

Some Analysable Instances of μ -synthesis

Arkadiusz Lewandowski, Paweł Zapałowski

Będlewo, June 2014

based on

- N. J. Young, *Some Analysable Instances of μ -synthesis*, *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications* **222** (2012) 351–368.
- J. Agler, Z. A. Lykova, N. J. Young, *The complex geometry of a domain related to μ -synthesis*, arXiv:1403.1960.

Outline

- 1 The μ -synthesis problem
- 2 The spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem—bidisc (Agler, Young, 1999)
- 3 The structured Nevanlinna-Pick problem—tetrablock (Abouhajar, White, Young, 2007)
- 4 The Agler-Lykova-Young problem—pentablock (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014)
- 5 The spectral/structured Carathéodory-Fejér problem (Huang, Marcantognini, Young, 2006)/(Young, 2008)

- The μ -synthesis problem is an interpolation problem for analytic matrix functions, a generalization of the classical problems of Nevanlinna-Pick and Carathéodory-Fejér.
- The symbol μ denotes a type of cost function that is a refinement of the usual operator norm of a matrix and is motivated by the problem of the robust stabilization of a plant that is subject to structured uncertainty.
- The μ -synthesis problem is to construct an analytic matrix function F on the unit disc
 - satisfying a finite number of interpolation conditions and such that
 - $\mu(F(\lambda)) \leq 1$ for $|\lambda| < 1$.

Let $l, k \in \mathbb{N}$. For a vector subspace $E \subset \mathbb{C}^{l \times k}$ and a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times l}$ put

$$E_A := \{X \in E : \det(\mathbb{I}_k - AX) = 0\}.$$

- 1 $E_0 = \emptyset$, $\{0\}_A = \emptyset$.
- 2 There are $E \neq \{0\}$ and $A \neq 0$ such that $E_A = \emptyset$.
- 3 If $A \neq 0$ then $\|X\| \geq \|A\|^{-1}$ for any $X \in E_A$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the operator norm.
- 4 In particular, $\inf\{\|X\| : X \in E_A\} > 0$, whenever $A \neq 0$.
- 5 If $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}_*$ then

$$\inf\{\|X\| : X \in E_{\alpha A}\} = |\alpha|^{-1} \inf\{\|X\| : X \in E_A\}.$$

Definition (Doyle, Stein, 1981)

The **structured singular value** of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times l}$ relative to the vector subspace $E \subset \mathbb{C}^{l \times k}$ we denote by $\mu_E(A)$ and define by

$$\mu_E(A) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\inf\{\|X\| : X \in E_A\}}, & \text{if } E_A \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & \text{if } E_A = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

- 1 $\mu_E : \mathbb{C}^{k \times l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. μ_E is u.s.c.
- 2 $\mu_{\{0\}} \equiv 0$, $\mu_E(0) = 0$.
- 3 There are $E \neq \{0\}$ and $A \neq 0$ such that $\mu_E(A) = 0$.
- 4 $\mu_E \leq \|\cdot\| = \mu_{\mathbb{C}^{l \times k}}$.
- 5 If $E' \subset E'' \subset \mathbb{C}^{l \times k}$, then $\mu_{E'} \leq \mu_{E''}$.
- 6 $\mu_E(\alpha A) = |\alpha| \mu_E(A)$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, $A \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times l}$.

If $l = k$, $n_1, \dots, n_s, m_1, \dots, m_t \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^s n_i + \sum_{j=1}^t m_j = k,$$

$$E = \{ \text{Diag}[z_1 \mathbb{I}_{n_1}, \dots, z_s \mathbb{I}_{n_s}, Z_1, \dots, Z_t] : z_j \in \mathbb{C}, Z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{m_j \times m_j} \},$$

then

- 1 $\mu_E(A) = \max\{r(XA) : X \in E, \|X\| \leq 1\}$,
- 2 μ_E is continuous,
- 3 $\mu_{\text{span}\{\mathbb{I}_k\}} = r$, where r is the spectral radius.

Going back to the general case of E ,

- 1 μ_E does not satisfy the triangle inequality,
- 2 if $l = k$, $\mathbb{I}_k \in E$, then $r \leq \mu_E$.

Problem (μ -synthesis)

Given $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, $E \subset \mathbb{C}^{l \times k}$, $A \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^{k \times l})$, $B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^{k \times k})$,
 $C \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^{l \times l})$, construct $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ of the form

$$F = A + BQC \quad \text{for some } Q \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^{k \times l}), \quad (1)$$

where $\Omega_{\mu_E} := \{X \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times l} : \mu_E(X) \leq 1\}$.

Our setting is

- $l = k$,
- $B(\lambda) = (\lambda - \lambda_1) \dots (\lambda - \lambda_n) \mathbb{I}_k$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
 $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$,
- $C = \mathbb{I}_k$.

We shall consider only two "extremal" cases of B .

If $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ whenever $i \neq j$ then

$$F \text{ satisfies (1) iff } F(\lambda_j) = A(\lambda_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Problem (Nevanlinna-Pick type)

Given $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $E \subset \mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$, $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$, $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ whenever $i \neq j$, $W_j \in \Omega_{\mu_E}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, construct an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ such that

$$F(\lambda_j) = W_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

- ① For $E = \text{span}\{\mathbb{I}_k\}$ we obtain the **spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem**.
- ② For $k = 2$, $E = \text{span}\left\{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right\}$ we obtain the **structured Nevanlinna-Pick problem**.
- ③ For $k = 2$, $E = \text{span}\left\{\mathbb{I}_2, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right\}$ we obtain the **Agler-Lykova-Young problem**.

If $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_n = 0$ then

$$F \text{ satisfies (1) iff } F^{(j)}(0) = A^{(j)}(0), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Problem (Carathéodory-Fejér type)

Given $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $E \subset \mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$, $V_j \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$, $V_0 \in \Omega_{\mu_E}$, construct an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ such that

$$F^{(j)}(0) = V_j, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

- ① For $E = \text{span}\{\mathbb{I}_k\}$ we obtain the **spectral Carathéodory-Fejér problem**.
- ② For $k = 2$, $E = \text{span}\left\{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right\}$ we obtain the **structured Carathéodory-Fejér problem**.

