

RATIONAL TETRA-INNER FUNCTIONS AND THE SPECIAL VARIETY OF THE TETRABLOCK

OMAR M. O. ALSALHI AND ZINAIDA A. LYKOVA

ABSTRACT. The set

$$\overline{\mathbb{E}} = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^3 : 1 - x_1z - x_2w + x_3zw \neq 0 \text{ whenever } |z| < 1, |w| < 1\}.$$

is called the tetrablock and has intriguing complex-geometric properties. It is polynomially convex, nonconvex and starlike about 0. It has a group of automorphisms parametrised by $\text{Aut } \mathbb{D} \times \text{Aut } \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ and its distinguished boundary $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ is homeomorphic to the solid torus $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \times \mathbb{T}$. It has a special subvariety

$$\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}} : x_1x_2 = x_3\},$$

called *the royal variety* of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$, which is a complex geodesic of \mathbb{E} that is invariant under all automorphisms of \mathbb{E} . We exploit this geometry to develop an explicit and detailed structure theory for the rational maps from the unit disc \mathbb{D} to $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ that map the unit circle \mathbb{T} to the distinguished boundary $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Such maps are called rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. We show that, for each nonconstant rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x , either $x(\mathbb{D}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}} \cap \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ or $x(\mathbb{D})$ meets $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ exactly $\deg(x)$ times. We study convex subsets of the set \mathcal{J} of all rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions and extreme points of \mathcal{J} .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The tetrablock \mathbb{E}	3
2.1. The tetrablock and the μ_{Diag} -synthesis problem	4
2.2. The distinguished boundary of the tetrablock	5
3. The symmetrised bidisc and Γ -inner functions	6
4. Rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions	8
4.1. Relations between $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions and Γ -inner functions	8
4.2. The degree of a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function	13
4.3. Description of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions	14
4.4. Superficial $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions	20
5. The construction of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions	23
5.1. The royal polynomial of an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function	23
5.2. Rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions of type (n, k)	25
6. Convex subsets of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and extremality	32
6.1. Convex subsets in the tetrablock	32
6.2. Extremality in the set of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions	34
References	46

Date: 10th September 2020.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 32F45, 30E05, 93B36, 93B50.

Key words and phrases. Inner functions, Tetrablock, Convexity, Extreme point, Distinguished boundary.

The first author was supported by the Government of Saudi Arabia. The second author was partially supported by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council grants EP/N03242X/1.

1. INTRODUCTION

Basic unsolved problems in H^∞ control theory led us to consider “inner mappings” from \mathbb{D} to certain domains in \mathbb{C}^d with $d > 1$. For example, a special case of the problem of robust stabilization under structured uncertainty, or the μ -synthesis problem [12, 13, 2, 4], leads naturally to a class of domains of which a typical member is

$$\mathbb{E} = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^3 : 1 - x_1z - x_2w + x_3zw \neq 0 \text{ whenever } |z| \leq 1, |w| \leq 1\}$$

the *open tetrablock*, as was observed by Abouhajar, White and Young in [1]. The complex geometry of \mathbb{E} was further developed in [14, 15, 16, 19] and associated operator theory in [8, 7]. The solvability of the μ -synthesis problem connected to \mathbb{E} can be expressed in terms of the existence of rational inner functions from the open unit disc \mathbb{D} in the complex plane \mathbb{C} to the closure of \mathbb{E} [9].

Recall that a classical *rational inner function* is a rational map f from the unit disc \mathbb{D} to its closure $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with the property that f maps the unit circle \mathbb{T} into itself. See [11] for a survey of results, linking inner functions and operator theory. We denote the closure of \mathbb{E} by $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and we define a *rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner or (tetra-inner) function* to be a rational analytic map $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ with the property that x maps \mathbb{T} into the distinguished boundary $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Here, $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ is the smallest closed subset of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ on which every continuous function on $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ that is analytic in \mathbb{E} attains its maximum modulus. Rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions have many similarities with rational inner functions, but also have some striking differences, which stem from the fact that \mathbb{E} has a more subtle complex geometry than $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Here are some points of difference between well-studied domains in \mathbb{C}^3 , such as the tridisc \mathbb{D}^3 and the Euclidean ball \mathbb{B}_3 on the one hand and \mathbb{E} on the other. Firstly, whereas \mathbb{D}^3 and \mathbb{B}_3 are homogeneous (so that the holomorphic automorphisms of these domains act transitively), \mathbb{E} is inhomogeneous [19].

Secondly, the distinguished boundary of \mathbb{E} differs markedly in its topological properties from those of \mathbb{D}^3 and \mathbb{B}_3 . The distinguished boundaries of \mathbb{D}^3 and \mathbb{B}_3 are the 3-dimensional torus and the 5-sphere respectively, which are smooth manifolds without boundary. In contrast, the distinguished boundary $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ of \mathbb{E} is homeomorphic to a solid torus $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \times \mathbb{T}$, which has a boundary. For a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x the curve $x(e^{it}), 0 \leq t < 2\pi$, lies in $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and may or may not touch the edge, with consequences for the algebraic and geometric properties of x .

We call the set

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : x_1x_2 = x_3\}.$$

the *royal variety* of the tetrablock. The complex geodesic $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}} \cap \mathbb{E}$ is invariant under the group of biholomorphic automorphisms of \mathbb{E} [19]. This paper shows that the variety $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ plays a central role in the function theory of \mathbb{E} . The intersection $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}} \cap b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ is exactly the boundary of $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$, that is, $\{(x_1, x_2, x_1x_2) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : |x_1| = |x_2| = 1\}$ [1, Theorem 7.1], which is homeomorphic to the 2-torus $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$.

These geometric properties of \mathbb{E} lead to dramatic phenomena in the theory of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions that have no analogue for classical inner functions. The first of our main theorems, a corollary of Theorem 5.12, is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *If x is a nonconstant rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function then either $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}} \cap \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ or $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ meets $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ exactly $\deg(x)$ times.*

Here $\deg(x)$ is the degree of x , defined in a natural way by means of fundamental groups (Subsection 4.2). In Proposition 4.14 we show that, for any rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, $\deg(x)$ is equal to the degree $\deg(x_3)$ (in the usual sense) of the

finite Blaschke product x_3 . The precise way of counting the number of times that $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ meets $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ is also described in Section 5. We call the points $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that $x(\lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ the *royal nodes* of x and, for such λ , we call $x(\lambda)$ a *royal point* of x .

The second main result describes the construction of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions of prescribed degree from certain interpolation data; one can think of this result as an analogue of the expression for a finite Blaschke product in terms of its zeros. Concretely, the following result is proved in Theorem 5.17.

Theorem 1.2. *Let n be a positive integer and suppose that $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, where $k_1 + k_2 = n$. Suppose that $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ are distinct from the points of the set $\{\alpha_j^i, j = 1, \dots, k_i, i = 1, 2\} \cap \mathbb{T}$. Then there exists a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ such that*

- (1) *the zeros of x_1 in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, repeated according to multiplicity, are $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1$;*
- (2) *the zeros of x_2 in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, repeated according to multiplicity, are $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2$;*
- (3) *the royal nodes of x are $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, with repetition according to multiplicity of the nodes.*

Such a function x can be constructed as follows. Let $t_+ > 0$ and let $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Let R be defined by

$$R(\lambda) = t_+ \prod_{j=1}^n (\lambda - \sigma_j)(1 - \overline{\sigma_j}\lambda).$$

Let E_1 be defined by

$$E_1(\lambda) = t \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (\lambda - \alpha_j^1) \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (1 - \overline{\alpha_j^2}\lambda).$$

Then the following statements hold:

- (i) *There exists an outer function D of degree at most n such that*

$$\lambda^{-n} R(\lambda) + |E_1(\lambda)|^2 = |D(\lambda)|^2$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$.

- (ii) *The function x defined by*

$$x = \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_1^{\sim n}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right) \text{ where, for any polynomial } D, D^{\sim n}(\lambda) = \overline{\lambda^n D\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)},$$

is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function such that the degree of x is equal to n and conditions (1), (2) and (3) hold. The royal polynomial R_x of x is equal to R .

Here the royal polynomial of x is defined as $R_x = [D^{\sim n}D - E_1E_1^{\sim n}]$. The proof of this theorem is constructive: it gives a prescription for the construction of a 3-parameter family of such functions x , subject to the computation of Fejér-Riesz factorizations of certain non-negative functions on the circle.

In Section 6 we study convex subsets of the set \mathcal{J} of all rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions and extremality. It is easy to see that the set \mathcal{J} is not convex. On the other hand, the subset of \mathcal{J} with a fixed inner function x_3 is convex (Theorem 6.5). Recall that the distinguished boundary of the tridisc \mathbb{D}^3 contain no line segments. Thus every inner function in the set of analytic functions $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D}^3)$ from \mathbb{D} to \mathbb{D}^3 is an extreme point of $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D}^3)$. However, this property contrasts sharply with the situation in the tetrablock. We show that whether x is an extreme point of \mathcal{J} depends on how many royal nodes lie on \mathbb{T} .

Theorem 1.3. *Let x be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function and let x have n royal nodes where k of them are in \mathbb{T} . If $2k \leq n$, then x is not an extreme point of \mathcal{J} .*

Here we use the precise way of counting the number of royal nodes, which we introduce in Section 5. In Proposition 6.21 we provide a class of extreme functions of the set \mathcal{J} .

The authors are grateful to Nicholas Young for some helpful suggestions.

2. THE TETRABLOCK \mathbb{E}

Definition 2.1. [1] *The open tetrablock is the domain defined by*

$$\mathbb{E} = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^3 : 1 - x_1z - x_2w + x_3zw \neq 0 \text{ for } |z| \leq 1, |w| \leq 1\}.$$

Despite the fact that \mathbb{E} is not convex, its intersection with \mathbb{R}^3 is. It is proved in [1] that $\mathbb{E} \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ is the open tetrahedron with the vertices $(1, 1, 1)$, $(1, -1, -1)$, $(-1, 1, -1)$ and $(-1, -1, 1)$. The following function plays an important role in the study of the tetrablock.

Definition 2.2. *For $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we define*

$$\Psi(z, x) = \frac{x_3z - x_1}{x_2z - 1}, \quad \text{whenever } x_2z \neq 1.$$

Remark 2.3. In the case that $x_3 = x_1x_2$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\Psi(z, x) = \frac{x_1x_2z - x_1}{x_2z - 1} = \frac{x_1(x_2z - 1)}{x_2z - 1} = x_1.$$

Theorem 2.4. [1, Theorem 2.2] *Let $x \in \mathbb{C}^3$. The following are equivalent*

- (1) $x \in \mathbb{E}$;
- (2) $\|\Psi(\cdot, x)\|_{H^\infty} < 1$ and if $x_1x_2 = x_3$, then, in addition, $|x_2| < 1$;
- (3) $|x_1 - \bar{x}_2x_3| + |x_2 - \bar{x}_1x_3| < 1 - |x_3|^2$;
- (4) there exists a 2×2 matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ such that $\|A\| < 1$ and $x = (a_{11}, a_{22}, \det(A))$;
- (5) $|x_3| < 1$ and there exist $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| < 1$ and

$$x_1 = \beta_1 + \bar{\beta}_2x_3, \quad x_2 = \beta_2 + \bar{\beta}_1x_3.$$

Theorem 2.5. [1, Theorem 2.4] *Let $x \in \mathbb{C}^3$. The following are equivalent*

- (1) $x \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$;
- (2) $\|\Psi(\cdot, x)\|_{H^\infty} \leq 1$ and if $x_1x_2 = x_3$, then, in addition, $|x_2| \leq 1$;
- (3) $|x_1 - \bar{x}_2x_3| + |x_2 - \bar{x}_1x_3| \leq 1 - |x_3|^2$ and if $\|x_3\| = 1$ then, in addition, $|x_1| \leq 1$;
- (4) there exists a 2×2 matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ such that $\|A\| \leq 1$ and $x = (a_{11}, a_{22}, \det(A))$;
- (5) $|x_3| \leq 1$ and there exist $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| \leq 1$ and

$$x_1 = \beta_1 + \bar{\beta}_2x_3, \quad x_2 = \beta_2 + \bar{\beta}_1x_3.$$

2.1. The tetrablock and the μ_{Diag} -synthesis problem. The tetrablock is associated with the μ_{Diag} -synthesis problem from \mathbb{D} to $\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$. The structured singular value in this case is defined by

$$(2.1) \quad \mu_{\text{Diag}}(A) = \frac{1}{\inf\{\|X\| : X \in \text{Diag}, \det(I - AX) = 0\}},$$

where

$$\text{Diag} := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & w \end{bmatrix} : z, w \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

We set $\mu_{\text{Diag}}(A) = 0$ if $(I - AX)$ is non-singular for all $X \in \text{Diag}$.

