

# Tractable Characterization of Discrete-Time Periodic Monotonicity Preserving Systems \*

Christian Grussler<sup>†</sup>

April 1, 2025

## Abstract

This paper studies three classes of discrete-time linear time-invariant systems, which differ by the set of periodic signals that they leave invariant. The first class preserves the property of periodic monotonicity, i.e., period-wise unimodality. The second class is invariant to signals with at most two sign changes per period, and the third class results from the second by additionally requiring that periodic signals with zero sign-changes are mapped to the same kind. We provide tractable characterizations for each system class by the use and extension of total positivity theory and combination with its geometric interpretations. In particular, central to our results is the characterization of sequentially convex contours.

Moreover, as many static non-linearities, e.g., ideal relay, saturation, sigmoid function, quantizer, etc. also preserve these signal sets, our invariance characterizations also apply to the loop gain of Lur'e feedback systems. Thus, potentially forming the base for new developments of signal-based fixed-point theorems towards the prediction of self-sustained oscillations. In particular, our examples provide first indications for how the property of periodic monotonicity preservation is valuable to the study of relay feedback systems.

## 1 Introduction

Self-sustained (i.e., unforced) oscillation is a fundamental phenomenon that is observed and utilized across many areas of science and engineering. Examples range from mechanical vibrations [16], over gene regulation and brain rhythms [17, 24], to PID-autotuning [1] via relay feedback. Although a variety of invariance tools have been developed to predict self-oscillations, e.g., Lyapunov-based theory, the celebrated Poincaré-Bendixon theorem, Poincaré maps [12], contraction analysis [18, 23] or the heuristic of describing function analysis [12], the problem remains largely open to this day (see, e.g., the widely communicated challenge by Karl J. Åström to characterize the class of linear systems that exhibit self-oscillations in relay feedback).

In Lur'e feedback systems, i.e., the negative feedback interconnection of a linear time-invariant (LTI) system  $G$  with a static non-linearity  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (see Figure 1), the presence of a self-sustained oscillation with period  $T$  is equivalent to the existence of a  $T$ -periodic signal  $u^*$  satisfying

$$u^* = -\mathcal{S}_g \psi(u^*), \quad (1)$$

where  $[\mathcal{S}_g u](t) = (g * u)(t)$  is the convolution operator resulting from the linear system's impulse response  $g$ . In other words, the prediction of self-oscillations is a fixed-point problem in the domain of periodic functions, which necessitates the establishment of new fixed-point theorems. This work aims at facilitating such developments by characterizing systems that leave certain sets of periodic signals invariant – a natural first step, considering that fixed-point theorems are typically based on invariant set assumptions (see, e.g., [7]). Concretely, we consider two subsets of  $T$ -periodic signals:

---

\*This work was conducted while the author was a Jane and Larry Sherman Fellow. It was further supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no.2406/22).

<sup>†</sup>C. Grussler is with the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, 3200003 Haifa, Israel [cgrussler@technion.ac.il](mailto:cgrussler@technion.ac.il)




Figure 1: Lur'e feedback systems with linear time-invariant system  $G$  and static non-linearity  $\psi$ .

- ( $S_1$ ) *Periodically monotone* (PM( $T$ )) signals, i.e., signals with an unimodal (i.e., single-peaked) period.
- ( $S_2$ ) Signals with a variation (i.e, number of sign changes) of at most two per period.

Note that our choice of sets resembles the predictions made by describing function analysis (which approximates  $u^*$  by a sinusoid) [12], as well as several other studies, e.g., on relay feedback systems (see [3, 6, 15, 19]).

We provide tractable characterizations of linear-time invariant (LTI) discrete-time systems that leave either of these sets invariant by the use and extension of total positivity theory [11], i.e., the study of variation bound/diminishing linear operators. In the first case, these systems are commonly referred to as *periodic monotonicity preserving* (PMP( $T$ )) [11], where our results establish a complete characterization of all such convolution operators. In the second case, under certain mild assumptions, we also find such tractable certificates for the classes of so-called *2-periodically variation diminishing* (CVD<sub>2</sub>( $T$ )) and *bounding* (CVB<sub>2</sub>( $T$ )) systems [11], where the former additionally ensures that there is no increase of variation for signals of 0-variation. Note that the set of PM( $T$ ) signals is included in ( $S_2$ ) and as such,

$$\text{CVD}_2(T) \implies \text{CVB}_2(T) \implies \text{PMP}(T).$$

In other words, greater generality of the signal shape comes at the cost of more stringent requirements on the system and vice versa. Finally, both signal sets are preserved by several common static non-linearities, e.g., ideal relay, saturation, quantizer, sigmoid function, etc. In combination with our system classes, this provides a tractable class of Lur'e feedback systems for which our signal sets are left invariant by its *loop gain*  $u \mapsto -\mathcal{S}_g \psi(u)$ .

The presented results extend the existing literature in several crucial aspects: firstly, despite the long history of integral kernels with the above invariance properties (see, e.g., the monograph [11] and [21]), the more general discrete-time case has not been considered yet. In fact, using standard sampling and limit arguments, the present work may be used to recover and extend these earlier results. Secondly, using existing total positivity theory [11], one can directly characterize CVD<sub>2</sub>( $T$ ) and CVB<sub>2</sub>( $T$ ) systems in terms of the *3-sign-consistency* of a corresponding cyclic matrix, i.e., all of its minors of order 3 share the same sign. However, checking all such minors quickly becomes intractable for large  $T$ . In this work, we resolve this issue by showing that only a very small subset of these minors is required. In particular, this enables us to arrive at tractable discrete-time analogues of [21] for PMP( $T$ ), as well as new extensions to CVB<sub>2</sub>( $T$ ) and CVD<sub>2</sub>( $T$ ). Lastly, contrary to the analysis-based investigations in [21], this work relies on total positivity theory and reinterprets its algebraic results geometrically. This approach comes with the advantage that a new tractable certificate for the verification of 3-sign consistency can be derived from the geometric property of  $T$ -periodic convex contours. The latter is central to our system characterizations and establishes a new connection between CVD<sub>2</sub> and convex contours. We also introduce and study so far neglected strict notions, which differ in how the variation is computed in the event of zero elements.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. After some preliminaries in Section 2, we review the theory of cyclic variation bounding and total positivity Section 3. Subsequently, we derive our main result on the characterization of sequentially convex contours in Section 4 and provide our convolution operator characterizations in Section 5. In Section 6, these results are illustrated by application to LTI and relay feedback systems. Conclusions are drawn in Section 7 and proofs are left to the appendix.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce notations and concepts that are essential for our subsequent discussions and derivations.

### 2.1 Notations

#### 2.1.1 Sets

We write  $\mathbb{Z}$  for the set of integers and  $\mathbb{R}$  for the set of reals, with  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  standing for the respective subsets of nonnegative elements – corresponding notations are also used for subsets starting from non-zero values, strict inequality as well as reversed inequality signs. For  $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we use  $(k : l) = \{k, k + 1, \dots, l\}$  if  $k \leq l$  and  $(k : l) = \{k, k - 1, \dots, l\}$  otherwise. The set of increasing  $r$ -tuples with elements in  $(1 : n)$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_{n,r} := \{v = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \subset \mathbb{N} : 1 \leq v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_r \leq n\}$$

where the  $i$ -th element of this set is a result of *lexicographic ordering*.

#### 2.1.2 Sequences

If a sequence  $x : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  fulfills  $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |x(i)| < \infty$  or  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |x(i)| < \infty$ , we write  $x \in \ell_\infty$  or  $x \in \ell_1$ , respectively. The *forward difference* of  $x$  is defined by  $\Delta x(t) := x(t + 1) - x(t)$ . The restriction of  $x$  to  $(k : l)$  is denoted by  $x(k : l)$ .  $x$  is called  *$T$ -periodic*,  $T \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ , if  $x(i) = x(i + T)$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  with the set of all  $T$ -periodic sequences being denoted by  $\ell_\infty(T)$ . The sequence of all ones is denoted by  $\mathbf{1}$  and the vector of all ones in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by  $\mathbf{1}_n$ .

#### 2.1.3 Matrices

For matrices  $X = (x_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , we say that  $X$  is *nonnegative*,  $X \geq 0$  or  $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times m}$  if all elements  $x_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  – corresponding notations are also used for matrices with strictly positive entries, reversed inequality signs. If  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , then  $\sigma(X) = \{\lambda_1(X), \dots, \lambda_n(X)\}$  denotes its *spectrum*, where the eigenvalues are ordered by descending absolute value, i.e.,  $\lambda_1(X)$  is the eigenvalue with the largest magnitude, counting multiplicity. If the magnitude of two eigenvalues coincides, we sub-sort them by decreasing real part. A (*consecutive*)  $j$ -*minor* of  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  is a minor that is constructed of (consecutive)  $j$  columns and  $j$  rows of  $X$ . The sub-matrix with rows  $\mathcal{I} \subset (1 : n)$  and columns  $\mathcal{J} \subset (1 : m)$  is written as  $X_{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})}$ , where we also use the notions  $X_{(:, \mathcal{J})} := X_{((1:n), \mathcal{J})}$ ,  $X_{(\mathcal{I}, :)} := X_{(\mathcal{I}, (1:m))}$ . In case of subvectors, we simply write  $x_{\mathcal{I}}$ .

