition 3.

Proof. This formula follows simple observation that

$$\mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{L}_n(\alpha) \mathbf{P}_n(x, \alpha).$$

Then we apply Proposition 2 i).

The fact that the same formula is satisfied by η 's and τ 's instead by π 's and λ 's follows the fact that we have $\mathbf{X}_n = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_n(\alpha) \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n(x, \alpha)$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n(x, \alpha)$ denotes the vector $(1, \tilde{p}_1(\alpha), \dots, \tilde{p}_n(\alpha))^T$ while $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_n(\alpha)$ denotes lower triangular matrix with (i, j) entry equal to $\tau_{i,j}(\alpha)$. \square

Corollary 2. *Let $\{b_n(\iota), a_{n+1}(\iota)\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\iota = \delta, \alpha$ denote coefficients of 3-term recurrences of polynomials respectively $\{\tilde{p}_n(x, \delta)\}_{n \geq -1}$ and $\{\tilde{p}_n(x, \alpha)\}_{n \geq -1}$. Then*

i)

$$\gamma_{n,n-1}(\delta, \alpha) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b_k(\alpha) - b_k(\delta),$$

ii)

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{n,n-2}(\delta, \alpha) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (a_k^2(\alpha) - a_k^2(\delta)) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (b_j(\alpha) - b_j(\delta)) \right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (b_j^2(\alpha) - b_j^2(\delta)) - b_{n-1}(\delta) \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (b_j(\alpha) - b_j(\delta)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. i) We use (3.1) with π replaced by η and λ replaced by τ and get $\gamma_{n,n-1}(\delta, \alpha)$

$$= \eta_{n,n-1}(\delta) \tau_{n,n}(\alpha) + \eta_{n,n}(\delta) \tau_{n,n-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (b_k(\alpha) - b_k(\delta)) \text{ by Proposition 5, ii)}$$

$$\text{ii) } \gamma_{n,n-2}(\delta, \alpha) = \eta_{n,n-2}(\delta) \tau_{n-2,n-2}(\alpha) + \eta_{n,n-1}(\delta) \tau_{n-1,n-2}(\alpha) + \eta_{n,n}(\delta) \tau_{n,n-2}(\alpha)$$

= $\eta_{n,n-2}(\delta) + \tau_{n,n-2}(\alpha) + \eta_{n,n-1}(\delta) \tau_{n-1,n-2}(\alpha)$. Now we apply Proposition 5, iii) and do some algebra. \square

Corollary 3. *Let us assume that both distributions α and δ are symmetric and coefficients of the 3-term recurrences satisfied by monic polynomials orthogonal with respect to distributions α and δ are respectively $\{a_n(\alpha)\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{a_n(\delta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ then*

$$\tilde{p}_n(x, \delta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \gamma_{n,n-2k}(\delta, \alpha) \tilde{p}_{n-2k}(x, \alpha),$$

where

$$\gamma_{n,n-2k}(\delta, \alpha) = \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \left(\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \dots \leq j_m \leq n-1, \\ j_{k+1} - j_k \geq 2, \\ k=1, \dots, m-1}} \prod_{i=1}^m a_{j_i}^2(\delta) \dots a_{j_m}^2(\delta) \right) \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{k-m} a(\alpha)_{j_1}^2 \dots \sum_{i_{k-m}=1}^{i_{k-m-1}+1} a(\alpha)_{i_{k-m}}^2 \right).$$

In particular

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{n,n}(\delta, \alpha) &= 1, \\ \gamma_{n,0}(\delta, \alpha) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ \chi_k & \text{if } n = 2k \end{cases}, \\ \gamma_{n,n-2}(\delta, \alpha) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (a_k^2(\alpha) - a_k^2(\delta)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\chi_k = \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \left(\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \dots \leq j_m \leq n-1, \\ j_{k+1} - j_k \geq 2, \\ k=1, \dots, m-1}} \prod_{i=1}^m a(\delta)_{j_i}^2 \dots a(\delta)_{j_m}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{k-m} a(\alpha)_{j_1}^2 \dots \sum_{i_{k-m}=1}^{i_{k-m-1}+1} a(\alpha)_{i_{k-m}}^2 \right).$$

Remark 7. It turns out that pairs of systems of orthogonal polynomials with the property that the connection coefficients between them are nonnegative are important. Basing on Corollaries 2 and 3 we see that a necessary conditions for coefficients $\gamma_{n,j}(\delta, \alpha)$ to be nonnegative is that $\forall n \geq 0 : \sum_{j=0}^n b_j(\alpha) \geq \sum_{j=0}^n b_j(\delta)$. If the measures that orthogonalize those systems of polynomials are such that $\forall n \geq 0 : b_n(\delta) = b_n(\alpha)$ then the necessary condition for the coefficients $\gamma_{n,j}(\delta, \alpha)$ to be nonnegative is $\forall n \geq 0 : \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2(\alpha) \geq \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2(\delta)$. The discussion why the nonnegativity of connection coefficients is important and what are the consequences of this fact is given in [20].