Definition 2.6. We define the map $\pi : \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^3$ for a matrix $A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ to be

$$\pi(A) = (a_{11}, a_{22}, \det(A)).$$

and Σ to be

$$\Sigma := \{A \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} : \mu_{\text{Diag}}(A) < 1\}$$

where $\mu_{\text{Diag}}(A)$ is defined by equation (2.1).

Theorem 2.7. [1, Theorem 9.2] Suppose that $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{D}$ are distinct points and $A_k = [a_{ij}^k] \in \Sigma$ are such that $a_{11}^k a_{22}^k \neq \det(A_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. The following conditions are equivalent.

- (1) There exists an analytic function $F : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that $F(\lambda_k) = A_k$, $1 \leq k \leq n$;
- (2) There exists an analytic function $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ such that $\varphi(\lambda_k) = \pi(A_k)$, that is,

$$\varphi(\lambda_k) = (a_{11}^k, a_{22}^k, \det(A_k)), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

In the following theorem the authors give a necessary and sufficient condition for the solvability of a μ_{Diag} -synthesis problem by a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function.

Theorem 2.8. [9, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 8.1] Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be distinct points in \mathbb{D} and let $A_k = [a_{ij}^k] \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ be such that $a_{11}^k a_{22}^k \neq \det(A_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. Let

$$(x_1^k, x_2^k, x_3^k) = (a_{11}^k, a_{22}^k, \det(A_k)), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

The following two conditions are equivalent.

- (1) There exists an analytic 2×2 matrix function F in \mathbb{D} such that

$$F(\lambda_k) = A_k \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, n,$$

and

$$\mu_{\text{Diag}}(F(\lambda)) \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{D};$$

- (2) there exists a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ such that

$$x(\lambda_k) = (x_1^k, x_2^k, x_3^k) \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Therefore, the understanding of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions will be useful for such μ -synthesis problems.

2.2. The distinguished boundary of the tetrablock.

Theorem 2.9. [1, Theorem 2.9] $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ is polynomially convex.

Therefore, there exists a distinguished boundary $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Let $A(\overline{\mathbb{E}})$ be the algebra of continuous scalar functions on $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ that are holomorphic on \mathbb{E} endowed with the supremum norm. If there is a function $f \in A(\overline{\mathbb{E}})$ and a point p in $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ such that $f(p) = 1$ and $|f(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in \overline{\mathbb{E}} \setminus \{p\}$, then $p \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and is called a *peak point* of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and the function f is called a *peaking function* for p .

Theorem 2.10. [1, Theorem 7.1] For $x \in \mathbb{C}^3$ the following are equivalent.

- (1) $x_1 = \bar{x}_2 x_3$, $|x_3| = 1$ and $|x_2| \leq 1$;
- (2) either $x_1 x_2 \neq x_3$ and $\Psi(\cdot, x)$ is an automorphism of \mathbb{D} or $x_1 x_2 = x_3$ and $|x_1| = |x_2| = |x_3| = 1$;
- (3) x is a peak point of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$;
- (4) there exists a 2×2 unitary matrix U such that $x = \pi(U)$;

- (5) *there exists a symmetric 2×2 unitary matrix U such that $x = \pi(U)$;*
- (6) *$x \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$;*
- (7) *$x \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and $|x_3| = 1$.*

Lemma 2.11. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$. Then $x \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ if and only if*

$$x_2 = \bar{x}_1 x_3, \quad |x_3| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_1| \leq 1.$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.10 (1),

$$x \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x_1 = \bar{x}_2 x_3, \quad |x_3| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_2| \leq 1.$$

Since $|x_3| = 1$ this implies $\bar{x}_3 x_3 = 1$. Now, since $x \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$,

$$x_1 = \bar{x}_2 x_3, \quad \text{and so} \quad \bar{x}_1 = x_2 \bar{x}_3.$$

Thus $\bar{x}_1 x_3 = x_2 \bar{x}_3 x_3 = x_2$. Note, by Theorem 2.5, $|x_1| \leq 1$.

Conversely, if

$$x_2 = \bar{x}_1 x_3, \quad |x_3| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_1| \leq 1$$

then, as in the previous steps, one can show that $x \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Therefore,

$$x \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x_2 = \bar{x}_1 x_3, \quad |x_3| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_2| \leq 1.$$

3. THE SYMMETRISED BIDISC AND Γ -INNER FUNCTIONS

In Section 4.1 we show that there exist useful relations between Γ -inner functions and $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. Recall the definition of the symmetrised bidisc Γ .

Definition 3.1. *The symmetrised bidisc is the set*

$$\mathbb{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(z + w, zw) : |z| < 1, |w| < 1\},$$

and its closure is

$$\Gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(z + w, zw) : |z| \leq 1, |w| \leq 1\}.$$

In 1995 Jim Agler and Nicholas Young started the study of the symmetrised bidisc with the aim of solving a robust control problem in H^∞ control theory. Although, the aim has not yet been achieved, it turned out that the symmetrised bidisc has a rich structure and it has attracted the attention of specialists in the several complex variables and in operator theory.

We shall often use the co-ordinates (s, p) for points in the symmetrized bidisc \mathbb{G} , chosen to suggest ‘sum’ and ‘product’. The following results afford useful criteria for membership of \mathbb{G} , of the distinguished boundary $b\Gamma$ of Γ and of the topological boundary $\partial\Gamma$ of Γ [3].

Proposition 3.2. [3, Proposition 3.2] *Let (s, p) belong to \mathbb{C}^2 . Then*

- (1) *(s, p) belongs to \mathbb{G} if and only if*

$$|s - \bar{s}p| < 1 - |p|^2;$$

- (2) *(s, p) belongs to Γ if and only if*

$$|s| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad |s - \bar{s}p| \leq 1 - |p|^2;$$

- (3) *(s, p) lies in $b\Gamma$ if and only if*

$$|p| = 1, \quad |s| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad s - \bar{s}p = 0;$$

- (4) *$(s, p) \in \partial\Gamma$ if and only if*

$$|s| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad |s - \bar{s}p| = 1 - |p|^2.$$

Γ -inner functions were defined and studied in [3].

Definition 3.3. A Γ -inner function is an analytic function $h : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that the radial limit

$$(3.1) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} h(r\lambda)$$

exists and belongs to $b\Gamma$ for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ with respect to Lebesgue measure.

By Fatou's Theorem, the limit (3.1) exists for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$.

Definition 3.4. Let f be a polynomial of degree less than or equal to n , where $n \geq 0$. Then we define the polynomial $f^{\sim n}$ by

$$f^{\sim n}(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{f(1/\bar{\lambda})}.$$

The polynomial f^\vee is defined by

$$f^\vee(\lambda) = \overline{f(\bar{\lambda})}.$$

Remark 3.5. One can see that

(1)

$$f^{\sim n}(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{f(1/\bar{\lambda})} = \lambda^n f^\vee(1/\lambda).$$

(2) If f is a polynomial of degree k , then, for $n \geq k$, $(f^{\sim n})^{\sim n}(\lambda) = f(\lambda)$.

Algebraic and geometric aspects of rational Γ -inner functions were studied in [5]. We are going to use some results from the paper.

Proposition 3.6. [5, Proposition 2.2] If $h = (s, p)$ is a rational Γ -inner function of degree n then there exist polynomials E and D such that

- (1) $\deg(E), \deg(D) \leq n$,
- (2) $E^{\sim n} = E$,
- (3) $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (4) $|E(\lambda)| \leq 2|D(\lambda)|$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (5) $s = \frac{E}{D}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (6) $p = \frac{E}{D^{\sim n}}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Furthermore, E_1 and D_1 is a second pair of polynomials that satisfy (1)–(6) if and only if there exists a nonzero $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$E_1 = tE \quad \text{and} \quad D_1 = tD.$$

Conversely, if E and D are polynomials that satisfy (1), (2), (4), $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ on \mathbb{D} , and s and p are defined by (5) and (6), then $h = (s, p)$ is a rational Γ -inner function of degree less than or equal to n .

The royal variety \mathcal{R}_Γ of the symmetrised bidisc is

$$\mathcal{R}_\Gamma = \{(s, p) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : s^2 = 4p\}.$$

Definition 3.7. [5, Page 7] Let $h = (s, p)$ be a Γ -inner function of degree n . Let E and D be as in Proposition 3.6. The royal polynomial R_h of h is defined by

$$R_h(\lambda) = 4D(\lambda)D^{\sim n}(\lambda) - E(\lambda)^2.$$

Definition 3.8. [5, Definition 3.6] *Let h be a rational Γ -inner function such that $h(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_\Gamma \cap \Gamma$. Let R_h be the royal polynomial of h . If σ is a zero of R_h of order ℓ , we define the multiplicity $\#\sigma$ of σ (as a royal node of h) by*

$$\#\sigma = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{if } \sigma \in \mathbb{D}, \\ \frac{1}{2}\ell & \text{if } \sigma \in \mathbb{T}. \end{cases}$$

We define the type of h to be the ordered pair (n, k) , where n is the sum of the multiplicities of the royal nodes of h that lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and k is the sum of the multiplicities of the royal nodes of h that lie in \mathbb{T} . We define $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma^{n,k}$ to be the collection of rational Γ -inner functions h of type (n, k) .

Theorem 3.9. [5, Theorem 3.8] *If $h \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma^{n,k}$ is nonconstant then $\deg(h) = n$.*

4. RATIONAL $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -INNER FUNCTIONS

In this section we give a definition of the degree of a rational tetra-inner function x by means of the fundamental group π_1 . Recall that the rational inner functions on \mathbb{D} of degree n are exactly the finite Blaschke products of degree n . As an analogue of this description of rational inner functions on \mathbb{D} we describe all rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions on \mathbb{D} in Theorem 4.15. In [5], the authors describe all rational Γ -inner functions (see Proposition 3.6). We use this description and the connection between Γ -inner functions and $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions to describe all rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions on \mathbb{D} .

4.1. Relations between $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions and Γ -inner functions.

Definition 4.1. *An $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner or tetra-inner function is a map $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ that is analytic and is such that the radial limit*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} f(r\lambda)$$

exists and belongs to $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Remark 4.2. Let $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Since x is rational and bounded on \mathbb{D} it has no poles in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and hence x is continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Thus one can consider the continuous function

$$\tilde{x} : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow b\overline{\mathbb{E}}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{x}(\lambda) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} x(r\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

In future we will use the same notation x for both continuous functions x and \tilde{x} .

