

# Analyticity domains of critical points of polynomials. A proof of Sendov's conjecture

Petar P. Petrov\*

November 29, 2021

## Abstract

Let  $\mathcal{P}_n^c(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})$  be the set of all complex polynomials  $p(z) = \prod_{i=1}^m (z - z_i)^{\mu_i}$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i = n$ , with derivatives of the form

$$p'(z) = n \prod_{i=1}^m (z - z_i)^{\mu_i - 1} \prod_{j=1}^k (z - \xi_j)^{\nu_j}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^k \nu_j = m - 1.$$

In this note we prove the following:

*For a fixed ordering  $\alpha = (1, 2, \dots, m)$ , the distinct zeros  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^m$  and the distinct critical points of the second kind  $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^k$  of polynomials from  $\mathcal{P}_n^c(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})$  are analytic functions  $\{z_i^{\alpha\beta}\}_{i=1}^m$  and  $\{\xi_j^{\alpha\beta}\}_{j=1}^k$ , resp.,  $\beta = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{k+1})$ , of any of the variables  $(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{k+1}})$  in the domain*

$$\{(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{k+1}}) \in \mathbb{C}^{k+1} \mid p \in \mathcal{P}_n^c(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})\},$$

*being also continuous on its boundary.*

This statement gives an immediate proof to the well-known conjecture of Bl. Sendov [4]:

*If  $n \geq 2$  and  $p(z) = \prod_{i=1}^n (z - z_i)$  is a polynomial of degree  $n$  such that  $z_i \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $|z_i| \leq 1$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , then for every  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , the disk  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z_i - z| \leq 1\}$  contains at least one zero of  $p'(z)$ .*

**Keywords:** Complex polynomials · Analyticity of critical points · Sendov's conjecture  
**MSC(2010):** 32A10 · 30C10 · 30C15

---

\*Email: peynovp@gmail.com

# 1 Domains of analyticity

Let  $\mathcal{P}_n^c$  be the set of complex polynomials of the form  $p(z) = \prod_{i=1}^n (z - z_i)$ . For given multiplicities  $\bar{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ ,  $m \geq 1$ , and  $\bar{\nu} := (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k)$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i = n \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^k \nu_i = m - 1, \quad (1)$$

let  $\mathbb{C}^n(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be the set consisting of all  $\bar{z} = ((z_1, \mu_1), \dots, (z_m, \mu_m))$ ,  $z_i \neq z_j$ ,  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ , such that there exists a polynomial  $p \in \mathcal{P}_n^c$  satisfying

(i)  $p(z) = p(\bar{z}; z) = \prod_{i=1}^m (z - z_i)^{\mu_i}$ ;

(ii)  $p$  possesses exactly  $k$  distinct critical points of the second kind (that is, zeros of  $p'$  which are not zeros of  $p$ ) with multiplicities  $\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_k$  and

$$p'(z) = n \prod_{i=1}^m (z - z_i)^{\mu_i - 1} \prod_{j=1}^k (z - \xi_j)^{\nu_j}.$$

The set of polynomials  $p$  satisfying (i) and (ii) will be denoted by

$$\mathcal{P}_n^c(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}) := \{p(\bar{z}; z) \in \mathcal{P}_n^c \mid \bar{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})\}.$$

**Theorem 1.** *For a prescribed ordering  $\alpha = (1, 2, \dots, m)$ , the distinct zeros  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^m$  and the distinct critical points of the second kind  $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^k$  of polynomials from  $\mathcal{P}_n^c(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})$  are analytic functions  $\{z_i^{\alpha\beta}\}_{i=1}^m$  and  $\{\xi_j^{\alpha\beta}\}_{j=1}^k$ , respectively,  $\beta = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{k+1})$ , of any of the variables  $(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{k+1}})$  in the domain*

$$\{(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{k+1}}) \in \mathbb{C}^{k+1} \mid \bar{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})\},$$

being also continuous on its boundary.