Define additionally

- $\Omega_{\mu_E}^o := \{A \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k} : \mu_E(A) < 1\}$,
- $\overline{\mathbb{B}}_k := \{A \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k} : \|A\| \leq 1\}$,
- $\mathbb{B}_k := \{A \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k} : \|A\| < 1\}$,
- $\Sigma_k := \{A \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k} : r(A) \leq 1\}$,
- $\Sigma_k^o := \{A \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k} : r(A) < 1\}$.

If $\text{span}\{\mathbb{I}_k\} \subset E \subset \mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$ then

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}}_k \subset \Omega_{\mu_E} \subset \Sigma_k, \quad \mathbb{B}_k \subset \Omega_{\mu_E}^o \subset \Sigma_k^o.$$

$\Omega_{\mu_E}^o$ is typically an unbounded nonconvex and hitherto unstudied domain, and so the construction of $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ is a challenge. A strategy to find F is

- 1 To find a dimension-reducing polynomial map

$$\pi : \mathbb{C}^{k \times k} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^r$$

with $\pi^{-1}(\pi(\Omega_{\mu_E})) = \Omega_{\mu_E}$ and $r < k^2$.

- 2 To construct an interpolating function $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \pi(\Omega_{\mu_E}))$ for $\pi(\Omega_{\mu_E})$, i.e. function h satisfying

$$h(\lambda_j) = \pi(W_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

The idea is that the geometry of lower-dimensional domain may be more accessible than that of Ω_{μ_E} itself.

- 3 To lift h modulo π to F , i.e. to construct an analytic lifting F of h .

We shall say that F is an **analytic lifting** of h if $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2})$ and $\pi \circ F = h$.

Recall that if F is an analytic lifting of h then $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ since $\pi^{-1}(\pi(\Omega_{\mu_E})) = \Omega_{\mu_E}$.

Recall that $\pi(\overline{\mathbb{B}}_k) \subset \pi(\Omega_{\mu_E})$. If, moreover,

$$\pi(\overline{\mathbb{B}}_k) = \pi(\Omega_{\mu_E})$$

then to get h one may proceed as follows.

- The geometry and the function theory of the Cartan domain \mathbb{B}_k is rich and long established and there are numerous ways of constructing $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{B}}_k)$; for example one may use the homogeneity of \mathbb{B}_k to construct an interpolating function H by the standard process of Schur reduction.
- Then $h := \pi \circ H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \pi(\Omega_{\mu_E}))$. Such an H we shall call a **Schur lifting** of h .

- ① (Agler, Young, 1999) If $k = 2$, $E = \text{span}\{\mathbb{I}_2\}$ then

$$\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} \ni A \xrightarrow{\pi} (\text{tr } A, \det A) \in \mathbb{C}^2,$$

$\pi(\Omega_{\mu_E}) = \pi(\overline{\mathbb{B}}_2) = \overline{\mathbb{G}}_2$, where \mathbb{G}_2 is the **symmetrized bidisc**.

- ② (Abouhajar, White, Young, 2007) If $k = 2$,

$E = \text{span}\left\{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right\}$ then

$$\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} \ni A = [a_{ij}] \xrightarrow{\pi} (a_{11}, a_{22}, \det A) \in \mathbb{C}^3,$$

$\pi(\Omega_{\mu_E}) = \pi(\overline{\mathbb{B}}_2) = \overline{\mathbb{E}}$, where \mathbb{E} is the **tetrablock**.

- ③ (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014) If $k = 2$, $E = \text{span}\{\mathbb{I}_2, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\}$ then

$$\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} \ni A = [a_{ij}] \xrightarrow{\pi} (a_{21}, \text{tr } A, \det A) \in \mathbb{C}^3,$$

$\pi(\Omega_{\mu_E}) = \pi(\overline{\mathbb{B}}_2) = \overline{\mathcal{P}}$, where \mathcal{P} is the **pentablock**.

We shall briefly discuss the dimension reduction strategy for these instances.

Problem (The spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem)

Given $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{D}$, $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ whenever $i \neq j$, and $W_1, \dots, W_n \in \Sigma_k$, construct an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_k)$ such that

$$F(\lambda_j) = W_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

For $k = 1$ it reduces to the classical Nevanlinna-Pick problem.

Theorem (Pick, 1916, Nevanlinna, 1919)

Let $\lambda_j, z_j \in \mathbb{D}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ whenever $i \neq j$. There is an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{D}})$ with $F(\lambda_j) = z_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, iff

$$\left[\frac{1 - \bar{z}_i z_j}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \lambda_j} \right]_{i,j=1}^n \geq 0,$$

i.e. the left-hand side matrix is nonnegative semidefinite.

Let $k = 2$ and $E = \text{span}\{\mathbb{I}_2\}$. Recall that the **closed** and **open symmetrized bidiscs** are defined by

$$\overline{\mathbb{G}} = \overline{\mathbb{G}}_2 := \{(z + w, zw) : z, w \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}\},$$

$$\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{G}_2 := \{(z + w, zw) : z, w \in \mathbb{D}\}.$$

So here we have

$$\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} \ni A \xrightarrow{\pi} (\text{tr } A, \det A) \in \mathbb{C}^2,$$

Recall that $\Omega_{\mu_E} = \Sigma_2$.

- $\mathbb{G}_2 = \pi(\Sigma_2^o)$, $\overline{\mathbb{G}}_2 = \pi(\Sigma_2)$, $\pi^{-1}(\overline{\mathbb{G}}_2) = \Sigma_2$, $\pi^{-1}(\mathbb{G}_2) = \Sigma_2^o$.
- \mathbb{G} is hyperconvex, polynomially convex, starlike about $(0, 0)$, and \mathbb{C} -convex, but not convex.
- $l_{\mathbb{G}} = c_{\mathbb{G}}$, while \mathbb{G} cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex ones.

The reason why \mathbb{G} is amenable to analysis is that we have a 1-parameter family of rational functions

$$\Phi_\omega(s, p) = \frac{2\omega p - s}{2 - \omega s}, \quad (s, p) \in \mathbb{G}, \omega \in \mathbb{T}.$$

We have

Proposition (Agler, Young, 2004)

$\Phi_\omega \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{D})$ for any $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$. Conversely, if $(s, p) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is such that $|\Phi_\omega(s, p)| < 1$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, then $(s, p) \in \mathbb{G}$.

as well as

Proposition (Agler, Young, 2004)

For any $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, Φ_ω maps $\overline{\mathbb{G}} \setminus \{(2\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega}^2)\}$ analytically into $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Conversely, if $(s, p) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is such that $|\Phi_\omega(rs, r^2p)| < 1$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ and $r \in (0, 1)$, then $(s, p) \in \overline{\mathbb{G}}$.

