

# On Zero-Preserving Linear Transformations

J. M. Carnicer, J. M. Peña and A. Pinkus

**Abstract.** For an arbitrary subset  $I$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  and for a function  $f$  defined on  $I$ , the number of zeros of  $f$  on  $I$  will be denoted by

$$Z_I(f).$$

In this paper we attempt to characterize all linear transformations  $T$  taking a linear subspace  $W$  of  $C(I)$  into functions defined on  $J$  ( $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ) such that

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in W$ .

## 1. Introduction

Let  $I$  and  $J$  be arbitrary subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $F(J)$  denote the space of (real-valued) functions defined on  $J$ , and let  $W$  be a linear subspace of  $C(I)$ . In this paper we consider linear transformations  $T$  from  $W$  into  $F(J)$  for which

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf) \tag{1.1}$$

for all  $f \in W$ , and attempt to completely characterize such transformations. When we can say something positive, it transpires that  $T$  always has the specific form

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y)) \tag{1.2}$$

for all  $y \in J$ , where  $q \in F(J)$  does not vanish on  $J$  and  $r$  is a 1-1 map from  $J$  onto  $I$ . That these conditions define a linear transformation  $T$  satisfying (1.1) is readily checked. It is the converse claim which we will work to verify.

We consider four main cases. If  $W = C(I)$  we prove (1.2) if  $I$  is compact, or  $I$  is an interval (we conjecture that for  $W = C(I)$  equation (1.2) should hold independent of  $I$ ). When  $W = \Pi$  (the space of all algebraic polynomials, restricted to  $I$ ), we prove that (1.2) holds for arbitrary  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . If  $W = \pi_N$  (the space of algebraic polynomials of degree at most  $N$ ), we show that (1.2) always holds for arbitrary  $I$  if  $N$  is even. However for  $N$  odd we have only been able to prove this result if  $I$  is bounded above or below, or if we impose certain additional constraints. (Again we conjecture that this result should always be valid.) We also consider certain subspaces  $W$  which are somewhat different (containing

complete Chebyshev systems of dimension 3) and look for a mechanism which enable us to verify (1.2) thereon.

Before proving these results, we wish to point out that it is not true that for every  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , subspace  $W$  of  $C(I)$ , and  $T$  satisfying (1.1) we must have  $T$  of the form (1.2) for some  $q$  and  $r$ . As a simple example consider  $I = J = (0, 1)$ , and the space

$$W = \text{span}\{1, x, (1/x) \sin(1/x)\}.$$

Note that

$$Z_{(0,1)}((1/x) \sin(1/x) + ax + b) = \infty$$

for every choice of  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $h \in C(0, 1)$  have this same property, i.e.,

$$Z_{(0,1)}(h(y) + ay + b) = \infty$$

for every choice of  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then the linear operator  $T$  given by  $T1 = 1$ ,  $Tx = y$  and

$$T((1/x) \sin(1/x))(y) = h(y)$$

satisfies (1.1), but is not of the desired form. Nevertheless, if  $T1 = 1$ ,  $Tx = y$  and

$$Z_{(0,1)}(f) = Z_{(0,1)}(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in C(0, 1)$ , then necessarily  $Tf = f$ .

The analytic problem we consider in this paper is related to the following geometric problem. Consider two curves  $A$  and  $B$  in the plane, and assume that the number of intersections of each straight line with  $A$  and  $B$  is the same. Does this imply that  $A = B$ ? If  $A$  and  $B$  are the graphs of two continuous function  $f$  and  $g$ , with common domain of definition  $I$ , we can reformulate this problem as follows. Assume  $f, g \in C(I)$  and

$$Z_I(f(x) - (ax + b)) = Z_I(g(x) - (ax + b))$$

for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Does this imply that  $f = g$ ? Defining the linear transformation  $T$  by  $T1 = 1$ ,  $Tx = x$  and  $Tf = g$  brings us back to our setting. (If (1.2) holds then  $f = g$ .) For this geometric problem, the values  $Z_I(f(x) - (ax + b))$  define what is known as the Crofton transform of  $f$ . For more on this subject, see Fast [2], Richardson [7], Horwitz [3] and references therein.

We, however, were led to a consideration of this problem from a totally different perspective. We were interested in the question of characterizing linear transformations  $T : \pi_n \rightarrow \pi_n$ , all  $n$ , for which

$$Z_I(p) \leq Z_J(Tp)$$

for all  $p \in \Pi$ . This problem has a long history, see Carnicer, Peña, Pinkus [1]. The ‘‘equality’’ case seemed simple. But, as so often happens in mathematical research, one thing led to another and the result is this paper.

## 2. Some General Results

In this paper we use three types of convexity. As our domain of definition  $I$  need not be connected or compact, we formally define them so as to prevent any misunderstanding.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $f \in C(I)$  where  $I$  is an arbitrary subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . We say that  $f$  is *convex* on  $I$  if to each  $\alpha \in I$  there exist constants  $a(\alpha), b(\alpha)$  such that

$$f(x) - (a(\alpha)x + b(\alpha)) \geq 0 \quad (2.1)$$

for all  $x \in I$ , and in addition

$$f(\alpha) - (a(\alpha)\alpha + b(\alpha)) = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

$f$  is said to be *strictly convex* on  $I$  if it is convex thereon and equality in (2.1) only holds for  $x = \alpha$ . We say that  $f$  is *uniformly convex* on  $I$  if  $f$  is strictly convex and if for each  $\alpha \in I$  and  $\delta > 0$  there exists a constant  $C(\delta, \alpha) > 0$  such that

$$f(x) - (a(\alpha)x + b(\alpha)) \geq C(\delta, \alpha) \quad (2.3)$$

for all  $x \in I$  for which  $|x - \alpha| \geq \delta$ .

For example,  $x^2$  is a strictly and uniformly convex function on every  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ .

Our first result concerns the form of  $T$  when restricted to convex functions if  $W$  contains the functions 1 and  $x$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** Let  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and assume  $W$  contains the functions 1,  $x$  and a function  $g$  strictly convex on  $I$ . Assume  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $W$  to  $F(J)$  satisfying

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in W$ . Then there exists a  $q \in F(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in F(J)$  which is a bijection (1-1 onto map) from  $J$  to  $I$ , such that

$$(T1)(y) = q(y), \quad (Tx)(y) = q(y)r(y)$$

and

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y)),$$

for every convex  $f \in W$ .

**Proof.** Set  $q(y) = (T1)(y)$ . Since  $Z_I(1) = 0$  we have  $Z_J(q) = 0$ . Thus  $q \in F(J)$  and  $q$  does not vanish on  $J$ .

Set  $(Tx)(y) = q(y)r(y)$ , i.e., let

$$r(y) = \frac{(Tx)(y)}{q(y)}.$$

Since  $q$  does not vanish, the function  $r$  is well-defined. By assumption

$$Z_J(r(y) - c) = Z_J(q(y)r(y) - cq(y)) = Z_I(x - c) = \begin{cases} 1, & c \in I \\ 0, & c \notin I \end{cases}.$$

Thus  $r$  is also 1-1 and the range of  $r$  is all of  $I$ .

It remains to prove that

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y)),$$

for every convex  $f \in W$ . Since  $T$  is linear, it suffices to prove this fact for strictly convex  $f$ . (We first prove this result for the strictly convex  $g$ , and then for  $f + g$  which is also strictly convex for any convex  $f$ .)

For each  $\alpha \in I$ , set

$$h(x; \alpha) = f(x) - (a(\alpha)x + b(\alpha))$$

where  $a(\alpha), b(\alpha)$  are as in Definition 2.1. Let

$$p(y; \alpha) = [Th(x; \alpha)](y).$$

Thus

$$Z_J(p(y; \alpha)) = Z_I(h(x; \alpha)) = 1 \tag{2.4}$$

for all  $\alpha \in I$ . Furthermore, from (2.1) we have that for all  $c > 0$

$$0 = Z_I(h(x; \alpha) + c) = Z_J(p(y; \alpha) + cq(y)) = Z_J\left(\frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} + c\right).$$

Thus  $p(y; \alpha)/q(y) + c$  has no zero in  $J$  for all  $c > 0$ , which implies that

$$\frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} \geq 0$$

for all  $y \in J$ .

Set

$$v(y) = (Tf)(y).$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} p(y; \alpha) &= [Th(x; \alpha)](y) \\ &= T(f(x) - (a(\alpha)x + b(\alpha)))(y) \\ &= v(y) - (a(\alpha)q(y)r(y) + b(\alpha)q(y)) \\ &= v(y) - q(y)f(r(y)) + q(y)[f(r(y)) - (a(\alpha)r(y) + b(\alpha))]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$0 \leq \frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} = \left[ \frac{v(y)}{q(y)} - f(r(y)) \right] + h(r(y); \alpha). \tag{2.5}$$

For  $y \in J$ , let  $\alpha = r(y)$ . Substituting in the above it follows from (2.2) that

$$\frac{v(y)}{q(y)} - f(r(y)) \geq 0, \tag{2.6}$$

for all  $y \in J$ .

For each  $\alpha \in I$  there exists a  $\tau(\alpha) \in J$  such that

$$p(\tau(\alpha); \alpha) = 0.$$

This follows from (2.4). Substituting in (2.5) we have from (2.6) and (2.1) that

$$\frac{p(\tau(\alpha))}{q(\tau(\alpha))} - f(r(\tau(\alpha))) = 0$$

and

$$h(r(\tau(\alpha)); \alpha) = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Now  $r(\tau(\alpha)) \in I$  and we therefore know that (2.7) implies that  $r(\tau(\alpha)) = \alpha$  since  $f$  is strictly convex (see (2.2) and the definition of strict convexity). As  $r$  is a 1-1 map from  $J$  onto  $I$ , it thus follows that as  $\alpha$  ranges over all of  $I$ ,  $\tau(\alpha)$  ranges over all of  $J$ . Thus for each  $y \in J$

$$\frac{v(y)}{q(y)} - f(r(y)) = 0,$$

i.e.,

$$(Tf)(y) = v(y) = q(y)f(r(y)). \quad \square$$

We can use the linearity of  $T$  and the fact that it is of the desired form on convex functions to prove the following result.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and  $W$  be a linear subspace of  $C(I)$  containing  $1, x$ , and a uniformly convex  $g$ . Assume  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $W$  to  $F(J)$  satisfying*

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in W$ . There exists a  $q \in F(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in F(J)$  which is a bijection from  $J$  to  $I$  such that for any  $f \in W$  which is also **bounded** on  $I$  we have

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y)).$$

**Proof.** The  $q$  and  $r$  are, of course, as given in Proposition 2.1, i.e.,  $T1 = q$  and  $Tx = qr$ . We use the method of proof of the well-known Bohman–Korovkin Theorem, which may be found in the book Korovkin [5].

Fix  $\alpha \in I$ . Since  $f$  is continuous at  $\alpha$ , given any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that if

$$|x - \alpha| < \delta$$

then

$$|f(x) - f(\alpha)| < \varepsilon.$$

We assume  $f$  is bounded on  $W$  and let  $M \geq |f(x)|$  for all  $x \in I$ .