The proof of Theorem 1 is entirely based on the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *Let there be given multiplicities  $(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})$  satisfying (1) with  $m > 1$ , and let a polynomial  $p$  with zeros  $\{(z_i, \mu_i)\}_{i=1}^m$  belong to  $\mathcal{P}_n^c(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})$ . Then, the distinct critical points of the second kind  $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^k$  and the first  $m - k - 1$  zeros  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{m-k-1}$ , are (locally) analytic functions of the remaining ones  $z_{m-k}, z_{m-k+1}, \dots, z_m$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p_0(\bar{z}^0; z) \in \mathcal{P}_n^c(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})$ . Set  $s := m - 1 - k$ . Clearly,  $s \geq 0$  (with equality only when  $\nu_j = 1$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ). Let us consider the following system of equations

$$p^{(\ell)}(\xi_j) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k; \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_j, \quad (2)$$

for  $p = p_0(\bar{z}^0; z)$ . The proof of the lemma is based on the system (2) and the Implicit Mapping Theorem (see, e.g., [2, p. 28]). We need to show that there exist analytic functions  $z_1 =$

$z_1(z_{s+1}, \dots, z_m), \dots, z_s = z_s(z_{s+1}, \dots, z_m)$  and  $\xi_1 = \xi_1(z_{s+1}, \dots, z_m), \dots, \xi_k = \xi_k(z_{s+1}, \dots, z_m)$ , satisfying (2) in an open neighbourhood of  $(z_{s+1}^0, \dots, z_m^0)$ , or in other words, that the system of  $m - 1$  equations (2) can be locally and analytically solved with respect to the  $m - 1$  functions  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^s, \{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^k$ , or equivalently, that the Jacobian matrix  $J$  of (2) possesses the maximal rank. The Jacobian matrix of (2) (we omit for simplicity the upper index 0) is  $J = \text{diag}\{p''(\xi_1), \dots, p''(\xi_k)\}$  if  $s = 0$ , and

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega'_1(\xi_1) & \Omega''_1(\xi_1) & \dots & \Omega_1^{(\nu_1)}(\xi_1) & \dots & \Omega'_1(\xi_k) & \Omega''_1(\xi_k) & \dots & \Omega_1^{(\nu_k)}(\xi_k) \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \Omega'_s(\xi_1) & \Omega''_s(\xi_1) & \dots & \Omega_s^{(\nu_1)}(\xi_1) & \dots & \Omega'_s(\xi_k) & \Omega''_s(\xi_k) & \dots & \Omega_s^{(\nu_k)}(\xi_k) \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & p^{(\nu_1+1)}(\xi_1) & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & p^{(\nu_k+1)}(\xi_k) \end{bmatrix}^T,$$

where  $\Omega_i(z) = -\frac{\mu_i p(z)}{z - z_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , if  $s \geq 1$ . We need to prove that  $\text{rank } J = m - 1$ . If  $s = 0$ , this is a direct consequence of  $p''(\xi_j) \neq 0$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . Let  $s \geq 1$  and let us assume the contrary, that is,  $\text{rank } J < m - 1$ . Using that  $p^{(\nu_j+1)}(\xi_j) \neq 0$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , our assumption implies the existence of a non-zero vector  $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_s) \in \mathbb{C}^s$  such that the polynomial  $\Omega \in \mathcal{P}_{n-1}^c$  (the set of all complex polynomials of degree at most  $n - 1$ ),

$$\Omega(z) := -\beta_1 \mu_1^{-1} \Omega_1(z) - \beta_2 \mu_2^{-1} \Omega_2(z) - \dots - \beta_s \mu_s^{-1} \Omega_s(z) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{\beta_i}{z - z_i} \right) p(z),$$

satisfies

$$\Omega^{(\ell)}(\xi_j) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{\beta_i}{z - z_i} \right) \Big|_{z=\xi_j}^{(\ell)} p(\xi_j) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k; \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_j - 1. \quad (3)$$

