

# THE MULTIPLE MARKOV THEOREM ON ANGELESCO SETS

K. CASTILLO AND G. GORDILLO-NÚÑEZ

ABSTRACT. By addressing a long-standing open problem, listed in a highly regarded collection of open questions in the field and described as a “worthwhile research project”, this note extends Markov’s theorem (Markoff, Math. Ann., 27:177–182, 1886) on the variation of zeros of orthogonal polynomials on the real line to the setting of multiple orthogonal polynomials on Angelesco sets. The analysis reveals that the only distinction from the classical 1886 result lies in establishing sufficient conditions for a given  $\mathcal{Z}$ -matrix—which, in the Markov case, is the identity matrix—to be an  $\mathcal{M}$ -matrix. In contrast to most existing studies, which often present highly technical proofs for specific results, this note seeks to provide a simple proof of a general result without imposing restrictions on the weight functions (such as their potential “classical” nature), the number of intervals, or the structure of the partition.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the third volume of *Mathematics of the 19th Century* (see [11, p. 52]<sup>1</sup>), Kolmogorov and Yushkevich compiled three papers by A. Markov addressing the behavior of the zeros of the non-constant elements in a sequence of orthogonal polynomials on the real line (OPRL),  $(p_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ , with respect to a parameter,  $t$ , varying within a real open interval. Among these theorems, one stands out as the most elegant of Markov’s results on orthogonal polynomials, highlighting the pivotal role of the orthogonality weight function,  $\omega$ , defined on a (not necessarily finite) real interval  $(a, b)$  (see [14, p. 178]):

*Under suitable conditions, the zeros of  $p_n(x; t)$  are increasing (respectively, decreasing) functions of  $t$ , provided that*

$$\frac{1}{\omega(x; t)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t}(x; t)$$

*is an increasing (respectively, decreasing)<sup>2</sup> function of  $x$  on  $(a, b)$ .*

From Szegő’s seminal 1939 book (see [17, Theorem 6.12.1]) to Ismail’s monograph (see [9, Theorem 7.1.1]), and through Freud’s book (see [8, Problems 14, 15, and 16, pp. 133–134]), Markov’s theorem has frequently appeared in the literature. Notably, Askey and Wilson used a direct consequence of Markov’s theorem, originally

---

*Date:* February 10, 2025.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30C15, 33C47.

<sup>1</sup>Originally published as “Matematika XIX veka: Chebyshevskoe napravlenie v teorii funktsii. Obyknoennye differentsial’nye uravneniia. Variatsionnoe ischislenie. Teoriia konechnykh raznostei,” Izdatel’stvo “Nauka”, Moskva, 1987.

<sup>2</sup>When strictly monotonic behavior is present in the hypotheses, the zeros also become strictly monotonic functions with respect to the parameter.

traced back to Szegő (see [17, Theorem 6.12.2]), to explore the monotonicity of the zeros of what are now known as the Askey-Wilson polynomials (see [2, Section 7]).

The monotonic behavior of the zeros of classical OPRL with respect to their parameters can often be deduced from their specific properties, including Rodrigues' formula, differential or difference equations, hypergeometric character, among others. In many instances, the simplicity of the problem is such that the expected result can almost be derived directly. For example, in the case of Laguerre polynomials, the problem can be reformulated as an eigenvalue problem, with the result following from the application of Hadamard's first variation formula (see, for instance, [18, (1.73)] or [3, Proposition 3.1]). However, it is its generality and simplicity that, as Szegő described, makes Markov's theorem "an important statement", or, in the words of Ismail, "an extremely useful theorem". The Laguerre polynomial of degree  $n$ ,  $L_n^{(\alpha)}(x)$ , with  $\alpha \in (-1, \infty)$ , satisfies the following orthogonality conditions:

$$\int_0^\infty x^j L_n^{(\alpha)}(x) e^{-x} x^\alpha dx = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1.$$

As previously mentioned, it would require little effort to observe that their zeros, whose weight function is given by

$$\omega(x; \alpha) = e^{-x} x^\alpha,$$

are increasing functions of  $\alpha$  on  $(-1, \infty)$ . However, according to Markov's theorem, this property effortlessly emerges because

$$(1) \quad \frac{1}{\omega(x; \alpha)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \alpha}(x; \alpha) (= \log x)$$

is an increasing function of  $x$  on  $(0, \infty)$ . Recently, relying solely on orthogonality conditions, it was proved in [4] that Markov's theorem remains essentially valid for weight functions defined on the unit circle, opening promising avenues for extending Markov's theorem to other contexts, such as multiple orthogonal polynomials, where applications demand such results.