Let  $g \in W$  be uniformly convex, and  $C(\delta, \alpha)$  be as defined in (2.3) with respect to  $g$ . Set

$$p_u(x) = f(\alpha) + \varepsilon + \frac{2M(g(x) - (a(\alpha)x + b(\alpha)))}{C(\delta, \alpha)}$$

and

$$p_\ell(x) = f(\alpha) - \varepsilon - \frac{2M(g(x) - (a(\alpha)x + b(\alpha)))}{C(\delta, \alpha)}.$$

We claim that  $p_u(x) > f(x) > p_\ell(x)$  for all  $x \in I$ . We prove only the first inequality. The proof of the second inequality is totally analogous. (In fact, we construct  $-p_\ell$  with respect to  $-f$  in the same way as we construct  $p_u$  with respect to  $f$ .)

If  $x = \alpha$ , then

$$p_u(\alpha) - f(\alpha) = \varepsilon > 0.$$

If  $0 < |x - \alpha| < \delta$  then  $|f(x) - f(\alpha)| < \varepsilon$ , and

$$p_u(x) - f(x) > \frac{2M(g(x) - (a(\alpha)x + b(\alpha)))}{C(\delta, \alpha)} > 0.$$

If  $|x - \alpha| \geq \delta$ , then  $|f(x) - f(\alpha)| \leq 2M$  and  $(g(x) - (a(\alpha)x + b(\alpha))) \geq C(\delta, \alpha)$ . Thus

$$p_u(x) - f(x) \geq \varepsilon - 2M + 2M > 0.$$

Since  $p_u(x) > f(x)$  for all  $x \in I$  we have

$$Z_I(p_u - f + c) = 0$$

for all  $c \geq 0$ . Thus

$$Z_J(Tp_u - Tf + cq) = 0$$

for all  $c \geq 0$ . As  $q$  does not vanish on  $J$ , this implies that

$$\frac{(Tp_u)(y) - (Tf)(y)}{q(y)} > 0$$

for every  $y \in J$ . Similarly,

$$\frac{(Tf)(y) - (Tp_\ell)(y)}{q(y)} > 0$$

for every  $y \in J$ . Now from Proposition 2.1

$$(Tp_u)(y) = q(y)p_u(r(y))$$

$$(Tp_\ell)(y) = q(y)p_\ell(r(y)).$$

Thus

$$p_u(r(y)) > \frac{(Tf)(y)}{q(y)} > p_\ell(r(y))$$

for all  $y \in J$ . As  $r$  is a 1-1 map from  $J$  onto  $I$ , there exists a  $z \in J$  such that  $r(z) = \alpha$ . Set  $y = z$  in the above to obtain

$$f(r(z)) + \varepsilon = p_u(r(z)) > \frac{(Tf)(z)}{q(z)} > p_\ell(r(z)) = f(r(z)) - \varepsilon.$$

Thus

$$\left| \frac{(Tf)(z)}{q(z)} - f(r(z)) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

As the choice of  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary,

$$(Tf)(z) = q(z)f(r(z)).$$

Since  $r$  is a 1-1 map from  $J$  onto  $I$ , this equality is valid for every  $z \in J$ . □

**Remark.** Once we identify  $q$  and  $r$ , we can define

$$(Sf)(x) = \frac{(Tf)(r^{-1}(x))}{q(r^{-1}(x))}.$$

Note that for  $f \in C(I)$  we have  $(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y))$  if and only if  $(Sf)(x) = f(x)$ . In Theorem 2.2  $S$  is the identity on 1,  $x$  and a uniformly convex function. In addition, a property which we very essentially used in the proof of Theorem 2.2 translates into the fact that  $S$  is a positive linear operator. This is why the method of proof of the Bohman–Korovkin Theorem applies. Nonetheless, it actually makes little difference if we work with  $T$  or  $S$ . We find it more convenient to work with  $T$ .

If  $I$  is compact, then every continuous function on  $I$  is bounded. In addition, on a compact set every strictly convex function is uniformly convex. We have as a consequence of Theorem 2.2:

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and assume  $I$  is compact. Let  $W$  be any linear subspace of  $C(I)$  containing 1,  $x$  and a strictly convex function. Assume  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $W$  to  $F(J)$  satisfying*

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in W$ . There exists a  $q \in F(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in F(J)$  which is a bijection from  $J$  to  $I$  such that for every  $f \in W$

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y)).$$

### 3. The Case $W = C(I)$

A special case of Corollary 2.3 is when  $W = C(I)$ . We formally state this.

**Corollary 3.1.** *Let  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and assume  $I$  is compact. Assume  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $C(I)$  to  $F(J)$  satisfying*

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in C(I)$ . There exists a  $q \in F(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in F(J)$  which is a bijection from  $J$  to  $I$  such that for every  $f \in C(I)$

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y)).$$

What if  $I$  is not compact? Since  $T$  is linear, we have, by Proposition 2.1, the following result. (For  $n$  even,  $x^n$  is convex. For  $n$  odd,  $x^n$  can be written as the difference of two easily defined convex functions in  $C(\mathbb{R})$  and thus in  $C(I)$ .)

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . Assume  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $C(I)$  to  $F(J)$  satisfying*

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in C(I)$ . There exists a  $q \in F(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in F(J)$  which is a bijection from  $J$  to  $I$  such that

$$(Tx^n)(y) = q(y)r^n(y),$$

for all  $n = 0, 1, \dots$

The idea used in the proof of Theorem 2.2 can be applied to the case where  $W = C(I)$  and  $I$  is any interval.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $I$  be an interval. Assume  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $C(I)$  to  $F(J)$  satisfying*

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in C(I)$ . Then there exists a  $q \in F(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in F(J)$  which is a bijection from  $J$  to  $I$  such that for every  $f \in C(I)$  we have

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y)).$$

**Proof.** Our proof is based on the method of proof of Theorem 2.2. Given any  $f \in C(I)$ ,  $\alpha \in I$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we will construct a convex  $p_u \in C(I)$  and concave  $p_\ell \in C(I)$  such that

$$p_u(x) > f(x) > p_\ell(x)$$

for all  $x \in I$ , while

$$p_u(\alpha) = f(\alpha) + \varepsilon, \quad p_\ell(\alpha) = f(\alpha) - \varepsilon.$$

This is exactly what is needed in the proof of Theorem 2.2. Previously, we had to take into consideration the demand that  $p_u$  and  $p_\ell$  be elements of  $W$ . Here  $W = C(I)$ , so we have more freedom in our construction of  $p_u$  and  $p_\ell$ .