Lemma 4.3. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Then*

- (1) $x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda)$, $|x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1$ and $|x_3(\lambda)| = 1$ for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$;
- (2) x_3 is an inner function on \mathbb{D} .

Proof. (1) By the definition of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function

$$x(\lambda) = (x_1(\lambda), x_2(\lambda), x_3(\lambda)) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}, \quad \text{for almost every } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}$$

and, by Theorem 2.10,

$$x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda), \quad |x_3(\lambda)| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1 \quad \text{for almost all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

(2) Since

$$x_3 : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}} \quad \text{and, for almost all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}, \quad |x_3(\lambda)| = 1,$$

x_3 is an inner function.

Remark 4.4. Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. By Lemma 4.3, x_3 is an inner function on \mathbb{D} , and so x_3 is a finite Blaschke product.

In [8] the author shows that there is a relation between points in the symmetrised bidisc and the tetrablock as follows

Lemma 4.5. [8, Lemma 3.2] *A point $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ belongs to the tetrablock if and only if the pair $(x_1 + zx_2, zx_3)$ is in the symmetrised bidisc \mathbb{G} for every $z \in \mathbb{T}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.2 (1), $(s, p) \in \mathbb{G}$ if and only if

$$(4.1) \quad |s - \bar{s}p| < 1 - |p|^2.$$

Suppose that $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{E}$, $s_z = x_1 + zx_2$ and $p_z = zx_3$.

$$\begin{aligned} |s_z - \bar{s}_z p_z| &= |x_1 + zx_2 - \overline{(x_1 + zx_2)} zx_3| \\ &= |x_1 - \bar{x}_2 x_3 + z(x_2 - \bar{x}_1 x_3)| \\ &\leq |x_1 - \bar{x}_2 x_3| + |x_2 - \bar{x}_1 x_3|, \quad \text{since } |z| = 1, \\ &< 1 - |x_3|^2 = 1 - |p_z|^2, \quad \text{by Theorem 2.4.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence $(s_z, p_z) \in \mathbb{G}$.

Conversely, let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ and, for $z \in \mathbb{T}$, let

$$(4.2) \quad s_z = x_1 + zx_2 \quad \text{and} \quad p_z = zx_3.$$

Suppose for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, we have $(s_z, p_z) \in \mathbb{G}$. We want to show that $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{E}$. Let us prove that

$$|x_1 - \bar{x}_2 x_3| + |x_2 - \bar{x}_1 x_3| < 1 - |x_3|^2.$$

By assumption for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, $|s_z - \bar{s}_z p_z| < 1 - |x_3|^2$. By equations (4.2), we have

$$(4.3) \quad |x_1 - \bar{x}_2 x_3 + z(x_2 - \bar{x}_1 x_3)| < 1 - |x_3|^2, \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Let

$$\begin{cases} z = e^{i\theta} & \theta \in (0, 2\pi]; \\ w_1 = x_1 - \bar{x}_2 x_3 = |w_1| e^{i\theta_1} & \theta_1 \in (0, 2\pi]; \\ w_2 = x_2 - \bar{x}_1 x_3 = |w_2| e^{i\theta_2} & \theta_2 \in (0, 2\pi]. \end{cases}$$

Now substitute z , w_1 and w_2 in inequality (4.3)

$$||w_1| e^{i\theta_1} + e^{i\theta} (|w_2| e^{i\theta_2})| < 1 - |x_3|^2.$$

This implies that

$$||w_1| e^{i\theta_1} + |w_2| e^{i(\theta+\theta_2)}| < 1 - |x_3|^2, \quad \text{for all } e^{i\theta}.$$

We can choose θ such that $\theta + \theta_2 = \theta_1$, that is, $\theta = \theta_1 - \theta_2$. Hence

$$||w_1| e^{i\theta_1} + |w_2| e^{i\theta_1}| = |e^{i\theta_1} (|w_1| + |w_2|)| = |w_1| + |w_2| = |x_1 - \bar{x}_2 x_3| + |x_2 - \bar{x}_1 x_3| < 1 - |x_3|^2.$$

By Theorem 2.4, $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{E}$.

Lemma 4.6. *A point $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ belongs to the closed tetrablock if and only if for every $a \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, $(ax_1 + \bar{a}x_2, x_3) \in \Gamma$.*

Proof. Suppose $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Consider $(s_a, p_a) = (ax_1 + \bar{a}x_2, x_3)$. By Proposition 3.2 (2), $(s, p) \in \Gamma$ if and only if

$$(4.4) \quad |s - \bar{s}p| \leq 1 - |p|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |s| \leq 2.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|s_a - \overline{s_a}p_a| &= |ax_1 + \overline{a}x_2 - \overline{(ax_1 + \overline{a}x_2)}x_3| \\
&= |a(x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3) + \overline{a}(x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3)| \\
&\leq |a(x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3)| + |\overline{a}(x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3)|, \\
&\leq |x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + |x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3|, \quad \text{since } |a| \leq 1, \\
(4.5) \quad &\leq 1 - |x_3|^2, \quad \text{by Theorem 2.5.}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $|s_a - \overline{s_a}p_a| \leq 1 - |x_3|^2 = 1 - |p_a|^2$ and $|s_a| = |ax_1 + \overline{a}x_2| \leq 2$. Hence $(s_a, p_a) \in \Gamma$.

Conversely, let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$. Suppose for every $a \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, we have $(s_a, p_a) \in \Gamma$ where

$$(4.6) \quad s_a = ax_1 + \overline{a}x_2 \quad \text{and} \quad p_a = x_3.$$

By equations (4.5) and (4.6), we have

$$(4.7) \quad |s_a - \overline{s_a}p_a| = |a(x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3) + \overline{a}(x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3)| \leq 1 - |p_a|^2, \quad \text{for all } a \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Take $a \in \mathbb{T}$, then

$$\begin{cases} a = e^{i\theta} & \theta \in (0, 2\pi]; \\ w_1 = x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3 = |w_1|e^{i\theta_1} & \theta_1 \in (0, 2\pi]; \\ w_2 = x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3 = |w_2|e^{i\theta_2} & \theta_2 \in (0, 2\pi]. \end{cases}$$

Substitute a , w_1 and w_2 into inequality (4.7), to get

$$\begin{aligned}
|a(x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3) + \overline{a}(x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3)| &= |e^{i\theta}|w_1|e^{i\theta_1} + e^{-i\theta}|w_2|e^{i\theta_2}| = ||w_1|e^{i(\theta+\theta_1)} + |w_2|e^{i(\theta_2-\theta)}| \\
&\leq 1 - |x_3|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

for every $\theta \in (0, 2\pi]$. Now choose $\theta = \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
|x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + |x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3| &= |w_1| + |w_2| \\
&= |e^{i(\frac{\theta_2+\theta_1}{2})}|(|w_1| + |w_2|) \\
&= ||w_1|e^{i(\frac{\theta_2+\theta_1}{2})} + |w_2|e^{i(\frac{\theta_2+\theta_1}{2})}| \\
&= ||w_1|e^{i(\frac{\theta_2-\theta_1}{2}+\theta_1)} + |w_2|e^{i(\theta_2-\frac{\theta_2-\theta_1}{2})}| \leq 1 - |x_3|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $s, p \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $|s| \leq 2$ and $|p| \leq 1$. The pair (s, p) belongs to Γ if and only if $(\frac{1}{2}s, \frac{1}{2}s, p) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.5,

$$(\frac{1}{2}s, \frac{1}{2}s, p) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}} \Leftrightarrow |\frac{1}{2}s - \frac{1}{2}\overline{s}p| + |\frac{1}{2}s - \frac{1}{2}\overline{s}p| \leq 1 - |p|^2.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
(\frac{1}{2}s, \frac{1}{2}s, p) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}} &\Leftrightarrow 2|\frac{1}{2}s - \frac{1}{2}\overline{s}p| \leq 1 - |p|^2 \\
&\Leftrightarrow |s - \overline{s}p| \leq 1 - |p|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By assumption $|s| \leq 2$, hence by Proposition 3.2 (2),

$$(\frac{1}{2}s, \frac{1}{2}s, p) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}} \Leftrightarrow (s, p) \in \Gamma.$$

Lemma 4.8. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Then*

- (1) $h_1(\lambda) = (x_1(\lambda) + x_2(\lambda), x_3(\lambda))$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, is a rational Γ -inner function;
- (2) $h_2(\lambda) = (ix_1(\lambda) - ix_2(\lambda), x_3(\lambda))$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, is a rational Γ -inner function.

Proof. (1) By Lemma 4.5, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, $x(\lambda) \in \mathbb{E}$ implies that

$$(x_1(\lambda) + x_2(\lambda), x_3(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{G}.$$

Consider $h_1 = (s_1, p_1)$ where

$$s_1(\lambda) = x_1(\lambda) + x_2(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad p_1(\lambda) = x_3(\lambda), \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

It is obvious that h_1 is a rational function from \mathbb{D} to \mathbb{G} . By assumption, x is an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Thus $x(\lambda) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ for almost every $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. By Theorem 2.10 and Lemma 2.11, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$(4.8) \quad x_2(\lambda) = \overline{x_1(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda), \quad x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda), \quad |x_3(\lambda)| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1.$$

It is clear that

$$|p_1(\lambda)| = |x_3(\lambda)| = 1 \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{T},$$

and, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |s_1(\lambda)| &= |x_1(\lambda) + x_2(\lambda)| \\ &\leq |x_1(\lambda)| + |x_2(\lambda)| \leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Since, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, $x_2(\lambda) = \overline{x_1(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{s_1(\lambda)}p_1(\lambda) &= [\overline{x_1(\lambda)} + \overline{x_2(\lambda)}]x_3(\lambda) \\ &= \overline{x_1(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda) + \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda), \quad \text{by equations (4.8),} \\ &= x_1(\lambda) + x_2(\lambda) = s_1(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $s_1(\lambda) = \overline{s_1(\lambda)}p_1(\lambda)$ for almost every $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.2 (3), h_1 is a rational Γ -inner function.