Denote

$$\omega(z) := \prod_{i=1}^s (z - z_i), \quad \omega_i(z) := \frac{\omega(z)}{z - z_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s,$$

and

$$q(z) := \prod_{j=1}^k (z - \xi_j)^{\nu_j - 1}.$$

Clearly,  $q(z) \in \mathcal{P}_s^c$  since  $\sum_{j=1}^k (\nu_j - 1) = m - 1 - k = s$ . Using that  $z_i \neq \xi_j$ , it easily follows from (3) that there exists a vector  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_s) \in \mathbb{C}^s$  such that

$$q(z) \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \omega_i(z) + \sum_{i=1}^s \beta_i \omega_i^2(z) \equiv 0. \quad (4)$$

If  $\beta_i \neq 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \tilde{s}$ , and  $\beta_i = 0$ ,  $i = \tilde{s} + 1, \tilde{s} + 2, \dots, s$ ,  $1 \leq \tilde{s} < s$ , then we rewrite (4) in this way

$$q_1(z)q_2(z) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \omega_i(z)}{\prod_{i=\tilde{s}+1}^s (z - z_i)^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{s}} \beta_i \tilde{\omega}_i^2(z) \equiv 0,$$

where  $q_1(z) \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{s}}^c$ ,  $q_2(z) \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \omega_i(z) / \prod_{i=\tilde{s}+1}^s (z - z_i)^2 \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{s}-1}^c$ ,  $\tilde{\omega}_i(z) := \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{\tilde{s}} (z - z_j)$ , and arrive at a similar equation with  $s$  replaced by  $\tilde{s}$

$$q_1(z) \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{s}} \tilde{\alpha}_i \tilde{\omega}_i(z) + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{s}} \beta_i \tilde{\omega}_i^2(z) \equiv 0.$$

Therefore, without loss of generality, we can and will assume that  $\beta_i \neq 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ . Setting in (4)  $z = z_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , we get

$$\beta_i = -\alpha_i q(z_i) [\omega_i(z_i)]^{-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s,$$

and

$$q(z) \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \omega_i(z) - \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i q(z_i) [\omega_i(z_i)]^{-1} \omega_i^2(z) \equiv 0. \quad (5)$$

It follows from (5) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i = 0 \quad (6)$$

and

$$q(z_i) \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \alpha_j \omega_j'(z_i) + \alpha_i [q'(z_i) \omega_i(z_i) - q(z_i) \omega_i'(z_i)] = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (7)$$

According to Lagrange interpolation formula

$$q(z) = \sum_{i=1}^s q(z_i) \frac{\omega_i(z)}{\omega_i(z_i)} + \omega(z),$$

and in addition, by (5),

$$\omega(z) \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \omega_i(z) + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \left[ \alpha_i \frac{q(z_j)}{\omega_j(z_j)} + \alpha_j \frac{q(z_i)}{\omega_i(z_i)} \right] \omega_i(z) \omega_j(z) \equiv 0. \quad (8)$$

Dividing (8) by  $\omega(z)$  and setting  $z = z_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , give

$$\alpha_i \left[ 1 + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \frac{q(z_j)}{\omega_j(z_j)(z_i - z_j)} \right] + \frac{q(z_i)}{\omega_i(z_i)} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \frac{\alpha_j}{z_i - z_j} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (9)$$

The first sum in (9) will be calculated from the following equation, using the properties of the divided difference

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= q[z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_i, z_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_s] \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \frac{q(z_j)}{\omega_j(z_j)(z_i - z_j)} + \frac{q'(z_i)}{\omega_i(z_i)} + \frac{q(z_i)}{\omega_i(z_i)} \cdot \frac{\omega_i'(z_i)}{\omega_i(z_i)}, \end{aligned}$$

or more precisely,

$$\alpha_i \left[ q'(z_i) + q(z_i) \cdot \frac{\omega_i'(z_i)}{\omega_i(z_i)} \right] + q(z_i) \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \frac{\alpha_j}{z_i - z_j} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (10)$$

Finally, we get from (7) and (10)

$$2\alpha_i q(z_i) \omega_i'(z_i) = \alpha_i q(z_i) \omega''(z_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s.$$