We define the  $(i, j)$ -th entry of the so-called  $r$ -th *multiplicative compound matrix*  $X_{[r]} \in \mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{r} \times \binom{m}{r}}$  of  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  by  $\det(X_{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})})$ , where  $\mathcal{I}$  is the  $i$ -th and  $\mathcal{J}$  is the  $j$ -th element in  $\mathcal{I}_{n,r}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{m,r}$ , respectively. For example, if  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ , then

$$X_{[2]} = \begin{bmatrix} \det(X_{\{1,2\},\{1,2\}}) & \det(X_{\{1,2\},\{1,3\}}) & \det(X_{\{1,2\},\{2,3\}}) \\ \det(X_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}) & \det(X_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}) & \det(X_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}}) \\ \det(X_{\{2,3\},\{1,2\}}) & \det(X_{\{2,3\},\{1,3\}}) & \det(X_{\{2,3\},\{2,3\}}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The term *multiplicative* refers to the fact that for  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$  and  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$  the so-called *Cauchy-Binet formula* [10, Subsection 0.8.1] applies

$$(XY)_{[r]} = X_{[r]}Y_{[r]}, \quad 1 \leq r \leq \min\{n, m, p\}. \quad (2)$$

The *cyclic matrix* corresponding to  $g \in \ell_\infty(T)$  is defined by

$$C^g := \begin{bmatrix} g(0) & g(T-1) & \dots & g(1) \\ g(1) & g(0) & \dots & g(2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ g(T-1) & g(T-3) & \dots & g(0) \end{bmatrix}$$

### 2.1.4 Functions

Finally, the indicator function of a subset  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}$  is denoted by

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}}(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & x \in \mathcal{S} \\ 0 & x \notin \mathcal{S}, \end{cases}$$

the *Heaviside function* by  $s(t) := \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(t)$ , the *unit pulse function* by  $\delta(t) := \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(t)$  and the *sign function* by  $\text{sign}(t) := \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_{> 0}}(t) - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_{< 0}}(t)$ .

## 2.2 Linear Dynamic Systems

We consider discrete-time linear time-invariant systems with input signal  $u \in \ell_{\infty}$  and output signal  $y \in \ell_{\infty}$ , where the *impulse-response*  $g \in \ell_1$  is the output of  $u = \delta$ . Inputs are link to outputs via the *convolution operator* as

$$y(t) = [\mathcal{S}_g u](t) := (g * u)(t) := \sum_{\tau=-\infty}^{\infty} g(t - \tau)u(\tau), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3)$$

where in case of  $u \in \ell_{\infty}(T)$ , this also reads as

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{S}_g u](t) &= \sum_{\tau=-\infty}^{\infty} g(t - \tau)u(\tau) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\tau=kT}^{(k+1)T-1} g(t - \tau)u(\tau) \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\tau=0}^{T-1} g(t - kT - \tau)u(kT + \tau) = \sum_{\tau=0}^{T-1} g_T(t - \tau)u(\tau) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with

$$g_T(t) := \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} g(t - kT) \in \ell_{\infty}(T). \quad (5)$$

denoting the *periodic summation* of  $g$ . Therefore, if  $g \in \ell_{\infty}(T)$ , we also define  $\mathcal{S}_g : \ell_{\infty}(T) \rightarrow \ell_{\infty}(T)$  by

$$(\mathcal{S}_g u)(t) := (g * u)(t) := \sum_{\tau=0}^{T-1} g(t - \tau)u(\tau), \quad t \in (0 : T - 1), \quad (6)$$

which can equivalently be identified with

$$y(0 : T - 1) = C^g u(0 : T - 1). \quad (7)$$

In particular, if  $g$  is the impulse response to a causal LTI systems with *transfer function*

$$G(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} g(k)z^{-k}$$

and *state-space realization*  $(A, b, c)$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} x(t+1) &= Ax(t) + bu(t) \\ y(t) &= cx(t) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $b, c^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $|\lambda_1(A)| < 1$ , then  $g(t) = cA^{t-1}bs(t-1)$  and its periodic summation computes as

$$g_T(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} g(t + kT) = cA^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} cA^{kT}b = cA^{t-1}(I_n - A^T)^{-1}b \quad (9)$$

for  $t \in (1 : T)$ . Note that  $g_T(1 : T) = \bar{g}(1 : T)$ , where  $\bar{g}$  is the impulse response of  $(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}) := (A, (I_n - A^T)^{-1}b, c)$  and

$$\Delta g_T(t) = \begin{cases} \bar{c}\bar{A}^{t-1}(\bar{A} - I_n)\bar{b} & \text{if } t \in (1 : T - 1) \\ \bar{c}(I_n - A^{T-1})\bar{b} & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (10)$$

### 3 Cyclic Variation Bounding Properties

The goal of this work is to provide tractable characterization of convolution operators with cyclic variation diminishing/bounding properties. In order to define and study these, we will need the following notions and preliminary results.

#### 3.1 Variation Bounding

**Definition 1** (Variation). *The variation of a vector  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is defined as the number of sign-changes in  $u$ , i.e.,*

$$S^-[u] := \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_{<0}}(\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_{i+1}), \quad S^-[0] := -1,$$

where  $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the vector that results from deleting all zeros in  $u$ . Further, we define the strict variation as  $S^+[u] := \limsup_{p \rightarrow u} S^-[p]$ , i.e., the maximum number of possible sign changes in  $u$  by allowing each zero in  $u$  to be replaced by  $\pm 1$ . The same notations are also used for sequences  $u \in \ell_\infty$ .

Although  $S^-[u] \leq S^+[u]$ , equality does not necessarily hold, e.g.,  $S^-[(1 \ 0 \ 2)] = S^-[(1 \ 2)] = 0$ , but  $S^+[(1 \ 0 \ 2)] = S^-[(1 \ -1 \ 2)] = 2$ . In particular, the following limit inequalities hold true [11, Lemma 5.1.1]:

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then,  $S^-[u] \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} S^+[x(t)]$  and  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} S^-[x(t)] \leq S^+[u]$ .*

Based on these definitions, we can also define their so-called cyclic analogues.

**Definition 2** (Cyclic Variation). *For a vector  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , its cyclic variation is defined by*

$$S_c^-[u] := \sup_{i \in (1:n)} S^-[(u_i \ u_{i+1} \ \dots \ u_n \ u_1 \ \dots \ u_i)]$$

and its strict cyclic variation by

$$S_c^+[u] := \sup_{i \in (1:n)} S^+[(u_i \ u_{i+1} \ \dots \ u_n \ u_1 \ \dots \ u_i)].$$

It is important to note that  $S_c^-[u]$  and  $S_c^+[u]$  are always *even* for  $u \neq 0$ , because

$$S_c^-[u] = \begin{cases} S^-[u] + 1 & \text{if } S^-[u] \text{ is odd,} \\ S^-[u] & \text{if } S^-[u] \text{ is even,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

and analogously for  $S_c^+[u]$ . With slight abuse of notation, we also apply these definitions to  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  and mean that we evaluate the cycle variations of  $u(0 : T - 1)$ , which by (11) is uniquely determined by  $S^-[u(0 : T - 1)]$  and  $S^+[u(0 : T - 1)]$ , respectively.

### 3.1.1 Variation Diminishing & Bounding

We are ready, now, to define the notions of variation diminishing/bounding linear mappings.

**Definition 3** (*k*-variation bounding/diminishing). For  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $k \in (0 : m - 1)$ , the linear map  $u \mapsto Xu$  is said to be

- (strictly) *k*-variation bounding ((S)VB<sub>k</sub>), if for all  $u \neq 0$  with  $S^-[u] \leq k$  it holds that  $S^-[Xu] \leq k$  ( $S^+[Xu] \leq k$ ).
- (strictly) *k*-variation diminishing ((S)VD<sub>k</sub>), if  $X$  is (S)VB<sub>j</sub> for all  $j \in (0 : k)$ .

The same notions are also used for operators  $X : \ell_\infty \rightarrow \ell_\infty$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . For brevity, we write  $X \in (S)VB_k$  and  $X \in (S)VD_k$ , respectively.

By replacing the variations in Definition 3 with their cyclic counter-parts, we also get the corresponding definitions of (strictly) cyclic *2k*-variation bounding CVB<sub>2k</sub>) and (strictly) cyclic *2k*-variation diminishing ((S)CVD<sub>2k</sub>), where in the operator case, we consider  $X : \ell_\infty(T) \rightarrow \ell_\infty(T)$ . The sufficiency of only considering even cyclic cases is due to (11), which also yields the following direct equivalences:

**Lemma 2.** Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then, the following hold:

- $S^-[u] \leq 2k$  ( $S^+[u] \leq 2k$ ) if and only if  $S_c^-[u] \leq 2k$  ( $S_c^+[u] \leq 2k$ ).
- $X \in (S)CVD_{2k}$  if and only if  $X \in (S)CVB_{2j}$  for all  $j = (0 : k)$ .
- $X \in (S)CVB_{2k}$  if and only if  $X \in (S)VB_{2k}$ .

### 3.1.2 Periodic Monotonicity Preservation

We further consider the shift invariant relaxation of (S)VB<sub>2</sub> of preserving *periodic monotonicity*, where the latter notion is defined as follows:

**Definition 4** (Periodic Monotonicity).  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  is called (strictly) *T*-periodically monotone ( $u \in (S)PM(T)$ ) if  $S_c^-[u - \gamma \mathbf{1}] \leq 2$  ( $S_c^+[u - \gamma \mathbf{1}] \leq 2$ ) for all  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ .

In other words,  $u \in PM(T)$  cannot cross any horizontal line more than twice in a period or equivalently, there exist  $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_1 + T - 1$  such that  $u(t)$  is nonincreasing on  $(t_1 : t_2)$  and nondecreasing on  $(t_2 : t_1 + T - 1)$ . In the strict case,  $u \in SPM(T)$  is additionally required to possess at most one  $t \in (0 : T - 1)$  with  $\Delta u(t) = 0$ , which then has to fulfill  $\text{sign}(\Delta u(t - 1)) = -\text{sign}(\Delta u(t + 1)) \neq 0$ . Thus, in our derivations, we can use the following equivalent characterization:

**Lemma 3.** Let  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$ , then  $u \in (S)PM(T)$  if and only if  $S_c^-[ \Delta u ] \leq 2$  ( $S_c^+[ \Delta u ] \leq 2$ ).