(2) Following the same steps as (1), let $h_2(\lambda) = (s_2(\lambda), p_2(\lambda))$, where

$$s_2(\lambda) = ix_1(\lambda) - ix_2(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad p_2(\lambda) = x_3(\lambda), \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

By Lemma 4.6, h_2 is rational function from \mathbb{D} to \mathbb{G} . Since x is an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, $x(\lambda) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. By Proposition 3.2, to prove that h_2 is a rational Γ -inner function we need to show that

$$|p_2(\lambda)| = 1, \quad |s_2(\lambda)| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad s_2(\lambda) = \overline{s_2(\lambda)}p_2(\lambda) \quad \text{for almost every } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

By Theorem 2.10, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, $|p_2(\lambda)| = |x_3(\lambda)| = 1$ and

$$|s_2(\lambda)| \leq |ix_1(\lambda)| + |ix_2(\lambda)| \leq 2.$$

By Lemma 2.11, $x_2(\lambda) = \overline{x_1(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda)$ for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Hence, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{s_2(\lambda)}p_2(\lambda) &= [\overline{ix_1(\lambda)} - \overline{ix_2(\lambda)}]x_3(\lambda) \\ &= i(\overline{x_2(\lambda)})x_3(\lambda) - i(\overline{x_1(\lambda)})x_3(\lambda), \quad \text{by equations (4.8),} \\ &= ix_1(\lambda) - ix_2(\lambda) = s_2(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $s_2(\lambda) = \overline{s_2(\lambda)}p_2(\lambda)$ for almost every $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.2, h_2 is a rational Γ -inner function.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Then*

$$x_1(\lambda) = x_2^\vee(1/\lambda)x_3(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.10, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda).$$

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, we have $|\lambda| = 1$, that is, $\lambda\bar{\lambda} = 1$, and so

$$\overline{x_2(\lambda)} = x_2^\vee(\bar{\lambda}) = x_2^\vee(\frac{1}{\lambda}).$$

Therefore, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$x_1(\lambda) = x_2^\vee(1/\lambda)x_3(\lambda).$$

Since x_1, x_2, x_3 are rational functions,

$$x_1(\lambda) = x_2^\vee(1/\lambda)x_3(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Proposition 4.10. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function*

- (1) *If $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a pole of x_3 of multiplicity $k \geq 0$ and $\frac{1}{a}$ is a zero of x_2 of multiplicity $\ell \geq 0$, then a is a pole of x_1 of multiplicity at least $k - \ell$.*
- (2) *If $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a pole of x_1 of multiplicity $k \geq 1$, then a is a pole of x_3 of multiplicity at least k .*

Proof. (1) By Lemma 4.9, we have

$$(4.9) \quad x_1(\lambda) = x_2^\vee(1/\lambda)x_3(\lambda) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Since x_3 is a rational inner function, x_3 cannot have any pole in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Hence $|a| > 1$ and so $|\frac{1}{a}| < 1$. We know that x_2^\vee is analytic in \mathbb{D} , so $\frac{1}{a}$ cannot be a pole of x_2^\vee . By equation (4.9),

$$(\lambda - a)^{k-\ell-1}x_1(\lambda) = (\lambda - a)^{k-\ell-1}x_2^\vee(1/\lambda)x_3(\lambda).$$

Take the limit for both sides as λ goes to a :

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow a} (\lambda - a)^{k-\ell-1}x_1(\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow a} (\lambda - a)^{k-\ell-1}x_2^\vee(1/\lambda)x_3(\lambda).$$

The right hand side goes to ∞ , therefore x_1 has a pole of multiplicity at least $k - \ell$ at a .

Now suppose that ∞ is a pole of x_3 of multiplicity k and 0 is a zero of x_2 of multiplicity ℓ . By equation (4.9), for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$x_1(\frac{1}{\lambda}) = x_2^\vee(\lambda)x_3(\frac{1}{\lambda}).$$

Multiply both sides by $\frac{\lambda^{k-1}}{\lambda^\ell}$ to obtain the equation

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{\lambda^{k-1}}{\lambda^\ell}x_1(\frac{1}{\lambda}) = \frac{\lambda^{k-1}}{\lambda^\ell}x_2^\vee(\lambda)x_3(\frac{1}{\lambda}).$$

Since x_2^\vee is analytic at 0 and has a zero of multiplicity $\ell > 0$ at 0 , we have

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{x_2^\vee(\lambda)}{\lambda^\ell} = c, \quad \text{where } c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Since by assumption, $x_3(\lambda)$ has a pole of multiplicity k at ∞ ,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda^{k-1}x_3(\frac{1}{\lambda}) = \infty.$$

Hence by equation (4.10),

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda^{k-\ell-1}x_1(\frac{1}{\lambda}) = \infty.$$

It follows that $x_1(\frac{1}{\lambda})$ has a pole of multiplicity at least $k - \ell$ at 0 . That is, $x_1(\lambda)$ has a pole of multiplicity at least $k - \ell$ at ∞ .

(2) Let $a \in \mathbb{C}$ be a pole of x_1 of multiplicity $k \geq 1$. Then $|a| > 1$. This implies $|\frac{1}{a}| < 1$. Therefore x_2^\vee is analytic at $\frac{1}{a}$. Now

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow a} (\lambda - a)^{k-1} x_1(\lambda) = \infty.$$

Thus a is a pole of x_3 of multiplicity at least k .

If ∞ is a pole of x_1 of multiplicity $k \geq 1$. Then 0 is a pole of $x_1(\frac{1}{\lambda})$ of multiplicity k , that is,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda^{k-1} x_1(\frac{1}{\lambda}) = \infty.$$

By relation (4.10),

$$\lambda^{k-1} x_1(\frac{1}{\lambda}) = \lambda^{k-1} x_2^\vee(\lambda) x_3(\frac{1}{\lambda}).$$

Since x_2^\vee is analytic at 0 , 0 cannot be a pole of x_2^\vee and thus

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} x_2^\vee(\lambda) = x_2^\vee(0).$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda^{k-1} x_3(\frac{1}{\lambda}) = \infty$$

This completes the proof that x_3 has a pole of multiplicity at least k at ∞ .

4.2. The degree of a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Let us clarify the notion of the degree of a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x .

Definition 4.11. *The degree $\deg(x)$ of a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x is defined to be $x_*(1)$, where $x_* : \mathbb{Z} = \pi_1(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \pi_1(b\overline{\mathbb{E}})$ is the homomorphism of fundamental groups induced by x when x is regarded as a continuous map from \mathbb{T} to $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$.*

We shall adopt the convention that $\deg(x)$ is a non-negative integer.

Lemma 4.12. *$b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ is homotopic to \mathbb{T} and $\pi_1(b\overline{\mathbb{E}}) = \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. The maps

$$\begin{aligned} f : b\overline{\mathbb{E}} &\rightarrow \mathbb{T}, \text{ defined by } f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_3, \\ g : \mathbb{T} &\rightarrow b\overline{\mathbb{E}}, \text{ defined by } g(z) = (0, 0, z), \end{aligned}$$

satisfy

$$(g \circ f)(x_1, x_2, x_3) = g(f(x_1, x_2, x_3)) = g(x_3) = (0, 0, x_3)$$

and

$$(f \circ g)(z) = f(0, 0, z) = z,$$

that is, $f \circ g = \text{id}_{\mathbb{T}}$. If $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1$, then $(tx_1, tx_2, x_3) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Let $I = [0, 1]$. Consider the map

$$h : b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \times I \rightarrow b\overline{\mathbb{E}},$$

which is defined by

$$h(x_1, x_2, x_3, t) = (tx_1, tx_2, x_3).$$

One can see that

$$h(x_1, x_2, x_3, 0) = (0x_1, 0x_2, x_3) = (0, 0, x_3) = (g \circ f)(x_1, x_2, x_3) \text{ and}$$

$$h(x_1, x_2, x_3, 1) = (1x_1, 1x_2, x_3) = (x_1, x_2, x_3) = \text{id}_{b\overline{\mathbb{E}}}.$$

Therefore h defines a homotopy between $g \circ f$ and $\text{id}_{b\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$, that is, $g \circ f \simeq \text{id}_{b\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$. Hence $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ is homotopically equivalent to \mathbb{T} and it follows that $\pi_1(b\overline{\mathbb{E}}) = \pi_1(\mathbb{T}) = \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 4.13. *Let B be a finite Blaschke product. Then the degree of B is equal to $B_*(1)$.*

Proof. Since B is a finite Blaschke product, it can be written as

$$B(\lambda) = e^{i\theta} \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{\lambda - \alpha_j}{1 - \overline{\alpha_j}\lambda}, \quad \text{where } \alpha_j \in \mathbb{D}, \quad j = 1 \dots N, \quad \text{and } \theta \in [0, 2\pi).$$

One can consider the map, $B : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$, and

$$B_* : \pi_1(\mathbb{T}) = \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{T}) = \mathbb{Z}.$$

Now $1 \in \pi_1(\mathbb{T})$ is the homotopy class of $\text{id}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $B_*(1)$ is equal to the homotopy class of $B \circ \text{id}_{\mathbb{T}} = B$, when B is regarded as a continuous map from \mathbb{T} to \mathbb{T} . Therefore $B_*(1) = n(\gamma, a)$, where $n(\gamma, a)$ is the winding number of γ about a , which lies inside $\gamma = \{B(e^{it}) : 0 \leq t \leq 2\pi\}$. Thus, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} n(\gamma, a) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{dz}{z - a} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{B'(z)dz}{B(z) - a}. \end{aligned}$$

By the Argument Principle, [6, Theorem 18], the integral

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{B'(z)}{B(z) - a} dz,$$

is equal to the number of zeros of B in \mathbb{D} . It is clear that B has N zeros, counting multiplicities, and has degree N . Therefore the number of zeros of B is equal to the winding number of γ about a , and it is equal to N .

Proposition 4.14. *For any rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, $\deg(x)$ is the degree $\deg(x_3)$ (in the usual sense) of the finite Blaschke product x_3 .*

Proof. Since x is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, x_3 is an inner function, and so x_3 is a finite Blaschke product. Two $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ and $y = (0, 0, x_3)$ are homotopic if there exists a continuous mapping $f : \mathbb{T} \times I \rightarrow b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ such that

$$f(\lambda, 0) = y(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad f(\lambda, 1) = x(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Let

$$x^t(\lambda) = (tx_1(\lambda), tx_2(\lambda), x_3(\lambda)) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{D} \text{ and } t \in [0, 1].$$

Since $x(\lambda) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, by Theorem 2.10 (1),

$$x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad |x_3(\lambda)| = 1.$$

Hence for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$tx_1(\lambda) = \overline{tx_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda).$$

Therefore,

$$x^t(\lambda) = (tx_1(\lambda), tx_2(\lambda), x_3(\lambda)) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Hence x^t is a homotopy between $x = x^1$ and $(0, 0, x_3) = x^0$.

It follows that the homomorphism

$$x_* : \pi_1(\mathbb{T}) = \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \pi_1(b\overline{\mathbb{E}}) = \mathbb{Z}$$

coincides with $(x^0)_* = (0, 0, x_3)_*$. By Lemma 4.13, $(x_3)_*(1) = \deg x_3$, since x_3 is a finite Blaschke product. Therefore $(0, 0, x_3)_*(1)$ is the degree of the finite Blaschke product x_3 .

4.3. Description of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions.

Theorem 4.15. *If $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function of degree n then there exist polynomials E_1, E_2, D such that*

- (1) $\deg(E_1), \deg(E_2), \deg(D) \leq n$,
- (2) $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (3) $x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (4) $x_1 = \frac{E_1}{D}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (5) $x_2 = \frac{E_2}{D}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (6) $|E_i(\lambda)| \leq |D(\lambda)|$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, for $i = 1, 2$,
- (7) $E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda)$, for $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Conversely, if E_1, E_2 and D satisfy (1), (6) and (7), $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ on \mathbb{D} and x_1, x_2 and x_3 are defined by (3)–(5), then $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function of degree at most n .

