S. Ruscheweyh and R. S. Varga Mathematisches Institut
Universität Würzburg
D-8700 Würzburg am Hubland
West Germany

Abstract. Consider any complex polynomial $p_n(z)=1+\sum_{j=1}^n a_j z^j$ which satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^n |a_j|=1$, and let Γ_n denote the supremum of the minimum moduli on |z|=1 of all such polynomials $p_n(z)$. We show that

$$1 - \frac{1}{n} \le \Gamma_n \le \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n}} \quad , \quad \text{for all} \quad n \ge 1 \quad .$$

If the coefficients of $p_n(z)$ are further restricted to be positive numbers and if $\tilde{\Gamma}_n$ denotes the analogous supremum of the minimum moduli on |z|=1 of such polynomials, we similarly show that

$$1 \, - \, \frac{1}{n} \, \leq \, \widetilde{\Gamma}_n \, \leq \sqrt{1 - \frac{3}{(2n+1)}} \quad \text{, for all} \quad n \, \geq \, 1 \quad .$$

We also include some recent numerical experiments on the behavior of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_n$, as well as some related conjectures.

1. Introduction

Consider any non-constant complex polynomial $p_n(z) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j z^j$ with $p_n(0) \neq 0$, and normalize $p_n(z)$ so that

(1.1)
$$p_n(z) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j z^j$$
, where $\sum_{j=1}^n |a_j| \neq 0$.

^{*}Research supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, the Department of Energy, and the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung.

By a well-known result of Cauchy (cf. Marden [4, p. 126]), if R (the cauchy radius of $p_n(z)$) is the unique positive zero of

(1.2)
$$1 - |a_1| \cdot R - \dots - |a_n| \cdot R^n$$
,

then each zero \hat{z} of $p_n(z)$ of (1.1) satisfies $|\hat{z}| \ge R$. On further normalizing the Cauchy radius R of $p_n(z)$ to be unity, i.e., on assuming

(1.3)
$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} |a_{j}| = 1 ,$$

then any polynomial $p_n(z)$ in (1.1) which satisfies (1.3) evidently has no zeros in |z| < 1. (It may have zeros on |z| = 1, as the examples $1 + z^n$ show.)

Our interest is in the following problem, which is related to the recent study of <u>global descent functions</u> for determining zeros of polynomials (cf. Henrici [2,3] and Ruscheweyh [6]). Consider the set of normalized polynomials

(1.4)
$$S_n := \{p_n(z) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j z^j : \sum_{j=1}^n |a_j| = 1\}$$
, for each $n \ge 1$,

and put

(1.5)
$$m(p_n) := min\{|p_n(e^{i\theta})| : \theta \text{ real}\}$$
, for any $p_n \in S_n$.

(1.6)
$$\Gamma_n := \sup\{m(p_n) : p_n \in S_n\}$$
 , $(n \ge 1)$,

our goal here is to establish rigorous upper and lower bounds for Γ_n , as a function of n . We also report on some numerical experiments, which in turn have inspired some related mathematical conjectures.

2. Upper and Lower Bounds for $\Gamma_{\rm n}$

The following inequality, based on conformal mappings, was derived in Ruscheweyh [6]:

(2.1)
$$m^{2}(p_{n}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} |a_{j}|^{2} \le 1$$
, for any $p_{n} \in S_{n}$.

As the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality applied to (1.3) gives that $\sum_{j=1}^n |a_j^{}|^2 \ge \frac{1}{n} \ , \quad \text{it follows from (2.1) that}$

(2.2)
$$m(p_n) \leq \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n}}$$
 , for any $p_n \in S_n$,

which yields (cf. (1.6)) the upper bound

(2.3)
$$\Gamma_n \leq \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n}}$$
 , for all $n \geq 1$.

To similarly derive a lower bound for $\ \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_n$, consider the specific polynomial

(2.4)
$$Q_n(z) := 1 + \frac{2}{n(n+1)} \sum_{k=1}^n (n+1-k) z^k$$
,

which is an element of $\,S_{_{\textstyle n}}\,$ for each $\,n\,\geq\,1\,$. Now, $\,{\rm Q}_{_{\textstyle n}}(z)\,$ can also be expressed as

$$Q_{n}(z) = \frac{n(n+1) - 2n^{2}z + (n-2)(n+1)z^{2} + 2z^{n+2}}{n(n+1)(1-z)^{2}},$$

and evaluating the above expression for z = -1 gives

(2.5)
$$Q_{n}(-1) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{n+1} & \text{, for n an even positive integer;} \\ 1 - \frac{1}{n} & \text{, for n an odd positive integer.} \end{cases}$$

Next, on defining

(2.6)
$$g_n(z) := \frac{1}{(n+1)} \sum_{k=0}^n (n+1-k)z^k$$
, $(n=1,2,...)$,

then $Q_n(z)$ and $g_n(z)$ are related through

(2.7)
$$Q_n(z) = \frac{n-2}{n} + \frac{2}{n} g_n(z)$$
.