Finally, let us define *periodic monotonicity preservation* for operators  $X : \ell_\infty(T) \rightarrow \ell_\infty(T)$ .

**Definition 5** (Periodic Monotonicity Preservation). A map  $X : \ell_\infty(T) \rightarrow \ell_\infty(T)$ ,  $T \geq 2$ , is said to be (strictly) *T*-periodic monotonicity preserving ((S)PMP(*T*)) if  $Xu \in (S)PM(T)$  for all  $u \in PM(T)$  with  $\Delta u \neq 0$ . For brevity, we write  $X \in (S)PMP(T)$ .

Note that the cases of  $T \in \{2, 3\}$  are not quite of interest, since the (strict) cyclic variation of vectors with dimensions smaller or equal to three cannot exceed two.

### 3.2 Total Positivity

Investigations of linear variation bounding mappings have a long history in areas such as interpolation theory, complex analysis, statistics, mechanics, etc. (see, e.g., the monographs [5, 11]). Within the systems and control community, however, such investigations have just begun (see, e.g., [2, 4, 8, 13, 14, 18, 20]). Central to the characterization of such mappings is the mathematical framework of *total positivity* [11]. Introduction of this framework requires the following matrix notions:

**Definition 6.** Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $k \leq \min\{m, n\}$ .  $X$  is called  $k$ -sign consistent ( $SC_k$ ) if  $X_{[k]} \geq 0$  or  $X_{[k]} \leq 0$ , and strictly  $k$ -sign consistent ( $SSC_k$ ) if  $X_{[k]} > 0$  or  $X_{[k]} < 0$ . For brevity, we write  $X \in (S)SC_k$ .

Note that  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  is 0-variation bounding/diminishing if and only if  $X = X_{[1]} \in SC_0$ , i.e., all entries share the same sign. This characterization also generalizes as follows [11, 20]:

**Proposition 1.** For  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $n \geq m$ , the following hold:

- i) if  $k \leq \min\{m, n\} - 1$ , then  $X \in SVB_{k-1}$  if and only if  $X \in SSC_k$ .
- ii) if  $\text{rank}(X) = m < n$ , then  $X \in VB_{m-1}$  if and only if  $X \in SC_m$ .
- iii) if  $r = \text{rank}(X) < m$ , then  $S^-[Xu] \leq \text{rank}(X) - 1$  for all  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  if and only if each column of  $X_{[r]}$  is  $SC_0$ .
- iv) if  $k < \text{rank}(X)$  and any  $k$  columns of  $X$  are linearly independent, then  $X \in VB_{k-1}$  if and only if  $X \in SC_k$ .

By Lemma 2 iii), analogous cyclic characterizations then read:

**Corollary 1.** Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $n \geq m$ . Then, the following hold:

- i) if  $2k + 2 \leq \min\{m, n\}$ , then  $X \in SCVB_{2k}$  if and only if  $X \in SSC_{2k+1}$ .
- ii) if  $\text{rank}(X) = m = 2k + 1 < n$ , then  $X \in CVB_{2k}$  if and only if  $X \in SC_{2k+1}$ .
- iii) if  $\text{rank}(X) = r < m$ , then  $S_c^-[Xu] \leq 2\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil$  for all  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  if each column of  $X_{[r]}$  is  $SC_0$ .
- iv) if  $2k + 1 < \text{rank}(X)$  and any  $2k + 1$  columns of  $X$  are linearly independent, then  $X \in CVB_{2k}$  if and only if  $X \in SC_{2k+1}$ .

Verifying that  $X \in (S)SC_m$  requires a tractable way of checking whether all elements in  $X_{[m]}$  share the same (strict) sign. Instead of computing all entries in  $X_{[m]}$ , certain strictness assumptions make it sufficient to only consider consecutive minors [11, Thm. 3.3.1]:

**Proposition 2.** Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $n \geq m$ , be such that

- i) all consecutive  $j$ -minors of  $X_{(:, (m:m-j+1))}$  share the same strict sign for all  $j \in (1 : m - 1)$ .
- ii) all consecutive  $m$ -minors of  $X$  share the same (strict) sign.

Then,  $X$  is  $(S)SC_m$ .

## 4 Convex Contours

In this section we present our first main result on the tractable characterization of so-called sequentially convex contours. This is a crucial intermediate result in preparation for our certificates of  $\mathcal{S}_g$  belonging to  $(S)PMP(T)$ ,  $(S)CVD_2(T)$  or  $(S)CVD_2(T)$ . Our result also establishes a natural generalization of Proposition 2 in case of  $m = 3$  and raises the non-trivial open question of extensions for  $m > 3$ .

## 4.1 Monotonicity & Convexity

We begin by showing that for  $m = 2$  and  $m = 3$ , Proposition 2 follows from the locality properties of monotonicity and convexity, respectively. Our characterization of convex contours will then follow naturally from these geometric interpretations.

**Definition 7** (Monotonicity).  $f : \mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called (strictly) monotonically decreasing if  $f(t_{i_1})(>) \geq f(t_{i_2})$  for all  $t_{i_1} < t_{i_2}$  from  $\mathcal{D}$ .  $f$  is (strictly) monotonically increasing if  $-f$  is (strictly) monotonically decreasing.

The following characterization of monotonicity by sign consistency follows from direct computations:

**Lemma 4.** Let  $f : \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $t_i < t_{i+1}$  for all  $i \in (1 : n - 1)$  and

$$M^f := \begin{bmatrix} f(t_1) & 1 \\ f(t_2) & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ f(t_n) & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then, the following are equivalent:

- i)  $f$  is (strictly) monotonically decreasing.
- ii)  $M_{[2]}^f(>) \geq 0$ .
- iii) For all  $i \in (1 : n - 1)$  it holds that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} f(t_i) & 1 \\ f(t_{i+1}) & 1 \end{bmatrix} (>) \geq 0$$

Alternatively, Lemma 4 can also be verified by noticing that a function is monotone if and only if it crosses any value in  $\mathbb{R}$  at most once and cannot remain in a value under the additional strictness assumption. As this property is invariant with respect to scaling and translation, this translates to

$$\forall u \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} : (S^+[u_1 f + u_2 \mathbf{1}]) S^-[u_1 f + u_2 \mathbf{1}] \leq 1,$$

which by Propositions 1 ii) and 1 iii) leads to the same conclusion. Moreover, Proposition 2 in case of  $m = 2$  can be recovered by from Lemma 4 by noticing that if the second column of  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2}$  consists of elements with the same strict sign, then by (2)

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} x_{12} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & x_{n2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_{11}}{x_{12}} & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{x_{n1}}{x_{n2}} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in (\text{S})\text{SC}_2 \quad (12)$$

if and only if the second factor is  $(\text{S})\text{SC}_2$ . Interpreting this second factor as the matrix  $M^f$  in Lemma 4, it follows from Lemma 4 iii) that it is enough to verify that only consecutive 2-minors share the same sign. This, however, is equivalent to checking the consecutive 2-minors of  $X$  itself.

Next, we will move on the case of  $m = 3$  and its links to convexity.

**Definition 8** (Convexity/Concavity). Let  $\mathcal{D} := \{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ . Then,  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is (strictly) convex if for all fixed  $\tau \in \mathcal{D}$

$$s(t, \tau) := \frac{f(t) - f(\tau)}{t - \tau} = \frac{f(\tau) - f(t)}{\tau - t} \quad (13)$$

is (strictly) monotonically increasing in  $t$  on  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \{\tau\}$ .  $f$  is called (strictly) concave if  $-f$  is (strictly) convex.



Note that this definition of convexity via the so-called *slope function*  $s(t, \tau)$  is a well-known equivalence in the theory of continuous convex functions [9, Proposition 1.1.4]. Moreover, by [9, Proposition 5.3.1], it follows that the piecewise-linear continuous extension  $\bar{f} : [t_1, t_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of  $f$  defined by

$$\bar{f}(t) := f(t_i) + \frac{f(t_{i+1}) - f(t_i)}{t_{i+1} - t_i}(t - t_i), t_i \leq t \leq t_{i+1} \quad (14)$$

is convex if and only if its right-derivatives are monotonically increasing. However, by the piecewise-linearity, these derivatives correspond to  $s(t_{i+1}, t_i)$ . Expressing the monotonicity of the slope function  $s(t, \tau)$  via Lemma 4, gives the following characterizations in terms of sign-consistency:

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $f : \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $t_i < t_{i+1}$  for all  $i \in (1 : n - 1)$  and*

$$M^f := \begin{bmatrix} t_1 & f(t_1) & 1 \\ t_2 & f(t_2) & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ t_n & f(t_n) & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

*Then, the following are equivalent:*

- i)  $f$  is (strictly) convex.*
- ii)  $\bar{f}$  in (14) is convex (and no three points of  $\{(t_i, f(t_i)) : t_i \in \mathcal{D}\}$  are co-linear).*
- iii)  $M_{[3]}^f(>) \geq 0$ .*
- iv) For all  $i \in (1 : n - 2)$  it holds that*

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} t_i & f(t_i) & 1 \\ t_{i+1} & f(t_{i+1}) & 1 \\ t_{i+2} & f(t_{i+2}) & 1 \end{bmatrix} (>) \geq 0.$$

Using Propositions 1 ii) and 1 iii), it can be seen that  $f$  is either convex or concave if and only if each line  $H := \{(x, y) : L_\alpha(x, y) := \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 x + \alpha_3 y = 0\}$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , is crossed at most twice by the curve  $\gamma : \{t_1, \dots, t_n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $\gamma(t_i) := (t_i, f(t_i))$ ,  $i \in (1 : n)$  and no more than two points of  $\gamma$  can be co-linear. Thus, drawing the connection to the classical definition of convexity/concavity. In terms of variation bounding, this reads as

$$\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3 : S^- [L_\alpha(\gamma)] (S^+ [L_\alpha(\gamma)]) \leq 2. \quad (15)$$

Again Proposition 2, in case of  $m = 3$ , can be recovered from Lemma 5 by applying the analogues factorization argument as in (12).