Following slight modification (ratio of densities is substituted by the Radon–Nikodym derivative of respective measures) of Proposition 1 iii) of [17] (see also [19]) we deduce the following general statement concerning :

Corollary 4. If $\frac{d\alpha}{d\delta}(x) = 1/Q_r(x)$ where Q_r is a polynomial of order r (positive on $\text{supp } \delta$) then for $N \geq r+1$ the symmetric matrix

$$\mathbf{L}_N^{-1}(\alpha) \mathbf{M}_N(\delta) (\mathbf{L}_N^{-1}(\alpha))^T$$

is a ' r -ribbon' matrix i.e. its (i, j) entries such that $|i - j| > r$ are zeros.

Proof. Using the above mentioned Proposition we deduce that the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{L}_N^{-1}(\alpha) \mathbf{L}_N(\delta)$ is a ' r -ribbon' matrix. We have $\mathbf{L}_N^{-1}(\alpha) \mathbf{L}_N(\delta) (\mathbf{L}_N^{-1}(\alpha) \mathbf{L}_N(\delta))^T = \mathbf{L}_N^{-1}(\alpha) \mathbf{M}_N(\delta) (\mathbf{L}_N^{-1}(\alpha))^T$. Then we use the fact that if \mathbf{A} is a lower triangular ' r -ribbon' matrix then $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T$ is also a ' r -ribbon' matrix. \square

As a more interesting consequence of Lemma 1 we have an important expansion of the Radon–Nikodym derivative of two measures $\alpha \ll \delta$.

Theorem 1. *Let the two measures α and δ both having all moments be such that $\alpha \ll \delta$ and $\int (\frac{d\alpha}{d\delta}(x))^2 d\delta(x) < \infty$, where $\frac{d\alpha}{d\delta}(x)$ denotes their Radon–Nikodym derivative. Then*

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{d\alpha}{d\delta}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\alpha} p_j(Z, \delta) p_j(x, \delta),$$

in $L_2(\text{supp } \delta, \mathcal{F}, d\delta)$, where \mathcal{F} denotes Borel sigma field of $\text{supp } \delta$. In particular we have (Parseval’s formula)

$$(3.3) \quad \int \left(\frac{d\alpha}{d\delta}(x)\right)^2 d\delta(x) = \sum_{j \geq 0} (\mathbb{E}_{\alpha} p_j(Z, \delta))^2.$$

Additionally when $\sum_{j \geq 0} (\mathbb{E}_{\alpha} p_j(Z, \delta))^2 \ln(j+1)^2 < \infty$, we have δ almost everywhere convergence.

Proof. Although the idea of this simple in fact theorem appeared in [17] where also its numerous nontrivial applications were presented we will give its simple proof for completeness of the paper.

Radon–Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\alpha}{d\delta}(x)$ is square integrable with respect to the measure δ i.e. hence it can be expanded in a Fourier series with respect to the system of orthogonal polynomials $\{p_j(x, \delta)\}_{j \geq 0}$

$$\frac{d\alpha}{d\delta}(x) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \omega_j p_j(x, \delta).$$

Now let us multiply both sides of this expansion by $p_k(x, \delta)$ and integrate with respect to $\delta(dx)$. On the right hand side we will get ω_k while on the left hand side $\int p_k(x, \delta) \alpha(dx) = \mathbb{E}_{\alpha} p_k(Z, \delta)$. (3.3) follows Bessel equality of orthogonal series. If $\sum_{j \geq 0} (\mathbb{E}_{\alpha} p_j(Z, \delta))^2 \ln(j+1)^2 < \infty$ then we apply Rademacher–Menshov Theorem (see e.g. [2]) and get almost everywhere convergence. \square

Remark 8. *Let us notice that if we write $p_n(x, \delta) = \sum_{i=0}^n \gamma_{n,i}(\delta, \alpha) p_i(x, \alpha)$, then $\gamma_{n,0}(\delta, \alpha) = \mathbb{E}_{\alpha} p_n(Z, \delta)$ after integrating both sides with respect to $\alpha(dx)$.*

Example 1. *As a corollary we will get the famous Poisson–Mehler expansion formula ((3.4), below). In order not to repeat too many known details we refer the reader to [17], [18] as far as the ideas and calculations are concerned and to [9] in order to get more properties of the mentioned below families of orthogonal polynomials.*

Namely we will consider the so called q –Hermite polynomials defined for $|q| < 1$ as $H_n(x|q)/\sqrt{[n]_q!}$, where $H_n(x|q)$ are monic polynomials satisfying 3-term recurrence given by (2.3) of [18].

We used here traditional notation common in the so called q –series theory: $[n]_q = (1 - q^n)/(1 - q)$, for $|q| < 1$ and $[n]_1 = n$, $[n]_q! = \prod_{j=1}^n [j]_q$, with $[0]_q! = 1$ (a) $_n = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (1 - aq^i)$, (the so called q –Pochhammer symbol).

One can consider also the case $q = 1$ obtaining similar results but for the sake of simplicity let us consider only the case $|q| < 1$. Let us mention only that for $q = 1$, q –Hermite polynomials are in fact equal to the classical Hermite polynomials,

more precisely the ones that are orthogonal with respect to measure with the density $\exp(-x^2/2)/\sqrt{2\pi}$.