Remark

The parameter r is needed: $|\Phi_\omega(s, p)| \leq 1$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ is not sufficient - for $p = 1$ the last statement holds true iff $s \in \mathbb{R}$, while for $(s, p) \in \overline{\mathbb{G}}$ there is $|s| \leq 2$.

We have the following Schwarz Lemma for $\overline{\mathbb{G}}$.

Theorem (Agler, Young, 2001)

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, $(s, p) \in \overline{\mathbb{G}}$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- 1 There exists an $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{G}})$ such that $H(0) = 0$,
 $H(\lambda) = (s, p)$;
- 2 $|s| < 2$ and $\frac{2|s - p\bar{s}| + |s^2 - 4p|}{4 - |s|^2} \leq |\lambda|$;
- 3 $||\lambda|^2 s - p\bar{s}| + |p|^2 + (1 - |\lambda|^2) \frac{|s|^2}{4} - |\lambda|^2 \leq 0$;
- 4 $|s| \leq \frac{2}{1 - |\lambda|^2} (|\lambda| |1 - p\bar{\omega}^2| - ||\lambda|^2 - p\bar{\omega}^2|)$ for any $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ with
 $s = |s|\omega$.

Observe that if $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$ solves the spectral NP problem (with $k = 2$), then $H := \pi \circ F$ is an analytic map from \mathbb{D} to $\overline{\mathbb{G}}$, such that

$$H(\lambda_j) = \pi(W_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

The problem of conversing the above claim is a little bit more subtle. Namely, we have

Theorem (Agler, Young, 2000)

Let $(\lambda_j, W_j)_{j=1}^n$ be as in spectral NP problem (with $k = 2$). Assume additionally that either all or none of the W_j 's are scalar matrices. The following conditions are equivalent:

- 1 There exists an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$ with $F(\lambda_j) = W_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$;
- 2 There exists an $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{G}})$ with $H(\lambda_j) = \pi(W_j)$,
 $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Sketch of proof. It only suffices to deliver the first conditions from the second. Let $H = (H_1, H_2)$ be as in the statement. There are two cases to be considered.

Case 1. The W_j 's are nonscalar. Then

$$W_j = P_j^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -p_j & s_j \end{bmatrix} P_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $(s_j, p_j) = \pi(W_j)$ and P_j is some nonsingular matrix, $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Observe that each P_j has a logarithm L_j . Let L be a matrix polynomial with $L(\lambda_j) = L_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, and for our purpose it suffices to put

$$F(\lambda) := e^{-L(\lambda)} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -H_2(\lambda) & H_1(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} e^{L(\lambda)}.$$

Case 2. $W_j = c_j \mathbb{I}_2$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then $H(\lambda_j) = (2c_j, c_j^2)$ and $|2c_j| \leq 2$, $|c_j^2| \leq 1$. If now some of the c_j 's lies on the unit circle, then by the maximum principle all of the W_j 's are equal and we may choose F to be a constant function. In the remaining case observe that $\|H_1\|_\infty \leq 2$ and putting $F(\lambda) := \frac{1}{2} H_1(\lambda) \mathbb{I}_2$ finishes the proof.

The assumption concerning the structure of the data matrices is essential. Indeed, we have

Example

Let $\lambda_1 = 0$, $\lambda_2 = \beta \in (0, 1)$, $W_1 = 0$, and $W_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \frac{2\beta}{1+\beta} \end{bmatrix}$. Using [Agler, Young, 2001] one can check that the function $H(\lambda) = \left(\frac{2\lambda(1-\beta)}{1-\beta\lambda}, \frac{\lambda(\lambda-\beta)}{1-\beta\lambda} \right)$ fulfills the second condition of the theorem. However, there is no F as in the first one.

To see this, suppose there is such an F . Then we may write $F(\lambda) = \lambda G(\lambda)$. By theorem of Vesentini, the function $\lambda \mapsto r(G(\lambda))$ is subharmonic. Using now the maximum principle one gets

$$\sup_{|\lambda| \leq t} r(G(\lambda)) = \sup_{|\lambda|=t} \frac{1}{t} r(F(\lambda)) \leq \frac{1}{t},$$

for $t \in (0, 1)$. Therefore $G \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$. On the other hand, the eigenvalues of $G(\beta)$ are 0 and $\frac{2}{1+\beta} > 1$, which is nonsense.

The importance of the above example lies in the fact, that it shows that the spectral NP problem can be ill-posed, meaning it can admit no solution. We shall discuss this issue later more detailed.

As we have seen, the interpolation into $\overline{\mathbb{G}}$ is equivalent to the interpolation into Σ_2 , unless one of the data matrices is scalar, while the second is not. However, in the latter case the interpolation into Σ_2 is equivalent to interpolation into $\overline{\mathbb{G}}$ with some differential condition.

Theorem (Agler, Young, 2000)

Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$, $W_1, W_2 \in \Sigma_2$, where $W_1 = c\mathbb{I}_2$ and W_2 is nonscalar. The following statements are equivalent

- ① there exists an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$ such that $F(\lambda_j) = W_j$, $j = 1, 2$;
- ② there exists an $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{G}})$ such that $H(\lambda_j) = \pi(W_j)$, $j = 1, 2$, and $H'_2(\lambda_1) = cH'_1(\lambda_1)$.

Sketch of proof. Let an F as in the first condition. Then all coefficients of the matrix function $F - c\mathbb{I}_2$ vanish at λ_1 , which yields $\det(F - c\mathbb{I}_2)$ has a zero of order at least 2 at λ_1 . We define

$$H := \pi \circ F$$

and simple calculation reveals it is good for our purpose. The other implication is a little bit more complicated. Let an H be as in the second statement. We know that

$$W_2 = P^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -p & s \end{bmatrix} P,$$

where $(s, p) = \pi(W_2)$ and P is nonsingular. We have three cases to consider.

