## Majorization of Zeros of Polynomials
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Let $f$ be a monic polynomial of degree $n$ with zeros $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}$. We show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu=1}^{k} \phi\left(\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right) & \leq \phi\left(M_{0}(f)\right)+(k-1) \phi(1) \quad(k=1, \ldots, n-1) \\
\sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \phi\left(\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right) & \leq \phi\left(M_{0}(f)\right)+(n-2) \phi(1)+\phi\left(|f(0)| / M_{0}(f)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\phi$ is any non-decreasing function such that $\phi \circ \exp$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}$ and $M_{0}(f)$ is the so-called Mahler measure of $f$. These inequalities describe a weak majorization. Certain upper bounds for the Mahler measure allow us to establish more explicit results, which are still sharp.

## 1. Introduction and Statement of Results

First, we introduce the following notation (see [3, p.10]). For any vector $\boldsymbol{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, we denote by $\left(x_{[1]}, \ldots, x_{[n]}\right)$ a rearrangement of the components of $\boldsymbol{x}$ such that $x_{[1]} \geq \cdots \geq x_{[n]}$. Now we can define the term majorization as follows.

Definition 1. For two vectors $\boldsymbol{a}=\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right)$ and $\boldsymbol{b}=\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{n}\right)$, we say that $\boldsymbol{a}$ is weakly majorized by $\boldsymbol{b}$, and write this as $\boldsymbol{a} \prec_{\mathrm{w}} \boldsymbol{b}$, if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{[j]} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_{[j]} \quad(k=1, \ldots, n) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, we say that $\boldsymbol{a}$ is (strongly) majorized by $\boldsymbol{b}$, and write this as $\boldsymbol{a} \prec \boldsymbol{b}$, if in (1) equality occurs for $k=n$.

Clearly, the inequalities (1) remain true if, on the left-hand side, we use any other arrangement of the components of $\boldsymbol{a}$.

A result of Weyl (see [8] or [3, p. 116, A.2]) states that, if $\boldsymbol{a} \prec_{\mathrm{w}} \boldsymbol{b}$ and $\psi$ is any non-decreasing convex function on $\mathbb{R}$, then

$$
\left(\psi\left(a_{1}\right), \ldots, \psi\left(a_{n}\right)\right) \prec_{\mathrm{w}}\left(\psi\left(b_{1}\right), \ldots, \psi\left(b_{n}\right)\right) .
$$

Majorizations have been studied not only in various branches of mathematics, but also in other subjects such as economics (see [3]). They are of interest since they provide some information about the distribution of the components of $\boldsymbol{a}$ as compared to those of $\boldsymbol{b}$. They also imply individual bounds for the components of $\boldsymbol{a}$.

In this paper, we are interested in majorizations for the moduli of the zeros of a polynomial $f$. Our main result refines and extends Theorem 1 in [5]. We shall use the quantity

$$
M_{0}(f):=\exp \left(\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \log \left|f\left(e^{i \theta}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} \theta\right)
$$

which has sometimes been called the Mahler measure of $f$.
Furthermore, we shall denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the class of all non-decreasing functions $\phi:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which $\phi \circ \exp$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}$. Examples of functions belonging to $\mathcal{F}$ are $\phi(x)=\log x, \phi(x)=\max \{a, \log x\}$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\phi(x)=x^{p}$ for any $p>0$.

Theorem 1. Let $f$ be a monic polynomial of degree $n$ with zeros $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}$. Then, for any $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu=1}^{k} \phi\left(\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right) & \leq \phi\left(M_{0}(f)\right)+(k-1) \phi(1) \quad(k=1, \ldots, n-1) \\
\sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \phi\left(\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right) & \leq \phi\left(M_{0}(f)\right)+(n-2) \phi(1)+\phi\left(|f(0)| / M_{0}(f)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Equality is attained throughout when

$$
f(z)=\left(z-z_{1}\right)\left(z-z_{n}\right) \prod_{\nu=2}^{n-1}\left(z-\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta_{\nu}}\right)
$$

where $\left|z_{1}\right| \geq 1,\left|z_{n}\right| \leq 1$, and $\theta_{2}, \ldots, \theta_{n-1} \in[0,2 \pi)$.
Note that the class of polynomials for which equality is attained is relatively large since it can be described by $n+2$ independent real parameters. Moreover, the proof will show that, for any monic polynomial, there is equality in at least two of the relations when $\phi$ is the logarithm.