## 4.2 Convex Contours

Next, we will extend these observations to establish our first main result on the characterization of so-called (strictly) convex contours, which we define directly in terms of our variation notions:

**Definition 9.** *A sequentially  $T$ -periodic curve  $\gamma : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is called a convex contour ( $\gamma \in \text{CC}(T)$ ) if for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$  it holds that  $S_c^- [\alpha_1 \gamma_1 + \alpha_2 \gamma_2 + \alpha_3] \leq 2$ .  $\gamma$  is said to be a strictly convex contour ( $\gamma \in \text{SCC}(T)$ ) if  $S_c^-$  can be replaced by  $S_c^+$ .*

Visually, if  $\gamma \in \text{CC}(T)$  does not lie on a line, then the polygon

$$\mathcal{P}_\gamma(t) := \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1(\lfloor t \rfloor) + (t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \gamma_1(\lceil t \rceil) \\ \gamma_2(\lfloor t \rfloor) + (t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \gamma_2(\lceil t \rceil) \end{bmatrix}, \quad t \in [0, T] \quad (16)$$

that results from connecting  $\gamma(0), \gamma(1), \dots, \gamma(T-1), \gamma(0)$  sequentially must be the boundary of a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and the curve must be *simple* (i.e., non-intersecting apart from consecutive points  $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(t) = \mathcal{P}_\gamma(t+1)$ ). In the strict case, it is additionally required that no three vertices of the polygon can be co-linear (see Figure 2 in Section 6).

Using Proposition 1 and Lemma 5, sequentially convex contours can be tractably characterized as follows:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\gamma : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be  $T$ -periodic with  $T \geq 4$ ,*

$$M^\gamma := \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1(0) & \gamma_2(0) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(1) & \gamma_2(1) & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \gamma_1(T-1) & \gamma_2(T-1) & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

and  $\tilde{\gamma} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be the  $\tilde{T}$ -periodic sequence that results from deleting all points with indices  $\mathcal{I}_0 := \{t \in \mathbb{Z} : \Delta\gamma(t) = 0\}$  from  $\gamma$ . If  $\text{rank}(M^\gamma) = 3$ , then the following are equivalent:

i)  $\gamma \in (S)\text{CC}(T)$ .

ii)  $M_{[3]}^\gamma \in (S)\text{SC}_3$ .

iii) All determinants

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1(t_1) & \gamma_2(t_1) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(t_2) & \gamma_2(t_2) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(t_3) & \gamma_2(t_3) & 1 \end{bmatrix}, t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_1 + T \quad (18)$$

share the same (strict) sign.

iv)  $P_\gamma$  is simple such that the set enclosed by  $P_\gamma([0, T])$  is convex (and no three points of  $\gamma(0 : T-1)$  are co-linear).

v) All determinants

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta\tilde{\gamma}_1(t) & \Delta\tilde{\gamma}_2(t) \\ \Delta\tilde{\gamma}_1(t+1) & \Delta\tilde{\gamma}_2(t+1) \end{bmatrix}, t \in (0, \tilde{T}-1) \quad (19)$$

share the same (strict) sign and  $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in (S)\text{PM}(\tilde{T})$ .

If  $\text{rank}(M^\gamma) = 2$ , then  $\gamma \in \text{CC}(T)$  if and only if  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \text{PM}(T)$ .

Note that the requirement for using  $\tilde{\gamma}$  in Theorem 1 v) cannot be removed. An example for this is the following

$$M^\gamma := \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1(0) & \gamma_2(0) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(1) & \gamma_2(1) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(2) & \gamma_2(2) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(3) & \gamma_2(3) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(4) & \gamma_2(4) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(5) & \gamma_2(5) & 1 \\ \gamma_1(6) & \gamma_2(6) & 1 \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0.5 & 0 & 1 \\ 0.5 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \text{PM}(7)$ . The corresponding determinants defined in (19) are zero, but  $S_c^-[M^\gamma\alpha] = 4$  for  $\alpha = [-1 \ 1 \ 0.25]^\top$ . Deletion of consecutive repetitive points in  $\gamma$  yields a new 4-periodic  $\tilde{\gamma}$  with

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\gamma}_1(0) & \tilde{\gamma}_2(0) \\ \tilde{\gamma}_1(1) & \tilde{\gamma}_2(1) \\ \tilde{\gamma}_1(2) & \tilde{\gamma}_2(2) \\ \tilde{\gamma}_1(3) & \tilde{\gamma}_2(3) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 0.5 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where this time

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_1(0) & \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_2(0) \\ \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_1(1) & \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_2(1) \end{bmatrix} = 1, \quad \det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_1(2) & \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_2(2) \\ \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_1(3) & \Delta \tilde{\gamma}_2(3) \end{bmatrix} = -0.5.$$

**Remark 1.** From the proof of Theorem 1, it can be deduced that if  $\mathcal{I}_+ := \{i \in (0 : T - 1) : \Delta \gamma_1(i) > 0\} = (T_0 : T_p)$  and  $\mathcal{I}_- := \{i \in (0 : T - 1) : \Delta \gamma_1(i) < 0\} = (T_b : T_n)$ ,  $T_p < T_b$  and  $S^-[\Delta \gamma_2(T_p + 1 : T_b - 1)] = S^-[\Delta \gamma_2(T_p + 1 : T_b - 1)] = 0$ , then  $\tilde{\gamma}$  can be replaced by  $\gamma$ . In particular, this is implied by  $\gamma_1 \in \text{SPM}(T)$ , because then  $T_b \leq T_p + 2$  due to Lemma 3.

Further, from the proof of Theorem 1, it can also be seen that the difference between positive and negative signs in (18) is due to the *orientation* of  $\mathcal{P}_\gamma$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{P}_\gamma$  is *positively (counter-clockwise)/negatively (clock-wise) oriented* if and only if the determinants in (18) are nonnegative/nonpositive.

Finally, by the same factorization as for  $m = 2$ , Theorem 1 provides a direct extension of Proposition 2 for the case of  $m = 3$ , which we will use to characterize  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{CVB}_2$ . However, this also raises the open question of how to geometrically extend these results to  $m > 3$ .

## 5 Cyclic Variation Bounding Systems

In this section, we will use Theorem 1 to derive our tractable certificates for kernels  $g \in \ell_\infty(T)$ , which define convolution operators  $\mathcal{S}_g$  property (S)PMP( $T$ ), (S)CVB<sub>2</sub>( $T$ ) or (S)CVD<sub>2</sub>( $T$ ). The latter two classes are discussed first.

### 5.1 Cyclic 2-Variation Diminishing/Bounding

By (7) and Lemmas 2 ii) and 2 iii),  $\mathcal{S}_g$  lies (S)CVD<sub>2</sub>( $T$ ) (or (S)CVB<sub>2</sub>( $T$ )) if and only if these properties are shared by  $C^g$ . Although this could be checked directly by computing all 3-minors of  $C^g$  (see Corollary 1), the following result establishes a significant reduction in complexity:

**Theorem 2.** For  $g \in \ell_\infty(T)$ ,  $T \geq 3$ , it holds that all 3-minors of  $C^g$  are sums of 3-minors of  $C^g_{(:,(1:3))}$ . In particular, if  $\text{rank}(C^g_{(:,(1:3))}) = 3$ , then the following are equivalent:

- i)  $\mathcal{S}_g \in (S)VB_2$
- ii)  $C^g \in (S)SC_3$
- iii)  $C^g_{(:,(1:3))} \in (S)SC_3$

The equivalence between the last two items is true independently of the rank assumption.

Assuming that additionally  $g(0 : T - 1) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^T \cup \mathbb{R}_{<0}^T$ ,  $C^g_{(:,(1:3))}$  can be factored as

$$\begin{bmatrix} g(T-2) & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & g(T-3) & \\ & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{g(0)}{g(T-2)} & \frac{g(T-1)}{g(T-2)} & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{g(T-1)}{g(T-3)} & \frac{g(T-2)}{g(T-3)} & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which by (2) and Theorems 1 and 2 shows that  $C^g \in (S)SC_3$  if and only if

$$\gamma : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad t \mapsto \left( \frac{g(t)}{g(t-2)}, \frac{g(t-1)}{g(t-2)} \right) \quad (20)$$

is a (strictly) convex contour. In particular, since

$$\frac{g(t)}{g(t-2)} = \frac{g(t)}{g(t-1)} \frac{g(t-1)}{g(t-2)},$$

it follows that  $\Delta\gamma(t) = 0$  if and only if  $\frac{g(t)}{g(t-1)} = \frac{g(t+1)}{g(t)}$ . By induction, this leads to  $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1^2 \equiv a \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , which is why the use of  $\tilde{\gamma}$  in Theorem 1 v) can be disregarded. In conjunction with Corollary 1, we arrive at the following characterization for  $\text{VD}_2(T)$ :

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $g \in \ell_\infty(T)$ ,  $T \geq 4$ , with  $g(0 : T-1) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^T \cup \mathbb{R}_{<0}^T$  and  $\gamma$  as defined in (20). Then, if  $\text{rank}(C^g_{(:,(1:3))}) = 3$ , the following are equivalent:*

- i)  $\mathcal{S}_g \in (S)\text{CVB}_2$
- ii)  $C^g \in (S)\text{SC}_3$
- iii)  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (S)\text{PM}(T)$  and all determinants

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta\gamma_1(t) & \Delta\gamma_2(t) \\ \Delta\gamma_1(t+1) & \Delta\gamma_2(t+1) \end{bmatrix}, t \in (0 : T-1)$$

share the same (strict) sign.