Since  $\alpha_i q(z_i) \neq 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , this means that  $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_1^c$ , that is,  $s = 1$ , and by (6),  $\alpha_1 = \beta_1 = 0$ . This is a contradiction to our assumption that  $\text{rank } J < m - 1$  and hence,  $\text{rank } J = m - 1$ . The lemma is proved.  $\square$

## 2 Sendov's conjecture

Sendov's conjecture is one of the fundamental problems in the theory of complex polynomials. It was announced back in 1958 by Bulgarian mathematicians Blagovest Sendov and Lyubomir Iliev (see [4] for the history of the problem and for references before 2001). Despite the significant analytical and computational efforts within the last more than 60 years, there has not been yet a definitive proof of its validity. Here we show that it is an almost direct consequence of Theorem 1.

Let  $D := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| \leq 1\}$  be the closed unit disk in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Sendov's conjecture states:

**Conjecture 1.** If  $n \geq 2$  and  $p(z)$  is a polynomial from  $\mathcal{P}_n^c$  such that  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset D$ , then for every  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , the disk  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z_i - z| \leq 1\}$  contains at least one zero of  $p'(z)$ .

Set  $\bar{z} := (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ . If  $p'(z) = n \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (z - \zeta_j)$ , then the statement of Conjecture 1 is equivalent to

$$\max_{\bar{z} \in D^n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \min_{1 \leq j \leq n-1} |z_i - \zeta_j| = 1.$$

In what follows, the zeros of  $p$  will also be represented in the (already familiar) form  $\{(z_i, \mu_i)\}_{i=1}^m$  using for simplicity the same letters. Let

$$\mathbb{C}^n(m, k) := \cup \{\mathbb{C}^n(\bar{\mu}', \bar{\nu}') \mid m' = m, k' = k\}.$$

**Remark 1.** Taking Theorem 1 into account, it follows that, up to the ordering  $\alpha = (1, 2, \dots, m)$  of the variables, there exist unique functions  $\{z_i^\alpha\}_{i=1}^m$  and  $\{\xi_j^\alpha\}_{j=1}^k$  of  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^{k+1}$ , analytic on  $\mathbb{C}^n(m, k)$ , which naturally coincide into new functions on  $\mathbb{C}^n(m', k')$ ,  $m' \leq m$ ,  $k' < k$ , when some of the variables (zeros of  $p$ ) and (or) some of the functions  $\{\xi_j^\alpha\}_{j=1}^k$  (critical points of the second kind of  $p$ ) overlap. Moreover,  $\{z_i^\alpha\}_{i=1}^m$  and  $\{\xi_j^\alpha\}_{j=1}^k$  are continuous on its boundary

$$\partial \mathbb{C}^n(m, k) = \mathbb{C}^n(m-1, k-1) \cup \mathbb{C}^n(m, k-1),$$

$$2 \leq m \leq n, \quad 2 \leq k \leq m-1.$$

*Proof of Conjecture 1.* Let  $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n(m, k)$ . Define the functions

$$S(\bar{z}) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \min_{1 \leq j \leq n-1} |z_i - \zeta_j| \quad (11)$$

and

$$S_\ell := \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} |z_\ell - \xi_j| \quad (12)$$

for all  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$  such that  $\mu_\ell = 1$ . We will prove the following enhancement of the conjecture under consideration:

**Theorem 3.** *If  $\bar{z} \in D^m$  and  $m \geq 2$ , then we have*

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq k} |z_\ell - \xi_j| \leq 1,$$

for any  $z_\ell$ ,  $\mu_\ell = 1$ , with equality if and only if  $m = n$ ,  $k = 1$  and  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n$  coincide with the roots of unity  $\{e^{\frac{2(i-1)\pi i}{n}}\}_{i=1}^n$ .