Over the past four decades, multiple orthogonal polynomials have garnered significant interest due to their extensive theoretical development and relevance in various mathematical contexts. The introduction of [6] provides an interesting and up-to-date discussion in this regard. However, a generalization of Markov's theorem to the setting of "several weight functions" has yet to be established, complicating the study of their monotonicity of the zeros. Although it had long been recognized as a significant challenge, in 2005, Ismail explicitly included this question in his collection of open problems and conjectures, which encompasses some of the most challenging problems in the field of Orthogonal Polynomials and Special Functions (see [9, Problem 24.1.5]):

*"There is no study of zeros of general or special systems of multiple orthogonal polynomials available. An extension of Theorem 7.1.1 [Markov's theorem] to multiple orthogonal polynomials would be a worthwhile research project."*

Nearly two decades after this problem was formally posed, some progress has been made in understanding the zeros of particular families of multiple orthogonal polynomials, as well as those possessing very specific properties, such as a hypergeometric character. Nevertheless, the central question regarding a general result in

the spirit of Markov's theorem remains open in full generality. The aim of this note is to present the first contribution in this direction. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect is that Markov's theorem remains essentially unchanged for multiple orthogonal polynomials on the real line (MOPRL) on Angelesco sets. More specifically, Markov's original condition, along with some additional condition for a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -matrix to be an  $\mathcal{M}$ -matrix, must be individually applied to each weight function. In the classical 1886 result, no additional assumptions beyond Markov's condition are required, as the  $\mathcal{Z}$ -matrix to be considered in this case is the identity matrix. The additional (sufficient) condition we present in the multiple Markov theorem below can be illustrated for the classical case (a singular Angelesco set) with Laguerre polynomials introduced above, where, in addition to condition (1), it is necessary to ensure that

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{\omega(x; \alpha)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}(x; \alpha) \left( = \frac{\alpha - x}{x} \right),$$

is a decreasing function of  $x$  on  $(0, \infty)$ . This leads to a restriction on the range of  $\alpha$  for which monotonicity of the zeros of Laguerre polynomials can be guaranteed, specifically  $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ . Nevertheless, it is essential to emphasize that our primary objective is to present a general result, particularly without imposing restrictions on the number of measures or the manner in which the partitions are defined. With this understanding in mind—that Markov's condition and the additional condition (2) must be satisfied for each weight function in the case of MOPRL on Angelesco sets (see (11) and (12) below)—and without delving into unnecessary details in an introduction intended solely to motivate the exploration of the subsequent sections, we now proceed to illustrate how certain results, previously difficult to envision based on the known findings, can be derived with remarkable simplicity.

EXAMPLE 1.1. *Let  $\{\nu_1, \nu_2\}$  denote a set of two nontrivial positive Borel measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  defined as*

$$d\nu_k(x; a_k, b_k, c_k) = \omega(x; a_k, b_k, c_k) dx, \quad k = 1, 2,$$

*with the weight functions expressed as*

$$\omega(x; a_k, b_k, c_k) = (x + a)^{a_k} |x|^{b_k} (b - x)^{c_k}, \quad a_k, b_k, c_k \in (-1, \infty).$$

*Assume that the support of  $\nu_1$  is restricted to the interval  $(-a, 0)$ , while the support of  $\nu_2$  is contained within  $(0, b)$ , as illustrated in the following figure:*




FIGURE 1. The support of  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$ .

(Magnus referred to  $\omega$  as a generalized Jacobi weight with three factors (see [13, Example 1]) and addressed its connection with discrete Painlevé equations.)

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be chosen such that it admits an unordered integer partition  $n_1, n_2$ . Since the supports of  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$  lie within pairwise disjoint real intervals, there exists

a MOPRL of degree  $n$ ,  $P_n^{(a,b;a_1,b_1,c_1,a_2,b_2,c_2)} = P_n^{(a_1,b_1,c_1,a_2,b_2,c_2)}$ , which satisfies the following orthogonality conditions:

$$\int_{-a}^0 x^j P_n^{(a_1,b_1,c_1,a_2,b_2,c_2)}(x) \omega(x; a_1, b_1, c_1) dx = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n_1 - 1,$$

$$\int_0^b x^j P_n^{(a_1,b_1,c_1,a_2,b_2,c_2)}(x) \omega(x; a_2, b_2, c_2) dx = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n_2 - 1.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\frac{1}{\omega(x; a_k, b_k, c_k)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial a_{k'}}(x; a_k, b_k, c_k) = \log(x + a) \delta_{k,k'},$$

$$\frac{1}{\omega(x; a_k, b_k, c_k)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial b_{k'}}(x; a_k, b_k, c_k) = \log|x| \delta_{k,k'},$$

$$\frac{1}{\omega(x; a_k, b_k, c_k)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial c_{k'}}(x; a_k, b_k, c_k) = \log(b - x) \delta_{k,k'},$$

are, respectively, an increasing function of  $x$  on  $(-a, b)$ , a decreasing function of  $x$  on  $(-a, 0)$  and an increasing function on  $(0, b)$ , and a decreasing function of  $x$  on  $(-a, b)$ . Furthermore, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\omega(x; a_k, b_k, c_k)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}(x; a_k, b_k, c_k) = \frac{a_k}{x + a} + \frac{b_k}{x} + \frac{c_k}{x - b},$$

are decreasing functions of  $x$  for positive values of  $a_1, b_1, c_1, a_2, b_2$ , and  $c_2$ . From the preceding expressions, we shall be able to conclude that the zeros of  $P_n^{(a_1,b_1,c_1,a_2,b_2,c_2)}$  are increasing functions of  $a_1, a_2$ , and  $b_2$ , and decreasing functions of  $b_1, c_1$ , and  $c_2$ , provided that all other parameters take positive values. In the very particular case where  $a_1 = a_2, b_1 = b_2, c_1 = c_2$ , and  $b = 1$ , we obtain the so-called Jacobi-Angelesco polynomials (see [9, Section 23.3.1]). If we further specialize and assume that  $n_1 = n_2$ , i.e., for some specific MOPRL of even degree<sup>3</sup>, the Rodrigues formula (see [9, (23.3.1)]), which provides an explicit expression for these polynomials (see [9, Section 23.3.1]) greatly simplifies the situation, allowing for the use of elementary techniques. Under all the aforementioned restrictions, the monotonicity of the zeros of the corresponding MOPRL is thoroughly analyzed in [7, 15] (see also [12]).