Writing $g_n(z)$ of (2.6) as

(2.8)
$$g_n(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k(n) z^k$$
, where $\alpha_k(n) := \begin{cases} \frac{n+1-k}{n+1}, & k=0,1,...,n \\ 0, & k \ge n+1 \end{cases}$,

then the coefficients $\alpha_k(n)$ of $g_n(z)$ can be seen to be <u>doubly</u> monotonic, i.e.,

(2.9)
$$\alpha_{k}(n) \geq 0$$
 , and $\alpha_{k}(n) - \alpha_{k+1}(n) \geq \alpha_{k+1}(n) - \alpha_{k+2}(n)$,

for all $k \ge 0$ and all $n \ge 1$. From a well-known result of Fejér [1], it follows that

(2.10) Re
$$g_n(z) \ge \frac{1}{2}$$
 , for all $|z| \le 1$.

Consequently (cf. (2.7)),

(2.11) Re
$$Q_n(z) = \frac{n-2}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \operatorname{Re} g_n(z) \ge 1 - \frac{1}{n}$$
, for all $|z| \le 1$,

which implies that

(2.12)
$$m(Q_n) \ge 1 - \frac{1}{n}$$
, for all $n \ge 1$.

(Note that because of (2.5), equality evidently holds in (2.12) for every odd positive integer n .) But, as $Q_n(z)$ is an element of S_n , (2.12) implies that

(2.13)
$$1 - \frac{1}{n} \le \Gamma_n$$
, for all $n \ge 1$.

Combining (2.13) and (2.3) then yields our first result of

Proposition 1. For each positive integer n ,

(2.14)
$$1 - \frac{1}{n} \le \Gamma_n \le \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n}}$$
.

Obviously, the bounds of (2.14) are tight for n=1 and give $\Gamma_1=0$. For n>1 , there is however a gap between the upper and lower bounds in (2.14).

Because of the bounds of (2.14), it is reasonable to express $\ \Gamma_{n}$ as

(2.15)
$$\Gamma_n := 1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{n}$$
 , for all $n \ge 1$,

so that from (2.14),

$$(2.16) n\left(1-\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{n}}\right) \leq \gamma_n \leq 1 , for all n \geq 1 .$$

Now, the lower bound in (2.16) is strictly decreasing as a function of n and has the limit 1/2 , so that

(2.17)
$$\frac{1}{2} < \gamma_n \le 1$$
 , for all $n \ge 1$.

Next, consider the following subset, \tilde{S}_n , of S_n :

(2.18)
$$\tilde{S}_n := \{p_n(z) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j z^j : p_n \in S_n \text{ and } a_j > 0 \text{ for all } 1 \le j \le n\}.$$

For $\tilde{\tilde{S}}_n$, we can associate the analogous quantity $\tilde{\tilde{\Gamma}}_n$:

$$(2.19) \qquad \tilde{\Gamma}_n := \sup\{m(p_n) : p_n \in \tilde{S}_n\} \quad , \qquad (n \ge 1) \quad .$$

Obviously, as $\tilde{S}_n \subset S_n$, then

(2.20)
$$\tilde{\Gamma}_n \leq \Gamma_n$$
 , for all $n \geq 1$.

But, noting that $\,Q_n^{}(z)\,$ of (2.4) is also an element of $\,\tilde{\Gamma}_n^{}$, then from (2.12), we also deduce

(2.21)
$$1-\frac{1}{n} \leq \widetilde{\Gamma}_n \quad \text{, for all } n \geq 1 \quad .$$

From (2.20) and (2.21), the upper and lower bounds of (2.14) apply equally well to $\tilde{\Gamma}_n$. But, for an improved upper bound for $\tilde{\Gamma}_n$, we establish

Proposition 2. For each positive integer n ,

$$(2.22) 1 - \frac{1}{n} \le \tilde{\Gamma}_n \le \sqrt{1 - \frac{3}{(2n+1)}} .$$

Proof. To obtain the upper bound in (2.22), set

(2.23)
$$M(p_n) := \max\{|p_n(e^{i\theta})| : \theta \text{ real}\}$$
 , for any $p_n \in S_n$.

Note that $M(p_n)=2$ for any $p_n\in \tilde{S}_n$, for each $n\geq 1$. Next, for each $p_n(z)=\sum_{j=0}^n a_j z^j$ (with $a_0:=1$) in \tilde{S}_n , consider the real trigonometric polynomial

(2.24)
$$T_n(\theta; p_n) := |p_n(e^{i\theta})|^2 - \sum_{j=0}^n a_j^2$$
,

which has the explicit form ($\underline{\text{without}}$ constant term)

(2.25)
$$T_n(\theta; p_n) = 2 \sum_{k=1}^n \cos(k\theta) \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} a_j a_{j+k}$$
.