*Proof.* Let us show first that the proof can be reduced to the case  $k = 1$ . Let  $k \geq 2$ ,  $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n(m, k)$  and  $|z_\ell| < 1$ . Denote by  $\text{rad}_c(A)$  the radius of the circumscribed disk of a set of points  $A$  (the smallest closed disk containing  $A$ ). Let  $\Phi$  be the map from Theorem 1 and consider all sufficiently small local paths  $\bar{z}(t)$ ,  $t \in [0, t_0)$  such that  $z_\ell(t) \in \text{int}(D)$ ,  $t \in [0, t_0)$ . For each such path we take the configuration  $\Phi(\bar{z}(t))$  and consider the points  $\Phi(\bar{z}(t))/\text{rad}_c(t) \subset D^{m+k}$ . All these points constitute a set  $V_1 \times \dots \times V_m \times W_1 \times \dots \times W_k \subset D^{m+k}$  such that  $V_\ell$  and  $W_1, \dots, W_k$  are open neighbourhoods of  $z_\ell$  and  $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^k$ , respectively. This means that we can move the points  $z_\ell, \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_k$  so that to increase  $S_\ell$  and  $\bar{z}$  to remain in  $\mathbb{C}^n(m, k) \cap D^m$ . Therefore, the maximum point of  $S_\ell$  is located on  $\partial(\mathbb{C}^n(m, k)) \cap D^m$ . Now, all we need to do next is to consider the case  $k = 1$ .

**The case  $k = 1$ .** Let  $(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu})$  be such that  $k = 1$  and  $\nu_1 = m - 1$ , respectively. Let  $p(z) = \prod_{i=1}^m (z - z_i)^{\mu_i}$  and  $p'(z) = n(z - \xi_1)^{m-1} \prod_{i=1}^m (z - z_i)^{\mu_i - 1}$ . Then, we have consecutively

$$\frac{p'(z)}{p(z)} = \frac{n(z - \xi_1)^{m-1}}{\prod_{i=1}^m (z - z_i)} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\mu_i}{z - z_i},$$

$$(z - \xi_1)^{m-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \omega_i(z), \quad \omega_i(z) = \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^m (z - z_j),$$

$$\xi := \xi_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} z_i, \quad \tilde{\mu}_i := \frac{n - \mu_i}{m - 1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

We have to prove that  $|z_\ell - \xi| \leq 1$  for all  $z_\ell$  such that  $\mu_\ell = 1$ . Let

$$|z_{i_0} - \xi| = \max_{\mu_\ell=1} |z_\ell - \xi|, \quad \text{for some } z_{i_0}, \quad |z_{i_0}| < 1.$$

Without loss of generality, we will assume that  $\text{rad}_c(\bar{z}) = 1$ . Let also  $m \geq 9$  (Conjecture 1 is proved for polynomials with  $m \leq 8$  [1]). Denote

$$\xi =: a + ib, \quad z_i =: a_i + ib_i, \quad \xi - z_i =: c_i e^{i\theta_i}, \quad c_i > 0, \quad \theta_i \in [0, 2\pi),$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , and  $c := \prod_{i=1}^m c_i$ ,  $\theta := \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i$ . By means of Kuhn-Tucker necessary conditions, we will investigate the extremal points of the problem

$$F_0 \rightarrow \max, \quad f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m; z) \equiv 0, \quad a_i^2 + b_i^2 \leq 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad (13)$$

where

$$F_0 := F_0(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) := (a - a_{i_0})^2 + (b - b_{i_0})^2,$$

and

$$f := f(z) := f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m; z) := (z - \xi)^{m-1} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \omega_i(z).$$

To this aim, set

$$F := F(z) := F_0(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) - \lambda_1 \Re f(z) - \lambda_2 \Im f(z) - \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i (a_i^2 + b_i^2 - 1),$$

where  $\eta_i \geq 0$  and  $\eta_i (a_i^2 + b_i^2 - 1) = 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , at the extremal points.