Since it is not necessary to know the explicit form of MOPRL on Angelesco sets, nor any of their specific properties, to predict the possible monotonic behavior of their zeros, we have complete freedom in choosing examples. In this sense, and as an illustration of the strength of the main theorem to be proved in this work, a final simple example is presented, whose result is far from elementary to predict, even computationally.

EXAMPLE 1.2. Let  $\{\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3\}$  denote a set of three nontrivial positive Borel measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  defined as

$$d\nu_k(a; a_k, b_k) = \omega(x; a_k, b_k) dx, \quad k = 1, 2, 3,$$

<sup>3</sup>Observe that an even degree can occur without necessarily requiring  $n_1 = n_2$ .

with the weight functions expressed as

$$\omega(x; a_1, b_1) = (-1 - x)^{a_1} e^{b_1 x}, \quad a_1 \in (-1, \infty), \quad b_1 \in (0, \infty),$$

$$\omega(x; a_2, b_2) = (1 + x)^{a_2} (-x)^{b_2}, \quad a_2, b_2 \in (-1, \infty),$$

$$\omega(x; a_3, b_3) = e^{-a_3 x^3 + b_3 x}, \quad a_3 \in (0, \infty), \quad b_3 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Assume that the support of  $\nu_1$  is restricted to the interval  $(-\infty, -1)$ , the support of  $\nu_2$  is contained within  $(-1, 0)$ , and the support of  $\nu_3$  lies within  $(0, \infty)$ , as illustrated in the following figure:




FIGURE 2. The support of  $\nu_1$ ,  $\nu_2$ , and  $\nu_3$ .

(The first two measures correspond to the classical Laguerre and Jacobi weights, respectively, whereas the third one was considered by Magnus in [13, Example 2], also in connection with discrete Painlevé equations.)

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be chosen such that it admits an unordered integer partition  $n_1, n_2, n_3$ . Since the supports of  $\nu_1, \nu_2$ , and  $\nu_3$  lie within pairwise disjoint real intervals, there exists a MOPRL of degree  $n$ ,  $P_n^{(a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3, b_3)}$ , which satisfies the following orthogonality conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{-1} x^j P_n^{(a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3, b_3)}(x) \omega(x; a_1, b_1) dx &= 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n_1 - 1, \\ \int_{-1}^0 x^j P_n^{(a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3, b_3)}(x) \omega(x; a_2, b_2) dx &= 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n_2 - 1, \\ \int_0^{\infty} x^j P_n^{(a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3, b_3)}(x) \omega(x; a_3, b_3) dx &= 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n_3 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\omega(x; a_1, b_1)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial a_1}(x; a_1, b_1) &= \frac{1}{\omega(x; a_2, b_2)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial a_2}(x; a_2, b_2) = \log |1 + x|, \\ \frac{1}{\omega(x; a_1, b_1)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial b_1}(x; a_1, b_1) &= \frac{1}{\omega(x; a_3, b_3)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial b_3}(x; a_3, b_3) = x, \\ \frac{1}{\omega(x; a_2, b_2)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial b_2}(x; a_2, b_2) &= \log |x|, \\ \frac{1}{\omega(x; a_3, b_3)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial a_3}(x; a_3, b_3) &= -x^3, \end{aligned}$$

which are, respectively, decreasing, increasing, increasing, decreasing, decreasing, and increasing functions of  $x$  on their respective domains of definition. Furthermore, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\omega(x; a_1, b_1)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}(x; a_1, b_1) = b_1 - \frac{a_1}{1-x},$$

$$\frac{1}{\omega(x; a_2, b_2)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}(x; a_2, b_2) = \frac{a_2}{1+x} + \frac{b_2}{x},$$

$$\frac{1}{\omega(x; a_3, b_3)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}(x; a_3, b_3) = -3a_3x^2 + b_3,$$

are decreasing functions of  $x$  for positive values of  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $b_2$ . From the preceding expressions, we shall be able to conclude that the zeros of  $P_n^{(a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3, b_3)}$  are increasing functions of  $b_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $b_3$ , and decreasing functions of  $a_1$ ,  $b_2$ , and  $a_3$ , provided that  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ ,  $b_2$ ,  $a_3$  take positive values.

In the following section, we introduce the necessary notation and establish the conditions required to ensure that the zeros of the MOPRL are differentiable functions of the parameter. The final section is dedicated to stating and proving the multiple version of the Markov theorem on Angelesco sets.

## 2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Let  $\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m\}$  be a nonempty set of nontrivial positive Borel measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ , each having finite moments. Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be chosen such that it admits an unordered integer partition  $n_1, \dots, n_m$  into  $m$  parts. A monic polynomial  $P_n$  of degree  $n$  (in one variable) associated with the set  $\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m\}$  and the partition  $n_1, \dots, n_m$  is called a MOPRL if it satisfies the following orthogonality conditions (see [1, Definition 1.1]):

$$(3) \quad \int x^j P_n(x) d\mu_k(x) = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n_k - 1, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

In some contexts, these polynomials are referred to as type II MOPRL. The existence of  $P_n$  is not guaranteed for any given set  $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m\}$  and any integer partition of  $n$ . However, if the supports of the measures lie within pairwise disjoint real intervals, then  $P_n$  exists and is unique (see [16, p. 135] and [1, Corollary 1.5]). In this case, the set  $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m\}$  is referred to as an Angelesco set or Angelesco system (see [1, Definition 1.3]). Henceforth, whenever  $P_n$  is written, it refers to a polynomial of degree  $n$  associated with an Angelesco set and a specific partition of  $n$  into the number of elements of the corresponding set of measures. The above notation is particularly well-suited to the problem at hand and ensures the highest level of clarity for a reader unfamiliar with MOPRL.