However, from a practical point of view, Theorem 1 may not be easily applicable since, in general, the determination of the Mahler measure $M_{0}(f)$ can be as difficult as the calculation of the zeros. This is shown by the following observation.

Proposition 1. For a polynomial $f$ of degree $n \geq 5$, it is in general not possible to express $M_{0}(f)$ in terms of the coefficients of $f$ by means of a finite number of rational operations and radicals.

For this reason, it is desirable to have results in terms of the $L^{2}$ norm

$$
\|f\|:=\left(\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|f\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} t}\right)\right|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t\right)^{1 / 2}=\left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{n}\left|a_{\nu}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

of a polynomial $f(z)=\sum_{\nu=0}^{n} a_{\nu} z^{\nu}$. From Theorem 1, we can deduce the following statement.

Corollary 1. Let $f$ be a monic polynomial of degree $n$ with zeros $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}$. Define

$$
N_{ \pm}(f):=\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\left(\|f\|^{2} \pm \sqrt{\|f\|^{4}-4|f(0)|^{2}}\right)}
$$

Then, for any $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu=1}^{k} \phi\left(\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right) & \leq \phi\left(N_{+}(f)\right)+(k-1) \phi(1) \quad(k=1, \ldots, n-1) \\
\sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \phi\left(\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right) & \leq \phi\left(N_{+}(f)\right)+(n-2) \phi(1)+\phi\left(N_{-}(f)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Equality is attained throughout when $f(z)=z^{n}+\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta}$, where $\theta \in[0,2 \pi)$.
Finally, we state another consequence of Theorem 1. It is slightly weaker than Corollary 1, but it allows us to interpret the polynomial $f$ as a perturbation of a binomial. As such, the result is a counterpart to Theorem 4 in [5].

Corollary 2. Let $f$ be a monic polynomial of degree $n$ with zeros $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}$ and let $f_{*}(z):=z^{n}+\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta}$, where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for any $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\nu=1}^{k} \phi\left(\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right) \leq \phi\left(1+\left\|f-f_{*}\right\|\right)+(k-1) \phi(1) \quad(k=1, \ldots, n-1), \\
& \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \phi\left(\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right) \leq \phi\left(1+\left\|f-f_{*}\right\|\right)+(n-2) \phi(1)+\phi\left(|f(0)| /\left(1+\left\|f-f_{*}\right\|\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Equality is attained throughout when $f=f_{*}$.

## 2. Auxiliary Results

It is well known (see, e.g., [1, Theorem 184]) that, for any monic polynomial $f$, we have $M_{0}(f) \leq\|f\|$. The following lemma gives a refinement of this inequality.

Lemma 1. For any monic polynomial $f$, we have, in the notation of Corollary 1,

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{0}(f) \leq N_{+}(f) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $f(z)=\prod_{\nu=1}^{n}\left(z-z_{\nu}\right)$, and let

$$
\{1, \ldots, n\}=I_{1} \cup I_{2} \quad\left(I_{1} \cap I_{2}=\emptyset\right)
$$

be any decomposition of the set of indices into two disjoint subsets. Then, by an inequality of Vicente Gonçalves [7],

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prod_{\mu \in I_{1}}\left|z_{\mu}\right|^{2}+\prod_{\nu \in I_{2}}\left|z_{\nu}\right|^{2} \leq\|f\|^{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where a product has to be replaced by 1 if the corresponding subset of indices is the empty set. Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{0}(f)=\prod_{\nu=1}^{n} \max \left\{1,\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right\} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