## 5.2 PMP Kernels

Finally, we will derive our characterizations of convolution operators  $\mathcal{S}_g \in (S)\text{PMP}(T)$ . We begin by noticing that if  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{CVB}_2(T)$ , then  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{PMP}(T)$ . In fact, for any  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds that  $\mathcal{S}_g u - \gamma \mathbf{1} = \mathcal{S}_g(u - \beta \mathbf{1})$  for some  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus, if  $u \in \text{PM}(T)$ , then  $S_c^-[u - \beta \mathbf{1}] \leq 2$ , which is why  $S_c^-[S_g u - \gamma \mathbf{1}] \leq 2$  if  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{CVB}_2(T)$ . By the following equivalence, it can be seen  $\text{CVB}_2 \neq \text{PMP}(T)$ :

**Lemma 6.** *For  $g \in \ell_\infty(T)$ , the following are equivalent:*

- i)  $\mathcal{S}_g \in (S)\text{PMP}(T)$ .
- ii) For all  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  with  $S_c^-[u] = 2$ , it holds that  $S_c^-[S_g u] \leq 2$  (and  $S_c^+[S_g u] \leq 2$  in the strict case).
- iii) For all  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  with  $\sum_{i=0}^T u(i) = 0$  and  $S_c^-[u] = 2$ , it holds that  $S_c^-[S_g u] \leq 2$  (and  $S_c^+[S_g u] \leq 2$  in the strict case).

In other words, by Lemma 6 iii),  $\text{PMP}(T)$  does not require  $S_c^-[S_g u] \leq 2$  for all  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  with  $S_c^-[u] \leq 2$  and as such implies viewer constraints than  $\text{CVB}_2(T)$ . A concrete example of  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{PMP}(T)$  with  $\mathcal{S}_g \notin \text{VB}_2(T)$  is given in Section 6.

Next, we need the notion of *convexity-preservation*, which we will see is equivalent to  $\text{PMP}(T)$  and will allow us to utilize Theorem 1 for our investigations:

**Definition 10** (Convexity Preservation). *For  $g \in \ell_\infty(T)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_g$  is called (strictly) convexity-preserving ( $\mathcal{S}_g \in (S)\text{CP}(T)$ ) if  $(\mathcal{S}_g u_1, \mathcal{S}_g u_2) \in (S)\text{CC}(T)$  for all  $u \in \text{CC}(T)$ .*

In our proof of Theorem 3, we will first show our characterization for  $\text{SPMP}(T)$ . The non-strict case can then be deduced by application of the following lemma, which is discussed in [11, Chap. 9.3]:

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $v_n \in \ell_\infty(T)$  be defined by  $v_n(t) := \cos\left(\frac{-\pi t}{T}\right)^{2n}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then, for any  $\gamma \in \text{CC}(T)$  it holds that*

- i)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (v_n * \gamma) = \gamma$
- ii)  $v_n * \gamma \in \text{SCC}(T)$  if at least one determinant of  $\gamma$  in (18) is non-zero.

We are ready, now, to state our desired tractable characterization of  $(S)\text{PMP}(T)$ :

**Theorem 3.** *For  $g \in \ell_\infty(T)$ ,  $T \geq 4$ , the following are equivalent:*

i)  $\mathcal{S}_g \in (S)\text{PMP}(T)$ .

ii)  $\mathcal{S}_g \in (S)\text{CP}(T)$ .

iii)  $(\Delta g, g) \in (S)\text{CC}(T)$  and has positive orientation.

iv)  $\Delta g \in (S)\text{PM}(T)$  and  $\Delta g(t)^2 \geq (>) \Delta g(t+1)\Delta g(t-1)$  for all  $t \in (0 : T-1)$ .

Note that Theorem 3 is similar to its continuous-time (CT) counter-parts in [21,22]. In fact, by invoking sampling arguments, it is possible to recover [21] from our discrete-time results. Yet, unlike the derivations in [21], our approach utilizes algebraic total positivity theory in conjunction with its geometric interpretations, which, besides allowing us to simultaneously deal with  $\text{CVD}_2$ , also paves the way for future extension of  $\text{PMP}(T)$  where  $S_c^-[\Delta u] \leq 2k$  implies  $S_c^-[\Delta(\mathcal{S}_g u)] \leq 2k$ .

## 6 Examples

In this section, we will illustrate the application of our main results Theorems 1 to 3 and Corollary 2 as well as their differences based on three examples. We begin by showing that series interconnections of first order lags with nonnegative poles are  $\text{PMP}(T)$  and, in fact,  $\text{VD}_2(T)$  for all  $T$ . Subsequently, we consider two cases of  $\text{PMP}(T)$  relay feedback systems and their self-sustained oscillations. In the first case, the loop gain is  $\text{VD}_2(T)$  for all  $T$  and the system exhibits a  $\text{PM}(T)$  self-oscillation, i.e., the loop gain has a fixed-point within our invariant set. In the second case, the loop gain is only  $\text{PMP}(T)$  for  $T \leq 4$ , which interestingly correlates with the period of the existing  $\text{PM}(4)$  self-oscillation. This demonstrates the potential of this property for our anticipated future analysis. Finally, as our last example is not  $\text{VB}_2(4)$ , it also exemplifies that  $\text{VB}_2(T) \neq \text{PMP}(T)$  as analyzed in Lemma 6.

### 6.1 Example: First Order Systems

For example, let  $(A, b, c) = (p, 1, \alpha)$  with  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $p \in (-1, 1)$  and  $T > 4$ . It follows then from (9) that

$$g_T(t) = \frac{\alpha p^{t-1}}{1-p^T}, \quad t \in (1 : T) \quad (21)$$

and by (10)

$$\Delta g_T(t) = \frac{\alpha}{1-p^T} \begin{cases} p^{t-1}(p-1) & \text{if } t \in (1 : T-1) \\ 1-p^{T-1} & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases}$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{PMP}(T)$  requires by Theorem 3 iv) that  $p \geq 0$ , because otherwise  $\Delta g_T \notin \text{PM}(T)$ . In fact, if  $0 \leq p < 1$ , then  $S^-[\Delta g_T(0 : T-0)] = 1$  and as such  $\Delta g_T \notin \text{PM}(T)$  by Lemmas 2 i) and 3. Next, let us verify that

$$\forall t \in (0 : T-1) : \Delta g_T(t)^2 - \Delta g_T(t-1)\Delta g_T(t+1) \geq 0.$$

For  $t \in (2 : T-2)$ , this inequality is an equality and as such, we only need to verify the following remaining cases:

$$\Delta g_T(0)^2 - \Delta g_T(T-1)\Delta g_T(1) = \frac{\alpha^2(p^T - p^2)}{p^2(p^T - 1)} \geq 0,$$

$$\Delta g_T(1)^2 - \Delta g_T(0)\Delta g_T(2) = \frac{\alpha^2(p-1)}{p^T - 1} \geq 0,$$

$$\Delta g_T(T-1)^2 - \Delta g_T(0)\Delta g_T(T-2) = \frac{\alpha^2 p^T (p-1)}{(p^T - 1)p^3} \geq 0.$$




Figure 2: Visualization of the curve  $(\Delta g_T, g_T)$  belonging to  $G$  in (22) with  $\cdots\cdots T = 5$ ,  $\text{---} T = 10$  and  $\text{---} T = 100$ . All three curves are convex contours, which by Theorem 3 implies that  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{PMP}(T)$ .

In summary, we have verified that a first order system with  $p \geq 0$  is  $\text{PMP}(T)$  for all  $T$ . This also holds true for all causal LTI systems of the form

$$G(z) = \frac{\alpha z^l}{\prod_{k=1}^n (z - p_k)}$$

with  $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq n}$ ,  $p_1, \dots, p_n \geq 0$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , as  $\text{PMP}(T)$  is preserved by series interconnection and time-shifts. This can also be visually inspected by Theorem 3 iii) as show in Figure 2 for

$$G(z) = \frac{1}{(z - 0.6)(z - 0.7)(z - 0.8)}. \quad (22)$$

Finally, note that our first order system is also  $\text{CVD}_2(T)$ . For  $p = 0$ , this is trivially the case as the system acts as a shift operator. Otherwise,  $g_T$  is strictly positive/negative and by

$$\det(C^{g_T}_{(1:3,1:3)}) = \frac{(p^T - 1)^2(p^3 - p^T)}{p^3} > 0,$$

it follows that the assumptions of Corollary 2 are fulfilled. Verifying Corollary 2 iii) works then similarly to our discussion on  $\text{PMP}(T)$ .