We will explain how to construct  $p_u$ . The construction of  $p_\ell$  is analogous. Let  $a < b$  be the endpoints of  $I$ , and choose sequences  $\{a_n\}_1^\infty, \{b_n\}_1^\infty$  such that  $a_n$  strictly decreases to  $a$  while  $b_n$  strictly increases to  $b$ . Assume  $a_1 < a_0 = \alpha = b_0 < b_1$ . (If  $\alpha$  is an endpoint we alter things very slightly.) We construct  $p_u$  as follows.  $p_u$  will be continuous, strictly decreasing for  $x < \alpha$ , strictly increasing for  $x > \alpha$ , linear on each  $(b_{m-1}, b_m)$  and  $(a_m, a_{m-1})$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , convex, and satisfy  $p_u(x) > f(x)$  for all  $x \in I$  and  $p_u(\alpha) = f(\alpha) + \varepsilon$ . This is in fact easily accomplished. Assume, for example, that  $p_u$  has already been defined on  $[a_m, b_m]$  satisfying the above properties. Thus  $p_u$  is linear on  $[b_{m-1}, b_m]$  with slope  $c_m > 0$  and  $p(b_m) > f(b_m)$ . On  $[b_m, b_{m+1}]$  the function  $f$  is continuous and thus bounded. We simply let  $p_u$  on  $[b_m, b_{m+1}]$  be any linear function with slope  $c_{m+1} > c_m$  (this gives the convexity) which is continuous at  $b_m$  and satisfies  $p_u(x) > f(x)$  for all  $x \in [b_m, b_{m+1}]$ . A similar construction is done on  $[a_{m+1}, a_m]$ . The remaining details are left to the reader.  $\square$

**Remark.** If  $I$  is the union of two disjoint open intervals, then it is not true that every  $f \in C(I)$  can be bounded above by a function which is convex in the above sense.

**Remark.** If  $I, J$  are arbitrary sets in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $C(I)$  to  $F(J)$  satisfying

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in C(I)$ , then we conjecture that we always have

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y))$$

for  $q$  and  $r$ , as previously defined.

#### 4. The Polynomial Case

If  $1, x \in W$ , and  $x^{2n} \in W$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then since  $x^{2n}$  is strictly convex, it follows from Proposition 2.1 that

$$(Tx^{2n})(y) = q(y)r^{2n}(y).$$

For  $x^{2n-1} \in W$ , we would have this same result if, for example, we could express  $x^{2n-1}$  as the difference of two strictly convex functions in  $W$  (see Corollary 3.2). (There are many ways in which  $x^{2n-1}$  can be expressed as the difference of two convex functions. However it is not necessarily true that these two functions are in  $W$ .) We now consider the special case where  $W$  is not all of  $C(I)$ , but rather  $W = \Pi$ , the space of all algebraic polynomials, or  $W = \pi_N$ , the space of all algebraic polynomials of degree at most  $N$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\Pi$  be the linear subspace of algebraic polynomials. Assume  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $\Pi$  to  $F(J)$  satisfying*

$$Z_I(p) = Z_J(Tp)$$

for all  $p \in \Pi$ . There exists a  $q \in F(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in F(J)$  which is a bijection from  $J$  to  $I$  such that for every  $p \in \Pi$  we have

$$(Tp)(y) = q(y)p(r(y)).$$

**Proof.** Our proof is simple. The  $q$  and  $r$  are of course given by  $T1 = q$  and  $Tx = qr$ . We also have from Proposition 2.1 that

$$(Tx^{2n})(y) = q(y)r^{2n}(y) \tag{4.1}$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $n \geq 2$ . Given any  $a \neq 0$ , we claim that there exists a  $b > 0$  such that

$$x^{2n} + ax^{2n-1} + bx^2$$

is strictly convex on all of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and thus on any  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . To prove this, simply consider the second derivative

$$2n(2n-1)x^{2n-2} + a(2n-1)(2n-2)x^{2n-3} + 2b.$$

For given  $a$  there exists an  $N$  such that for all  $|x| > N$

$$2n(2n-1)x^{2n-2} + a(2n-1)(2n-2)x^{2n-3} > 0.$$

Thus for  $b > 0$  sufficiently large

$$2n(2n-1)x^{2n-2} + a(2n-1)(2n-2)x^{2n-3} + 2b > 0,$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

We now use the fact that  $T$  is linear, Proposition 2.1 and (4.1) which proves that

$$(Tx^{2n-1})(y) = q(y)r^{2n-1}(y)$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . □

**Remark.** When considering algebraic polynomials it is often natural to consider  $Z^*$  rather than  $Z$ , where  $Z^*$  counts zeros, including multiplicities. Is there any difference in our results if, for example, we are asked to characterize all linear transformations  $T$  mapping  $\Pi$ , defined on  $I$ , to  $C^\infty(J)$  and satisfying

$$Z_I^*(p) = Z_J^*(Tp)$$

for all  $p \in \Pi$ ? The  $q$  and  $r$  must now be in  $C^\infty(J)$ , and satisfy the previous properties. There is only one further difference, and that is that  $r'$  must not vanish on  $J$ .