(see [2, p.98, formula(2)] or [4, p.105]), there exists a decomposition such that

$$
M_{0}(f)=\prod_{\mu \in I_{1}}\left|z_{\mu}\right|
$$

Moreover, $z_{1} \cdots z_{n}=(-1)^{n} f(0)$. Hence, it follows from (3) that

$$
M_{0}(f)^{2}+|f(0)|^{2} M_{0}(f)^{-2} \leq\|f\|^{2}
$$

that is,

$$
M_{0}(f)^{4}-\|f\|^{2} M_{0}(f)^{2}+|f(0)|^{-2} \leq 0
$$

This is a quadratic inequality for $M_{0}(f)^{2}$, which implies (2).
Lemma 2. For $a \in \mathbb{C}$, define

$$
\Phi(x):=\left[x+(1-|a|)^{2}\right]\left[x+(1+|a|)^{2}\right]
$$

and

$$
\Psi(x):=\left[2-2 \Re a+|1-a|^{2}+x+4 \sqrt{x+|1-a|^{2}}\right]^{2}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi(x) \leq \Psi(x) \quad(x \geq 0) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. At $x=0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi(0) & =\left[2-2 \Re a+|1-a|^{2}+4|1-a|\right]^{2}=\left[1-|a|^{2}+2|1-a|^{2}+4|1-a|\right]^{2} \\
& =\left(1-|a|^{2}\right)^{2}+4\left(|1-a|^{2}+2|1-a|\right)\left(|1-a|^{2}+2|1-a|+1-|a|^{2}\right) \\
& =\Phi(0)+4\left(|1-a|^{2}+2|1-a|\right)\left[(1+|1-a|)^{2}-|a|^{2}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since, by the triangular inequality, $|a| \leq 1+|1-a|$, we see that the term in square brackets is non-negative, and so $\Phi(0) \leq \Psi(0)$.

Next, we compare the derivatives of $\Phi$ and $\Psi$. Obviously,

$$
\Psi^{\prime}(x)=2\left[2+|1-a|^{2}-2 \Re a+x+4 \sqrt{x+|1-a|^{2}}\right]\left(1+\frac{2}{\sqrt{x+|1-a|^{2}}}\right)
$$

Since

$$
2-2 \Re a+2 \sqrt{x+|1-a|^{2}} \geq 2(1-\Re a)+2|1-a| \geq 0
$$

we conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi^{\prime}(x) & \geq 2\left[|1-a|^{2}+x+2 \sqrt{x+|1-a|^{2}}\right]\left(1+\frac{2}{\sqrt{x+|1-a|^{2}}}\right) \\
& \geq 2\left[|1-a|^{2}+2|1-a|+x\right]+8 \\
& =2(|1-a|+1)^{2}+2 x+6 \geq 2|a|^{2}+2 x+6=\Phi^{\prime}(x)+4
\end{aligned}
$$

Altogether, we have shown that $\Phi(0) \leq \Psi(0)$ and $\Phi^{\prime}(x) \leq \Psi^{\prime}(x)$ for $x \geq 0$. This implies that (5) holds.

Lemma 3. Let $f$ be a monic polynomial of positive degree and let $f_{*}(z):=$ $z^{n}+\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta}$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, in the notation of Corollary 1 ,

$$
N_{+}(f) \leq 1+\left\|f-f_{*}\right\|
$$

Proof. First, we note that

$$
\left\|f-f_{*}\right\|=\sqrt{\|f\|^{2}-2 \Re a}
$$

where $a=f(0) e^{-\mathrm{i} \theta}$. Hence we have to show that

$$
\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\|f\|^{2}+\sqrt{\|f\|^{4}-4|a|^{2}}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}-1 \leq \sqrt{\|f\|^{2}-2 \Re a}
$$

By a simple calculation, we find that this inequality is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\|f\|^{2}-2|a|\right)\left(\|f\|^{2}+2|a|\right) \leq\left[2+\|f\|^{2}-4 \Re a+4 \sqrt{\|f\|^{2}-2 \Re a}\right]^{2} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, introducing $S:=\sum_{\nu=1}^{n-1}\left|a_{\nu}\right|^{2}$, we have

$$
\|f\|^{2}=1+|a|^{2}+S, \quad\|f\|^{2}-2 \Re a=S+|1-a|^{2},
$$

and so (6) may be rewritten as
$\left[S+(1-|a|)^{2}\right]\left[S+(1+|a|)^{2}\right] \leq\left[2-2 \Re a+|1-a|^{2}+S+4 \sqrt{S+|1-a|^{2}}\right]^{2}$,
which is true, as a consequence of Lemma 2 and the fact that $S \geq 0$. This completes the proof.