Case 1. $c = 0$. Then we may write

$$H_2(\lambda) = (\lambda - \lambda_1)g(\lambda),$$

where g is analytic on \mathbb{D} and $g(\lambda_1) = 0$. Define

$$F(\lambda) = P^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{\lambda - \lambda_1}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} \\ -(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)g(\lambda) & H_1(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} P.$$

Using the fact that the characteristic polynomial of $F(\lambda)$ is

$$z^2 - H_1(\lambda)z + H_2(\lambda)$$

and that $H(\lambda) \in \overline{\mathbb{G}}$, one easily verifies that F fulfills the first statement.

Case 2. $c \in \mathbb{D}$. Let

$$h = B_c \circ H : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{G}}, \quad \widetilde{W}_2 = \mu_c(W_2),$$

where $B_c(z + w, zw) = (b_c(z) + b_c(w), b_c(z)b_c(w))$, $z, w \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
 $b_c(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda - c}{1 - \bar{c}\lambda}$, and $\mu_c(A) := (A - c\mathbb{I}_2)(\mathbb{I}_2 - \bar{c}A)^{-1}$. We have

$$\pi(\widetilde{W}_2) = B_c(s, p) = h(\lambda_2),$$

$$h(\lambda_1) = B_c(2c, c^2) = (0, 0).$$

Also, h is analytic and

$$h_2 = \frac{H_2 - cH_1 + c^2}{1 - \bar{c}H_1 + \bar{c}^2H_2},$$

which yields $h'_2(\lambda_1) = 0$. Making use of Case 1, we find an
 $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$ with $\tilde{h}(\lambda_1) = 0$ and $\tilde{f}(\lambda_2) = \widetilde{W}_2$. It is now enough
 to put $F := \mu_{-c} \circ \tilde{h}$.

Case 3. $c \in \mathbb{T}$. Then, since $H(\lambda_1) = (2c, c^2)$, by the maximum
 principle we conclude that H_1 and H_2 are constant. Therefore,
 $\text{tr } W_2 = 2c$, $\det W_2 = c^2$. Furthermore,

$$W_2 = R^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} c & 1 \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix} R$$

with a nonsingular R . To the end we are looking out for, it suffices
 to choose an analytic g of \mathbb{D} with $g(\lambda_1) = 0$ and $g(\lambda_2) = 1$, and
 put

$$F(\lambda) = R^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} c & g(\lambda) \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix} R.$$

Theorem (Agler, Young, 2000)

Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$ and $W_1, W_2 \in \Sigma_2$, where $W_1 = c\mathbb{I}_2$ for a $c \in \mathbb{D}$. Then there exists an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma)$ such that $F(\lambda_j) = W_j$, $j = 1, 2$, iff

$$r(\mu_c(W_2)) \leq \left| \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_2 \lambda_1} \right| =: m(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Observe that the last condition is equivalent to saying that

$$\max \left\{ \left| \frac{\xi_1 - c}{1 - \bar{\xi}_1 c} \right|, \left| \frac{\xi_2 - c}{1 - \bar{\xi}_2 c} \right| \right\} \leq m(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

where ξ_1, ξ_2 are the eigenvalues of W_2 .

Theorem (Agler, Young, 2000)

Let $\beta \in \mathbb{D}_*$ and $W_1, W_2 \in \Sigma_2$. Assume that W_1 has a unique eigenvalue, say $c \in \mathbb{D}$. Put $(s, p) = \pi(W_2)$.

- 1 If both or neither of the W_j 's are scalar matrices, then there exists an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$ with $F(0) = W_1, F(\beta) = W_2$ iff

$$\frac{2|s - \bar{s}p - 2c(1 - |p|^2) + c^2(\bar{s} - s\bar{p})| + (1 - |c|^2)|s^2 - 4p|}{|2 - \bar{c}s|^2 - |s - 2\bar{c}p|^2} \leq |\beta|.$$
- 2 If W_1 is scalar, while W_2 is not, then an F as above exists iff

$$\begin{aligned} & 2|\beta| |(-2\bar{c}p + (1 + |c|^2)s - 2c)(1 - \bar{c}\bar{s} + c^2\bar{p}) \\ & \quad - |\beta|^{-2}(-2\bar{p}c + (1 + |c|^2)\bar{s} - 2\bar{c})(p - cs + c^2)| \\ & \quad + (1 - |c|^2)^2|s^2 - 4p| + 4(1 - |\beta|^2)|1 - \bar{c}s + \bar{c}^2p|^2 \\ & \leq (1 - |c|^2)(|2 - \bar{c}s|^2 - |s - 2\bar{c}p|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem (Agler, Young, 2000)

Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$, $W \in \Sigma_2$, and $c \in \mathbb{T}$. Then, there exists an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$ such that $F(\lambda_1) = c\mathbb{I}_2$, $F(\lambda_2) = W$ iff c is the only eigenvalue of W .

Let F be a solution of spectral NP problem (with $k = 2$ and arbitrary n). Put $(s_j, p_j) = \pi(W_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. For any $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ and $t \in (0, 1)$, the composition

$$\Phi_\omega \circ \pi \circ tF$$

is an analytic self map of \mathbb{D} which sends λ_j to

$\Phi_\omega(ts_j, t^2p_j) = \frac{2\omega t^2 p_j - ts_j}{2 - \omega ts_j}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Hence, by Pick's theorem,

$$\left[\frac{1 - \overline{\Phi_\omega(ts_i, t^2p_i)} \Phi_\omega(ts_j, t^2p_j)}{1 - \overline{\lambda_i} \lambda_j} \right]_{i,j=1}^n \geq 0.$$

Conjugating the above matrix by $[(2 - \omega ts_j) \delta_{ji}]_{i,j=1}^n$ (δ_{ji} stands for the Kronecker delta) and putting $\alpha = t\omega$ we have delivered the following necessary condition for the solvability of a 2×2 spectral NP problem.

Theorem (Agler, Young, 1999)

Let F be a solution of spectral NP problem (with $k = 2$ and arbitrary n). Put $(s_j, p_j) = \pi(W_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then for any $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ we have

$$\left[\frac{(\overline{2 - \alpha s_i})(2 - \alpha s_j) - |\alpha|^2(\overline{2\alpha p_i - s_i})(2\alpha p_j - s_j)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \lambda_j} \right]_{i,j=1}^n \geq 0.$$

In general, the condition given above is **not** sufficient for the solvability of the 2×2 spectral NP problem as the following example shows.