**PROPOSITION 2.1.** *Let  $\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m\}$  be an Angelesco set, with each measure depending on a parameter  $t$  that varies within a real open interval containing  $t_0$ . Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be chosen such that it admits an unordered integer partition  $n_1, \dots, n_m$  into*

$m$  parts. Define  $P_n(x; t)$  as the monic MOPRL associated with the Angelesco set and the previously given partition of  $n$ . Assume that

$$d\nu_k(x; t) = \omega_k(x; t) d\mu_k(x), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

and that the support of each measure is contained in  $(a_k, b_k)$ . Furthermore, assume that  $\omega_k(x; t)$  is finite and admits a partial derivative with respect to  $t$  almost everywhere in  $(a_k, b_k)$ . Suppose there exist functions  $\alpha_k$  such that

$$\left| \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial t}(x; t) \right| \leq \alpha_k(x), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

almost everywhere in  $(a_k, b_k)$ , and that all the moments of  $\alpha_k d\mu_k$  are finite. If  $P_n(y_0; t_0) = 0$ , then there exist  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta > 0$ , and a unique function  $y : (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon) \rightarrow (t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta)$ , differentiable on  $(t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon)$ , such that  $y(t_0) = y_0$  and

$$P_n(y(t); t) = 0,$$

for every  $t \in (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon)$ .

*Proof.* Set

$$(4) \quad c_j^{(k)}(t) = \int x^j \omega_k(x; t) d\mu_k(x), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n + n_k - 1, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Since  $\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m\}$  is an Angelesco set, the polynomial

$$Q_n(x; t) =$$

$$\begin{vmatrix} c_0^{(1)}(t) & c_1^{(1)}(t) & \cdots & c_n^{(1)}(t) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n_1-1}^{(1)}(t) & c_{n_1}^{(1)}(t) & \cdots & c_{n+n_1-1}^{(1)}(t) \\ \cdots & \cdots & & \cdots \\ c_0^{(m)}(t) & c_1^{(m)}(t) & \cdots & c_n^{(m)}(t) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n_m-1}^{(m)}(t) & c_{n_m}^{(m)}(t) & \cdots & c_{n+n_m-1}^{(m)}(t) \end{vmatrix}^{-1} \begin{vmatrix} c_0^{(1)}(t) & c_1^{(1)}(t) & \cdots & c_n^{(1)}(t) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n_1-1}^{(1)}(t) & c_{n_1}^{(1)}(t) & \cdots & c_{n+n_1-1}^{(1)}(t) \\ \cdots & \cdots & & \cdots \\ c_0^{(m)}(t) & c_1^{(m)}(t) & \cdots & c_n^{(m)}(t) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n_m-1}^{(m)}(t) & c_{n_m}^{(m)}(t) & \cdots & c_{n+n_m-1}^{(m)}(t) \\ 1 & x & \cdots & x^n \end{vmatrix}$$

is well defined and, indeed,  $Q_n = P_n$  (see, for instance, [6, Section 2.1]). Since  $x^j d\mu_k(x)$  may not be positive in general, we cannot directly apply differentiation results that require a positive measure. However, combining the Jordan decomposition theorem (see [19, Theorem 10.21]) with the theorem of differentiation under the integral sign with respect to a parameter [5, (13.8.6), pp. 127–128], we can differentiate  $c_j^{(k)}(t)$  inside the integral. Hence, the coefficients of  $P_n(x; t)$ , which are rational functions of the moments given in (4), are differentiable functions of  $t$ . Since  $P_n(y_0; t_0) = 0$ , by the simplicity of the zeros of  $P_n(x; t)$  (see [1, Theorem 1.4]), we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial P_n}{\partial x}(x; t) \right|_{x=y_0, t=t_0} \neq 0,$$

and the result follows from the implicit function theorem.  $\square$

The preceding proposition can be extended to include, for instance, MOPRL on Nikishin sets or Nikishin systems (see [1, Definition 1.6]). However, we do not believe that, in general and under our conditions, a multiple Markov theorem can be established in this context, as the zeros “share” the same interval, making it not always possible to derive certain essential inequalities needed for the subsequent analysis. It is also not surprising that in known cases, due to their nature—almost always related to classical measures—the reader may observe numerically the monotonicity of the zeros; however, these cases do not provide a reliable indication of what will happen in general.

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

The proof of the main result will follow directly from a series of lemmas. We highlight that many of these lemmas, and consequently the monotonicity of the zeros of MOPRL on Angelesco sets, emerge exclusively from the orthogonality properties (3).

Recall that a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -matrix is defined as a square matrix with positive diagonal elements and non-positive off-diagonal entries [10, p. 90]. An  $\mathcal{M}$ -matrix is a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -matrix that is invertible and whose inverse has all non-negative entries.