Furthermore, a triple of polynomials E_1^1, E_2^1 and D^1 satisfies (1)–(7) if and only if there exists a real number $t \neq 0$ such that

$$E_1^1 = tE_1, \quad E_2^1 = tE_2 \quad \text{and} \quad D^1 = tD.$$

Proof. By assumption $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. By Lemma 4.8 (1), $h_1 = (s, p)$ where $s = x_1 + x_2, p = x_3$ is a rational Γ -inner function. Since $x_3 : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ is an inner function, it is a finite Blaschke product and, by [3, Corollary 6.10], it can be written in the form

$$x_3(\lambda) = c \frac{\lambda^k D^{\sim(n-k)}(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)},$$

where $|c| = 1, 0 \leq k \leq n$ and D is a polynomial of degree $n - k$ such that $D(0) = 1$. By Proposition 3.6, there exist polynomials E, D such that

- (1) $\deg(E), \deg(D) \leq n$,
- (2) $E^{\sim n} = E$,
- (3) $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (4) $|E(\lambda)| \leq 2|D(\lambda)|$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (5) $s = \frac{E}{D}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (6) $p = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Hence

$$(4.11) \quad x_1 + x_2 = s = \frac{E}{D} \quad \text{and} \quad x_3 = p = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}.$$

By Lemma 4.8 (2), $h_2 = (s_2, p_2)$, where $s_2 = ix_1 - ix_2, p_2 = x_3 = p_1$ is a rational Γ -inner function. By Proposition 3.6, for $h_2 = (s_2, p_2)$, there exist polynomials G, D such that

- (1) $\deg(G), \deg(D) \leq n$,
- (2) $G^{\sim n} = G$,
- (3) $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (4) $|G(\lambda)| \leq 2|D(\lambda)|$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (5) $s_2 = ix_1 - ix_2 = \frac{G}{D}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (6) $p_2 = x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Therefore, by (5),

$$(4.12) \quad x_1 - x_2 = -\frac{iG}{D}.$$

By relation (4.11),

$$(4.13) \quad x_1 + x_2 = \frac{E}{D}.$$

Add equations (4.12) and (4.13) to get

$$x_1 = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(E - iG)}{D}.$$

Substituting x_1 in equation (4.13) gives

$$x_2 = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(E + iG)}{D}.$$

Define the polynomials E_1 and E_2 by

$$E_1 = \frac{1}{2}(E - iG), \quad E_2 = \frac{1}{2}(E + iG).$$

Since the degrees of both polynomials E, G are at most n , $\deg(E_1), \deg(E_2) \leq n$. Thus, for $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$x_1(\lambda) = \frac{E_1(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} \quad \text{and} \quad x_2(\lambda) = \frac{E_2(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)}.$$

Since x is an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, for $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |x_1(\lambda)| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1, \\ \text{and so} \quad |E_1(\lambda)| \leq |D(\lambda)| \quad \text{and} \quad |E_2(\lambda)| \leq |D(\lambda)|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $|E_i(\lambda)| \leq |D(\lambda)|$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, where $i = 1, 2$. Therefore (1)–(6) of Theorem 4.15 are satisfied.

By assumption, x is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Thus, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda) &\Leftrightarrow \frac{E_1(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} = \frac{\overline{E_2(\lambda)}}{D(\lambda)} \times \frac{D^{\sim n}(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{E_1(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} = \frac{\overline{E_2(\lambda)}}{D^\vee(1/\lambda)} \times \frac{\lambda^n D^\vee(1/\lambda)}{D(\lambda)}, \text{ since } \overline{D(\lambda)} = D^\vee(\overline{\lambda}) = D^\vee(1/\lambda). \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{E_1(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} = \frac{\lambda^n \overline{E_2(\lambda)}}{D(\lambda)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{E_1(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} = \frac{E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} \\ (4.14) \quad &\Leftrightarrow E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, and therefore on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Thus (7) is proved.

Let us prove the converse statement. Let E_1, E_2 and D satisfy (1), (6) and (7) of Theorem 4.15 and $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ on \mathbb{D} , and x_1, x_2, x_3 be defined by (3)–(5), that is,

$$x_1 = \frac{E_1}{D}, \quad x_2 = \frac{E_2}{D} \quad \text{and} \quad x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}.$$

Let us show that $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. By Theorem 2.10, we have to prove that $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ and the following conditions are satisfied.

- (1) $|x_3(\lambda)| = 1$ for almost all λ on \mathbb{T} , that is, x_3 is inner,
- (2) $|x_2| \leq 1$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

(3) $x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda)$ for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$.

(1) Firstly, if D has no zeros on the unit circle, then D and $D^{\sim n}$ have no common factor. Therefore, $x_3(\lambda) = \frac{D^{\sim n}(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)}$ maps \mathbb{T} to \mathbb{T} . Hence, x_3 is inner function and

$$\deg(x_3) = \deg\left(\frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}\right) = \max\{\deg(D^{\sim n}), \deg(D)\} = n.$$

Second case: if D has the zeros a_1, \dots, a_ℓ on \mathbb{T} then D and $D^{\sim n}$ have the common factor $\prod_{i=1}^\ell (\lambda - a_i)$ and hence $x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}$ is inner and

$$\deg(x_3) = \deg\left(\frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}\right) \leq n - \ell.$$

(2) By assumption (6),

$$|E_2(\lambda)| \leq |D(\lambda)| \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

This implies $|\frac{E_2(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)}| \leq 1$ and hence $|x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1$.

(3) By assumption (7), $E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda)$, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ and by equality (4.14), $x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda)$, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$.

Let us show that $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) = \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_2}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}\right)$ **maps** \mathbb{D} **to** \mathbb{E} , that is, $x(\lambda) = (x_1(\lambda), x_2(\lambda), x_3(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{E}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. By Theorem 2.5, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$x(\lambda) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}} \Leftrightarrow \|\Psi(\cdot, x(\lambda))\|_{H^\infty} \leq 1,$$

where $\Psi(z, x) = \frac{x_3 z - x_1}{x_2 z - 1}$. Note that, for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(z, x) : \mathbb{D} &\rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ &: \lambda \rightarrow \Psi(z, x(\lambda)) \end{aligned}$$

is analytic on \mathbb{D} because $x_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, are analytic functions on \mathbb{D} , and $|x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1$ and $x_2(\lambda)z \neq 1$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. We have shown above that, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, $x(\lambda) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Thus, by Theorem 2.10 (2),

$$x(\lambda) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \text{ if and only if } \Psi(\cdot, x(\lambda)) \text{ is an automorphism of } \mathbb{D}.$$

By the maximum principle, for all $z, \lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, $|\Psi(z, x(\lambda))| < 1$. Thus by Theorem 2.10, $x(\lambda) \in \mathbb{E}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$.

Suppose that t is a nonzero real number and

$$E_1^1 = tE_1, \quad E_2^1 = tE_2 \quad \text{and} \quad D^1 = tD.$$

Then it is clear that E_1^1, E_2^1 and D^1 satisfy (1)–(7). Conversely, let E_1^1, E_2^1 and D^1 be a second triple that satisfies (1)–(7). Then

$$(4.15) \quad x_1 = \frac{E_1}{D} = \frac{E_1^1}{D^1} \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{D}},$$

$$(4.16) \quad x_2 = \frac{E_2}{D} = \frac{E_2^1}{D^1} \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{D}},$$

$$(4.17) \quad x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} = \frac{D^{1 \sim n}}{D^1} \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Suppose that $D(\lambda) = a_0 + a_1\lambda + \dots + a_k\lambda^k$ where $a_0 \neq 0$ and $k \leq n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D^{\sim n}(\lambda) &= \lambda^n \overline{D(1/\bar{\lambda})} \\ &= \lambda^n \left(\overline{a_0 + \frac{a_1}{\lambda} + \dots + \frac{a_k}{\lambda^k}} \right) \\ &= \bar{a}_0\lambda^n + \bar{a}_1\lambda^{n-1} + \dots + \bar{a}_k\lambda^{n-k}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} = \frac{\lambda^{n-k}(\bar{a}_0\lambda^k + \bar{a}_1\lambda^{k-1} + \dots + \bar{a}_k)}{a_0 + a_1\lambda + \dots + a_k\lambda^k}.$$

Therefore, x_3 has a zero of multiplicity $(n-k)$ at 0, has k poles in \mathbb{C} , counting multiplicity, and has degree n . Hence the poles of x_3 in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > 1\}$, n and k are determined by x_3 . Therefore, D and D^1 have the same degree k and the same finite number of zeros in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > 1\}$, counting multiplicity. Thus there exists $t \in \mathbb{C}, t \neq 0$ where

$$(4.18) \quad D^1 = tD \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

By equality (4.17), for $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$

$$x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} = \frac{D^{1 \sim n}}{D^1} = \frac{\bar{t}D^{\sim n}}{tD}$$

Thus $t = \bar{t}$, and so, $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. By the equalities (4.15) and (4.18)

$$x_1 = \frac{E_1}{D} = \frac{E_1^1}{D^1} = \frac{E_1^1}{tD}, \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

This implies that $E_1^1 = tE_1$. By the equalities (4.16) and (4.18)

$$x_2 = \frac{E_2}{D} = \frac{E_2^1}{D^1} = \frac{E_2^1}{tD}, \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Thus $E_2^1 = tE_2$.

Remark 4.16. For a fixed polynomial D of degree n , the set of polynomials E_1 satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4.15 is a subset of a real vector space of dimension $2n + 2$. Hence the set of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions of degree n with $x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}$ is a subset of a $(2n + 2)$ -dimensional real space of rational functions.

Lemma 4.17. *Let*

$$x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) = \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_2}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right)$$

be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Then, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|E_1(\lambda)| = |E_2(\lambda)|, \quad \text{and so} \quad |x_1(\lambda)| = |x_2(\lambda)|.$$

Proof. By Theorem 4.15 (7), for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{E_2(1/\bar{\lambda})}.$$

Thus, since $\lambda\bar{\lambda} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |E_1(\lambda)| &= |\lambda^n \overline{E_2(1/\bar{\lambda})}| \\ &= |E_2(1/\bar{\lambda})| = |E_2(\lambda)|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|x_1(\lambda)| = |x_2(\lambda)|.$$

Example 4.18. Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function such that $x_3(\lambda) = \lambda$. Clearly,

$$\deg(x) = \deg(x_3) = 1.$$

By Theorem 4.15, there exist polynomials E_1, E_2, D such that

$$D(\lambda) = 1, \quad \deg(E_1) \leq 1, \quad \deg(E_2) \leq 1,$$

$$E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda), \quad |E_i(\lambda)| \leq |D(\lambda)| = 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}},$$

and

$$x = \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_2}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim 1}}{D} \right).$$

Therefore the function

$$x(\lambda) = (a_1 + a_2\lambda, \overline{a_2} + \overline{a_1}\lambda, \lambda)$$

is rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner for $a_1, a_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that

$$|a_1 + a_2\lambda| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\overline{a_2} + \overline{a_1}\lambda| \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

In particular, one can choose $a_1 = 1$ and $a_2 = 0$ to get the rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function

$$x(\lambda) = (1, \lambda, \lambda).$$

Example 4.19. $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions

Suppose that $\mathbb{B}_{2 \times 2} = \{A \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2} : \|A\| < 1\}$. Let us construct an analytic map from the open unit disc \mathbb{D} to $\mathbb{B}_{2 \times 2}$. Consider nonconstant inner functions $\varphi, \psi \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and the diagonal matrix

$$h(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & \psi(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Note $\|h(\lambda)\| = \max\{|\varphi(\lambda)|, |\psi(\lambda)|\} < 1$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ and $h : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{2 \times 2}$ is analytic.

By Theorem 2.4, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$(\varphi(\lambda), \psi(\lambda), \det h(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{E},$$

and $\varphi(\lambda)\psi(\lambda) = \det h(\lambda)$. Recall that such points are called triangular points of \mathbb{E} . However, we are seeking more interesting and general examples. To get such examples we make use of the singular value decomposition.

Let U, V be 2×2 unitary matrices. Then $h_1 : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ defined by

$$h_1 = UhV$$

maps \mathbb{D} to $\mathbb{B}_{2 \times 2}$. For example, if

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V = I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

then U is unitary and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
h_1(\lambda) &= Uh(\lambda)I \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & \psi(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(\lambda) & \psi(\lambda) \\ -\varphi(\lambda) & \psi(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ by $x = \pi \circ h_1$, where π is given in Definition 2.6. Then, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
x(\lambda) &= \pi(h_1(\lambda)) \\
&= \pi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(\lambda) & \psi(\lambda) \\ -\varphi(\lambda) & \psi(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}\right) \\
&= \left(\frac{\varphi(\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{\psi(\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}}, \varphi(\lambda)\psi(\lambda)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this $x(\lambda)$ is not a triangular point unless either $\varphi(\lambda) = 0$ or $\psi(\lambda) = 0$.