## 6.2 Example: Relay Feedback System

Next, let us inspect how  $\text{PMP}(T)$  affects the existence of self-sustained oscillations in relay feedback systems, i.e., a Lur'e feedback system (see Figure 1), where  $\psi = \text{sign}$  and self-oscillations are characterized as fixed-points of the loop gain

$$u \mapsto -\mathcal{S}_g \text{sign}(u). \quad (23)$$

### 6.2.1 Third Order System – $\text{PMP}(T)$ for all $T$

We begin with the case of  $G$  being the system in (22). Since we have already verified that  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{PMP}(T)$  for all  $T$  and the same is true for any monotonic static non-linearity, incl. the ideal relay, we can conclude that also the open loop gain is  $\text{PMP}(T)$  independently of  $T$ . As the open loop gain leaves the set of periodically




Figure 3: Output simulation for relay feedback systems with  $G$  as in (22). The system exhibits a periodically monotone self-oscillation of period  $T = 16$ , i.e., fixed-point to (23).

monotone signals invariant, one may speculate that (23) has periodically monotone fixed-points. This is, indeed, the case as visualized in Figure 3. Note that this fixed-point can be computed and verified by

$$u^*(0 : 15) = -C^{g_{16}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_8 \\ -\mathbf{1}_8 \end{bmatrix}.$$

### 6.2.2 Fourth Order System – PMP( $T$ ) for $T \leq 4$

In our next example, we use the following fourth order system

$$G(z) = \frac{(z-1)(z-3)}{(z-4)^4}. \quad (24)$$

Graphically, we can verify that  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{PMP}(T)$  only for  $T \in (2 : 4)$  (see Figure 4). Therefore, this time, we may only expect that for these values of  $T$  there exists a PM( $T$ ) fixed-point of the loop gain. It turns out that by computing

$$u^*(0 : 4) = -C^{g_4} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_2 \\ -\mathbf{1}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4.5261 \\ 1.2672 \\ -4.5261 \\ -1.2672 \end{bmatrix},$$

we can see that  $u^* \in \text{PM}(4)$  corresponds to such a self-oscillation. Thus, indicating the value of the PMP( $T$ ) property for the analysis of self-oscillations in relay feedback systems. Further, note that as

$$C^{g_4}_{(:,(1:3))_{[3]}} = 5.7506 [1 \quad -1 \quad 1 \quad -1]^T,$$

$\mathcal{S}_g \notin \text{CVB}_2$  by Theorem 2. This confirms our analysis in Lemma 6 and shows the practical need for the less restrictive notion of PMP( $T$ ).

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we have provided tractable characterizations for three nested classes of cyclic variation bounding discrete-time LTI systems: periodic monotonic preservation (PMP) and cyclic 2-variation bounding/diminishing.




Figure 4: Visualization of the curve  $(\Delta g_T, g_T)$  belonging to  $G$  in (24) with  $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$   $T = 4$ ,  $\text{-}\cdot\text{-}\cdot\text{-}$   $T = 5$  and  $\text{-}\square\text{-}$   $T = 10$ . Since only the curve corresponding to  $T = 4$  is a convex contour, it follows by Theorem 3 that  $\mathcal{S}_g \in \text{PMP}(T)$  exclusively for  $T = 4$ .

Central to our derivations is a bridge between algebraic total positivity theory [11] and its geometric interpretations, which has led to a tractable characterization of sequentially convex contours.

Our results are intended to facilitate the development of new fixed-point theorems that will support the study of self-sustained oscillations in Lur’e feedback systems. The presented examples on relay feedback systems already indicate how the PMP property provides valuable insights into the existence of such oscillations by limiting the potential set of oscillations and periods. A similar supporting observation has also been made recently in [3]. Further, our examples show that the considered system classes are not identical to each other, and as such may be of distinct value in future investigations.

## References

- [1] Karl Johan Åström and Tore Hägglund. Automatic tuning of simple regulators with specifications on phase and amplitude margins. *Automatica*, 20(5):645–651, 1984.
- [2] Eyal Bar-Shalom, Omri Dalin, and Michael Margaliot. Compound matrices in systems and control theory: a tutorial. *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, 35(3):467–521, 2023.
- [3] Thomas Chaffey and Fulvio Forni. Amplitude response and square wave describing functions, 2024.
- [4] Tobias Damm Christian Grussler and Rodolphe Sepulchre. Balanced truncation of  $k$ -positive systems. arXiv:2006.13333, 2020.
- [5] Shaun Fallat, Charles R. Johnson, and Alan D. Sokal. Total positivity of sums, hadamard products and hadamard powers: Results and counterexamples. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 520:242 – 259, 2017.
- [6] J.M. Goncalves, A. Megretski, and M.A. Dahleh. Global stability of relay feedback systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 46(4):550–562, 2001.
- [7] Andrzej Granas, James Dugundji, et al. *Fixed point theory*, volume 14. Springer, 2003.



- [8] Christian Grussler and Rodolphe Sepulchre. Variation diminishing linear time-invariant systems. *Automatica*, 136:109985, 2022.
- [9] Jean-Baptiste Hiriart-Urruty and Claude Lemaréchal. *Convex Analysis and Minimization Algorithms I: Fundamentals*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1996.
- [10] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 2013.
- [11] Samuel Karlin. *Total positivity*, volume 1. Stanford University Press, 1968.
- [12] H.K. Khalil. *Nonlinear Systems*. Prentice Hall PTR, 2002.
- [13] Michael Margaliot and Eduardo D. Sontag. Revisiting totally positive differential systems: A tutorial and new results, 2018.
- [14] Maya V. Marmary and Christian Grussler. Tractable downfall of basis pursuit in structured sparse optimization, 2025.
- [15] A. Megretski. Global stability of oscillations induced by a relay feedback. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 29(1):1931–1936, 1996. 13th World Congress of IFAC, 1996, San Francisco USA, 30 June - 5 July.
- [16] Ali H Nayfeh and Dean T Mook. *Nonlinear oscillations*. John Wiley & Sons, 2024.
- [17] Béla Novák and John J Tyson. Design principles of biochemical oscillators. *Nature reviews Molecular cell biology*, 9(12):981–991, 2008.
- [18] Ron Ofir, Michael Margaliot, Yoash Levron, and Jean-Jacques Slotine. A sufficient condition for  $k$ -contraction of the series connection of two systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(9):4994–5001, 2022.
- [19] Maben Rabi. Relay self-oscillations for second order, stable, nonminimum phase plants. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(9):4282–4288, 2021.
- [20] Chaim Roth and Christian Grussler. On system operators with variation bounding properties, 2024.
- [21] Stephan Ruscheweyh and Luis C. Salinas. On the preservation of periodic monotonicity. *Constructive Approximation*, 8(2):129–140, June 1992.
- [22] Isaac J Schoenberg. On variation diminishing approximation methods. *On numerical approximation*, pages 249–274, 1959.
- [23] Eyal Weiss and Michael Margaliot. A generalization of linear positive systems with applications to nonlinear systems: Invariant sets and the poincaré-bendixson property. arXiv:1902.01630, 2019.
- [24] Arthur T Winfree. *The geometry of biological time*, volume 2. Springer, 1980.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Proof to Lemma 5

*Proof.* The equivalence between Lemmas 5 i) and 5 ii) follows as discussed prior to Lemma 5 by [9, Proposition 1.1.4 & 5.3.1]. The additional requirements in the strict case are readily verified by noticing that three

points  $(t_{i_1}, f(t_{i_1}))$ ,  $(t_{i_2}, f(t_{i_2}))$ ,  $(t_{i_3}, f(t_{i_3}))$  are co-linear if and only if  $s(t_{i_1}, t_{i_2}) = s(t_{i_2}, t_{i_3})$ . Finally, to see the equivalence with Lemmas 5 iii) and 5 iv), it suffices to note that the elements in  $M_{[3]}^f$  compute as

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} t_{i_1} & f(t_{i_1}) & 1 \\ t_{i_2} & f(t_{i_2}) & 1 \\ t_{i_3} & f(t_{i_3}) & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} t_1 & f(t_1) & 1 \\ t_2 - t_1 & f(t_2) - f(t_1) & 0 \\ t_3 - t_2 & f(t_3) - f(t_2) & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{f(t_{i_2}) - f(t_{i_1})}{t_{i_2} - t_{i_1}} \\ 1 & \frac{f(t_{i_3}) - f(t_{i_1})}{t_{i_3} - t_{i_1}} \end{bmatrix} = s(t_{i_2}, t_{i_3}) - s(t_{i_1}, t_{i_2})$$

for  $i_1 < i_2 < i_3$ . Hence, Lemma 5 iii) is equivalent to Definition 8 and by [9, Proposition 5.3.1] it is enough to check the consecutive determinants in Lemma 5 iv).  $\square$

## A.2 Proof to Theorem 1

*Proof.* In the following let  $L_\alpha(x, y) := \alpha_1 x + \alpha_2 y + \alpha_3$  for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$  and  $\text{rank}(M^\gamma) = 3$ . We begin by noticing that as

$$S_c^-[L_\alpha(\gamma)] = S_c^-[M^\gamma \alpha] \quad \text{and} \quad S_c^+[L_\alpha(\gamma)] = S_c^+[M^\gamma \alpha],$$

it follows from Corollary 1 ii) (Corollary 1 i)) that  $\gamma \in (\text{S})\text{CC}(T)$  if and only if  $M^\gamma \in (\text{S})\text{SC}_3$  or equivalently all determinants of the form (18) share the same (strict) sign. This proves the equivalence between Theorems 1 i) to 1 iii).

Theorem 1 i)  $\Rightarrow$  Theorem 1 v): Note that as (19) are merely 3-minors of  $M^\gamma$ , it follows via Theorem 1 ii) that these determinants share the same (strict) sign. Moreover, as  $S_c^-[L_\alpha \tilde{\gamma}](S_c^+[L_\alpha(\tilde{\gamma})]) \leq 2$  whenever  $\alpha_1 = 0$  or  $\alpha_2 = 0$ , it must hold that  $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in (\text{S})\text{PM}(T)$ .