It is known that q -Hermite polynomials are orthogonal for $|q| < 1$, $x \in S(q) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| \leq 2/\sqrt{1-q}\}$ with respect to the measure with the density $f_N(x|q)$ whose exact formula is not very important and which is given e.g. in [18] (formula (2.10)). The measure with the density $f_N(x|q)$ is our measure δ . It is also known (see same references) that the measure with the density :

$$f_{CN}(x|y, \rho, q) = f_N(x|q) \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1 - \rho^2 q^k)}{w_k(x, y|\rho, q)},$$

where

$$w_k(x, y|\rho, q) = (1 - \rho^2 q^{2k})^2 - (1 - q)\rho q^k(1 + \rho^2 q^{2k})xy + (1 - q)\rho^2(x^2 + y^2)q^{2k},$$

for $x, y \in S(q)$, $|\rho| < 1$ for $|q| < 1$ has orthonormal polynomials equal to the so called Al-Salam-Chihara polynomials $P_n(x|y, \rho, q)$ satisfying the 3-term recurrence given by formula (2.6) of [18] divided by $\sqrt{(\rho^2)_n [n]_q!}$ as it follows from Proposition 1,iii) of [18] (to get orthonormality).

Measure with density the f_{CN} it is our measure α . Following formula (4.7) in [10] we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}_\alpha H_n(Z|q) = \rho^n H_n(y|q).$$

where $y \in S(q)$ and $|\rho| < 1$ are some parameters. Details are in [18] but the can be traced to earlier works of Bryc, Matysiak, Szabłowski [5].

$$\frac{d\alpha}{d\delta}(x) = \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1 - \rho^2 q^k)}{w_k(x, y|\rho, q)} I_{S(q)}(x).$$

Notice also that this function is bounded from above and as such square integrable with respect to any finite measure on $S(q)$. Again details of the proof of this simple fact are in [18]. Now following (3.2) we get:

$$(3.4) \quad \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1 - \rho^2 q^k)}{w_k(x, y|\rho, q)} = \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{\rho^j}{[j]_q!} H_j(x|q) H_j(y|q),$$

for every $y \in S(q)$ and almost all $x \in S(q)$. Notice that for $q = 1$ (3.4) is also true but it requires some more properties of Hermite polynomials.

Remark 9. Situation described above is an illustration of the situation often met in the theory of Markov processes. Namely suppose that we have process $\mathbf{X} = \{X_t : t \in T\}$, where T is some ordered set of infinite cardinality and $\forall t \in T : X_t$ is a random variable with support of infinite cardinality. Suppose dP_t is the distribution of X_t and that $\mathbb{E}_t |X_t|^n$ is finite for all t and n . Suppose also that $\{p_n^{(t)}\}$ are polynomials orthogonal with respect to dP_t . Further suppose that the conditional distribution of X_s given $X_t = x$ for $s > t$ i.e. $dC_{s,t}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to dP_s and that $\frac{dC_{s,t}}{dP_s}(x)$ is square integrable with respect to dP_s for every $s > t$ and $y \in \text{supp } X_t$. Then as it follows from Theorem 1 in $L_2(\text{supp } X_s, \mathcal{F}, dP_s)$ we have:

$$dC_{s,t} = \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} \mathbb{E}_{s,t} p_j^{(s)}(X_s) p_j^{(s)}(x) \right) dP_s,$$

where as usually in the theory of Markov processes $\mathbb{E}_{s,t}(p_j^{(s)}(X_s))$ denotes expectation with respect to distribution $C_{s,t}$ i.e. it denotes conditional expectation of

$p_j^{(s)}(X_s)$ given $X_t = x$. In other words we get expansion of the transfer function of our process.

4. LINEARIZATION COEFFICIENTS

Notice that Propositions 1 and 2 allow us to formulate an algorithm to get so called 'linearization coefficients'. Let us recall that linearization formula is popular name for the expansions of the form

$$p_n(x)p_m(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m+n} c_{n,m,j} p_j(x).$$

The problem is to find coefficients $c_{n,m,j}$ for all $n, m \geq 1$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 2. For $\forall n, m \geq 0$ and $s = 0, \dots, m+n$

$$c_{n,m,s} = \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq n, \\ 0 \leq k \leq m, j+k \geq s}} \pi_{n,j} \pi_{m,k} \lambda_{j+k,s} \right).$$

Proof. For $N \geq \max(m, n)$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} p_n(x)p_m(x) &= (\mathbf{P}_N(x)\mathbf{P}_N^T(x))_{n,m} = (\mathbf{\Pi}_N \mathbf{X}_N \mathbf{X}_N^T \mathbf{\Pi}_N^T)_{n,m} \\ &= \sum_{j,k=0}^N (\mathbf{\Pi}_N)_{n,j} (\mathbf{X}_N \mathbf{X}_N^T)_{j,k} (\mathbf{\Pi}_N^T)_{k,m} = \sum_{j,k=0}^N \pi_{n,j} x^{j+k} \pi_{m,k} = \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{2N} p_s(x) \left(\sum_{j,k=0}^N \pi_{n,j} \pi_{m,k} \lambda_{j+k,s} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now use the fact that $\pi_{n,j} = 0$ for $n < j$ and $\lambda_{k,j} = 0$ for $k < j$. \square

Remark 10. Following general properties of orthogonal polynomials we deduce that $\forall k < |n-m| : \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq n, \\ 0 \leq j \leq m, j+i \geq k}} \pi_{n,i} \pi_{m,j} \lambda_{i+j,k} \right) = 0$. More precisely $c_{n,m,s} = 0$ for $s = 0, \dots, |n-m| - 1$.