**LEMMA 3.1.** *Assume the notation of Proposition 2.1. Let  $Q_{n_k}(x; t)$  denote the monic polynomial whose zeros,  $x_{k,i}(t)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n_k$ , are precisely the zeros of  $P_n(x; t)$  in  $(a_k, b_k)$ . Define the block matrix*

$$\mathbf{A}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{A}_{1,2}(t) & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{1,m-1}(t) & \mathbf{A}_{1,m}(t) \\ \mathbf{A}_{2,1}(t) & \mathbf{I} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{2,m-1}(t) & \mathbf{A}_{2,m}(t) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{m-1,1}(t) & \mathbf{A}_{m-1,2}(t) & \cdots & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{A}_{m-1,m}(t) \\ \mathbf{A}_{m,1}(t) & \mathbf{A}_{m,2}(t) & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{m,m-1}(t) & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  denotes the identity matrix, and  $\mathbf{A}_{k,l}(t)$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{A}_{k,l}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} a_{1,1}^{(k,l)}(t) & a_{1,2}^{(k,l)}(t) & \cdots & a_{1,n_l-1}^{(k,l)}(t) & a_{1,n_l}^{(k,l)}(t) \\ a_{2,1}^{(k,l)}(t) & a_{2,2}^{(k,l)}(t) & \cdots & a_{2,n_l-1}^{(k,l)}(t) & a_{2,n_l}^{(k,l)}(t) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{n_k-1,1}^{(k,l)}(t) & a_{n_k-1,2}^{(k,l)}(t) & \cdots & a_{n_k-1,n_l-1}^{(k,l)}(t) & a_{n_k-1,n_l}^{(k,l)}(t) \\ a_{n_k,1}^{(k,l)}(t) & a_{n_k,2}^{(k,l)}(t) & \cdots & a_{n_k,n_l-1}^{(k,l)}(t) & a_{n_k,n_l}^{(k,l)}(t) \end{pmatrix},$$



with entries<sup>4</sup>

$$a_{i,j}^{(k,l)}(t) = \frac{\int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)P_n(x;t)}{(x-x_{k,i}(t))(x-x_{l,j}(t))} d\nu_k(x;t)}{\int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)P_n(x;t)}{(x-x_{k,i}(t))^2} d\nu_k(x;t)}, \quad k, l = 1, \dots, m, \quad j = 1, \dots, n_l,$$

whenever  $k \neq l$ . Then, there exists a neighborhood of  $t_0$  in which  $\mathbf{A}(t)$  is a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -matrix.

*Proof.* Set

$$d_i^{(k)}(t) = \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)P_n(x;t)}{(x-x_{k,i}(t))^2} d\nu_k(x;t).$$

Given the properties of the zeros of  $P_n$  (see [1, Theorem 1.4]), it is straightforward to observe that  $\text{sgn } R_k(x;t)$ , where

$$R_k(x;t) = \prod_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^m Q_{n_l}(x;t),$$

remains constant in  $(a_k, b_k)$ . Moreover, by examining the expression for  $d_i^{(k)}(t)$ , it can be deduced that

$$\text{sgn } d_i^{(k)}(t) = \text{sgn } R_k(x;t)$$

on  $(a_k, b_k)$ . Define, for an arbitrary function  $g$ , the divided difference  $g[x, y]$  as

$$g[x, y] = \frac{g(x) - g(y)}{x - y},$$

whenever  $x \neq y$ . Observe that

$$a_{i,j}^{(k,l)}(t) d_i^{(k)}(t) = \int R_k(x;t) f[x, x_{k,i}(t)] Q_{n_k}^2(x;t) d\nu_k(x;t),$$

where  $f(x;t) = (x - x_{l,j}(t))^{-1}$ , because the orthogonality condition implies

$$\frac{1}{x_{k,i}(t) - x_{l,j}(t)} \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)P_n(x;t)}{x - x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t) = 0.$$

Moreover, leveraging the properties of the zeros of  $P_n$ , we deduce that

$$f[x, x_{k,i}(t)] < 0$$

on  $(a_k, b_k)$ , as  $f$  is strictly decreasing with respect to  $x$  in this interval. Thus, in  $(a_k, b_k)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sgn} \left( a_{i,j}^{(k,l)}(t) d_i^{(k)}(t) \right) &= \text{sgn} \left( R_k(x;t) f[x, x_{k,i}(t)] Q_{n_k}^2(x;t) \right) \\ &= -\text{sgn } d_i^{(k)}(t), \end{aligned}$$

from which the lemma follows.  $\square$

<sup>4</sup>A reader who chooses to skip the proof should note that these quantities are well-defined, given the distribution of the zeros of  $P_n$  (see [1, Theorem 1.4]).

LEMMA 3.2. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Lemma 3.1. Define the vectors*

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \left( \frac{dx_{1,1}}{dt}(t), \frac{dx_{1,2}}{dt}(t), \dots, \frac{dx_{1,n_1}}{dt}(t), \dots, \frac{dx_{m,1}}{dt}(t), \frac{dx_{m,2}}{dt}(t), \dots, \frac{dx_{m,n_m}}{dt}(t) \right)^T,$$

$$\mathbf{b}(t) = \left( b_1^{(1)}(t), b_2^{(1)}(t), \dots, b_{n_1}^{(1)}(t), \dots, b_1^{(m)}(t), b_2^{(m)}(t), \dots, b_{n_m}^{(m)}(t) \right)^T,$$

where

$$b_i^{(k)}(t) = \frac{\int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial t}(x;t) d\mu_k(x)}{\int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)P_n(x;t)}{(x-x_{k,i}(t))^2} d\nu_k(x;t)}, \quad k=1, \dots, m, \quad i=1, \dots, n_k.$$

Then, there exists a neighborhood of  $t_0$  in which  $\mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{b}(t)$ .