The construction of the function  $F$  needs some additional comments. Formally, we should define it by using  $m$  different equality constraints, corresponding to  $m$  different arbitrary points  $z$  in an open neighbourhood of  $\xi$ . However, our calculations below implicitly use these constraints in taking the partial derivatives of  $F$  with respect to  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $\{a_i, b_i\}_{i=1}^m$  and setting  $z = \xi$ . This is justified by the fact that the constraint functions (and so, the extremal points) are continuous functions of  $z$ . Next, we calculate the corresponding partial derivatives at  $z = \xi$ . First,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial a_i} = -\frac{\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} (m-1) (z - \xi)^{m-2} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^m \mu_j \omega_{ij}(z), \quad \omega_{ij}(z) = \frac{\omega_i(z)}{z - z_j}, \quad i \neq j.$$

From here,

$$(z - z_i) \frac{\partial f}{\partial a_i} = -\frac{\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} (m-1)(z - \xi)^{m-2}(z - z_i) + (z - \xi)^{m-1} - \frac{\mu_i}{n} \omega_i(z)$$

and

$$(\xi - z_i) \frac{\partial f}{\partial a_i}(\xi) = -\frac{\mu_i}{n} \omega_i(\xi).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} c_i e^{i\theta_i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial a_i}(\xi) &= -\frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i} e^{i(\theta-\theta_i)}, & \frac{\partial f}{\partial a_i}(\xi) &= -\frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i^2} e^{i(\theta-2\theta_i)}, \\ c_i e^{i\theta_i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial b_i}(\xi) &= -\frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i} i e^{i(\theta-\theta_i)}, & \frac{\partial f}{\partial b_i}(\xi) &= -\frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i^2} i e^{i(\theta-2\theta_i)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Re f}{\partial a_i}(\xi) &= -\frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i^2} \cos(\theta - 2\theta_i), & \frac{\partial \Re f}{\partial b_i}(\xi) &= +\frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i^2} \sin(\theta - 2\theta_i) \\ \frac{\partial \Im f}{\partial a_i}(\xi) &= -\frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i^2} \sin(\theta - 2\theta_i), & \frac{\partial \Im f}{\partial b_i}(\xi) &= -\frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i^2} \cos(\theta - 2\theta_i). \end{aligned}$$

For the partial derivatives of  $F_0$  with respect to  $a_i, b_i, i \neq i_0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial a_i} &= \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} (a - a_{i_0}) = \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} c_{i_0} \cos(\theta_{i_0}), \\ \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial b_i} &= \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} (b - b_{i_0}) = \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} c_{i_0} \sin(\theta_{i_0}), \end{aligned}$$

and, in addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial a_{i_0}} &= \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - 2n}{n} c_{i_0} \cos(\theta_{i_0}), \\ \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial b_{i_0}} &= \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - 2n}{n} c_{i_0} \sin(\theta_{i_0}). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are ready to write Kuhn-Tucker necessary conditions for a maximum of  $F_0$  at the points  $\{a_i + ib_i\}_{i=1}^m$  under the conditions given in (13) for  $z = \xi$  (for simplicity, we do not change the notation for the points of maximum). More precisely, the following must be fulfilled

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_i} &= \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} c_{i_0} \cos(\theta_{i_0}) + \frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i^2} [\lambda_1 \cos(\theta - 2\theta_i) + \lambda_2 \sin(\theta - 2\theta_i)] - 2\eta_i a_i = 0, \quad i \neq i_0, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial b_i} &= \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_i}{n} c_{i_0} \sin(\theta_{i_0}) + \frac{c\mu_i}{nc_i^2} [-\lambda_1 \sin(\theta - 2\theta_i) + \lambda_2 \cos(\theta - 2\theta_i)] - 2\eta_i b_i = 0, \quad i \neq i_0, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_{i_0}} &= \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - 2n}{n} c_{i_0} \cos(\theta_{i_0}) + \frac{c\mu_{i_0}}{nc_{i_0}^2} [\lambda_1 \cos(\theta - 2\theta_{i_0}) + \lambda_2 \sin(\theta - 2\theta_{i_0})] - 2\eta_{i_0} a_{i_0} = 0, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial b_{i_0}} &= \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - 2n}{n} c_{i_0} \sin(\theta_{i_0}) + \frac{c\mu_{i_0}}{nc_{i_0}^2} [-\lambda_1 \sin(\theta - 2\theta_{i_0}) + \lambda_2 \cos(\theta - 2\theta_{i_0})] - 2\eta_{i_0} b_{i_0} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$