Let us now restrict ourselves to  $T$  restricted to polynomials  $p$  and such that  $Tp$  is also a polynomial. If we have

$$Z_I(p) = Z_J(Tp)$$

for all  $p \in \Pi$  and  $Tp \in \Pi$ , then from Proposition 4.1 we must have  $q \in \Pi$  and also  $qr^n \in \Pi$  for all  $n$ . This latter condition implies that  $r \in \Pi$ . Furthermore, as  $r$  is a 1-1 map from  $J$  onto  $I$  this restricts the pair of permissible  $I$  and  $J$ . For example, if  $J$  is an interval, then  $I$  must be an interval of the same type. However the converse need not hold. What if, in addition,  $T : \pi_n \rightarrow \pi_n$ , for every  $n$ , where  $\pi_n$  denotes the set of polynomials of degree at most  $n$ ? Then it necessarily follows that  $q$  is a non-zero constant, and  $r$  is a linear function (which is not a constant). This implies that the  $I$  and  $J$  are related by translation and dilation, i.e.,  $I = aJ + b$ ,  $a \neq 0$ .

We formally state this as follows:

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\pi_n$  be the linear subspace of algebraic polynomials of degree at most  $n$ . Assume  $T$  is a linear transformation from  $\pi_n$  to  $\pi_n$ , all  $n$ , satisfying*

$$Z_I(p) = Z_J(Tp)$$

for all  $p \in \Pi$ . Then

$$(Tp)(y) = cp(ay + b),$$

for some constants  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a, c \neq 0$ . Furthermore  $I = aJ + b$ .

If  $T : \pi_N \rightarrow \pi_N$  for some fixed  $N$ , then from the method of proof of Proposition 4.1, it follows that if  $N$  is even we have

$$(Tp)(y) = q(y)p(r(y))$$

for all  $p \in \pi_N$ , without any a priori restriction on  $I$  or  $J$ . If  $N$  is odd, then we necessarily have

$$(Tp)(y) = q(y)p(r(y))$$

for all  $p \in \pi_{N-1}$  (again from the method of proof of Proposition 4.1). If, in addition,  $I$  is bounded, either above or below, then  $A(x - \alpha)^N$  is strictly convex on  $I$  for some  $A$  and  $\alpha$ , and we therefore also have

$$(Tx^N)(y) = q(y)r^N(y).$$

Another case in which the desired result holds is the following.  $T$  will be a map from  $\pi_N$  to  $C^\infty(J)$  (with restrictions on  $J$ ), and we will demand that

$$Z_I^*(p) = Z_J^*(Tp)$$

for all  $p \in \pi_N$ , where  $Z_I^*(f)$  counts the number of zeros, including multiplicities, of  $f$  on  $I$ . As  $f \in C^\infty(I)$ , we have no problem with such a count.

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and assume  $J$  is a countable union of connected intervals, none of which is a singleton. Assume  $T : \pi_N \rightarrow C^\infty(J)$  for  $N$ , odd, and*

$$Z_I^*(p) = Z_J^*(Tp)$$

for all  $p \in \pi_N$ . There exists a  $q \in C^\infty(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in C^\infty(J)$  which is a bijective map from  $J$  to  $I$  for which also  $r'$  does not vanish on  $J$ , such that

$$(Tp)(y) = q(y)p(r(y))$$

for all  $p \in \pi_N$ .

**Proof.** We assume that  $N = 2m + 1 \geq 3$  is odd. Set  $q(y) = (T1)(y)$ , and  $q(y)r(y) = (Tx)(y)$ . This defines  $q$  and  $r$  with the desired properties. As stated above, we have from Corollary 3.2 and the proof of Proposition 4.1 that

$$(Tx^n)(y) = q(y)r^n(y) \tag{4.2}$$

for  $n = 0, 1, \dots, 2m$ . It remains to prove that

$$(Tx^{2m+1})(y) = q(y)r^{2m+1}(y).$$

For  $\alpha \in I$ , set

$$p(y; \alpha) = (T(x - \alpha)^{2m+1})(y).$$

Thus

$$Z_J^*(p(y; \alpha)) = Z_I^*((x - \alpha)^{2m+1}) = 2m + 1.$$

We claim that  $p(y; \alpha)$  has a zero in  $J$  of multiplicity at least 2. This follows from the fact that for each  $\alpha \in I$

$$Z_I^*((x - \alpha)^{2m+1} + c) \leq 1$$

for all  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $c \neq 0$ . Thus

$$Z_J^*(p(y; \alpha) + cq(y)) \leq 1$$

for all  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $c \neq 0$ . The function  $p(y; \alpha)$  has  $2m + 1$  zeros in  $J$ , counting multiplicity. Each zero lies in a component of  $J$  which is connected, but not a singleton. For each such zero the function  $p(y; \alpha) + cq(y)$  contains at least one nearby zero for all  $c$  sufficiently small and of one fixed sign (since  $q$  does not vanish). But then  $p(y; \alpha)$  has at most two distinct zeros. Since  $2m + 1 \geq 3$ , one of these zeros must be of multiplicity at least 2.

Set

$$v(y) = (Tx^{2m+1})(y)$$

A simple calculation based on (4.2) shows that

$$p(y; \alpha) = v(y) - q(y)r^{2m+1}(y) + q(y)(r(y) - \alpha)^{2m+1}. \tag{4.3}$$

We first prove that

$$\frac{1}{r'(y)} \left( \frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} \right)' \geq 0.$$

for all  $y \in J$

We know that  $r'$  never vanishes on  $J$ . Assume there exists a point  $y_0 \in J$  at which

$$\frac{1}{r'(y_0)} \left( \frac{p(y_0; \alpha)}{q(y_0)} \right)' < 0.$$

Then for some constants  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a > 0$

$$\frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} + a(r(y) + b)$$

has a double zero at  $y_0$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 2 &\leq Z_J^* \left( \frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} + a(r(y) + b) \right) = Z_J^*(p(y; \alpha) + aq(y)(r(y) + b)) \\ &= Z_I^*((x - \alpha)^{2m+1} + ax + ab) \leq Z_{\mathbb{R}}^*((x - \alpha)^{2m+1} + a(x - \alpha) + a(b + \alpha)) \\ &= Z_{\mathbb{R}}^*(z^{2m+1} + az + c) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $a > 0$ , it easily follows that

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}^*(z^{2m+1} + az + c) = 1$$

for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . This contradiction implies the above claim.