Let us show that this function x is $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner. By Theorem 2.10(1), for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, since φ, ψ are inner functions,

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda) &= \overline{\left(\frac{\psi(\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}}\right)}\varphi(\lambda)\psi(\lambda) = \frac{\varphi(\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}}\overline{\psi(\lambda)}\psi(\lambda) \\
&= \frac{\varphi(\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}}|\psi(\lambda)|^2 = \frac{\varphi(\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}} = x_1(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|\psi(\lambda)| < 1$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, this implies that $\left|\frac{\psi(\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}}\right| < 1$. Thus $|x_2(\lambda)| < 1$. Finally, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, since φ, ψ are inner functions,

$$\begin{aligned}
|x_3(\lambda)| &= |\varphi(\lambda)\psi(\lambda)| \\
&= |\varphi(\lambda)||\psi(\lambda)| = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore x is an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function.

Remark 4.20. In the previous example if we choose the functions φ and ψ to be in the Schur class but not to be inner functions then one can check that we obtain an analytic function $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ which is not an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function.

Proposition 4.21. *Let (s, p) be a Γ -inner function. Then $x = \left(\frac{s}{2}, \frac{s}{2}, p\right)$ is an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.7, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, $x(\lambda) = \left(\frac{s}{2}(\lambda), \frac{s}{2}(\lambda), p(\lambda)\right) \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$. It is easy to see that x is in the set of analytic functions $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{E}})$ from \mathbb{D} to the tetrablock $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. By Proposition 3.2 (3), for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|p(\lambda)| = 1, \quad |s(\lambda)| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad s(\lambda) - \overline{s(\lambda)}p(\lambda) = 0.$$

Thus, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|p(\lambda)| = 1, \quad \frac{s(\lambda)}{2} = \frac{\overline{s(\lambda)}}{2}p(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|s(\lambda)|}{2} \leq 1.$$

Hence x is $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner.

See [3] for many examples of Γ -inner functions.

4.4. Superficial $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. In this section, we study $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions x such that $x(\lambda)$ lies in the topological boundary $\partial\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$.

The topological boundary of \mathbb{E} is denoted by $\partial\mathbb{E}$.

Lemma 4.22. [1] Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$. Then $x \in \partial\mathbb{E}$ if and only if

$$|x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + |x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3| = 1 - |x_3|^2, \quad |x_1| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_2| \leq 1.$$

Here we show that, for any inner function x_3 and $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| = 1$, the function $x = (\beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3, \beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3, x_3)$ is $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner and has the property that it maps \mathbb{D} to $\partial\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Recall the definition of superficial function in the set of analytic functions $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \Gamma)$ from \mathbb{D} to the symmetrised bidisc Γ from [3].

Definition 4.23. An analytic function $h : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Gamma$ is superficial if $h(\mathbb{D}) \subset \partial\Gamma$.

One can define a similar notion for functions in $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \overline{\mathbb{E}})$.

Definition 4.24. An analytic function $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ is superficial if $x(\mathbb{D}) \subset \partial\overline{\mathbb{E}}$.

We also consider relations between superficial Γ -inner functions and superficial $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions.

Proposition 4.25. [3, Proposition 8.3] A Γ -inner function h is superficial if and only if there is an $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ and an inner function p such that $h = (\omega p + \overline{\omega}, p)$.

Proposition 4.26. An analytic function $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ such that

$$x(\lambda) = (\beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda), \beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda), x_3(\lambda)), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{D},$$

where x_3 is an inner function and $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| = 1$ is $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner and superficial.

Proof. By Lemma 4.22, we need to show that, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$x(\lambda) = (\beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda), \beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda), x_3(\lambda)).$$

is in $\partial\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Here

$$x_1(\lambda) = \beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda), \quad x_2(\lambda) = \beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda).$$

Note, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (4.19) \quad |(x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3)(\lambda)| &= \left| \beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda) - \overline{(\beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda))}x_3(\lambda) \right| \\ &= \left| \beta_1(1 - |x_3(\lambda)|^2) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.20) \quad |(x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3)(\lambda)| &= \left| \beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda) - \overline{(\beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda))}x_3(\lambda) \right| \\ &= \left| \beta_2(1 - |x_3(\lambda)|^2) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by equations (4.19) and (4.20), for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3)(\lambda)| + |(x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3)(\lambda)| &= \left| \beta_1(1 - |x_3(\lambda)|^2) \right| + \left| \beta_2(1 - |x_3(\lambda)|^2) \right| \\ &= (|\beta_1| + |\beta_2|)(1 - |x_3(\lambda)|^2) = 1 - |x_3(\lambda)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.5 and Lemma 4.22, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, the point

$$x(\lambda) = (x_1(\lambda), x_2(\lambda), x_3(\lambda))$$

lies in $\partial\mathbb{E}$. Let us check that x is $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner. Clearly, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{x_2(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda) &= \overline{(\beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda))}x_3(\lambda) \\ &= \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda) + \beta_1\overline{x_3(\lambda)}x_3(\lambda) \\ &= \beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda) = x_1(\lambda).\end{aligned}$$

We also have, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|x_2(\lambda)| = |\beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda)| \leq |\beta_2| + |\beta_1x_3(\lambda)| = |\beta_2| + |\beta_1| = 1.$$

Since x_3 is inner, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, $|x_3(\lambda)| = 1$. Therefore $x(\lambda) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, and hence x is $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner.

Lemma 4.27. *Let $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ be such that $x(\lambda) = (\beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda), \beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda), x_3(\lambda))$, where x_3 is a non-constant rational inner function and $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| = 1$. Then $\Psi_\omega(x(\lambda)) = k$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, where*

$$\omega = \frac{\overline{\beta_2}}{|\beta_2|}, \quad k = \frac{\beta_1}{|\beta_1|} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}.$$

Proof. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_\omega(x(\lambda)) &= \frac{x_3(\lambda)\omega - x_1(\lambda)}{x_2(\lambda)\omega - 1} \\ &= \frac{x_3(\lambda)\omega - (\beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda))}{(\beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda))\omega - 1} \\ &= \frac{x_3(\lambda)\omega - \beta_1 - \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda)}{\beta_2\omega + \overline{\beta_1}\omega x_3(\lambda) - 1}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_\omega(x(\lambda)) = k &\Leftrightarrow \frac{x_3(\lambda)\omega - \beta_1 - \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda)}{\beta_2\omega + \overline{\beta_1}\omega x_3(\lambda) - 1} = k \\ &\Leftrightarrow x_3(\lambda)\omega - \beta_1 - \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda) = k[\beta_2\omega + \overline{\beta_1}\omega x_3(\lambda) - 1] \\ &\Leftrightarrow x_3(\lambda)[\omega - \overline{\beta_2} - k\overline{\beta_1}\omega] + [k - \beta_1 - k\beta_2\omega] = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since x_3 is a nonconstant rational inner function, this statement is equivalent to

$$\omega - \overline{\beta_2} - k\overline{\beta_1}\omega = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad k - \beta_1 - k\beta_2\omega = 0.$$

Multiply both sides of the first equation by $\overline{\omega}$ and the second equation by \overline{k} . We get

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{cases} \overline{\beta_1}k + \overline{\beta_2}\overline{\omega} = 1 \\ \beta_1\overline{k} + \beta_2\omega = 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| = 1$, it is easy to see that

$$\omega = \frac{\overline{\beta_2}}{|\beta_2|} \quad \text{and} \quad k = \frac{\beta_1}{|\beta_1|}$$

satisfy equation (4.21), and so

$$\Psi_\omega(x(\lambda)) = k \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Lemma 4.28. *For any inner function $x_3 : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, there are $x_1, x_2 : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that the function $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ defined by $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a superficial $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, but $h = (x_1 + x_2, x_3) : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Gamma$ is not a superficial Γ -inner function.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.26, for any $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| = 1$, the function $x : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ defined by

$$x = \left(\beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3, \beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3, x_3 \right)$$

is a superficial $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. By Proposition 4.25, $h : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Gamma$ is superficial if and only if there exists an $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $h = (\omega p + \overline{\omega}, p)$. Note that, for $x_1 = \beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3$ and $x_2 = \beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3$,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\lambda) = (x_1 + x_2, x_3)(\lambda) &= \left(\beta_1 + \overline{\beta_2}x_3(\lambda) + \beta_2 + \overline{\beta_1}x_3(\lambda), x_3(\lambda) \right) \\ &= \left((\overline{\beta_1} + \overline{\beta_2})x_3(\lambda) + (\beta_1 + \beta_2), x_3(\lambda) \right), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{D}. \end{aligned}$$

One can see that there are some $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| = 1$, but $\beta_1 + \beta_2 \notin \mathbb{T}$. For example, take

$$\beta_1 = i\frac{1}{2}, \quad \beta_2 = -i\frac{1}{2}.$$

Then $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1$, but $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = i\frac{1}{2} - i\frac{1}{2} = 0 \notin \mathbb{T}$. Thus, h is not a superficial Γ -inner function for $\beta_1 = \frac{i}{2}$ and $\beta_2 = \frac{-i}{2}$.

5. THE CONSTRUCTION OF RATIONAL $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -INNER FUNCTIONS

The formula for a Blaschke product is an explicit representation of a rational inner function in terms of its zeros and one other parameter (a unimodular complex number). In this chapter we aim to find a comparable representation for rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. The first question is: what is the tetrablock analogue of the zeros of an inner function? We shall show that one satisfactory choice consists of the royal nodes of an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x together with the zeros of x_1 and x_2 . We construct a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x from its royal nodes and the zeros of x_1 and x_2 . We show that there exists a 3-parameter family of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions with prescribed zero sets of x_1 , x_2 and prescribed royal nodes. We also prove that a nonconstant rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x of degree n either maps $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ to the royal variety of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ or $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ meets the royal variety exactly n times.

5.1. The royal polynomial of an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. We define the *royal variety* for $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ to be

$$\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : x_1x_2 = x_3\}.$$

It was shown in [19] that $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}} \cap \mathbb{E}$ is the orbit of $\{(0, 0, 0)\}$ under the group of biholomorphic automorphisms of \mathbb{E} . By Theorem 4.15, for a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, there are polynomials E_1, E_2, D such that

$$x_1 = \frac{E_1}{D}, \quad x_2 = \frac{E_2}{D}, \quad x_3 = \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}.$$

Thus, for $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$(x_3 - x_1x_2)(\lambda) = \left[\frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} - \frac{E_1 E_2}{D D} \right](\lambda).$$

The *royal polynomial* of the rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x is defined to be

$$\begin{aligned} R_x(\lambda) &= D^2(\lambda) \left[\frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} - \frac{E_1 E_2}{D^2} \right](\lambda) \\ &= [D^{\sim n} D - E_1 E_2](\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 5.1. [5, Definition 3.4] *We say a polynomial f is n -symmetric if $\deg(f) \leq n$ and $f^{\sim n} = f$.*

Definition 5.2. [5, Definition 3.4] *For any $E \subset \mathbb{C}$, the number of zeros of f in E , counted with multiplicities, is denoted by $\text{ord}_E(f)$ and $\text{ord}_0(f)$ means the same as $\text{ord}_{\{0\}}(f)$.*

Proposition 5.3. *Let x be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function of degree n and let R_x be the royal polynomial of x . Then, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,*

- (1) $\lambda^{-n}R_x(\lambda) = |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_2(\lambda)|^2$ and
- (2) $\lambda^{-n}R_x(\lambda) = |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1(\lambda)|^2$.