Remark 11. By Proposition 3 we deduce that for monic versions of polynomials p_n we have similar formula. More precisely let $\tilde{p}_n(x)$ be the monic version of polynomial $p_n(x)$ then

$$\tilde{p}_n(x)\tilde{p}_m(x) = \sum_{s=0}^{n+m} \tilde{c}_{n,m,s} \tilde{p}_s(x),$$

where

$$(4.1) \quad \tilde{c}_{n,m,s} = \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq n, \\ 0 \leq k \leq m, j+k \geq s}} \eta_{n,j} \eta_{m,k} \tau_{j+k,s} \right).$$

This is so since $\left(\prod_{j=1}^n a_j \right) \pi_{n,k} \left(\prod_{j=1}^m a_j \right) \pi_{m,l} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^s a_j} \lambda_{l+k,s} = \eta_{n,k} \eta_{m,l} \tau_{k+l,s}$.

Corollary 5. *We have i)*

$$c_{n,m,m+m-1} = \sum_{j=\max(n,m)}^{n+m-1} (b_j - b_{j-\max(n,m)}),$$

ii)

$$\begin{aligned} c_{n,m,n+m-2} &= \sum_{j=\max(m,n)}^{m+n-1} a_j^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{n,m\}-1} a_j^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=\max(n,m)}^{m+n-2} b_j \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=0}^{\min(n,m)-1} b_j \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=\max(n,m)}^{m+n-2} b_j^2 - \sum_{j=0}^{\min(n,m)-1} b_j^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. i) By (4.1) we have $c_{n,m,n+m-1} = \eta_{n,n}\eta_{m,m}\tau_{n+m,n,m-1} + \eta_{n,n-1}\eta_{m,m}\tau_{n+m-1,n+n-1}$
 $+ \eta_{n,n}\eta_{m,m-1}\tau_{n+m-1,n+n-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n+m-1} b_k - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b_k - \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} b_k$.

ii) By (4.1) we have $c_{n,m,m+m-2} = \eta_{n,n}\eta_{m,m}\tau_{n+m,n,m-2} + \eta_{n,n-2}\eta_{m,m}\tau_{n+m-2,n+m-2} +$
 $\eta_{n,n}\eta_{m,m-2}\tau_{n+m-2,n+m-2} + \eta_{n,n-1}\eta_{m,m}\tau_{n+m-1,n+m-2} + \eta_{n,n}\eta_{m,m-1}\tau_{n+m-1,n+m-2}$
 $+ \eta_{n,n-1}\eta_{m,m-1}\tau_{n+m-2,m+n-2} = \sum_{k=1}^{n+m-1} a_k^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} a_k^2 - (\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j$
 $+ \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} b_j) \sum_{j=0}^{n+m-2} b_j + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} b_j$. After little algebra we get the desired form. \square

Remark 12. *As in the case of the connection coefficients the fact that linearization coefficients are nonnegative is important. Why it is so, what are the straightforward consequences of this fact and in what particular situation it happens is again given in [20]. From the above mentioned Corollary one can derive in fact necessary condition for linearization coefficients to be nonnegative.*

5. PROOFS

Proof of Proposition 2. i) Follows uniqueness of both Cholesky decomposition and orthonormal polynomials provided sign of the leading coefficient is selected.

ii) We

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathbf{P}_n(x, \alpha) \mathbf{P}_n^T(x, \alpha) d\alpha(x) &= \mathbf{L}_n^{-1} \int \mathbf{X}_n \mathbf{X}_n^T d\alpha(x) (\mathbf{L}_n^{-1})^T \\ &= \mathbf{L}_n^{-1} \mathbf{M}_n (\mathbf{L}_n^{-1})^T = \mathbf{I}_n. \end{aligned}$$

Further we have

$$\mathbf{P}_n^T(x, \alpha) \mathbf{P}_n(y, \alpha) = \mathbf{X}_n^T (\mathbf{L}_n^{-1})^T \mathbf{L}_n^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_n = (\mathbf{X}_n)^T (\mathbf{L}_n \mathbf{L}_n^T)^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_n.$$

Thus obviously we have

$$|\mathbf{X}_n|^2 / \xi_{n,n} \leq \mathbf{X}_n^T \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_n \leq |\mathbf{X}_n|^2 / \xi_{0,n}, \text{ and } |\mathbf{X}_n|^2 = \sum_{i=0}^n x^{2i}.$$

iii)