## 3. Proofs of the Results

Proof of Theorem 1. Clearly, (4) implies that, for any $k \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$, we have

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{k} \log \left|z_{j}\right| \leq \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \log \left(\max \left\{1,\left|z_{\nu}\right|\right\}\right)=\log M_{0}(f)
$$

Moreover,

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \log \left|z_{j}\right|=\log |f(0)|
$$

Hence we have the (strong) majorization

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\log \left|z_{1}\right|, \ldots, \log \left|z_{n}\right|\right) \prec\left(\log M_{0}(f), 0, \ldots, 0, \log \left(|f(0)| / M_{0}(f)\right),\right. \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and so the result follows from Weyl's theorem.
Proof of Proposition 1. With the help of a computer algebra program (such as Maple), it is readily verified that the polynomial

$$
h(z):=z^{5}-10 z^{4}+11 z^{3}-10 z^{2}+6 z-5
$$

has a zero at $z_{1}:=8.88035275 \ldots$ and two pairs of conjugate zeros inside the unit circle. Hence, in view of (4),

$$
f(z):=(z-1)^{n-5} h(z) \quad(n \geq 5)
$$

is a monic polynomial such that $M_{0}(f)=z_{1}$. It is shown in [6, pp. 393-394] that the Galois group of $h(-z)$ is the symmetric group. This implies that none of the zeros of $h$ is contained in an extension of the field of rational numbers by radicals. Thus $M_{0}(f)$ cannot be expressed in terms of the coefficients of $f$ by means of rational operations and radicals.

Proof of Corollaries 1 and 2. The relation (7) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^{k} \log \left|z_{j}\right| \leq \log M_{0}(f) \quad(k=1, \ldots, n-1) \\
& \sum_{j=1}^{n} \log \left|z_{j}\right|=\log |f(0)|
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that, if $K \geq M_{0}(f)$, then also

$$
\left(\log \left|z_{1}\right|, \ldots, \log \left|z_{n}\right|\right) \prec(\log K, 0, \ldots, 0, \log (|f(0)| / K)) .
$$

According to Lemmas 1 and 3, the numbers $N_{+}(f)$ and $1+\left\|f-f_{*}\right\|$ are upper bounds for $M_{0}(f)$. Using these bounds as $K$, and applying again Weyl's result, we obtain the conclusions of the corollaries.

## References

[1] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, "Inequalities", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1934.
[2] K. Mahler, An application of Jensen's inequality to polynomials, Mathematica 7 (1960), 98-100.
[3] A. W. Marshall and I. Olkin, "Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications", Academic Press, San Diego, 1979.
[4] L. Mirsky, Some applications of a minimum principle in linear algebra, Monatsh. Math. 67 (1963), 104-112.
[5] G. Schmeisser, Sharp inequalities for the zeros of polynomials and power series, Results in Mathematics 39 (2001), 333-334.
[6] N. Tschebotaröw, "Grundzüge der Galois'schen Theorie", P. Nordhoff N.V., Groningen, 1950.
[7] J. Vicente Gonçalves, L'inégalité de W. Specht, Revista da Faculdade de Ciências de Lisboa (2) 1A (1950), 167-171.
[8] H. Weyl, Inequalities between two kinds of eigenvalues of a linear transformation, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 35 (1949), 408-411.

Gerhard Schmeisser
Mathematical Institute
University of Erlangen-Nuremberg
Bismarckstrasse $1 \frac{1}{2}$
D-91054 Erlangen
GERMANY
E-mail: schmeisser@mi.uni-erlangen.de