Let $r \in (0, 1)$ and let

$$h(\lambda) = \left(2(1-r) \frac{\lambda^2}{1+r\lambda^3}, \frac{\lambda(\lambda^3+r)}{1+r\lambda^3} \right).$$

Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathbb{D}$ be any three distinct points and let $h(\lambda_j) = (s_j, p_j)$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. Then, using (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2012), one can prove that in any neighbourhood of (s_1, s_2, s_3) in $(2\mathbb{D})^3$ there exists a point (s'_1, s'_2, s'_3) such that $(s'_j, p_j) \in \mathbb{G}$, the interpolation data

$$\lambda_j \mapsto (s'_j, p_j), \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

satisfy the necessary condition of the Theorem, and yet there is no function $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{G}})$ such that $H(\lambda_j) = (s'_j, p_j)$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. In the case $n = k = 2$ however, the condition in the Theorem **is** also sufficient for the solvability of spectral NP problem.

Theorem (Agler, Young, 2004)

Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$, let $W_1, W_2 \in \Sigma_2$ be nonscalar, and let $(s_j, p_j) = \pi(W_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. The following statements are equivalent

- 1 there exists an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$ such that $F(\lambda_j) = W_j$, $j = 1, 2$;
- 2 $\max_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{(s_2 p_1 - s_1 p_2) \omega^2 + 2(p_2 - p_1) \omega + s_1 - s_2}{(s_1 - \bar{s}_2 p_1) \omega^2 - 2(1 - p_1 \bar{p}_2) \omega + \bar{s}_2 - s_1 \bar{p}_2} \right| \leq m(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$;
- 3 for all $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ the matrix

$$\left[\frac{(\overline{2 - \omega s_i})(2 - \omega s_j) - (\overline{2\omega p_i - s_i})(2\omega p_j - s_j)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \lambda_j} \right]_{i,j=1}^n$$

is nonnegative semidefinite.

Sketch of proof. Recall that for a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^k$ the **Lempert function** $l_\Omega : \Omega^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined as

$$l_\Omega(z_1, z_2) := \inf m(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

where infimum is taken over all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$ such that there exists an $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega)$ sending λ_j to z_j , $j = 1, 2$.

After (Agler, Young, 2004), we define the **Carathéodory distance** $C_\Omega : \Omega^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$C_\Omega(z_1, z_2) := \sup m(f(z_1), f(z_2)),$$

where the supremum is taken over all $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega, \mathbb{D})$, i.e. we omit the \tanh^{-1} on the right-hand side.

Let $z_j = (s_j, p_j) \in \mathbb{G}$.

(1) \Leftrightarrow (2). We only have to show that the inequality in (2) is equivalent to the existence of an $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{G}})$ such that $H(\lambda_j) = z_j$, $j = 1, 2$. By definition of the Lempert function, such an H exists iff $l_{\mathbb{G}}(z_1, z_2) \leq m(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. Using (Agler, Young, 2004), we get

$$l_{\mathbb{G}}(z_1, z_2) = C_{\mathbb{G}}(z_1, z_2) = \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} m(\Phi_{\omega}(z_1), \Phi_{\omega}(z_2))$$

$$= \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{(s_2 p_1 - s_1 p_2)\omega^2 + 2(p_2 - p_1)\omega + s_1 - s_2}{(s_1 - \bar{s}_2 p_1)\omega^2 - 2(1 - p_1 \bar{p}_2)\omega + \bar{s}_2 - s_1 \bar{p}_2} \right| \leq m(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

(2) \Leftrightarrow (3). By what we have just proved, the condition (2) is equivalent to

$$\max_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} m(\Phi_{\omega}(z_1), \Phi_{\omega}(z_2)) \leq m(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Using the Schwarz-Pick lemma we conclude that the above inequality holds true iff for any $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ there is a function $f_{\omega} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$ with $f_{\omega}(\lambda_j) = \Phi_{\omega}(z_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. This latter, by Pick's theorem is equivalent to

$$\left[\frac{1 - \bar{\Phi}_{\omega}(z_i)\Phi_{\omega}(z_j)}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_i \lambda_j} \right]_{i,j=1}^2 \geq 0,$$

from which one easily derives the conclusion.

Remark

If we drop the structural assumption about the data matrices, we also have a solvability criterion: if both W_j 's are scalar, then the problem reduces to the one-dimensional one. Also, we already know the required criterion in the case $W_1 = c\mathbb{I}_2$ and W_2 nonscalar. Recall that then the corresponding spectral NP problem is solvable iff $r(\mu_c(W_2)) \leq m(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$.

Observe that the spectral NP problem never has a unique solution. For if F is such a solution, then so is $P^{-1}FP$ for any $P \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^{k \times k})$ such that the values of P are nonsingular matrices and $P(\lambda_j)$ is a scalar matrix for each interpolant λ_j . On the other hand, the solution of the corresponding problem of the interpolation into $\overline{\mathbb{G}}$ can be unique. In fact, such a solution (provided it exists) is unique iff each pair of distinct points of \mathbb{G} lies on a unique complex geodesic of \mathbb{G} , and the latter is true by (Agler, Young, 2004) and (Agler, Young, 2006).

We have already mentioned that the spectral NP problem can be ill-posed. In fact, it can admit no solution even if there are arbitrarily close data admitting a solution.

Example

Let $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 = \beta \in (0, 1), \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$W_1(\alpha) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \alpha \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \frac{2\beta}{1+\beta} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We already know that the case $\alpha = 0$ has no solution. On the other hand, for $\alpha \neq 0$, the assumptions of Theorem are fulfilled, and

$$H(\lambda) = \left(\frac{2\lambda(1-\beta)}{1-\beta\lambda}, \frac{\lambda(\lambda-\beta)}{1-\beta\lambda} \right)$$

satisfies its second condition.

Nevertheless, we can give a precise answer to the question: for which $\eta \in \mathbb{D}$ there **is** an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2)$ such that

$$F(0) = W_1(\alpha), \quad F(\eta) = W_2.$$

It is as follows:

- 1 If $\alpha \neq 0$, then F exists iff $|\eta| \geq \beta$.
- 2 If $\alpha = 0$, then F exists iff $|\eta| \geq \frac{2\beta}{1+\beta}$.

Currently, we glimpse at the difficulties which appear when passing to the more general case, with arbitrary k .