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathbf{P}_n^T(x) \mathbf{M}_n \mathbf{P}_n(x) d\alpha &= \int \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_n \mathbf{P}_n(x) \mathbf{P}_n^T(x)) d\alpha \\ &= \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_n \mathbf{L}_n^{-1} \mathbf{M}_n (\mathbf{L}_n^{-1})^T = \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_n. \end{aligned}$$

iv) Denote $\mathbf{e}_n^T(t) = (1, e^{it}, \dots, e^{int})$. We have by Proposition 2, i) $\mathbf{P}_n(e^{it}) = \mathbf{\Pi}_n \mathbf{e}_n^T(t)$, hence $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{P}_n(e^{it}) \mathbf{P}_n^T(e^{-it}) dt = \mathbf{\Pi}_n (\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{e}_n(t) \mathbf{e}_n^T(-t) dt) \mathbf{\Pi}_n^T$. Secondly notice that (k, j) -th entry of the matrix $\mathbf{e}_n(t) \mathbf{e}_n^T(-t)$ is equal to $e^{it(k-j)}$ consequently $(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{e}_n(t) \mathbf{e}_n^T(-t) dt)$ is equal to an identity matrix. Second statement follows the fact that $\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=0}^n \int_0^{2\pi} |p_j(e^{it})|^2 dt$ is the trace of $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{P}_n(e^{it}) \mathbf{P}_n^T(e^{-it}) dt$. But $\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Pi}_n \mathbf{\Pi}_n^T) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Pi}_n^T \mathbf{\Pi}_n) = \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_n^{-1}$.

v) By Proposition 2, ii) considered for $x = y = 0$. We get $\sum_{i=0}^n |p_i(0)|^2 = \mathbf{0}_n^T \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{0}_n$, where $\mathbf{0}_n^T = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, which means that $\sum_{i=0}^n |p_i(0)|^2$ is $(0, 0)$ entry of \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} .

vi) Let us denote $\bar{p}_n(x, \alpha) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1} \log^2(n+2)} \sum_{i=0}^n p_i(x, \alpha)$. It satisfies recursion

$$\bar{p}_{n+1}(x, \alpha) = \sqrt{\frac{n+1}{n+1} \frac{\log^2(n+2)}{\log^2(n+3)}} \bar{p}_n(x) + p_{n+1}(x) / \sqrt{n+2} \log^2(n+3).$$

Since we have $\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\log^2(n+2)}{(n+2) \log^4(n+2)} < \infty$ we deduce by Rademacher–Menshov theorem that series $\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{p_n(x)}{\sqrt{n+1} \log^2(n+2)}$ converges α -a.s. Further we apply [16] (Thm. 5). \square

Proof of Proposition 3. i) Trivial. ii) Multiplying both sides of (1.9) and (1.10) by $\prod_{i=1}^n a_i$ and dividing both sides of (1.11) and (1.13) by $\prod_{i=1}^n a_i$ we see that the quantities η and τ satisfy system of equations (2.7)-(2.10). iii) Follows the fact that $j > i : \sum_{k=i}^j \pi_{j,k} \lambda_{k,j} = \sum_{k=i}^j \lambda_{j,k} \pi_{k,j} = 0$ and the fact that $\lambda_{j,k} \pi_{k,i} = \tau_{j,k} \eta_{k,i}$ and similarly for the product $\eta_{j,k} \tau_{k,i}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. First let us consider sequences with upper indices (1). We have $\xi_{n+1,0}^{(1)} = -a_n^2 \xi_{n-1,0}^{(1)}$. Recall that then $\xi_{0,0}^{(1)} = 1$ and $\xi_{1,0}^{(1)} = 0$. So we see that $\xi_{n,0}^{(1)}$ with odd n must be equal to zero.

To see $\xi_{n,n-2k+1}^{(1)} = 0$, and $\zeta_{n,n-2k-1}^{(1)} = 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n \geq 2k+1$ is easy since then our formulae (2.12) and (2.14) become now:

$$(5.1) \quad \xi_{n+1,n+1-(2k+1)}^{(1)} = -a_n^2 \xi_{n-1,n-1-(2k-1)}^{(1)} + \xi_{n,n-(2k+1)}^{(1)},$$

$$(5.2) \quad \zeta_{n+1,n+1-(2k+1)}^{(1)} = \zeta_{n,n-(2k+1)}^{(1)} + a_{n-1}^2 \zeta_{n-1,n-1-(2k-1)}^{(1)}.$$

We argue in case of (5.1) by induction assuming $\eta_{n-1,n-2k} = 0$ and having $\eta_{2k+1,0} = 0$ as shown above. In the case of (5.2) firstly we notice that from (2.13) with $n = 0$ we deduce that $\zeta_{1,0} = 0$. Then taking in (5.2) $n = 2$ and $k = 1$ we deduce that $\zeta_{3,0} = 0$. We use induction in the similar way and deduce that $\zeta_{2k+1,0} = 0$, $k = 0, \dots$. Now taking $k = 0$ we get

$$\zeta_{n+1,n}^{(1)} = \zeta_{n,n-1}^{(1)} + a_{n-2}^2 \zeta_{n-1,n}^{(1)} = \zeta_{n,n-1}^{(1)},$$

from which we deduce that $\zeta_{n,n-1} = 0$ for $n \geq 1$. Now take $k = 1$ we get

$$\zeta_{n+1,n-2}^{(1)} = \zeta_{n,n-3}^{(1)} + a_{n-2}^2 \zeta_{n-1,n-2}^{(1)} = \zeta_{n,n-3}^{(1)},$$

from which we deduce that $\zeta_{n,n-3} = 0$ for all $n \geq 3$. In the similar way we show that $\zeta_{n,n-2k-1} = 0$ for all $n \geq 2k+1$.