*Proof.* (The notation introduced in the proof of the previous lemma will be used.)

By the analytic implicit function theorem, the derivative of  $x_{k,i}(t)$  with respect to  $t$  exists in a neighborhood of  $t_0$  and is given by

$$(5) \quad \frac{dx_{k,i}}{dt}(t) = - \frac{\frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial t}(x;t) \Big|_{x=x_{k,i}(t)}}{\frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial x}(x;t) \Big|_{x=x_{k,i}(t)}}.$$

The task reduces to determining explicit expressions for the numerator and denominator of the fraction in (5), relying solely on the orthogonality conditions (3).

For any polynomial  $h$  of degree at most  $n_k$ , (3) implies that

$$\int P_n(x;t)h[x, x_{k,i}(t)] d\nu_k(x;t) = 0,$$

which can equivalently be written as

$$h(x_{k,i}(t)) \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t) = \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} h(x) d\nu_k(x;t).$$

Substituting

$$h(x) = \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial t}(x;t)$$

into the equation above yields

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial t}(x;t) \Big|_{x=x_{k,i}(t)} \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t) \\ = \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial t}(x;t) d\nu_k(x;t). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, substituting  $h(x) = Q_{n_k}[x, x_{k,i}(t)]$  leads to

$$\frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial x}(x;t) \Big|_{x=x_{k,i}(t)} \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t) = d_i^{(k)}(t).$$

Consequently, from the proof of Lemma 3.1, we conclude that

$$(7) \quad \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t) \neq 0,$$

and therefore, from (6), we obtain a well-defined expression for the denominator on the right-hand side of (5). By taking the derivative with respect to  $t$ , which is justified under our hypotheses, in the expression

$$(8) \quad \int h(x)P_n(x;t) d\nu_k(x;t) = 0,$$

where  $h$  is now a polynomial of degree at most  $n_k - 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int h(x) \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial t}(x;t) R_k(x;t) d\nu_k(x;t) \\ &= - \int h(x) P_n(x;t) \left( \frac{1}{R_k(x;t)} \frac{\partial R_k}{\partial t}(x;t) + \frac{1}{\omega_k(x;t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial t}(x;t) \right) d\nu_k(x;t). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting

$$h(x) = Q_{n_k}[x, x_{k,i}(t)]$$

into the above equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x - x_{k,i}(t)} \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial t}(x;t) d\nu_k(x;t) \\ &= \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t) P_n(x;t)}{x - x_{k,i}(t)} \left( \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_l} \frac{dx_{l,j}(t)}{x - x_{l,j}(t)} - \frac{1}{\omega_k(x;t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial t}(x;t) \right) d\nu_k(x;t). \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying further, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x - x_{k,i}(t)} \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial t}(x;t) d\nu_k(x;t) \\ &= -d_i^{(k)}(t) b_i^{(k)}(t) + d_i^{(k)}(t) \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_l} a_{i,j}^{(k,l)}(t) \frac{dx_{l,j}(t)}{dt}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using equations (6) and (7), we conclude that

$$(9) \quad \left. \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial t}(x;t) \right|_{x=x_{k,i}(t)} = - \frac{d_i^{(k)}(t) b_i^{(k)}(t) - d_i^{(k)}(t) \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_l} a_{i,j}^{(k,l)}(t) \frac{dx_{l,j}(t)}{dt}}{\int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x - x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t)}.$$

Substituting

$$h(x) = \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t) - \left. \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial x}(x;t) \right|_{x=x_{k,i}(t)} (x - x_{k,i}(t))}{(x - x_{k,i}(t))^2}$$

into the equation (8) yields

$$\left. \frac{\partial Q_{n_k}}{\partial x}(x;t) \right|_{x=x_{k,i}(t)} \int \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x - x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t) = d_i^{(k)}(t).$$

From this, and using (5) and (9), we conclude that

$$(10) \quad \frac{dx_{k,i}}{dt}(t) + \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_l} a_{i,j}^{(k,l)}(t) \frac{dx_{l,j}}{dt}(t) = b_i^{(k)}(t),$$

which directly implies the desired result.  $\square$

The argument used to prove the following lemma is deeply rooted in Markov's work, forming the basis for the first (sufficient) conditions of the multiple Markov theorem on Angelesco sets: Markov's original conditions must be satisfied by each weight function.

LEMMA 3.3. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Lemma 3.2. Then  $b_i^{(k)}(t)$  is positive in a neighborhood of  $t_0$ , provided that*

$$\frac{1}{\omega_k(x;t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial t}(x;t), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

are increasing functions of  $x$  on  $(a_k, b_k)$ .