There is an obvious way to generalize the symmetrized bidisc. Namely, we define the **open symmetrized polydisc** ($k \geq 2$)

$$\mathbb{G}_k := \{(\sigma_1(z), \dots, \sigma_k(z)) : z \in \mathbb{D}^k\} \subset \mathbb{C}^k,$$

where σ_j denotes the elementary symmetric polynomial in $z = (z^1, \dots, z^k)$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. Along the same lines one defines the **closed symmetrized polydisc** $\overline{\mathbb{G}}_k$.

As in the case $k = 2$, we can reduce the spectral NP problem to an interpolation problem into $\overline{\mathbb{G}}_k$ under some hypotheses on the target matrices W_j . Namely, we need to assume that they are nonderogatory (this means that each eigenvalue of W_j has geometric multiplicity exactly one, i.e. the dimension of corresponding eigenspace is one).

In the case $k = 2$, a matrix A is nonderogatory exactly when it is nonscalar. Also, we have used the fact that a matrix A is nonderogatory iff it is similar to the companion matrix of its characteristic polynomial (Horn, Johnson, 1990).

Two basic problems appear while discussing the relations between the interpolation into Σ_k and into $\overline{\mathbb{G}}_k$.

- 1 For $k > 2$ there is no such a simple characterization of nonderogatory matrices (cf. (Nikolov, Pflug, Thomas, 2010) for the case $k = 3$).
- 2 It is not true that $l_{\mathbb{G}_k} = C_{\mathbb{G}_k}$ for $k > 2$ (Nikolov, Pflug, Zwonek, 2007).

In the engineering literature the space E is usually taken to be given by a block diagonal structure. If we confine ourselves to $k = 2$ it is natural to study the space of diagonal matrices

$$E = \text{span}\left\{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right\}.$$

Put

$$\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} \ni A = [a_{ij}] \xrightarrow{\pi} (a_{11}, a_{22}, \det A) \in \mathbb{C}^3$$

and let $\mathbb{E} := \pi(\mathbb{B}_2)$ denote the **tetrablock**.

- \mathbb{E} is a polynomially convex, \mathbb{C} -convex and pseudoconvex bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^3 .
- \mathbb{E} is starlike about 0, non-circular but $(1, 0, 1)$ -, $(0, 1, 1)$ - and $(1, 1, 2)$ -balanced.
- $\mathbb{E} \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ is a regular tetrahedron with vertices $(1, 1, 1)$, $(1, -1, -1)$, $(-1, 1, -1)$, and $(-1, -1, 1)$.
- $l_{\mathbb{E}} = c_{\mathbb{E}}$ although \mathbb{E} cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex ones.

• $\mathbb{E} = \pi(\Omega_{\mu_E}^o)$, $\bar{\mathbb{E}} = \pi(\Omega_{\mu_E})$, $\pi^{-1}(\bar{\mathbb{E}}) = \Omega_{\mu_E}$.

But the true reason that \mathbb{E} is amenable to analysis is that, as in the case of \mathbb{G}_2 , there is 1-parameter family of rational functions

$$\Psi_\eta(z_1, z_2, z_3) := \begin{cases} \frac{\eta z_3 - z_2}{\eta z_1 - 1}, & \text{if } \eta z_1 \neq 1 \\ z_2, & \text{if } z_1 z_2 = z_3 \end{cases},$$

where $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$, $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ is such that $\eta z_1 \neq 1$ or $z_1 z_2 = z_3$.

Theorem (Abouhajar, White, Young, 2007)

Let $z \in \mathbb{C}^3$. Then the following are equivalent

- 1 $z \in \mathbb{E}$;
- 2 $|\Psi_\eta(z)| < 1$ for any $\eta \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$.

In particular, $\Psi_\eta \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{D})$ for any $\eta \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$.

Solution of the interpolation problem for \mathbb{E} and $n = 2$ is the following Schwarz Lemma for \mathbb{E}

Theorem (Abouhajar, White, Young, 2007)

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_*$, $z = (a, b, p) \in \mathbb{E}$. Then the following are equivalent

- 1 there is $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$, with $h(0) = 0$, $h(\lambda) = z$;
- 2 there is $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \bar{\mathbb{E}})$, with $h(0) = 0$, $h(\lambda) = z$;
- 3 $\max \left\{ \frac{|a - \bar{b}p| + |ab - p|}{1 - |b|^2}, \frac{|b - \bar{a}p| + |ab - p|}{1 - |a|^2} \right\} \leq |\lambda|$;
- 4 either
 - $|b| \leq |a|$ and $\frac{|a - \bar{b}p| + |ab - p|}{1 - |b|^2} \leq |\lambda|$ or
 - $|a| \leq |b|$ and $\frac{|b - \bar{a}p| + |ab - p|}{1 - |a|^2} \leq |\lambda|$;
- 5 there is $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \bar{\mathbb{B}}_2)$ with $H(0) \in \pi^{-1}(0)$, $H(\lambda) \in \pi^{-1}(z)$.

The interpolation problems for Ω_{μ_E} and $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ are equivalent in the following sense.

Theorem (Abouhajar, White, Young, 2007)

Let $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$, $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ whenever $i \neq j$, $W_j \in \Omega_{\mu_E}^o$ (resp. $W_j \in \Omega_{\mu_E}$), $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then the following are equivalent

- 1 there is $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E}^o)$ (resp. $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$) with $F(\lambda_j) = W_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$;
- 2 there is $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$ (resp. $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{E}})$) with $h(\lambda_j) = \pi(W_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, and, if $W_j = [w_{st}^j]$ is diagonal, then

$$h'_3(\lambda_j) = w_{22}^j h'_1(\lambda_j) + w_{11}^j h'_2(\lambda_j).$$

On putting together three previous theorems one get the partial solution of the structured Nevanlinna-Pick problem for $n = 2$.