Hence let us consider the case of even differences in indices i and j in $\xi_{i,j}^{(1)}$.

The proofs will be by induction. Let us prove (2.15) first. We will prove it for indices $(n, n - 2k)$. Recursive formula (2.12) becomes now:

$$(5.3) \quad \xi_{n+1, n+1-2k}^{(1)} = -a_n^2 \xi_{n-1, n-1-2(k-1)}^{(1)} + \xi_{n, n-2k}^{(1)}$$

First notice that since sign of $\eta_{n, n-2k}$ is $(-1)^k$ and of $\eta_{n-1, n-2k+1}$ is $(-1)^{k-1}$ by induction assumption we deduce that the sign of $\eta_{n+1, n+1-2k}$ is $(-1)^k$ as claimed. Secondly notice that (2.15) can be interpreted as a sum of products of elements of k -combinations drawn from the set $\{a_1^2, \dots, a_{n-1}^2\}$ such that distance between numbers of chosen elements is greater than 1. For example from 3 elements we can select only one such 2-combinations. After little reflection one sees that one there are $\binom{n-k}{k}$ such combinations consequently that $\eta_{n, n-2k}$ contains $\binom{n-k}{k}$ products. Equation (5.3) states that sum of such products of k -combinations chosen from the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ can be decomposed on the sum of such products chosen from the set with indices $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and a sum of products containing element a_n^2 times products of similarly chosen $(k-1)$ -combinations but from the set $\{1, \dots, n-2\}$. There are $\binom{n-k}{k}$ summands of the first type and $\binom{n-1-(k-1)}{k-1}$ summand of the second type (i.e. containing a_n^2). The total number of summands in $\eta_{n+1, n+1-2k}$ is just

$$\binom{n-1-(k-1)}{k-1} + \binom{n-k}{k} = \binom{n+1-k}{k},$$

by the well know property of the Pascal triangle as it should be.

The proof of (2.17). Let us denote by $\beta_{n,l}$ the right hand side of (2.21). We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{n+2k, n} - \beta_{n-1+2k, n-1} &= a_{n+1}^2 \sum_{j_2=1}^{n+2} a_{j_1}^2 \cdots \sum_{j_k=1}^{j_{k-1}+1} \\ &= a_{n+1}^2 \beta_{n+1+2k-2, n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Further we have $\beta_{n+2, n} = \sum_{j_1=1}^{n+1} a_{j_1}^2$ by direct calculation. Now notice that sequences $\zeta^{(1)}$ and β satisfy the same difference equations and have the same initial conditions. Hence they are identical.

Now let us consider sequences with upper index (2). First of all notice that by (2.18) can be also written

$$(5.4) \quad \zeta_{n+j, n}^{(2)} = \sum_{k_1=0}^n b_{k_1} \sum_{k_2=0}^{k_1} b_{k_2} \cdots \sum_{k_j=0}^{k_{j-1}} b_{k_j}.$$

Let us denote by $\gamma_{n+j, n}$ the left hand side of (5.4). From this form we can easily deduce that

$$\gamma_{n+1+j, n+1} - \gamma_{n+j, n} = b_{n+1} \gamma_{n+j, n+1}.$$

Thus $\gamma_{n+j, n}$ satisfies the same recurrence as $\zeta_{n+j, n}^{(2)}$ with the same initial condition. Consequently $\zeta_{n+j, n}^{(2)} = \gamma_{n+j, n}$.

Now it remained to prove (2.16). First of all notice that left hand side of (2.16) is a sum of products of all of the sets $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n+j-1}\}$ of the size j . Let us denote it by $\delta_{n+j, n}$. From what was stated earlier it follows that $\delta_{n+1+j, n+1} - \delta_{n+j, n}$ is equal to the sum of product of subsets of the set $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n+j-1}\}$ of the size j that contain