Setting $\lambda_0 := \sum_{j=0}^n a_j^2$, it is evident from (2.24) that

$$(2.26) \begin{cases} \max\limits_{\theta \text{ real}} T_n(\theta; p_n) = M^2(p_n) - \lambda_0 = 4 - \lambda_0 \text{, and} \\ -\min\limits_{\theta \text{ real}} T_n(\theta; p_n) = \lambda_0 - m^2(p_n) \text{.} \end{cases}$$

From Pólya-Szegö [5, p. 84, Exercise 58], it is known that

$$\max_{\theta} T_n(\theta; p_n) \leq -n \cdot \min_{\theta} T_n(\theta; p_n)$$
,

or equivalently, using (2.26),

(2.27)
$$4 + n \cdot m^2 (p_n) \le (n+1) \lambda_0$$
.

But since $\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{j}^{2} \leq 1 - m^{2}(p_{n})$ from (2.1), then

$$\lambda_0 := 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 \le 2 - m^2(p_n)$$
.

Substituting the above in (2.27) then yields

(2.28)
$$m^2(p_n) \le \frac{2n-2}{2n+1} = 1 - \frac{3}{2n+1}$$
 , for all $p_n \in \tilde{S}_n$,

which gives the desired upper bound of (2.22). $\mbox{\ensuremath{\square}}$ In analogy with (2.15), we similarly define

(2.29)
$$\tilde{\Gamma}_n := 1 - \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n}{n}$$
 , for all $n \ge 1$.

Thus, from (2.22),

(2.30)
$$n\left\{1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{3}{2n+1}}\right\} \le \gamma_n \le 1$$
 , for all $n \ge 1$,

which further yields

(2.31)
$$0.732213 \dots = 3\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{4}{7}}\right) \le \tilde{\gamma}_n \le 1$$
 , for all $n \ge 1$,

as well as

$$(2.32) \quad \frac{3}{4} \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\gamma}_n \leq \overline{\lim}_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\gamma}_n \leq 1 \quad .$$

3. Computational Results

Intrigued by these numbers Γ_n , $\tilde{\Gamma}_n$, γ_n , and $\tilde{\gamma}_n$, we embarked on some numerical calculations to give further insight into their behavior as $n \to \infty$. First, we conjecture that $\Gamma_n = \tilde{\Gamma}_n$ for all $n \ge 1$, and we hope to establish this in a later work. Thus, our calculations (to be described below) were aimed at determining sharp lower bounds for $\tilde{\Gamma}_n$.

The idea in our calculations was to find an "extremal" $\tilde{\textbf{p}}_n\left(z\right)$ in $\tilde{\textbf{S}}_n$ such that

$$(3.1) \qquad \tilde{p}_n(e^{i\theta}) = m(\tilde{p}_n) \quad \text{in precisely n distinct points} \quad \{\theta_j\}_{j=1}^n \quad .$$

For convenience, all calculations were performed for n even, say

$$n = 2k$$
, $k \ge 1$. Then, for $p_{2k}(z) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2k} a_j z^j$ in \tilde{s}_{2k} (so that $a_j > 0$ for $j = 1, ..., 2k$, and $a_1 + a_2 + ... + a_{2k} = 1$), write

(3.2)
$$|1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2k} a_j e^{ij\theta}|^2 = m^2(p_{2k}) + 2^{2k} a_{2k} \prod_{j=1}^{k} (\epsilon_j + \cos \theta)^2 ,$$

with the objective of maximizing $m^2(p_{2k})$. Writing

(3.3)
$$|1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2k} a_j e^{ij\theta}|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{2k} A_j \cos j\theta , \text{ and } \prod_{j=1}^k (\epsilon_j + \cos \theta)^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{2k} B_j \cos j\theta ,$$

where $A_j = A_j(a_1, \dots, a_{2k})$, and where $B_j = B_j(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k)$, then (3.2) and (3.3) give us that

(3.4)
$$\begin{cases} m^{2}(p_{2k}) = A_{0} - 2^{2k}a_{2k} B_{0}, \\ A_{j} - 2^{2k}a_{2k} B_{j} = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, 2k-1, \\ a_{1} + a_{2} + \dots + a_{2k} = 1. \end{cases}$$

We then formulate this as the following $\underline{\text{Lagrange multiplier problem}}$. Consider