Theorem 1 v)  $\Rightarrow$  Theorem 1 iv): We begin by remarking that the requirements on  $P_\gamma$  are implied by verifying them for  $P_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ . Therefore, we can assume in the following that  $\mathcal{I}_0 = \emptyset$ . Further, by our rank assumption,  $\gamma_1$  cannot be constant, which is why

$$\mathcal{I}_+ := \{i \in (0 : T - 1) : \Delta\gamma_1(i) > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_- := \{i \in (0 : T - 1) : \Delta\gamma_1(i) < 0\}$$

are non-empty sets. Assuming, w.l.o.g., that  $0 \in \mathcal{I}_+$ ,  $T - 1 \notin \mathcal{I}_+$  and that all determinants in (19) are (strictly) positive, we want to show, now, that there exists a  $T_p \in (1 : T - 2)$  such that  $\mathcal{I}_+ = (0 : T_p)$ . Since by assumption  $\gamma_1 \in \text{PM}(T)$ , it follows from Lemma 3 that if no such  $T_p$  existed, then we could find  $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < T - 1$  such that

$$\Delta\gamma_1(t_1) > 0, \quad \Delta\gamma_1(t_1 + 1) = 0, \quad \Delta\gamma_1(t_2) > 0.$$

To see that this is impossible, note that  $\Delta\gamma_2(t_1 + 1) \neq 0$  by assumption. Thus, an evaluation of (19) at  $t = t_1$  and  $t = t_1 + 1$  yields

$$\Delta\gamma_1(t_1)\Delta\gamma_2(t_1 + 1) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta\gamma_1(t_1 + 2)\Delta\gamma_2(t_1 + 1) \geq 0, \quad (25)$$

and as such  $\Delta\gamma_1(t_1 + 2) = 0$ . Inductive application of this argument shows that  $\Delta\gamma_1(t_2) = 0$ . Analogously, we can show that there exist  $T_b, T_n \in (T_p + 1 : T - 1)$  such that  $\mathcal{I}_- = (T_b : T_n)$ . Thus, by Lemma 5

$$f : \{\gamma_1(0), \dots, \gamma_1(T_p + 1)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \gamma_1(i) \mapsto \gamma_2(i)$$

is (strictly) convex and

$$g : \{\gamma_1(T_b), \dots, \gamma_1(T_n + 1)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \gamma_1(i) \mapsto \gamma_2(i).$$

(strictly) concave. Next, it follows analogously to (25) that

$$\Delta\gamma_2(T_p + 1), \Delta\gamma_2(T_b - 1) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta\gamma_2(T_n + 1), \Delta\gamma_2(T - 1) < 0.$$

Thus, by  $\gamma_2 \in \text{PM}(T)$  and Lemma 3, we can conclude that  $\Delta\gamma_2(t) \geq 0$  for  $t \in (T_p + 1 : T_b - 1)$  and  $\Delta\gamma_2(t) \leq 0$  for  $t \in (T_n + 1 : T - 1)$ . Hence,  $P_\gamma$  is simple and such that  $g$  lies above the graph of  $f$  and

$$\gamma_1(T_p + 1) = \dots = \gamma_1(T_b) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_1(T_n) = \dots = \gamma_1(T) = \gamma_1(0)$$

Therefore, by Lemma 5,  $P_\gamma([0, T])$  is the intersection of the epi-graph of the continuous convex function  $\bar{f}$  and the hyper-graph of a continuous concave function  $\bar{g}$  as defined in (14). As these sets are convex [9, Prop. IV.1.1.6], the same applies to their intersection [9, Prop. III.1.2.1]. In particular, if there exist three co-linear points of  $\gamma(0 : T - 1)$ , the convexity of this set implies that also all points with intermediate indices have to lie on the same line, i.e., there exist three consecutive points of  $\gamma(0 : T - 1)$  that have to be co-linear. In the strict case, this is impossible on the sets  $(0 : T_p + 1)$  and  $(T_b : T_n + 1)$  due to the strict convexity and concavity of  $f$  and  $g$ , respectively (see Lemma 5). Also on the intervals that include the remaining points, we can exclude this possibility as  $\gamma_1 \in \text{SPM}(T)$  requires that  $\Delta\gamma_1$  has no consecutive zeros, i.e.,  $T_b - T_p, T - T_n \leq 2$  by Lemma 3.

Theorem 1 iv)  $\Rightarrow$  Theorem 1 iii): By convexity and simplicity, there is no line that can intersect  $P_\gamma([0, T])$  more than twice, i.e.,  $S_c^-[L_\alpha(\gamma)] = S_c^-[M^\gamma\alpha] \leq 2$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$  or equivalently  $M^\gamma$  is CVB<sub>2</sub>. By Corollary 1 ii), this requires that all minors in (18) share the same sign, where the sign is strict if no three points of  $\gamma(0 : -T - 1)$  are co-linear.

In case that  $\text{rank}(M^\gamma) = 2$ ,  $\gamma$  lies on the line segment between two points,  $\gamma(t_{\min})$  and  $\gamma(t_{\max})$ , where  $\gamma_i(t_{\min}), \gamma_i(t_{\max}) \in \max \gamma_i(0 : T - 1) \cup \min \gamma_i(0 : T - 1)$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Hence,  $S_c^-[L_\alpha(\gamma)] \leq 2$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3$  if and only if  $\Delta\gamma_i$  is monotonically increasing/decreasing when traversing from  $\gamma(t_{\min})$  to  $\gamma(t_{\max})$  and monotonically decreasing/increasing on the way back. In other words,  $S_c^-(\Delta\gamma_i) \leq 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , which by Lemma 3 is equivalent to  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \text{PM}(T)$ . □

### A.3 Proof to Theorem 2

*Proof.* We only need to show the first claim, as the equivalences of Propositions 2 ii) and 2 iii) are immediate and the equivalence with Proposition 2 i) follows from Corollary 1 and (7) due to our rank assumption.

Let us start by noticing that all 3-minors of  $C^g \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$  are given by

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} g(t_3 - s_3) & g(t_2 - s_3) & g(t_1 - s_3) \\ g(t_3 - s_2) & g(t_2 - s_2) & g(t_1 - s_2) \\ g(t_3 - s_1) & g(t_2 - s_1) & g(t_1 - s_1) \end{bmatrix} \quad (26)$$

with  $t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_1 + T$  and  $s_1 < s_2 < s_3 < s_1 + T$ . We will prove our claim by induction over the distance  $s_3 - s_1$ . As  $T > s_3 - s_1 \geq 2$ , we get the following base case and induction hypothesis:

1. *Base Case:* In case of  $s_3 - s_1 = 2$ , i.e., 3-minors that result from consecutive row indices, it holds that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} g(t_3 - 2) & g(t_2 - 2) & g(t_1 - 2) \\ g(t_3 - 1) & g(t_2 - 1) & g(t_1 - 1) \\ g(t_3) & g(t_2) & g(t_1) \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} g(t_1) & g(t_1 - 1) & g(t_1 - 2) \\ g(t_2) & g(t_2 - 1) & g(t_2 - 2) \\ g(t_3) & g(t_3 - 1) & g(t_3 - 2) \end{bmatrix},$$

which is why they correspond to 3-minors of  $C^g_{(:,(1:3))}$ .

2. *Inductive Hypothesis:* Assume that for  $2 < (s_3 - s_1) = n < T - 1$ , (26) is a sum of 3-minors of  $C^g_{(:,(1:3))}$ .
3. *Induction Step:* Now, let  $(s_3 - s_1) = n + 1 < T$  with  $s_3 - 1 > s_2$ , then by direct computation, it can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} \det \begin{bmatrix} g(t_3 - s_3) & g(t_2 - s_3) & g(t_1 - s_3) \\ g(t_3 - s_2) & g(t_2 - s_2) & g(t_1 - s_2) \\ g(t_3 - s_1) & g(t_2 - s_1) & g(t_1 - s_1) \end{bmatrix} &= \det \begin{bmatrix} g(t_3 - s_3) & g(t_2 - s_2 - 1) & g(t_1 - s_2 - 1) \\ g(t_3 - s_2 - 1) & g(t_2 - s_2) & g(t_1 - s_2) \\ g(t_3 - s_2) & g(t_2 - s_1) & g(t_1 - s_1) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \det \begin{bmatrix} g(t_3 - s_2 - 1) & g(t_2 - s_3) & g(t_1 - s_2 - 1) \\ g(t_3 - s_2) & g(t_2 - s_2 - 1) & g(t_1 - s_2) \\ g(t_3 - s_1) & g(t_2 - s_2) & g(t_1 - s_1) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \det \begin{bmatrix} g(t_3 - s_2 - 1) & g(t_2 - s_2 - 1) & g(t_1 - s_3) \\ g(t_3 - s_2) & g(t_2 - s_2) & g(t_1 - s_2 - 1) \\ g(t_3 - s_1) & g(t_2 - s_1) & g(t_1 - s_2) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

is a sum of minors as described in our Induction Hypothesis, which by assumption is a sum of 3-minors of  $C^g_{(:,(1:3))}$ . This proves our claim for  $s_3 - 1 > s_2$  and the case of  $s_2 - 1 > s_1$  can be treated analogously.  $\square$

#### A.4 Proof to Lemma 6

*Proof.* We will only show the non-strict case, as the strict case follows analogously.

Lemma 6 i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  Lemma 6 ii): Note that  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  satisfying  $\Delta u \neq 0$  and  $S_c^-[\Delta u] \leq 2$  are given by  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  satisfying  $S_c^-[\Delta u] = 2$ . Moreover, since  $\Delta(\mathcal{S}_g u) = \mathcal{S}_g(\Delta u)$ , it holds that  $S_c^-[\Delta(\mathcal{S}_g u)] = S_c^-[\mathcal{S}_g(\Delta u)]$  which is why the equivalence is implied by Lemma 3.

Lemma 6 iii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  Lemma 6 ii): Since  $\Delta$  is an invertible operator on the set of  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  satisfying  $\sum_{i=0}^T u(i) = 0$ , it follows that for every such  $u$  there exists a  $\tilde{u} \in \ell_\infty(T)$  with  $u = \Delta \tilde{u}$  and vice-versa. Thus, the equivalence follows.  $\square$

#### A.5 Proof to Theorem 3

*Proof.* In case that  $\Delta g = 0$ , i.e.,  $g$  is constant, each item holds and as such they are equivalent. Therefore, we can assume that  $\Delta g \neq 0$ , which, since  $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \Delta g(t) = 0$ , implies that  $\Delta g$  has strictly positive and strictly negative elements.