element b_{n+j-1} . Another word it is equal to $-(-1)^{j-1}b_{n+j-1}\delta_{n+j-1,n}$. Hence $\delta_{n+j,n}$ and $\xi_{n+j,n}^{(2)}$ satisfy the same recurrence with the same initial condition. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. i) Combining (2.7), (2.8) with (2.11) and (2.12) we get $\hat{\eta}_{n+1,j} = \eta_{n+1,j} - \xi_{n+1,j}^{(1)} - \xi_{n+1,j}^{(2)} = \eta_{n,j-1} - b_n\eta_{n,j} - a_n^2\eta_{n-1,j} - (\xi_{n,j-1}^{(1)} - a_n^2\xi_{n-1,j}^{(1)}) - (\xi_{n,j-1}^{(2)} - b_n\xi_{n,j}^{(2)}) = \hat{\eta}_{n,j-1} - b_n(\eta_{n,j} - \xi_{n,j}^{(2)} - \xi_{n,j}^{(1)}) - b_n\xi_{n,j}^{(1)} - a_n^2(\eta_{n-1,j} - \xi_{n-1,j}^{(1)} - \xi_{n-1,j}^{(2)}) - a_n^2\xi_{n-1,j}^{(2)}$ which is first of the equations in i). Now let us consider (2.9), (2.10), (2.13) and (2.14). We get $\hat{\tau}_{n+1,j} = \tau_{n+1,j} - \zeta_{n+1,j}^{(1)} - \zeta_{n+1,j}^{(2)} = \tau_{n,j-1} + b_j\tau_{n,j} + a_{j+1}^2\tau_{n,j+1} - (\zeta_{n,j-1}^{(1)} + a_{j+1}^2\zeta_{n,j+1}^{(1)}) - (\zeta_{n,j-1}^{(2)} + b_j\zeta_{n,j}^{(2)}) = \hat{\tau}_{n,j-1} + a_{j+1}^2(\tau_{n,j+1} - \zeta_{n,j+1}^{(1)} - \zeta_{n,j+1}^{(2)}) + a_{j+1}^2\zeta_{n,j+1}^{(2)} + b_j(\tau_{n,j} - \zeta_{n,j}^{(2)} - \zeta_{n,j}^{(1)}) + b_j\zeta_{n,j}^{(1)}$.

ii) Consider (2.19) and (2.20) with $k = n$. We get then $\hat{\eta}_{n+1,n} = \hat{\eta}_{n,n-1}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{n+1,n} = \hat{\tau}_{n,n-1}$. Since for $n = 1$ we have $\hat{\eta}_{1,0} = \hat{\tau}_{1,0} = 0$ we get the assertion.

iii) Take $k = n - 1$ in (2.19) and (2.20). We get then $\hat{\eta}_{n+1,n-1} = \hat{\eta}_{n,n-2} - b_n\hat{\eta}_{n,n-1} - a_n^2\hat{\eta}_{n-1,n-1} - b_n\xi_{n,n-1}^{(1)} - a_n^2\xi_{n-1,n-1}^{(2)} = \hat{\eta}_{n,n-2}$, since $\hat{\eta}_{n,n-1} = \xi_{n,n-1}^{(1)} = 0$ and $\hat{\eta}_{n-1,n-1} = -\xi_{n-1,n-1}^{(2)} = -1$. Further since $\hat{\eta}_{2,0} = 0$ we get the assertion.

iv) As before we take $k = n - 2$ in (2.19) and (2.20). We get then $\hat{\tau}_{n+1,n-2} = \hat{\tau}_{n,n-3} + b_{n-2}\hat{\tau}_{n,n-2} + a_{n-1}^2\hat{\tau}_{n,n-1} + a_{n-1}^2\zeta_{n,n-1}^{(2)} + b_{n-2}\zeta_{n,n-2}^{(1)} = \hat{\tau}_{n,n-3} + a_{n-1}^2\zeta_{n,n-1}^{(2)} + b_{n-2}\zeta_{n,n-2}^{(1)}$, since $\hat{\tau}_{n,n-2} = \hat{\tau}_{n,n-1} = 0$ as shown above. Besides $\zeta_{n,n-1}^{(2)} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b_k$ and $\zeta_{n,n-2}^{(1)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k^2$ as shown in (2.17) and (2.18). Now it a matter of algebra. We reason in the similar way in case of $\eta_{n+3,n}$ using the fact that $\hat{\eta}_{n+2,n} = \hat{\eta}_{n+1,n} = 0$ and knowing $\xi_{n+2,n}^{(1)}$ and $\xi_{n+1,n}^{(2)}$ by (2.15) and (2.16).

So now let us consider $\eta_{n+4,n}$. By taking $k = n - 3$ in (2.19) we get: $\hat{\eta}_{n+1,n-3} = \hat{\eta}_{n,n-4} - b_n\hat{\eta}_{n,n-3} - a_n^2\hat{\eta}_{n-1,n-3} - b_n\xi_{n,n-3}^{(1)} - a_n^2\xi_{n-1,n-3}^{(2)} = \hat{\eta}_{n,n-4} - b_n\hat{\eta}_{n,n-3} - a_n^2\sum_{0 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq n-2} b_{k_1}b_{k_2}$ since $\hat{\eta}_{n-1,n-3} = \xi_{n,n-3}^{(1)} = 0$ as shown above and by (2.15). Further we use (2.16) and some algebra.