From (4.3)

$$\frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} = \frac{v(y)}{q(y)} - r^{2m+1}(y) + (r(y) - \alpha)^{2m+1}.$$

Differentiate each side and then divide by  $r'(y)$  (which is non-zero) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{r'(y)} \left( \frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} \right)' = \frac{1}{r'(y)} \left( \frac{v(y)}{q(y)} \right)' - (2m+1)r^{2m}(y) + (2m+1)(r(y) - \alpha)^{2m},$$

for all  $y \in J$ ,  $\alpha \in I$ . We now follow the proof of Proposition 2.1, almost word-for-word. We have shown that the left-hand side is non-negative on all of  $J$ . This easily implies that

$$\frac{1}{r'(y)} \left( \frac{v(y)}{q(y)} \right)' - (2m+1)r^{2m}(y) \geq 0$$

for all  $y \in J$ , while obviously

$$(2m+1)(r(y) - \alpha)^{2m} \geq 0$$

for all  $y \in J$ . By a previous claim,  $p(y; \alpha)$  has a double zero in  $J$ , and at such a point  $\left( \frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} \right)' = 0$ . It therefore follows, using the previous reasoning, that at this zero  $\tau(\alpha)$ ,

$$r(\tau(\alpha)) = \alpha,$$

and thus we obtain for all  $y \in J$

$$\frac{1}{r'(y)} \left( \frac{v(y)}{q(y)} \right)' = (2m+1)r^{2m}(y).$$

That is,

$$\left( \frac{v(y)}{q(y)} \right)' = (2m+1)r'(y)r^{2m}(y)$$

for all  $y \in J$ , which implies that

$$v(y) = q(y)r^{2m+1}(y) + cq(y)$$

for some constants  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , which may differ from component to component of  $J$ . Substituting in (4.3) we get

$$p(y; \alpha) = cq(y) + q(y)(r(y) - \alpha)^{2m+1}.$$

Setting  $y = \tau(\alpha)$  (and since  $q$  does not vanish) we see that  $c = 0$  on the component containing  $\tau(\alpha)$ . But as  $\alpha$  varies over all  $I$ ,  $\tau(\alpha)$  varies over all  $J$ . Thus  $c = 0$  on every component of  $J$ , which proves the result.  $\square$

We do believe that the result of Proposition 4.3 should hold without these unnecessary topological conditions.

**Remark.** The arguments of this paper are analytic. We have used very little geometry. To use the geometry in some meaningful way, it seems necessary to restrict the sets  $I$  and  $J$ , and the range of  $T$ . For example, let  $I = J = [a, b]$ , and  $T$  satisfy  $T1 = 1$ ,  $Tx = x$ , and  $Tp = q$  where  $p$  and  $q$  are some fixed polynomials. Assume

$$Z_I^*(ap + bx + c) = Z_I^*(aq + bx + c)$$

for all possible constants  $a, b, c$ . Thus  $T$  is defined only on  $\text{span}\{1, x, p\}$ . It follows from Horwitz [3, Theorem 3] that necessarily  $p = q$ . It seems that we can in fact replace  $Z_I^*$  by  $Z_I$ .

The next proposition tells us about the possible forms of  $T$  if it is a map from  $\pi_N$  to  $\pi_N$  which satisfies (1.2).

**Proposition 4.4.** Assume  $T : \pi_N \rightarrow \pi_N$  for some fixed  $N$  and

$$(Tp)(y) = q(y)p(r(y))$$

for every  $p \in \pi_N$ , where  $q$  does not identically vanish and  $r$  is not a constant function. Then  $r$  has the form

$$r(y) = \frac{ay + b}{cy + d}$$

with  $ad - bc \neq 0$ , and  $q(y) = A(cy + d)^N$ , for some constants  $a, b, c, d$  and  $A$ .

**Proof.** Since  $q$  and  $qr$  are in  $\pi_N$ , it follows that  $q$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $N$  and  $r$  is a rational function with numerator and denominator in  $\pi_N$ . Assume  $r = g/h$  where  $g, h \in \pi_N$  have no common factors.

If  $h$  is a constant function then since  $r$  is not a constant function,  $g$  must be of degree at least 1. Since  $qr^N \in \pi_N$ , this implies that  $g$  is of degree exactly 1, and as a consequence  $q$  is a constant function. (This is the case  $c = 0$ .)

Assume  $h$  is not the constant function. As  $qr^N \in \pi_N$ , and  $g$  and  $h$  have no common factors, we must have  $q/h^N \in \pi_N$ . As  $q \in \pi_N$  this implies that  $h$  must be a linear polynomial of the form  $cy + d$  and  $q(y) = A(cy + d)^N$ . Thus  $qr^N = Ag^N \in \pi_N$  and hence  $g$  is a non-zero polynomial of degree at most 1.  $\square$

**Remark.** Aside from the conditions of Proposition 4.4, we also demand that  $r$  map  $J$  to  $I$  in a 1-1 manner. This poses additional restrictions. For example, if  $I = J = \mathbb{R}$ , then we must have  $c = 0$ . If  $I = J = [0, 1]$ , then there exist constants  $A \neq 0$ , and  $a, b > 0$  such that either

$$r(y) = \frac{ay}{ay + b(1 - y)}, \quad \text{and} \quad q(y) = A(ay + b(1 - y))^N,$$

or

$$r(y) = \frac{b(1 - y)}{ay + b(1 - y)}, \quad \text{and} \quad q(y) = A(ay + b(1 - y))^N.$$

(If  $a = b$ , then  $r$  is linear.)