Theorem 3 i)  $\Rightarrow$  Theorem 3 ii): We begin by noticing that  $u \in \text{CC}(T)$  if and only if  $\alpha_1 u_1 + \alpha_2 u_2 \in \text{PM}_T$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Assuming that  $g \in (\text{S})\text{CP}(T)$ , it follows then with  $\alpha_1 = 1$  and  $u_2 \equiv 0$  that  $g * u_1 \in (\text{S})\text{PM}(T)$  for all  $u_1 \in (\text{S})\text{PM}(T)$ . Hence,  $g \in (\text{S})\text{PMP}(T)$ .

Theorem 3 ii)  $\Rightarrow$  Theorem 3 iii): Let  $g \in (\text{S})\text{CP}(T)$  and  $u \in \text{CC}(T)$  be such that  $u(kT) = e_1$ ,  $u(1 + kT) = e_2$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and otherwise  $u(t)$  is zero. Then, since  $(g * u_1)(t) = g(t)$ ,  $(g * u_2)(t) = g(t - 1)$  and  $(g * u_1, g * u_2) \in (\text{S})\text{CC}(T)$  by assumption, it follows from Theorem 1 that all non-vanishing determinants

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} g(t_1) & g(t_1 - 1) & 1 \\ g(t_2) & g(t_2 - 1) & 1 \\ g(t_3) & g(t_3 - 1) & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_1 + T$$

have the same (strict) sign. Equivalently, the same holds true for all

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta g(t_1 - 1) & g(t_1 - 1) & 1 \\ \Delta g(t_2 - 1) & g(t_2 - 1) & 1 \\ \Delta g(t_3 - 1) & g(t_3 - 1) & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_1 + T \quad (27)$$

which by Theorem 1 shows that  $(\Delta g, g) \in (\text{S})\text{CC}(T)$ . In particular, it must hold that  $S_c^-(\Delta g) = 2$ , which is why there exists a  $t$  such that  $\Delta g(t) \neq 0$  and  $\Delta g(t - 1)\Delta g(t + 1) \leq 0$ . Hence,

$$0 < \det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta g(t) & \Delta g(t - 1) \\ \Delta g(t + 1) & \Delta g(t) \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta g(t - 1) & g(t - 1) & 1 \\ \Delta g(t) - \Delta g(t - 1) & \Delta g(t - 1) & 0 \\ \Delta g(t + 1) - \Delta g(t) & \Delta g(t) & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta g(t - 1) & g(t - 1) & 1 \\ \Delta g(t) & g(t) & 1 \\ \Delta g(t + 1) & g(t + 1) & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

i.e.,  $(\Delta g, g)$  has positive orientation.

Theorem 3 iii)  $\Rightarrow$  Theorem 3 iv): From Theorem 1 and (28), we receive the inequality conditions as well as that  $(g, \Delta g) \in (\text{S})\text{PM}(T)$ . Moreover, the requirement that  $g \in (\text{S})\text{PM}(T)$  is already implied by  $\Delta g \in (\text{S})\text{PM}(T)$ .

Theorem 3 iv)  $\Rightarrow$  Theorem 3 iii): Since by assumption  $S_c^-(\Delta g) = 2$  and  $\Delta g \in \text{SPM}(T)$ , it holds that  $\mathcal{I}_+ := \{i \in (0 : T - 1) : \Delta g > 0\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_- := \{i \in (0 : T - 1) : \Delta g < 0\}$  consist each of consecutive entries, which is why the requirements of Remark 1 are fulfilled for  $\gamma_1 := g$  and  $\Delta \gamma_2 := g$ . Thus, Theorem 1 applies even when replacing  $\tilde{\gamma}$  with  $\gamma$ , which via (28) shows the claim.

Theorem 3 iii)  $\Rightarrow$  Theorem 3 i): By Lemmas 1 and 7, it suffices to prove the strict case, which by Lemma 6 and Lemma 2 i) is equivalent to showing that  $\Delta y := \mathcal{S}_g \Delta u$  fulfills  $S_c^+[\Delta y] \leq 2$  for all  $u \in \ell_\infty(T)$  with  $S_c^-[\Delta u] = 2$ . To this end, we assume w.l.o.g. that there exists an  $s \in (0 : T - 3)$  such that  $\Delta u(0), \dots, \Delta u(s) \geq 0$  with  $\Delta u(0) > 0$  and  $\Delta u(s + 1), \dots, \Delta u(T - 1) \leq 0$  with  $\Delta u(s + 1) < 0$  (analogous arguments also apply if  $s = T - 2$ ). Combining this assumption with the fact that  $\Delta u(T - 1) = -\sum_{i=0}^{T-2} \Delta u(i)$  allows us to express  $\Delta y(k : k + 2) = v_1 - v_2$  with

$$v_1 := \sum_{i=0}^s |\Delta u(i)| \begin{bmatrix} g(k-i) - g(k-1) \\ g(k+1-i) - g(k) \\ g(k+2-i) - g(k+1) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad v_2 := \sum_{j=s+1}^{T-2} |\Delta u(j)| \begin{bmatrix} g(k-j) - g(k-1) \\ g(k+1-j) - g(k) \\ g(k+2-j) - g(k+1) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By the multi-linearity of the determinant, we arrive then at

$$0 = \det [\Delta y(k : k + 2) \quad v_1 \quad v_2] = \sum_{i=1}^s |\Delta u(i)| \sum_{j=s+1}^{T-1} |\Delta u(j)| \det(M_{k,i,j})$$

for

$$M_{k,i,j} := \begin{bmatrix} \Delta y(k) & g(k-i) - g(k-1) & g(k-j) - g(k-1) \\ \Delta y(k+1) & g(k+1-i) - g(k) & g(k+1-j) - g(k) \\ \Delta y(k+2) & g(k+2-i) - g(k+1) & g(k+2-j) - g(k+1) \end{bmatrix},$$

which is why by Laplace expansion of  $\det(M_{k,i,j})$

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^s |\Delta u(i)| \sum_{j=s+1}^{T-1} |\Delta u(j)| [\Delta y(k) \alpha_{k,i,j} - \Delta y(k+1) \alpha_{k+1,i,j} + \Delta y(k+2) \alpha_{k+2,i,j}] \quad (29)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{k+2,i,j} &= \det \begin{bmatrix} g(k-i+1) - g(k+1) & g(k-j+1) - g(k+1) \\ g(k-i+2) - g(k+2) & g(k-j+2) - g(k+2) \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta g(k+1) & g(k+1) & 1 \\ \Delta g(k-i+1) & g(k-i+1) & 1 \\ \Delta g(k-j+1) & g(k-j+1) & 1 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \\ \alpha_{k+1,i,j} &= \det \begin{bmatrix} g(k-i) - g(k) & g(k-j) - g(k) \\ g(k-i+2) - g(k+2) & g(k-j+2) - g(k+2) \end{bmatrix} \\ \alpha_{k,i,j} &= \det \begin{bmatrix} g(k-i) - g(k) & g(k-j) - g(k) \\ g(k-i+1) - g(k+1) & g(k-j+1) - g(k+1) \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} \Delta g(k) & g(k) & 1 \\ \Delta g(k-i) & g(k-i) & 1 \\ \Delta g(k-j) & g(k-j) & 1 \end{bmatrix} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Delta u(0) \neq 0 \neq \Delta u(s + 1)$ , it follows that if  $\Delta y(k + 1) = 0$ , then (29) requires that

$$\Delta y(k) \Delta y(k + 2) < 0 \quad (30)$$

or  $\Delta y(k) = \Delta y(k + 1) = \Delta y(k + 2) = 0$ . In the first case,  $S_c^-[\Delta y] = S_c^+[\Delta y]$ , while in latter it follows inductively that  $\Delta y \equiv 0$ . Note that  $\Delta y \equiv 0$  if and only if  $v_1 = v_2$ , in which case (29) has to hold even after substitution with  $\Delta y(k) = 1$ ,  $\Delta y(k + 1) = 0$  and  $\Delta y(k + 2) = 1$ , which as just confirmed is impossible.

Finally, we will show that if  $S_c^-[\Delta y] > 2$ , then it is possible to construct a  $\hat{u} \in \text{PM}(T)$  such that  $\Delta \hat{y} = \mathcal{S}_g \Delta \hat{u}$  does not fulfill (30). To this end, note that since  $\Delta g \in \text{SPM}(T)$  by Theorem 3 iv), it holds by assumption that  $\Delta g(i) = 0$  if and only if  $\Delta g(i - 1) \Delta g(i + 1) < 0$ , i.e.,  $S_c^-(\Delta g) = S_c^+(\Delta g) = 2$ . Thus, if  $S_c^-[\Delta y] > 2$ , there must exists a  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $k^*$  such that  $\Delta \hat{y} := (1 - t) \Delta g + t \Delta y$ ,  $\Delta \hat{y}(k^*) = 0$  and  $\Delta \hat{y}(k^* - 1) \Delta \hat{y}(k^* + 1) > 0$ . However, as  $\Delta g = \mathcal{S}_g \Delta u_1$  for  $u_1(0 : T - 1) := e_1$ , it follows that  $\Delta \hat{y} = \mathcal{S}_g \Delta \hat{u}$  with  $\Delta \hat{u} = (1 - t) \Delta u_1 + t \Delta u$ , which by assumption on  $\Delta u(0) > 0$  and  $\Delta u(T - 1) \leq 0$  fulfills  $S_c^-(\Delta \hat{u}) \leq 2$ . This yields the desired contradiction.  $\square$