

## ZEROS AND ORTHOGONALITY OF THE POLYNOMIAL SET $B_n(x, y)$

By I. K. Khanna

### 1. Introduction

The present paper comprises of a discussion on the nature of the zeros of the polynomial set  $B_n(x, y)$  followed by a note on its orthogonality.  $B_n(x, y)$ , the generalization of as many as eighteen classical polynomials like Hermite polynomial, Laguerre polynomial, Legendre polynomial etc. have been defined by means of the generating relation

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n(x, y) t^n = {}_pF_q [(\alpha_p); (\beta_q); \nu xt] {}_rF_s [(a_r); (b_s); \mu y^{-m} t^m] \quad (1.1)$$

valid under suitable conditions given in [1] and [2].

### 2. Zeros of $B_n(x, y)$

By the use of 'Descartes' Rule of signs of the theory of equation [4], the following conclusions regarding the zeros of the polynomial set  $B_n(x, y)$  can be summarized as:

A. If  $\nu, \mu, y, (\alpha_p), (\beta_q), (a_r)$  and  $(b_s)$  be all positive, then

(i)  $B_n(x, y)$  has no positive zero.

(ii) It has no negative zero if  $m$  be even

(iii) If  $m$  be odd, the number of negative zeros is not more than  $\left[ \frac{n}{m} \right]$ .

(iv) If  $n$  be not an integral multiple of  $m$ , then  $x=0$  is at least one of the zeros, while otherwise, results, (i) to (iii) again hold good.

B. If  $\nu, y, (\alpha_p), (\beta_q), (a_r)$  and  $(b_s)$  be all positive, but  $\mu$  be negative then

(i) Numbers of positive zeros of  $B_n(x, y)$  are not more than  $\left[ \frac{n}{m} \right]$ .

(ii) It has no negative zero, if  $m$  be odd.

(iii) If  $m$  be even, maximum number of its negative zeros is  $\left[ \frac{n}{m} \right]$

(iv) Same as (iv) of (A).

C. If  $\mu, y, (\alpha_p), (\beta_q), (a_r)$  and  $(b_r)$  be all positive, but  $\nu$  be negative, then according as  $m$  is even or odd, all the four conclusions of (A) and (B) respectively hold good.

- D. If  $\mu, \nu, (\alpha_p), (\beta_q), (a_r)$  and  $(b_s)$  be all positive, but  $y$  be negative then according as  $m$  is even or odd, all the four conclusions of (A) and (B) respectively hold good.
- E. If  $y, (\alpha_p), (\beta_q), (a_r)$  and  $(b_s)$  be all positive, but  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  be both negative, then according as  $m$  is odd or even, (A) and (B) respectively hold good.
- F. If  $\nu, (\alpha_p), (\beta_q), (a_r)$  and  $(b_s)$  be all positive, but  $\mu$  and  $y$  be both negative, then according as  $m$  is odd or even, (A) and (B) respectively hold good.
- G. If  $\mu, (\alpha_p), (\beta_q), (a_r)$  and  $(b_s)$  be all positive, but  $\nu$  and  $y$  be both negative, then all the conclusions of (A) hold good.
- H. If  $(\alpha_p), (\beta_q), (a_r)$  and  $(b_s)$  be all positive, but  $\nu, \mu$  and  $y$  be all negative, then all the conclusions of (B) hold good.
- I. Furthermore, by virtue of several examples similar to the two given below, it is evident that the zeros of  $B_n(x, y)$  are not all distinct:

EXAMPLE 1.  $B_{2;\nu;(\alpha_p);(a_r)}^{1;\mu;(\alpha_p);(a_r)}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2y^2} (\nu xy + \mu)^2.$

EXAMPLE 2.  $B_{2;\nu;-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2};(a_r)}^{1;\mu;-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2};(a_r)}(x, y) = \frac{1}{8y^2} (\nu xy + 4\mu)^2.$

- J. The zeros of  $B_n(x, y)$  are not interlaced.

### 3. Orthogonality

The polynomial set  $B_n(x, y)$  is not orthogonal, which is evident because of the following observations:

- I. we know that, if a simple set of real polynomials  $\phi_n(x)$  is orthogonal, then the zeros of  $\phi_n(x)$  are all distinct [5; p. 149. theorem, 55]. But in our case, results of article 2 show that the zeros of  $B_n(x, y)$  is not orthogonal.
- II. Recently, J. Shohat [6] has shown that a necessary and sufficient condition, that the sequence of polynomials

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_0(x) &= 1 \\ \phi_1(x) &= x - c_1 \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ \phi_n(x) &= x^n - S_n x^{n-1} + d_{n, n-2} x^{n-2} + \dots\dots (n=2, 3, \dots\dots) \end{aligned}$$

form a sequence of orthogonal polynomial, is that they satisfy a differential equation of the form

$$\phi_n(x) = (x - c_n)\phi_{n-1}(x) - \lambda_n\phi_{n-2}(x), \quad (n \geq 2; c_n, \lambda_n \text{ are constants})$$

with positive  $\lambda_n$ .

Now, our polynomial set  $B_n(x, y)$  does not satisfy this type of difference equation. Hence it is not orthogonal.

III. Abdul Halim and W.A. Al-Salam [3] have given two elegant proofs of the result, that the only orthogonal polynomials of the form

$$(3.1) \quad {}_{p+1}F_q \left[ \begin{matrix} -n, (a_i) \\ (b_i) \end{matrix}; x \right],$$

where  $n$  is a non-negative integer and the  $a_i$ 's and  $b_j$ 's are independent of  $x$  and  $n$ . are  ${}_1F_1[-n; b; x]$ .

Hence, clearly, our polynomial, which is a generalization of (3.2) cannot be orthogonal.

IV. Since our polynomial set does not satisfy the three-term recurrence relation, we observe [5; p. 151(1)] that  $B_n(x, y)$  is not orthogonal.

Banaras Hindu University  
Varanasi 221005  
India

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Agrawal, B.D. & Khanna, I.K. *A general differential equations for classical, polynomials*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. vol. 22, 1969, 646-649.
- [2] Agrawal, B.D. & Khanna, I.K., *Unification of certain classical polynomial*, Prog. of Math. vol. 8, no. 2, 1974, p. 15-24.
- [3] Abdul-Halim, N and Al-Salim, *A characterization of the Laguerre polynomials*, Rend. Sem. Univ. Padova, 34 (1964), 176-179.
- [4] Hall and Knight, *Higher Algebra*.
- [5] Rainville, E.D., *Special functions*, Macmillan, New York, 1960.
- [6] Shohat, J., *The relation of the classical orthogonal polynomials to the polynomials of Appell*, Amer. Jour. of Math., vol.58 (1936), 453-464.