### 5. $W$ does not contain 1 or $x$

Let us consider what we can say if  $W$  does not contain the functions 1 or  $x$ .

We will assume that  $I$  is an arbitrary subset of  $[a, b]$  and that we are given  $\{e_0, e_1, e_2\}$  which is a CT-system (complete Chebyshev system) on  $[a, b]$ . This means that each of  $\{e_0\}$ ,  $\{e_0, e_1\}$  and  $\{e_0, e_1, e_2\}$  is a T-system (Chebyshev system) on  $[a, b]$ . (A finite dimensional subspace  $U$  is a T-system on  $[a, b]$  if each  $u \in U \setminus \{0\}$  has at most  $\dim U - 1$  distinct zeros in  $[a, b]$ .) What we will need, at least in our proof, is, for each  $\alpha \in I$ , the existence of a function

$$h(x; \alpha) = e_2(x) + \gamma e_1(x) + \delta e_0(x)$$

which is strictly positive on  $[a, b] \setminus \{\alpha\}$  and vanishes at  $\alpha$ . (We may have to multiply  $e_2$  by  $-1$ , but this is a minor technicality.) As  $\{e_0, e_1, e_2\}$  is a CT-system on  $[a, b]$ , it follows from a theorem of Krein [6], see also Karlin, Studden [4, p. 28], that this can be done for all  $\alpha \in (a, b)$ . However the endpoints may be problematic. As we also need the endpoint result, we will impose additional minor conditions. We could, for example, demand that  $\{e_0, e_1, e_2\}$  be a CT-system on  $(a', b')$  where  $a' < a < b < b'$ , or we might demand that  $\{e_0, e_1, e_2\}$  be an ECT-system (extended complete Chebyshev system) on  $[a, b]$ . (An ECT-system differs from a CT-system simply in that zeros are counted according to their multiplicity.)

Let  $\widetilde{W}$  be a linear subspace of  $C[a, b]$  and  $W$  be the restriction of  $\widetilde{W}$  to  $I$ . Thus each  $f \in W$  is also a bounded function. Assume that  $e_0, e_1, e_2 \in \widetilde{W}$ . Under the above assumptions we will prove the following result.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let the previous assumptions apply and  $T$  be a linear transformation from  $W$  to  $F(J)$  ( $J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ) satisfying*

$$Z_I(f) = Z_J(Tf)$$

for all  $f \in W$ . There exists a  $q \in F(J)$  which does not vanish on  $J$ , and an  $r \in F(J)$  which is a 1-1 map from  $J$  onto  $I$  such that

$$(Tf)(y) = q(y)f(r(y)),$$

for every  $f \in W$ .

**Proof.** In the proof of this theorem we use the methods of proof of Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 2.2. We first construct  $q$  and  $r$ . Previously  $q$  and  $r$  were easily defined. Here there is a bit more work.

Let  $Te_i = g_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2$ . As  $\{e_0\}$  is a T-system on  $[a, b]$ , it does not vanish thereon. We assume, without loss of generality, that  $e_0$  is positive on  $[a, b]$ . (If not, simply multiply it by  $-1$ .) Thus

$$0 = Z_I(e_0) = Z_J(Te_0) = Z_J(g_0)$$

and  $g_0$  does not vanish on  $J$ . By assumption  $\{e_0, e_1\}$  is a T-system on  $[a, b]$ . Thus

$$Z_I(\beta e_0 + \gamma e_1) \leq 1$$

for every choice of  $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(\beta, \gamma) \neq (0, 0)$ . Set

$$K = \left\{ \frac{e_1(x)}{e_0(x)} : x \in I \right\}.$$

For each  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$

$$Z_J(g_1 - \alpha g_0) = Z_I(e_1 - \alpha e_0) = \begin{cases} 1, & \alpha \in K \\ 0, & \alpha \notin K \end{cases}. \quad (5.1)$$

Then from (5.1) it also follows that

$$K = \left\{ \frac{g_1(y)}{g_0(y)} : y \in J \right\}.$$

In fact the two maps

$$\frac{e_1}{e_0} : I \rightarrow K \quad \frac{g_1}{g_0} : J \rightarrow K$$

are 1-1 maps onto  $K$ . As such

$$\left( \frac{e_1}{e_0} \right)^{-1}$$

exists. From our assumption that  $\{e_0, e_1\}$  is a T-system on all of  $[a, b]$  (and not only on  $I$ ) it actually follows that  $(e_1/e_0)^{-1}$  is continuous. Set

$$r(y) = \left( \frac{e_1}{e_0} \right)^{-1} \left( \left( \frac{g_1}{g_0} \right) (y) \right), \quad (5.2)$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{e_1(r(y))}{e_0(r(y))} = \frac{g_1(y)}{g_0(y)}.$$

The function  $r$  is a 1-1 map from  $J$  onto  $I$ . Set

$$q(y) = \frac{g_0(y)}{e_0(r(y))}. \quad (5.3)$$

Thus  $q \in F(J)$  and does not vanish thereon. These definitions of  $q$  and  $r$  imply (from (5.3))

$$(Te_0)(y) = g_0(y) = q(y)e_0(r(y))$$

and from (5.2)

$$(Te_1)(y) = g_1(y) = \frac{g_0(y)e_1(r(y))}{e_0(r(y))} = q(y)e_1(r(y)).$$

We now prove, paralleling the proof of Proposition 2.1, that

$$(Te_2)(y) = q(y)e_2(r(y)).$$

Let

$$h(x; \alpha) = e_2(x) + \gamma e_1(x) + \delta e_0(x)$$

where  $h(x; \alpha) > 0$  for all  $x \in [a, b]$ , and  $h(\alpha; \alpha) = 0$ . Set

$$p(y; \alpha) = [Th(x; \alpha)](y).$$

Thus

$$Z_J(p(y; \alpha)) = Z_I(h(x; \alpha)) = 1.$$

Since  $h$  is non-negative and  $e_0$  is strictly positive on  $[a, b]$ , we have for all  $c > 0$

$$0 = Z_I(h(x; \alpha) + ce_0(x)) = Z_J(p(y; \alpha) + cq(y)e_0(r(y))) = Z_J\left(\frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} + ce_0(r(y))\right).$$

Thus  $p(y; \alpha)/q(y) + ce_0(r(y))$  has no zero in  $J$  for all  $c > 0$ , which implies that

$$\frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} \geq 0$$

for all  $y \in J$ .