(3.5)
$$F(a_{1},...,a_{2k},\epsilon_{1},...,\epsilon_{k},\lambda_{1},...\lambda_{2k})$$

$$:= (A_{0} - 2^{2k}a_{2k} B_{0}) + \sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} \lambda_{j} (A_{j} - 2^{2k}a_{2k} B_{j}) + \lambda_{2k} (a_{1} + ... + a_{2k}-1),$$

subject to the conditions

(3.6)
$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial a_{j}} = 0 , j = 1,...,2k ; \frac{\partial F}{\partial \epsilon_{j}} = 0, j = 1,2,...k ;$$

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_{j}} = 0, j = 1,2,...,2k .$$

As a start-vector, we used the polynomials $Q_{2k}(z)$ of (2.4), to give the initial estimates for the coefficients $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{2k}$. Similarly, the negative cosines of the points of local minima of $Q_{2k}(e^{i\theta})$ were used as initial estimates for $\{\epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^k$, from which the associated constants $\{A_j\}_{0}^{2k}$ and $\{B_j\}_{0}^{2k}$ were determined. Then, solving the linear system $\{\frac{\partial F}{\partial a_j} = 0\}_{j=1}^{2k}$ (in the parameters $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2k}$) determined our initial

estimates for $\{\lambda_j^2\}_{j=1}^{2k}$. From this point, a standard nonlinear Newton procedure was used and this converged quadratically in all cases treated, thanks, no doubt, to the good start polynomials $Q_{2k}(z)$. These calculations were carried out by Timothy S. Norfolk using Richard Brent's MP (multiple precision) package on the VAX-11/780 in the Department of Mathematical Sciences at Kent State University.

Below, we give the converged values $\{\hat{\Gamma}_{2k}\}_{k=1}^{11}$ from our numerical experiments (rounded to twelve decimals), along with the associated numbers $\hat{\gamma}_{2k} := 2k(1-\hat{\Gamma}_{2k})$. (These constants $\hat{\Gamma}_{2k}$ are surely lower bounds for $\tilde{\Gamma}_{2k}$ and Γ_{2k} , but we conjecture that $\hat{\Gamma}_{2k} = \Gamma_{2k}$ in all cases below.)

k	Î _{2k}				$\hat{\gamma}_{2k}$			
1	0.544	331	053	952	0.911	337	892	096
2	0.778	192	979	320	0.887	228	082	721
3	0.853	294	443	051	0.880	233	341	695
4	0.890	391	158	846	0.876	870	729	236
5	0.912	511	021	366	0.874	889	786	340
6	0.927	201	419	083	0.873	582	971	010
7	0.937	667	439	454	0.872	655	847	650
8	0.945	502	263	242	0.871	963	788	123
9	0.951	587	367	216	0.871	427	390	110
10	0.956	450	029	314	0.870	999	413	712
11	0.960	425	000	586	0.870	649	987	104

Table 1

Finally, it seems reasonable to suppose that constants $~\mu_0$, $~\mu_1$,... exist, independent of ~2k , such that

$$(3.7) 2k(1-\hat{\Gamma}_{2k}) = \mu_0 + \frac{\mu_1}{2k} + \frac{\mu_2}{(2k)^2} + \dots , for k \to \infty.$$

Assuming (3.7), the Richardson extrapolation method (with $x_k = \frac{1}{2k}$) was then numerically applied to the column of numbers $\{\hat{\gamma}_{2k}\}_{k=1}^{11}$ of Table 1, to accelerate the convergence of these numbers. Numerically, this Richardson extrapolation converged very rapidly, so much so that we were led to our final two conjectures. We conjecture that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} 2k(1 - \hat{\Gamma}_{2k}) \quad \text{exists, i.e.,}$$

(3.8)
$$\lim_{k \to \infty} 2k(1 - \hat{r}_{2k}) = \mu_0$$
,

and we further conjecture that

(3.9) $\mu_0 = 0.867 189 051 .$

References

- 1. L. Fejér, "Trigonometrische Reihen und Potenzreihen mit mehrfach monotoner Koeffizientenfolge", Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 39 (1936), 18-59.
- P. Henrici, <u>Applied and Computational Complex Analysis</u>, volume 1, John Wiley, New York, 1974.
- 3. P. Henrici, "Methods of descent for polynomial equations", Computational Aspects of Complex Analysis (H. Werner, L. Wuytack, E. Ng, and H. J. Bünger, eds.), pp. 133-147. D. Reidel Publishing Co., Boston, 1983.
- 4. M. Marden, <u>Geometry of Polynomials</u>, Mathematical Surveys 3, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1966.
- G. Pólya and G. Szegö, <u>Aufgaben und Lehrsatze aus der Analysis</u>, volume II, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1954.
- S. Ruscheweyh, "On a global descent method for polynomials", Numerische Mathematik (submitted).