Proof. (1) For $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda^{-n}R_x(\lambda) &= \lambda^{-n}[D^{\sim n}D - E_1E_2](\lambda) \\
 &= \lambda^{-n}[\lambda^n \overline{D(1/\bar{\lambda})}D(\lambda) - E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda)E_2(\lambda)], \quad \text{since } E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda) \text{ on } \mathbb{T} \\
 &= \lambda^{-n}[\lambda^n \overline{D(\bar{\lambda})}D(\lambda) - \lambda^n \overline{E_2(1/\bar{\lambda})}E_2(\lambda)], \quad \text{since } E_2(1/\bar{\lambda}) = E_2(\lambda) \text{ on } \mathbb{T} \\
 &= \lambda^{-n}[\lambda^n \overline{D(\bar{\lambda})}D(\lambda) - \lambda^n \overline{E_2(\bar{\lambda})}E_2(\lambda)] \\
 (5.1) \quad &= |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_2(\lambda)|^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

(2) Since x is rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, by Lemma 4.17,

$$(5.2) \quad |E_1(\lambda)| = |E_2(\lambda)| \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

By equations (5.1) and (5.2),

$$\lambda^{-n}R_x(\lambda) = |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1(\lambda)|^2 \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Lemma 5.4. *Let E_1 and E_2 be two polynomials such that $\deg E_1, \deg E_2 \leq n$. Then*

$$E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad E_2(\lambda) = E_1^{\sim n}(\lambda) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Then by definition,

$$E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{E_2(1/\bar{\lambda})}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Therefore, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_1(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{E_2(1/\bar{\lambda})} \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T} &\Leftrightarrow (1/\lambda^n)E_1(\lambda) = \overline{E_2(1/\bar{\lambda})} \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \\
 &\Leftrightarrow (1/\bar{\lambda})^n \overline{E_1(\bar{\lambda})} = E_2(1/\bar{\lambda}) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \\
 &\Leftrightarrow \lambda^n \overline{E_1(1/\bar{\lambda})} = E_2(\lambda) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \\
 &\Leftrightarrow E_1^{\sim n}(\lambda) = E_2(\lambda) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The converse is obvious.

Definition 5.5. *A nonzero polynomial R is n -balanced if*

- (1) $\deg(R) \leq 2n$,
- (2) R is $2n$ -symmetric, and
- (3) $\lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$.

For completeness, we shall say that zeros of the zero polynomial have infinite order.

Proposition 5.6. *Let x be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function of degree n and let R_x be the royal polynomial of x . Then R_x is $2n$ -symmetric, $\lambda^{-n}R_x(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, and the zeros of R_x on \mathbb{T} have even order or infinite order.*

Proof. To show that R_x is $2n$ -symmetric we have to prove that $R_x^{\sim 2n}(\lambda) = R_x(\lambda)$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Recall that

$$R_x(\lambda) = D^{\sim n}(\lambda)D(\lambda) - E_1(\lambda)E_2(\lambda), \quad \text{where } x = \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_2}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right),$$

By Theorem 4.15 (7) and Lemma 5.4, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{E_2(1/\overline{\lambda})}, \quad E_2(\lambda) = E_1^{\sim n}(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{E_1(1/\overline{\lambda})}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} R_x^{\sim 2n}(\lambda) &= \lambda^{2n} \overline{R_x(1/\overline{\lambda})} \\ &= \lambda^{2n} \overline{D^{\sim n}(1/\overline{\lambda})D(1/\overline{\lambda}) - E_1(1/\overline{\lambda})E_2(1/\overline{\lambda})} \\ &= \lambda^n \overline{D^{\sim n}(1/\overline{\lambda})} \lambda^n \overline{D(1/\overline{\lambda})} - \lambda^n \overline{E_1(1/\overline{\lambda})} \lambda^n \overline{E_2(1/\overline{\lambda})} \\ &= D(\lambda)D^{\sim n}(\lambda) - E_2(\lambda)E_1(\lambda) = R_x(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Hence R_x is $2n$ -symmetric.

Clearly, if $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$, the royal polynomial R_x is identically zero. Hence the zeros of R_x on \mathbb{T} have infinite order.

In the case $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$, by Proposition 5.3, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$(5.3) \quad \lambda^{-n} R_x(\lambda) = |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_2(\lambda)|^2.$$

By Theorem 4.15 (6),

$$(5.4) \quad |D|^2 - |E_2|^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}.$$

By equations (5.3) and (5.4), $\lambda^{-n} R_x(\lambda) \geq 0$ on \mathbb{T} . By the Fejér-Riesz theorem [17, Section 53], there exists an analytic polynomial $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i \lambda^i$ of degree n such that P is outer and

$$\lambda^{-n} R_x(\lambda) = |P(\lambda)|^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Hence if $\sigma \in \mathbb{T}$ is a zero of R_x , then σ is a zero of even order. Therefore in the case $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$, the zeros of R_x that lie in \mathbb{T} have even order.

Lemma 5.7. *Let x be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function of degree n . Then the royal polynomial R_x of x is either n -balanced or identically zero.*

Proof. If $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ then, by the definition of the royal variety,

$$x_1(\lambda)x_2(\lambda) = x_3(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Thus

$$E_1(\lambda)E_2(\lambda) = D(\lambda)D^{\sim n}(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Therefore the royal polynomial R_x is identically zero.

If $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ then, by Proposition 5.6, the royal polynomial R_x of x is $2n$ -symmetric and $\lambda^{-n} R_x(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Clearly, R_x has degree less than or equal to $2n$. Hence R_x is n -balanced.

5.2. Rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions of type (n, k) .

Definition 5.8. Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function such that $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$. Let R_x be the royal polynomial of x . If σ is a zero of R_x of order ℓ , we define the multiplicity $\#\sigma$ of σ (as a royal node of x) by

$$\#\sigma = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{if } \sigma \in \mathbb{D}, \\ \frac{1}{2}\ell & \text{if } \sigma \in \mathbb{T}. \end{cases}$$

We define the type of x to be the ordered pair (n, k) , where n is the sum of the multiplicities of the royal nodes of x that lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and k is the sum of the multiplicities of the royal nodes of x that lie in \mathbb{T} .

Definition 5.9. Let $\mathcal{R}^{n,k}$ denote the collection of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions of type (n, k) .

Remark 5.10. [5, Equations (3.2) and (3.3)] For any m -symmetric polynomial f , the following two relations hold

(1)

$$\deg(f) = m - \text{ord}_0(f).$$

(2) Since f is m -symmetric, if $\alpha \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ is zero of f , then $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ is also a zero of f . Thus

$$\text{ord}_0(f) + 2\text{ord}_{\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}}(f) + \text{ord}_{\mathbb{T}}(f) = \deg(f).$$

Theorem 5.11. If $x \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$ is nonconstant then the degree of x is equal to n .

Proof. Let R_x be the royal polynomial of x . By assumption $x \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$ and is nonconstant. Hence $n \geq 1$ and $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$. Thus R_x is not identically zero. By Proposition 5.6, R_x is $2\deg(x)$ -symmetric. By Remark 5.10 (1) and (2), it follows that

$$\deg(R_x) = 2\deg(x) - \text{ord}_0(R_x)$$

and

$$\text{ord}_0(R_x) + 2\text{ord}_{\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}}(R_x) + \text{ord}_{\mathbb{T}}(R_x) = \deg(R_x).$$

Substitute the first equation in the second equation,

$$\text{ord}_0(R_x) + 2\text{ord}_{\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}}(R_x) + \text{ord}_{\mathbb{T}}(R_x) = 2\deg(x) - \text{ord}_0(R_x),$$

which implies that

$$2\text{ord}_0(R_x) + 2\text{ord}_{\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}}(R_x) + \text{ord}_{\mathbb{T}}(R_x) = 2\deg(x).$$

Therefore, by Definition 5.9,

$$n = \text{ord}_0(R_x) + \text{ord}_{\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}}(R_x) + \frac{1}{2}\text{ord}_{\mathbb{T}}(R_x) = \deg(x).$$

Theorem 5.12. If x is a nonconstant rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, then either $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ or $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ meets $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ exactly $\deg(x)$ times.

Proof. Suppose that x is a nonconstant rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Then either, $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ and the royal polynomial R_x of x is identically zero, or by Theorem 5.11, $x(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ meets $\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ exactly $\deg(x)$ times.

Lemma 5.13. [5, Lemma 4.4] *For $\sigma \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, let the polynomial Q_σ be defined by the formula*

$$Q_\sigma(\lambda) = (\lambda - \sigma)(1 - \overline{\sigma}\lambda).$$

Let n be a positive integer and let R be a nonzero polynomial. The polynomial R is n -balanced if and only if there exist points $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $t_+ > 0$ such that

$$R(\lambda) = t_+ \prod_{j=1}^n Q_{\sigma_j}(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Proposition 5.14. *Let the royal nodes of a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x be $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$, with repetition according to multiplicity of the royal nodes as described in Definition 5.8. The royal polynomial R_x of x , up to a positive multiple, is*

$$(5.5) \quad R_x(\lambda) = \prod_{j=1}^n Q_{\sigma_j}(\lambda).$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.7, R_x is n -balanced. This implies that, by Lemma 5.13, there exists $t_+ > 0$ and $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that

$$R_x(\lambda) = t_+ \prod_{j=1}^n Q_{\eta_j}(\lambda).$$

By Definition 5.8, the royal nodes of x and their multiplicities are defined in terms of zeros of R_x in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and their multiplicities. Hence the list η_1, \dots, η_n coincides, up to a permutation, with the list $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$. Therefore R_x is given, up to a positive multiple, by equation (5.5).