v) To see that (2.21) holds true it is enough to apply (2.19) and (2.20) with $b_k = 0$, $k \geq 0$ which results in $\xi_{n,k}^{(2)} = \zeta_{n,k}^{(2)} = 0$, for $n > 0$, $k \geq 0$ and which leads to relationships $\hat{\eta}_{n+1,k} = \hat{\eta}_{n,k-1} - a_n^2\hat{\eta}_{n-1,k}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{n+1,k} = \hat{\tau}_{n,k-1} + a_{k+1}^2\hat{\tau}_{n,k+1}$ with $\hat{\eta}_{n,n} = \hat{\tau}_{n,n} = 0$, for $n > 0$ and $\hat{\eta}_{i,0} = \hat{\tau}_{i,0} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Now it is elementary to see that we must have $\hat{\eta}_{n,k} = \hat{\tau}_{n,k} = 0$ for all $n > 0$, $k \geq 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Akhiezer, N. I. The classical moment problem and some related questions in analysis. Translated by N. Kemmer *Hafner Publishing Co.*, New York 1965 x+253 pp. MR0184042 (32 #1518)
- [2] Alexits, G. Convergence problems of orthogonal series. Translated from the German by I. Földes. *International Series of Monographs in Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 20 Pergamon Press*, New York-Oxford-Paris 1961 ix+350 pp. MR0218827 (36 #1911)
- [3] Berg, Christian; Szwarz, Ryszard. The smallest eigenvalue of Hankel matrices. *Constr. Approx.* **34** (2011), no. 1, 107–133. MR2796093 (2012e:15058)
- [4] Brezinski, Claude. Padé-type approximation and general orthogonal polynomials. *International Series of Numerical Mathematics*, **50**. *Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel-Boston, Mass.*, 1980. 250 pp. ISBN: 3-7643-1100-2 MR0561106 (82a:41017)
- [5] Bryc, Włodzimierz; Matysiak, Wojciech; Szablowski, Paweł J. Probabilistic aspects of Al-Salam-Chihara polynomials. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **133** (2005), no. 4, 1127–1134 (electronic). MR2117214 (2005m:33033)

- [6] Chihara, T. S. An introduction to orthogonal polynomials. Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 13. *Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York-London-Paris*, 1978. xii+249 pp. ISBN: 0-677-04150-0 MR0481884 (58 #1979)
- [7] Golinski, Leonid; Zlatoš, Andrej. Coefficients of orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle and higher-order Szegő theorems. *Constr. Approx.* **26** (2007), no. 3, 361–382. MR2335688 (2008k:42080)
- [8] Fox, L. An introduction to numerical linear algebra. Monographs on Numerical Analysis *Clarendon Press*, Oxford 1964 xi+295 pp. MR0164436 (29 #1733)
- [9] Ismail, Mourad E. H. Classical and quantum orthogonal polynomials in one variable. With two chapters by Walter Van Assche. With a foreword by Richard A. Askey. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 98. *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 2005. xviii+706 pp. ISBN: 978-0-521-78201-2; 0-521-78201-5 MR2191786 (2007f:33001)
- [10] Ismail, Mourad E. H.; Rahman, Mizan; Stanton, Dennis. Quadratic q -exponentials and connection coefficient problems. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **127** (1999), no. 10, 2931–2941. MR1621949 (2000a:33027)
- [11] Morgenthaler, George W. A central limit theorem for uniformly bounded orthonormal systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **79**, (1955). 281–311. MR0070876 (17,49a)
- [12] Nevai, Paul. Géza Freud, orthogonal polynomials and Christoffel functions. A case study. *J. Approx. Theory* **48** (1986), no. 1, 167 pp. MR0862231 (88b:42032)
- [13] Serre, Denis. Matrices. Theory and applications. Translated from the 2001 French original. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **216**. *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 2002. xvi+202 pp. ISBN: 0-387-95460-0 MR1923507 (2003h:15001)
- [14] Simon, Barry. The classical moment problem as a self-adjoint finite difference operator. *Adv. Math.* **137** (1998), no. 1, 82–203. MR1627806 (2001e:47020)
- [15] Simon, Barry. Orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. Part 1. Classical theory. *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*, **54**, Part 1. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005. xxvi+466 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-3446-0 MR2105088 (2006a:42002a)
- [16] Szablowski, P. J. Generalized laws of large numbers and auxiliary results concerning stochastic approximation with dependent disturbances. II. *Comput. Math. Appl.* **13** (1987), no. 12, 973–987. MR0898944 (88k:62160b)
- [17] Szablowski, Paweł J. Expansions of one density via polynomials orthogonal with respect to the other. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **383** (2011), no. 1, 35–54. MR2812716, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1011.1492>
- [18] Szablowski, Paweł J. On the structure and probabilistic interpretation of Askey-Wilson densities and polynomials with complex parameters. *J. Funct. Anal.* **261** (2011), no. 3, 635–659. MR2799574, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1011.1541>
- [19] Szablowski, Paweł J. On affinity relating two positive measures and the connection coefficients between polynomials orthogonalized by these measures. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **219** (2013), no. 12, 6768–6776. MR3027843
- [20] Szwarz, Ryszard. Linearization and connection coefficients of orthogonal polynomials. *Monatsh. Math.* **113** (1992), no. 4, 319–329. MR1169235 (93f:42047)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCES,, WARSAW UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, UL. KOSZYKOWA 75, 00-662 WARSAW, POLAND
E-mail address: pawel.szablowski@gmail.com