Using that  $\lambda_1 = \lambda \cos(\theta_\lambda)$  and  $\lambda_2 = \lambda \sin(\theta_\lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $\theta_\lambda \in [0, 2\pi)$ , Equations (14) can be rewritten as follows

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tilde{\mu}_i c_{i_0} \cos(\theta_{i_0}) + \lambda \frac{c\mu_i}{c_i^2} \cos(\theta - 2\theta_i - \theta_\lambda) - 2n\eta_i a_i &= 0, \quad i \neq i_0, \\ 2\tilde{\mu}_i c_{i_0} \sin(\theta_{i_0}) - \lambda \frac{c\mu_i}{c_i^2} \sin(\theta - 2\theta_i - \theta_\lambda) - 2n\eta_i b_i &= 0, \quad i \neq i_0, \\ (2\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - 2n)c_{i_0} \cos(\theta_{i_0}) + \lambda \frac{c\mu_{i_0}}{c_{i_0}^2} \cos(\theta - 2\theta_{i_0} - \theta_\lambda) - 2n\eta_{i_0} a_{i_0} &= 0, \\ (2\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - 2n)c_{i_0} \sin(\theta_{i_0}) - \lambda \frac{c\mu_{i_0}}{c_{i_0}^2} \sin(\theta - 2\theta_{i_0} - \theta_\lambda) - 2n\eta_{i_0} b_{i_0} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tilde{\mu}_i(\bar{\xi} - \bar{z}_{i_0}) + \lambda \frac{c\mu_i}{c_i^2} e^{i(\theta - 2\theta_i - \theta_\lambda)} - 2n\eta_i \bar{z}_i &= 0, \quad i \neq i_0, \\ (2\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - 2n)(\bar{\xi} - \bar{z}_{i_0}) + \lambda \frac{c\mu_{i_0}}{c_{i_0}^2} e^{i(\theta - 2\theta_{i_0} - \theta_\lambda)} - 2n\eta_{i_0} \bar{z}_{i_0} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

from where

$$\lambda e^{-i\theta_\lambda} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^m (\xi - z_j)}{(\xi - z_i)^2} + \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_i}{\mu_i} (\bar{\xi} - \bar{z}_{i_0}) - 2n \frac{\eta_i}{\mu_i} \bar{z}_i = 0, \quad i \neq i_0, \quad (15)$$

$$\lambda e^{-i\theta_\lambda} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^m (\xi - z_j)}{(\xi - z_{i_0})^2} + \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - 2n}{\mu_{i_0}} (\bar{\xi} - \bar{z}_{i_0}) - 2n \frac{\eta_{i_0}}{\mu_{i_0}} \bar{z}_{i_0} = 0. \quad (16)$$

Equations (15) and (16) yield

$$\begin{aligned} (\xi - z_i)^2 \left[ \frac{\tilde{\mu}_i}{\mu_i} (\bar{\xi} - \bar{z}_{i_0}) - n \frac{\eta_i}{\mu_i} \bar{z}_i \right] &= \\ (\tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - n)(\xi - z_{i_0})^2 (\bar{\xi} - \bar{z}_{i_0}) &= -\frac{\lambda}{2} e^{-i\theta_\lambda} \prod_{j=1}^m (\xi - z_j), \quad i \neq i_0, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

since  $\mu_{i_0} = 1$  and  $\eta_{i_0} = 0$ . Remind that  $|z_{i_0}| < 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_{i_0} &= \frac{n-1}{m-1}, \quad \tilde{\mu}_i = \frac{n-\mu_i}{m-1}, \quad i \neq i_0, \\ \tilde{\mu}_{i_0} - n &= \frac{n-1-(m-1)n}{(m-1)} < 0, \quad \frac{\tilde{\mu}_i}{\mu_i} = \frac{n-\mu_i}{(m-1)\mu_i}, \quad i \neq i_0. \end{aligned}$$