*Proof.* From (3), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\omega_k(x_{k,i}(t);t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial t}(x_{k,i}(t);t) \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t) P_n(x;t)}{x - x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x) = 0,$$

and, consequently, by adding this zero to the expression for  $b_i^{(k)}(t)$  given in the statement of Lemma 3.2, we obtain the desired result as indicated in Markov's original work (see [14, p. 179]). The details of this argument (see also [17, p. 116]), as timeless as it is elegant, are left to the reader.  $\square$

Taking into account Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, everything reduces to analyzing when the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , defined in Lemma 3.1, is invertible and, in such a case, determining under what conditions the entries of its inverse are positive. Note that, in the case of a singular Angelesco set, the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is simply the identity matrix. We now turn our attention to establishing practical and manageable sufficient conditions for the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  to qualify as an  $\mathcal{M}$ -matrix.

LEMMA 3.4. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Lemma 3.2. Suppose that all the measures are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure; that is,*

$$d\nu_k(x;t) = \omega_k(x;t) dx, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

*Suppose that  $\omega_k(x;t)$  is absolutely continuous on  $(a_k, b_k)$ . Then there exists a neighborhood of  $t_0$  in which  $\mathbf{A}(t)$  is an  $\mathcal{M}$ -matrix, provided that*

$$\frac{1}{\omega_k(x;t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial x}(x;t), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

are decreasing functions of  $x$  on  $(a_k, b_k)$ .

*Proof.* (The notation introduced in the proof of Lemma 3.1 will be used.) Given that  $\mathbf{A}(t)$  is a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -matrix, as established in Lemma 3.1, it follows from [10, p. 93] that it suffices to verify that this matrix is strictly diagonally dominant. Define

$$S_{k,i}(t) = 1 + \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_l} a_{i,j}^{(k,l)}(t),$$

and use  $a_{i,j}^{(k,l)}(t)$  and  $d_i^{(k)}(t)$  as defined in Lemma 3.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_i^{(k)}(t)S_{k,i}(t) &= \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t) \\ &\quad + \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq k}}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_l} \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{l,j}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t). \end{aligned}$$

From (3), we deduce that

$$0 = \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{n_k} \frac{P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,j}(t)} d\nu_k(x;t).$$

Adding this last expression to the right-hand side of the previous one and employing the logarithmic derivative of  $P_n(x;t)$ , we deduce that

$$d_i^{(k)}(t)S_{k,i}(t) = \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} \frac{\partial P_n}{\partial x}(x;t) d\nu_k(x;t).$$

Since  $\omega_k(x;t)$  is absolutely continuous on  $(a_k, b_k)$ , integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\left. \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} P_n(x;t) \omega_k(x;t) \right|_{a_k}^{b_k} \\ &= d_i^{(k)}(t)S_{k,i}(t) + \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} P_n(x;t) \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial x}(x;t) dx, \end{aligned}$$

because by (3),

$$\int \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} \right) P_n(x;t) d\nu_k(x;t) = 0.$$

Clearly,

$$\operatorname{sgn} \left( \left. \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} P_n(x;t) \omega_k(x;t) \right|_{a_k}^{b_k} \right) = \operatorname{sgn} d_i^{(k)}(t).$$

Moreover, using the argument employed in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} P_n(x;t) \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}(x;t) dx \\ &= \int Q_{n_k}(x;t) P_n(x;t) \frac{1}{\omega(x;t)} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}[x, x_{k,i}(t)] d\nu_k(x;t), \end{aligned}$$

and, consequently,

$$\operatorname{sgn} \left( \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} P_n(x;t) \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}(x;t) dx \right) = -\operatorname{sgn} d_i^{(k)}(t).$$

Therefore,  $S_{k,i}(t)$  is positive, and hence,  $\mathbf{A}(t)$  is strictly diagonally dominant, which proves the lemma.  $\square$

By synthesizing the essence of all the preceding lemmas, the culmination of the objectives outlined at the outset is achieved.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let  $\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m\}$  be an Angelesco set, with each measure depending on a parameter  $t$  that varies within a real open interval containing  $t_0$ . Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be chosen such that it admits an unordered integer partition  $n_1, \dots, n_m$  into  $m$  parts. Define  $P_n(x; t)$  as the monic MOPRL associated with the Angelesco set and the previously given partition of  $n$ . Suppose that all the measures are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure; that is,*

$$d\nu_k(x; t) = \omega_k(x; t) dx, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

*Suppose that  $\omega_k(x; t)$  is absolutely continuous on  $(a_k, b_k)$ . Then the zeros of  $P_n(x; t)$  are increasing (respectively, decreasing) functions of  $t$  in a neighborhood of  $t_0$ , provided that<sup>5</sup>*

$$(11) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_k(x; t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial t}(x; t), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

*are (respectively, decreasing) functions of  $x$  on  $(a_k, b_k)$  and*

$$(12) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_k(x; t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial x}(x; t), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

*are decreasing functions of  $x$  on  $(a_k, b_k)$ .*

The interested reader may now revisit the examples presented in the introduction and verify that all the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 are indeed satisfied. The arguments developed in the previous section provide significant flexibility for addressing situations beyond those considered in this note. Whenever a genuine necessity arises, the reader may adapt them to various contexts as needed. Let an example be considered. Assume the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 3.1, where we now additionally assume that the endpoints of the intervals depend on  $t$ , i.e.,  $a_k = a_k(t)$  and  $b_k = b_k(t)$ , and are continuously differentiable functions. Under these conditions, the zeros of  $P_n(x; t)$  are increasing (respectively, decreasing) functions of  $t$  in a neighborhood of  $t_0$ , provided that the functions in (11) are increasing (respectively, decreasing) with respect to  $x$  on their respective domains of definition, the functions in (12) are decreasing with respect to  $x$  on their respective domains of definition, and that both  $a_k(t)$  and  $b_k(t)$  are increasing (respectively, decreasing) functions of  $t$  for each  $k = 1, \dots, m$ . Indeed, rewriting the proof of Lemma 3.2 in this context, which involves the application of Leibniz's rule for differentiation under the integral sign, it is not difficult to conclude that  $\mathbf{A}(t) \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{c}(t)$ , where

$$\mathbf{c}(t) = \left( c_1^{(1)}(t), c_2^{(1)}(t), \dots, c_{n_1}^{(1)}(t), \dots, c_1^{(m)}(t), c_2^{(m)}(t), \dots, c_{n_m}^{(m)}(t) \right)^T,$$