Now

$$\begin{aligned} p(y; \alpha) &= [Th(x; \alpha)](y) \\ &= T(e_2(x) + \gamma e_1(x) + \delta e_0(x))(y) \\ &= g_2(y) + \gamma q(y)e_1(r(y)) + \delta q(y)e_0(r(y)) \\ &= g_2(y) - q(y)e_2(r(y)) + q(y)[e_2(r(y)) + \gamma e_1(r(y)) + \delta e_0(r(y))]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$0 \leq \frac{p(y; \alpha)}{q(y)} = \left[ \frac{g_2(y)}{q(y)} - e_2(r(y)) \right] + [e_2(r(y)) + \gamma e_1(r(y)) + \delta e_0(r(y))].$$

For  $y \in J$ , let  $\alpha = r(y)$ . Then  $\alpha \in I$  and substituting in the above it follows that

$$\frac{g_2(y)}{q(y)} - e_2(r(y)) \geq 0.$$

Thus

$$\frac{g_2(y)}{q(y)} - e_2(r(y)) \geq 0,$$

for all  $y \in J$ . We now continue the proof, word for word, as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, to obtain

$$(Te_2)(y) = q(y)e_2(r(y)).$$

We now consider any  $f \in W$ . We will use the method of proof of Theorem 2.2, i.e., that based on the idea of proof of the Bohman–Korovkin Theorem, to prove the desired result. As the proof is much the same we just mention where the differences arise and how to deal with them.

Fix  $\alpha \in I$ . Given any  $\varepsilon > 0$  it follows from the fact that  $f$  is continuous at  $\alpha$ , and  $e_0$  is continuous and strictly positive on  $[a, b]$ , that there exists an  $\eta > 0$  such that for

$$|x - \alpha| < \eta$$

we have

$$|f(x) - f(\alpha)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

and

$$\frac{e_0(x)}{e_0(\alpha)} > \frac{1}{2}.$$

As  $f \in W$  has an extension to a continuous function on  $[a, b]$ , it follows that  $f$  is bounded on  $W$ . Let  $M \geq |f(x)|$  for all  $x \in I$ .

We now set

$$p_u(x) = f(\alpha) + \varepsilon \frac{e_0(x)}{e_0(\alpha)} + A(\eta; \alpha) [e_2(x) + \gamma e_1(x) + \delta e_0(x)]$$

and

$$p_\ell(x) = f(\alpha) - \varepsilon \frac{e_0(x)}{e_0(\alpha)} - B(\eta; \alpha) [e_2(x) + \gamma e_1(x) + \delta e_0(x)]$$

We claim that  $p_u(x) > f(x) > p_\ell(x)$  for all  $x \in I$  for some judicious choice of positive  $A(\eta; \alpha)$  and  $B(\eta; \alpha)$ . We prove only the first inequality. The proof of the second inequality is totally analogous.

If  $x = \alpha$ , then

$$p_u(\alpha) - f(\alpha) = \varepsilon > 0.$$

If  $0 < |x - \alpha| < \eta$  then  $|f(x) - f(\alpha)| < \varepsilon/2$ , and

$$p_u(x) - f(x) > -\varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 + A(\eta; \alpha) [e_2(x) + \gamma e_1(x) + \delta e_0(x)] > 0$$

If  $|x - \alpha| \geq \eta$ , then  $|f(x) - f(\alpha)| \leq 2M$  and

$$e_2(x) + \gamma e_1(x) + \delta e_0(x)$$

is thereon strictly positive and also bounded below away from zero. We now choose  $A(\eta; \alpha) > 0$  so that on this set

$$A(\eta; \alpha) [e_2(x) + \gamma e_1(x) + \delta e_0(x)] > 2M.$$

This then implies that

$$p_u(x) - f(x) > 0$$

on  $|x - \alpha| \geq \eta$ .

The rest of proof now follows the proof of Theorem 2.2. □

### References

- [1] J. M. Carnicer, J. M. Peña, and A. Pinkus, On some zero-increasing operators, preprint.
- [2] H. Fast, Inversion of the Crofton transform for sets in the plane, *Real Anal. Exchange*, **19** (1993/94), 59–80.
- [3] A. Horwitz, Reconstructing a function from its set of tangent lines, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **96** (1989), 807–813.
- [4] S. Karlin and W. J. Studden, *Tchebycheff Systems: with Applications in Analysis and Statistics*, Interscience, N. Y., 1966.
- [5] P. P. Korovkin, *Linear Operators and Approximation Theory*, Hindustan Pub. Corp., Delhi, 1960.
- [6] M. G. Krein, The ideas of P. L. Cebyshev and A. A. Markov in the theory of limiting values of integrals and their further development, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl., Ser. 2*, **12** (1951), 1–122.
- [7] T. J. Richardson, Total curvature and intersection tomography, *Advances in Math.*, **130** (1997), 1–32.

J. M. Carnicer and J. M. Peña  
 Departamento de Matematica Aplicada  
 Universidad de Zaragoza  
 Edificio Matematicas Planta 1  
 Zaragoza, 50009  
 Spain

A. Pinkus  
 Department of Mathematics  
 Technion, I. I. T.  
 Haifa, 32000  
 Israel