Let there exist another zero  $z_i$  with  $|z_i| < 1$  and  $\eta_i = 0$ . Then, (17) implies for  $m \geq 4$

$$\frac{|\xi - z_{i_0}|^2}{|\xi - z_i|^2} = \frac{n-\mu_i}{\mu_i} \cdot \frac{1}{(m-1)n - (n-1)} < \frac{1}{2\mu_i}.$$

If  $\mu_i = 1$ , this is a contradiction to our assumption that  $|\xi - z_{i_0}| = \max_{\{i|\mu_i=1\}} |\xi - z_i|$ . If  $\mu_i > 1$ , then

$$|\xi - z_{i_0}| < 1.$$

Accordingly, it is sufficient to consider the case  $|z_i| = 1$  and  $\eta_i > 0$ ,  $i \neq i_0$ . Let  $z_i := e^{i\gamma_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ,  $i \neq i_0$ . By using an appropriate rotation with center 0, we can and will suppose that  $\Im(\xi - z_{i_0}) = 0$  and  $\xi - z_{i_0} < 0$ . Take an arbitrary  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $i \neq i_0$ . Then, it follows from (17) that 0 lies in the interior of the triangle with vertices 1,  $\psi_1 := (\xi - z_i)^2 = c_i^2 e^{i2\theta_i}$  and  $\psi_2 := (\xi - z_i)^2 \bar{z}_i = c_i^2 e^{i(2\theta_i - \gamma_i)}$ , and thus,

$$\Im\psi_1 \Im\psi_2 < 0. \quad (18)$$

Further, if  $l : \Im z = \alpha \Re z + \beta$  is the line passing through  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$ , and  $\psi$  is the intersection point of  $l$  with the real axis, then

$$\psi = -\frac{\beta}{\alpha} = \frac{\Im\psi_2 \Re\psi_1 - \Im\psi_1 \Re\psi_2}{\Im\psi_2 - \Im\psi_1} < 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$\Re\psi_1 < \frac{\Im\psi_1}{\Im\psi_2} \Re\psi_2. \quad (19)$$

Clearly, inequalities (18) and (19) are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \sin(2\theta_i) \sin(2\theta_i - \gamma_i) &< 0, \\ \cos(2\theta_i) &< \frac{\sin(2\theta_i)}{\sin(2\theta_i - \gamma_i)} \cos(2\theta_i - \gamma_i). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

In view of inequalities (20), we have either  $\theta_i \in (\pi/2, \pi)$  and  $\gamma_i \in (0, \pi)$  (if  $\sin(2\theta_i) < 0$  and  $\sin(\gamma_i) > 0$ ) or  $\theta_i \in (\pi, 3\pi/2)$  and  $\gamma_i \in (\pi, 2\pi)$  (if  $\sin(2\theta_i) > 0$  and  $\sin(\gamma_i) < 0$ ). In both cases the points  $\xi$ ,  $z_i$  and  $\xi - z_i$  lie in the same open half-plane with respect to the real axis, for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ,  $i \neq i_0$ . Since  $|z_{i_0}| < 1$ , this implies that  $\text{rad}_c(\bar{z}) < 1$ , which is a contradiction. Consequently, the maximum of  $|z_{i_0} - \xi|$  is attained when all the points  $z_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , lie on the unit circle  $\partial D$ . Applying [3, Theorem 1] to  $z_{i_0}$ , it follows that  $\xi = 0$  and the maximum is equal to 1. Finally, using again [3, Theorem 1], we conclude that this can happen only if  $m = n$ ,  $k = 1$  and  $p(z) = z^n - 1$ . Theorem 3 is proved.  $\square$

## References

- [1] J. E. Brown and G. Xiang, On the Sendov's conjecture for polynomials of degree at most eight, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 252, pp. 272–292, 1999.
- [2] L. Kaup and B. Kaup, *Holomorphic functions of several variables*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1983.
- [3] Z. Rubinstein, On a problem of Ilyeff, *Pacific J. Math.*, 26, pp. 159–161, 1968.
- [4] Bl. Sendov, Hausdorff geometry of polynomials, *East J. Approx.*, 7, pp. 123–178, 2001.