Theorem (Abouhajar, White, Young, 2007)

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_*$, $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega_{\mu_E}$, where $\pi(A_1) = 0$, $\pi(A_2) = (a, b, p)$, and $A_2 \notin E$. Then the following are equivalent

- 1 there is $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ with $F(0) = A_1$, $F(\lambda) = A_2$;
- 2
$$\begin{cases} \max \left\{ \frac{|a-\bar{b}p|+|ab-p|}{1-|b|^2}, \frac{|b-\bar{a}p|+|ab-p|}{1-|a|^2} \right\} \leq |\lambda|, & \text{if } A_1 \neq 0 \\ \left(\frac{a}{\lambda}, \frac{b}{\lambda}, \frac{p}{\lambda^2} \right) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}, & \text{if } A_1 = 0 \end{cases}.$$

- The solvability of structured Nevanlinna-Pick problem is equivalent to the calculation of $l_{\mathbb{E}}$.
- If $z = (a, b, p) \in \mathbb{E}$ then
$$l_{\mathbb{E}}(0, z) = \max \left\{ \tanh^{-1} \frac{|a-\bar{b}p|+|ab-p|}{1-|b|^2}, \tanh^{-1} \frac{|b-\bar{a}p|+|ab-p|}{1-|a|^2} \right\}.$$
- What about $l_{\mathbb{E}}(w, z)$ for $w \neq 0$? It suffices to consider $w = (0, 0, \alpha)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Using the form of automorphisms of \mathbb{E} and the previous theorems we may get the following

Theorem (Abouhajar, White, Young, 2007)

Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$, $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega_{\mu_E}$, where $\pi(A_1) = z$, $\pi(A_2) = w$, and A_1 is triangular. Then the following are equivalent

- 1 there is $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ with $F(\lambda_1) = A_1$, $F(\lambda_2) = A_2$;
- 2 $\max \{ \alpha(z, w), \alpha(\tilde{z}, \tilde{w}) \} \leq \left| \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{1 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2} \right|$, where
 - $\alpha(z, w) := \frac{(1 - |z_1|^2)\beta(w) + |\gamma(w) - \delta(w)z_1 + \epsilon(w)z_1^2|}{|1 - \bar{z}_1 w_1|^2 - |w_2 - \bar{z}_1 w_3|^2}$,
 - $\beta(w) = |w_3 - w_1 w_2|$,
 - $\gamma(w) = w_1 - \bar{w}_2 w_3$,
 - $\delta(w) = 1 + |w_1|^2 - |w_2|^2 - |w_3|^2$,
 - $\epsilon(w) = \bar{w}_1 - w_2 \bar{w}_3$,
 - $\tilde{x} = (x_2, x_1, x_3)$ for any $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$.

Take in the second last theorem above $(a, b, p) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. Since $\pi(A_1) = 0$ there is $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \zeta \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \zeta & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then there is $F_\zeta \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ with $F_\zeta(0) = A_1$, $F_\zeta(\lambda) = A_2$ iff

$$|\lambda| \geq \begin{cases} \frac{2}{3}, & \text{if } A_1 \neq 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, & \text{if } A_1 = 0 \end{cases}.$$

It follows that if $\frac{2}{3} < |\lambda| < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ then F_ζ cannot be locally bounded as $\zeta \rightarrow 0$. For such λ , if ζ is close to zero then the solutions of the interpolation problem are very sensitive to small changes in ζ .

Recently Agler, Lykova, and Young started the investigation of the μ -synthesis problem related to the space

$$E = \text{span} \{ \mathbb{I}_2, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \},$$

another natural choice of E . Put

$$\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} \ni A = [a_{ij}] \xrightarrow{\pi} (a_{21}, \text{tr } A, \det A) \in \mathbb{C}^3,$$

and let $\mathcal{P} := \pi(\mathbb{B}_2)$ denote the **pentablock**.

- \mathcal{P} is a polynomially convex, non-convex bounded domain.
- \mathcal{P} is starlike about 0, non-circular but $(1, 0, 0)$ - and $(k, 1, 2)$ -balanced, $k \geq 0$.
- $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ is a convex body bounded by five faces, comprising two triangles, an ellipse and two curved surfaces, with four vertices $(0, -2, 1)$, $(0, 2, 1)$, $(1, 0, -1)$, and $(-1, 0, -1)$.
- $\mathcal{P} = \pi(\Omega_{\mu_E}^o)$, $\bar{\mathcal{P}} = \pi(\Omega_{\mu_E})$, $\pi^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{P}}) = \Omega_{\mu_E}$.

Again, there is 1-parameter family of rational functions ($\eta \in \mathbb{D}$)

$$\Psi_\eta(z) := \frac{(1 - |\eta|^2)z_1}{1 - \eta z_2 + \eta^2 z_3}, \quad z = (z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3, \quad 1 \neq \eta z_2 - \eta^2 z_3.$$

Theorem (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014)

Let $a \in \mathbb{C}$, $s = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$, $p = \lambda_1 \lambda_2$, where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$. Put $z = (a, s, p)$. Then the following are equivalent

- 1 $z \in \mathcal{P}$;
- 2 $|a| < \left| 1 - \frac{s\bar{\beta}/2}{1 + \sqrt{1 - |\beta|^2}} \right|$, where $\beta := \frac{s - \bar{s}p}{1 - |p|^2}$;
- 3 $|a| < \frac{1}{2} \left(|1 - \lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2| + \sqrt{(1 - |\lambda_1|^2)(1 - |\lambda_2|^2)} \right)$;
- 4 $\sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{D}} |\Psi_\eta(z)| < 1$.

In particular, $\Psi_\eta \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{D})$ for any $\eta \in \mathbb{D}$.

What is the Schwarz Lemma for \mathcal{P} , i.e for which pairs $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_*$ and $z \in \mathcal{P}$ does there exist $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P})$ such that $h(0) = 0$ and $h(\lambda) = z$? A necessary condition is the following

Theorem (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014)

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_*$ and $z = (a, s, p) \in \mathcal{P}$. If $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P})$ satisfies $h(0) = 0$ and $h(\lambda) = z$, then

$$\max \left\{ \frac{2|s - s\bar{s}p| + |s^2 - 4p|}{4 - |s|^2}, \frac{|a|}{\left| 1 - \frac{s\bar{\beta}/2}{1 + \sqrt{1 - |\beta|^2}} \right|} \right\} \leq |\lambda|,$$

where

$$\beta = \frac{s - \bar{s}p}{1 - |p|^2}.$$

On dividing through λ the above inequality and letting $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ we obtain an infinitesimal necessary condition.

Corollary (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014)

If $h = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P})$ satisfies $h(0) = 0$, then

$$|h'_1(0)| \leq 1, \quad \frac{1}{2}|h'_2(0)| + |h'_3(0)| \leq 1.$$

Is there a converse? Is it the case that if

$$|z_1| \leq 1, \quad \frac{1}{2}|z_2| + |z_3| \leq 1 \tag{2}$$

then there is $h = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathcal{P}})$ such that $h(0) = 0$ and $h'(0) = (z_1, z_2, z_3)$?