---

<sup>5</sup>When there exists at least one  $k$  for which (11) is a strictly monotonic function, the zeros are strictly monotonic functions with respect to the parameter. The condition (12) does not play any role in this regard. This is derived by explicitly analyzing the structure of the inverse of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

with

$$\begin{aligned} c_i^{(k)}(t) & \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)P_n(x;t)}{(x-x_{k,i}(t))^2} d\nu_k(x;t) \\ & = \int \frac{Q_{n_k}(x;t)P_n(x;t)}{x-x_{k,i}(t)} \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial t}(x;t) dx + b'_k(t) \frac{Q_{n_k}(b_k(t);t)P_n(b_k(t);t)}{b_k(t)-x_{k,i}(t)} \\ & \quad - a'_k(t) \frac{Q_{n_k}(a_k(t);t)P_n(a_k(t);t)}{a_k(t)-x_{k,i}(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the expected result follows directly. Revisiting Example 1.1 once again, the reader may conclude that the zeros of  $P_n^{(a,b;a_1,b_1,c_1,a_2,b_2,c_2)}$  are decreasing functions of  $a$  and increasing functions of  $b$ , provided that the remaining parameters take positive values.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A. I. Aptekarev. Multiple orthogonal polynomials. *J. Comp. Appl. Math.*, 99:423–447, 1998.
- [2] R. Askey and J. Wilson. *Some basic hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials that generalize Jacobi polynomials*, volume 54. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 1985.
- [3] K. Casillo and I. Zaballa. On a formula of Thompson and McEntegert for the adjugate matrix. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 634:37–56, 2022.
- [4] K. Castillo. Markov’s theorem for weight functions on the unit circle. *Constr. Approx.*, 55:605–627, 2022.
- [5] J. Dieudonné. *Treatise on analysis. Vol. II (Enlarged and Corrected Printing)*. Translated from the French by I. G. Macdonald, volume 10-II of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1976.
- [6] A. Doliwa. Determinantal approach to multiple orthogonal polynomials and the corresponding integrable equations. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 153:12726, 2024.
- [7] E. J. C. dos Santos. Monotonicity of zeros of Jacobi-Angelesco polynomials. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145(11):4741–4750, 2017.
- [8] G. Freud. *Orthogonal polynomials*. Pergamon Press, Oxford-New York, 1971.
- [9] M. E. H. Ismail. *Classical and quantum orthogonal polynomials in one variable*, volume 98 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [10] C. R. Johnson, R. L. Smith, and M. J. Tsatsomeros. *Matrix positivity*, volume 221 of *Cambridge Tracts in Math*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020.
- [11] A. N. Kolmogorov and A. P. Yushkevich, editors. *Mathematics of the 19th century*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1998. Function theory according to Chebyshev, ordinary differential equations, calculus of variations, theory of finite differences, Translated from the 1987 Russian original by Roger Cooke.
- [12] M. Leurs. *Jacobi-Angelesco multiple orthogonal polynomials and applications*. PhD thesis, KU Leuven, Arenberg Doctoral School, 2022.
- [13] A. P. Magnus. Painlevé-type differential equations for the recurrence coefficients of semi-classical orthogonal polynomials. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 57(1-2):215–237, 1995.
- [14] A. Markoff. Sur les racines de certaines équations (second note). *Math. Ann.*, 27:177–182, 1886.
- [15] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein and R. Morales. Interlacing and monotonicity of zeros of Angelesco-Jacobi polynomials. *Pure Appl. Funct. Anal.*, 9(5):1259–1279, 2024.
- [16] E. M. Nikishin and V. N. Sorokin. *Rational Approximations and Orthogonality*, volume 92 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1991.
- [17] G. Szegő. *Orthogonal polynomials*, volume 23. Amer. Math. Soc. Coll. Publ., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., Fourth edition, 1975.
- [18] T. Tao. *Topics in random matrix theory*, volume 132 of *Grad. Stud. Math*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.

- [19] J. Yeh. *Real Analysis. Theory of Measure and Integration*. Word Scientific, 3rd edition, 2014.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partially supported by the Centre for Mathematics of the University of Coimbra, funded by the Portuguese Government through FCT/MCTES (DOI: 10.54499/UIDB/00324/2020). The first author acknowledges support from FCT through the grant DOI: 10.54499/2022.00143.CEECIND/CP1714/CT0002. The second author acknowledges support from FCT through the grant UI.BD.154694.2023.

CMUC, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA, 3000-143 COIMBRA,  
PORTUGAL  
*Email address:* `kenier@mat.uc.pt`

CMUC, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA, 3000-143 COIMBRA,  
PORTUGAL  
*Email address:* `up202310693@up.pt`