The answer is **no**.

Take $z_1 = 1$, $0 < z_3 < 1$, $z_2 = 2(1 - z_3)$. The inequalities (2) hold. Suppose there is $h = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathcal{P}})$ such that $h(0) = 0$ and $h'(0) = (z_1, z_2, z_3)$. Since $h_1 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$, $h_1(0) = 0$, and $h_1'(0) = 1$ we infer that $h_1 = \text{id}_{\mathbb{D}}$. Since $\frac{1}{2}|z_2| + |z_3| = 1$, the description of complex geodesics of \mathbb{G}_2 tells us that

$$(h_2, h_3)(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{1 + z_3\lambda} (2(1 - z_3), \lambda + z_3), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{D},$$

is unique function $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_2)$ with $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi'(0) = (z_2, z_3)$. However, $h(\mathbb{D}) \not\subset \overline{\mathcal{P}}$. Indeed, $h(1) = (1, 2\xi, 1)$, where $\xi = \frac{1-z_3}{1+z_3} \in (0, 1)$. For the point $(s, p) = (2\xi, 1)$ we have $\beta = \xi$, and so

$$\left| 1 - \frac{s\bar{\beta}/2}{1 + \sqrt{1 - |\beta|^2}} \right| = 1 - \frac{\xi^2}{1 + \sqrt{1 - \xi^2}} = \sqrt{1 - \xi^2} < 1.$$

Hence $h(1) = (1, 2\xi, 1) \notin \overline{\mathcal{P}}$.

The lifting problem for $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P})$ is delicate, as the following examples show.

Example (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014)

Let $h(\lambda) = (\lambda, 0, \lambda)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. This $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P})$ lifts to Schur lifting $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{B}}_2)$ given by

$$H(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ \lambda & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here $H(\lambda) \notin \mathbb{B}_2$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, since $\|H(\lambda)\| = 1$.

On the other hand, there is non-analytic lifting $H : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_2$ of h given by

$$H(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} i\sqrt{1 - |\lambda|}\zeta & -\lambda \\ \lambda & -i\sqrt{1 - |\lambda|}\zeta \end{bmatrix},$$

where ζ is a square root of λ .

Example (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014)

Let $h(\lambda) = (\lambda^2, 0, \lambda)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. This $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P})$ has no analytic lifting.

Indeed, suppose $H \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2})$ is an analytic lifting of h . We can write

$$H(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} -\eta(\lambda) & g(\lambda) \\ \lambda^2 & \eta(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{D},$$

for some $g, \eta \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$. Since $\det H(\lambda) = \lambda$, we must have

$$(\eta(\lambda))^2 = -\lambda - \lambda^2 g(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

This is a contradiction, since the right hand side has a simple zero at 0, while the left hand side has a zero of multiplicity at least 2.

These examples point to the following result.

Proposition (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014)

A function $h = (a, s, p) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P})$ has analytic lifting iff there is no $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ such that, for some odd positive integer n ,

- $h(\alpha) \in \mathcal{R} := \{(0, 2\lambda, \lambda^2) : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$,
- α is a zero of $s^2 - 4p$ of multiplicity n , and
- α is a zero of a of multiplicity greater than n .

Example (Agler, Lykova, Young, 2014)

Let $h(\lambda) = (\frac{1}{2}, 0, \lambda)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. This $h \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathcal{P}})$ has an analytic lifting but no Schur lifting.

The upshot of the three examples and proposition is that the μ -synthesis problem for μ_E and the interpolation problem for $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathcal{P}})$ are quite closely related, but that the rich function theory of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{B}}_2)$ may not be helpful for their solution.

Problem (The spectral Carathéodory-Fejér problem)

Given $V_0, \dots, V_n \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$, $V_0 \in \Sigma_k$, construct an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_k)$ such that

$$F^{(j)}(0) = V_j, \quad j = 0, \dots, n.$$

For $k = 1$ it reduces to the classical Carathéodory-Fejér problem.

Theorem (Carathéodory, Fejér, 1911)

Let $z_j \in \mathbb{C}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$, $z_0 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. There is an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{D}})$ with $F^{(j)}(0) = z_j$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$ iff Toeplitz matrix $T = [t_{ij}]_{i,j=0}^n$, where

$$t_{ij} := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i - j < 0 \\ c_{i-j}, & \text{if } i - j \geq 0 \end{cases},$$

is a contraction, i.e. $\|T\| \leq 1$.

For $k = 2$, $n = 1$ we have the following

Theorem (Huang, Marcantognini, Young, 2006)

Let $V_j = [v_{ik}^j]_{i,k=1}^2 \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$, $j = 0, 1$, where $V_0 \in \Sigma_2^o$ is nonscalar. The following are equivalent

- 1 there is an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Sigma_2^o)$ with $F(0) = V_0$, $F'(0) = V_1$;
- 2 $\max_{\omega \in \mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{(s_1 p_0 - s_0 p_1) \omega^2 + 2\omega p_1 - s_1}{\omega^2 (s_0 - \bar{s}_0 p_0) - 2\omega (1 - |p_0|^2) + \bar{s}_0 - s_0 \bar{p}_0} \right| \leq 1$, where $(s_0, p_0) = \pi(V_0)$, $s_1 = \text{tr } V_1$, and

$$p_1 = \begin{vmatrix} v_{11}^0 & v_{12}^1 \\ v_{21}^0 & v_{22}^1 \end{vmatrix} + \begin{vmatrix} v_{11}^1 & v_{12}^0 \\ v_{21}^1 & v_{22}^0 \end{vmatrix}.$$

Problem (The structured Carathéodory-Fejér problem)

Given $V_0, \dots, V_n \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$, $V_0 \in \Omega_{\mu_E}$, construct an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ such that

$$F^{(j)}(0) = V_j, \quad j = 0, \dots, n.$$

Again the problem can be reduced to an interpolation problem for \mathbb{E} , but the resulting problem has only been solved in an exceedingly special case.

Theorem (Young, 2008)

Let $V_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \zeta \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, and let $V_1 = [v_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^2 \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ be nondiagonal. The following are equivalent

- 1 there is an $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_{\mu_E})$ with $F(0) = V_0$, $F'(0) = V_1$;
- 2 $\max\{|v_{11}|, |v_{22}|\} + |\zeta v_{21}| \leq 1$.

Thank You!