Before we proceed to the next theorem on the construction of a tetra-inner function x from the zeros of x_1 and x_2 and royal nodes of x , let us prove the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 5.15. *Let E_1 and E_2 be polynomials of degree at most n such that $E_1(\lambda) = E_2^{\sim n}(\lambda)$, for $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Let $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1$ be the zeros of E_1 in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and let $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2$ be the zeros of E_2 in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, where $k_1 + k_2 = n$. Then*

$$E_1(\lambda) = t \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (\lambda - \alpha_j^1) \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (1 - \overline{\alpha_j^2} \lambda),$$

where $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. Since $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, where $k_1 + k_2 = n$, are zeros of E_1 and E_2 respectively, we have

$$(5.6) \quad E_1(\lambda) = (\lambda - \alpha_1^1) \dots (\lambda - \alpha_{k_1}^1) \cdot p_1(\lambda)$$

and

$$E_2(\lambda) = (\lambda - \alpha_1^2) \dots (\lambda - \alpha_{k_2}^2) \cdot p_2(\lambda).$$

where the polynomials $p_1(\lambda)$ and $p_2(\lambda)$ do not vanish in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Since $E_1(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{E_2(1/\overline{\lambda})}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, we have

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} E_1(\lambda) &= \overline{\lambda^n (1/\overline{\lambda} - \alpha_1^2) \dots (1/\overline{\lambda} - \alpha_{k_2}^2) \cdot p_2(1/\overline{\lambda})} \\ &= \lambda^{n-k_2} (1 - \overline{\alpha_1^2} \lambda) \dots (1 - \overline{\alpha_{k_2}^2} \lambda) \cdot \overline{p_2(1/\overline{\lambda})}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\deg E_1 \leq n$ and $k_1 + k_2 = n$, equations (5.6) and (5.7) implies that E_1 can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(\lambda) &= t_1(\lambda - \alpha_1^1)\dots(\lambda - \alpha_{k_1}^1) (1 - \bar{\alpha}_1^2\lambda)\dots(1 - \bar{\alpha}_{k_2}^2\lambda) \\ &= t_1 \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (\lambda - \alpha_j^1) \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (1 - \bar{\alpha}_j^2\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}, \end{aligned}$$

for some $t_1 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, and

$$E_2(\lambda) = t_2 \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (\lambda - \alpha_j^2) \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (1 - \bar{\alpha}_j^1\lambda) \quad \lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{D}},$$

for some $t_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Since $E_2(\lambda) = \lambda^n \overline{E_1(1/\bar{\lambda})}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^n \overline{E_1(1/\bar{\lambda})} &= \lambda^n \overline{t_1 \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (1/\bar{\lambda} - \alpha_j^1) \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (1 - \bar{\alpha}_j^2 1/\bar{\lambda})} \\ &= \lambda^n \bar{t}_1 \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (1/\lambda - \bar{\alpha}_j^1) \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (1 - \alpha_j^2 1/\lambda) \\ &= \bar{t}_1 \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (1 - \bar{\alpha}_j^1\lambda) \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (\lambda - \alpha_j^2) \\ &= E_2(\lambda) = t_2 \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (\lambda - \alpha_j^2) \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (1 - \bar{\alpha}_j^1\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}, \end{aligned}$$

and so $t_2 = \bar{t}_1$.

Remark 5.16. For the polynomials E_1 and E_2 from Lemma 5.15, if $\alpha \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ and α is a zero of E_1 then $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ is a zero of E_2 .

Theorem 5.17. *Suppose that $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1 \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2 \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$, where $k_1 + k_2 = n$. Suppose that $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$ are distinct from points of the set $\{\alpha_j^i, j = 1, \dots, k_i, i = 1, 2\} \cap \mathbb{T}$. Then there exists a rational $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{E}}$ such that*

- (1) *the zeros of x_1 in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$, repeated according to multiplicity, are $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1$;*
- (2) *the zeros of x_2 in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$, repeated according to multiplicity, are $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2$;*
- (3) *the royal nodes of x are $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$, with repetition according to multiplicity of the nodes.*

Such a function x can be constructed as follows. Let $t_+ > 0$ and let $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Let R be defined by

$$R(\lambda) = t_+ \prod_{j=1}^n (\lambda - \sigma_j)(1 - \bar{\sigma}_j\lambda), \quad \text{and}$$

let E_1 be defined by

$$E_1(\lambda) = t \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (\lambda - \alpha_j^1) \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (1 - \bar{\alpha}_j^2\lambda).$$

Then the following statements hold.

- (i) *There exists an outer polynomial D of degree at most n such that*

$$(5.8) \quad \lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) + |E_1(\lambda)|^2 = |D(\lambda)|^2$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$.

- (ii) *The function x defined by*

$$x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) = \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_1^{\sim n}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right)$$

is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function such that the degree of x is equal to n and conditions (1), (2) and (3) hold. The royal polynomial of x is R .

Proof. (i) By Lemma 5.13, R is n -balanced, and so $\lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Therefore

$$\lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) + |E_1(\lambda)|^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

By the Fejér-Riesz theorem, there exists an outer polynomial D of degree at most n such that

$$(5.9) \quad \lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) + |E_1(\lambda)|^2 = |D(\lambda)|^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

(ii) Let D be an outer polynomial of degree at most n such that equality (5.9) holds for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. By hypothesis

$$\{\sigma_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\} \cap \left(\{\alpha_j^i : 1 \leq j \leq k_i, i = 1, 2\} \cap \mathbb{T} \right) = \emptyset.$$

Then $\lambda^{-n}R(\lambda)$ and $|E_1(\lambda)|^2$ are non-negative trigonometric polynomials on \mathbb{T} with no common zero. Thus

$$\lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) + |E_1(\lambda)|^2 > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}.$$

By equality (5.9), D has no zero on \mathbb{T} , and so D and $D^{\sim n}$ have no common factor. Hence

$$\deg(x_3) = \deg\left(\frac{D^{\sim n}}{D}\right) = \max\{\deg(D), \deg(D^{\sim n})\} = n.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) &\geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}, \\ |D(\lambda)|^2 &= \lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) + |E_1(\lambda)|^2 \geq |E_1(\lambda)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. It follows that

$$|D(\lambda)| \geq |E_1(\lambda)|, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Since $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, the function $\frac{E_1}{D}$ is analytic in a neighbourhood of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. By the Maximum Modulus Principle, we have

$$\frac{|E_1(\lambda)|}{|D(\lambda)|} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Therefore, by the converse of Theorem 4.15, since conditions (1), (2), (6) and (7) are satisfied, the function

$$x(\lambda) = \left(\frac{E_1(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)}, \frac{E_1^{\sim n}(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)}, \frac{D^{\sim n}(\lambda)}{D(\lambda)} \right) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{D},$$

is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function such that $\deg(x) = n$. The royal polynomial of x is defined by

$$R_x(\lambda) = D(\lambda)D^{\sim n}(\lambda) - E_1(\lambda)E_2(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{D},$$

where $E_2(\lambda) = E_1^{\sim n}(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. By Proposition 5.3, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\lambda^{-n} R_x(\lambda) = |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1(\lambda)|^2.$$

Therefore, by equation (5.8),

$$\lambda^{-n} R_x(\lambda) = \lambda^{-n} R(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T},$$

where $E_2(\lambda) = E_1^{\sim n}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. Thus $R_x = R$, that is, the royal polynomial of x is equal to R .

Remark 5.18. (1) For large n the task of finding an outer polynomial D satisfying equation (5.8) cannot be solved algebraically.

(2) The solution D is only identified up to a multiplication by $\bar{\omega} \in \mathbb{T}$. Thus if we replace D by $\bar{\omega}D$ we obtain a new solution

$$x = \left(\omega \frac{E_1}{D}, \omega \frac{E_1^{\sim n}}{D}, \omega^2 \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right).$$

Example 5.19. Let $n = 1$, $\alpha_1^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\sigma_1 = 0$. Let us construct a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ such that α_1^2 is a zero of x_2 and σ_1 is a royal node of x .

As in Theorem 5.17, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} R(\lambda) &= t_+ \lambda, & t_+ \text{ is a positive real number.} \\ E_1(\lambda) &= t(1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda), & t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The equation (5.8) for the polynomial D is the following, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (5.10) \quad |D(\lambda)|^2 &= \lambda^{-1} R(\lambda) + |E_1(\lambda)|^2 \\ &= \bar{\lambda} t_+ \lambda + |t(1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda)|^2 \\ &= t_+ + \frac{5}{4}|t|^2 - \frac{|t|^2}{2}\lambda - \frac{|t|^2}{2}\bar{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the degree of D is at most 1, $D(\lambda) = a_1 + a_2\lambda$, where $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (5.11) \quad D(\lambda)\overline{D(\lambda)} &= |a_1 + a_2\lambda|^2 \\ &= (a_1 + a_2\lambda)(\bar{a}_1 + \bar{a}_2\bar{\lambda}) = |a_1|^2 + |a_2|^2 + a_1\bar{a}_2\bar{\lambda} + \bar{a}_1 a_2 \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Compare equations (5.10) and (5.11). We have

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{cases} \bar{a}_1 a_2 = -\frac{|t|^2}{2}, \\ a_1 \bar{a}_2 = -\frac{|t|^2}{2}, \\ |a_1|^2 + |a_2|^2 = t_+ + \frac{5}{4}|t|^2. \end{cases}$$

Finally the function x can be written in the form

$$x = \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_1^{\sim 1}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim 1}}{D} \right),$$

where

$$\begin{cases} x_1(\lambda) = \frac{E_1}{D}(\lambda) = \frac{t(1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda)}{a_1 + a_2\lambda}, \\ x_2(\lambda) = \frac{E_1^{\sim 1}}{D}(\lambda) = \frac{\bar{t}(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})}{a_1 + a_2\lambda}, \\ x_3(\lambda) = \frac{D^{\sim 1}}{D}(\lambda) = \frac{\bar{a}_1\lambda + \bar{a}_2}{a_1 + a_2\lambda}, \end{cases}$$

where $|a_2| < |a_1|$ and a_1, a_2 are given by solving equations (5.12) as functions of t_+ and t . These formulas give a parametrization of solutions for the above problem.

For example, for the given $t = \sqrt{2}$ and $t_+ = \frac{7}{4}$, the system (5.12) has solutions

$$a_1 = -2i, a_2 = \frac{1}{2}i \quad \text{or} \quad a_1 = -2, a_2 = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence the functions

$$x(\lambda) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}(1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda)}{-2\omega(1 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda)}, \frac{\sqrt{2}(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})}{-2\omega(1 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda)}, \frac{\bar{\omega}(\lambda - \frac{1}{4})}{\omega(1 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda)} \right), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{D},$$

where $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, are rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions such that $\frac{1}{2}$ is a zero of x_2 and 0 is a royal node of x .

Remark 5.20. Theorem 5.17 gives a 3-parameter family of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions with prescribed royal nodes and prescribed zeros of x_1 and x_2 . It appears at first sight that the construction in Theorem 5.17 gives us a 4-parameter family of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions with the given data. However, the choice of t_+, t, D and ω leads to the same x as the choice $1, t/\sqrt{t_+}, D/\sqrt{t_+}$ and ω . Theorem 5.21 tells us that the construction yields all solutions of the problem, and so the family of functions x with the required properties is indeed a 3-parameter family.

Theorem 5.21. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function of degree n such that*

- (1) *the zeros of x_1 , repeated according to multiplicity, are $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,*
- (2) *the zeros of x_2 , repeated according to multiplicity, are $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, where $k_1 + k_2 = n$, and*
- (3) *the royal nodes of x are $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, repeated according to multiplicity.*

There exists some choice of $t_+ > 0$, $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ such that the recipe in Theorem 5.17 with these choices produces the function x .

Proof. By Theorem 4.15, there exist polynomials E_1^1, E_2^1 and D^1 such that

- (1) $\deg(E_1^1), \deg(E_2^1)$ and $\deg(D^1) \leq n$,
- (2) $D^1(\lambda) \neq 0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,
- (3) $E_2^1(\lambda) = (E_1^1)^{\sim n}(\lambda)$
- (4) $|E_i^1(\lambda)| \leq |D^1(\lambda)|$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, $i = 1, 2$ and
- (5) $x_1 = \frac{E_1^1}{D^1}, \quad x_2 = \frac{E_2^1}{D^1}$ and $x_3 = \frac{(D^1)^{\sim n}}{D^1}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

By hypothesis, the zeros of x_1 , repeated according to multiplicity, are $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1$, and the zeros of x_2 , repeated according to multiplicity, are $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2$ where $k_1 + k_2 = n$.

By Lemma 5.15,

$$E_1^1(\lambda) = t \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} (\lambda - \alpha_j^1) \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} (1 - \bar{\alpha}_j^2 \lambda) \quad \text{for some } t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \text{ and all } \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

By hypothesis, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ are the royal nodes of x . Thus, by Proposition 5.14, for the royal polynomial R^1 of x , there exists $t_+ > 0$ such that

$$R^1(\lambda) = t_+ \prod_{j=1}^n (\lambda - \sigma_j)(1 - \bar{\sigma}_j \lambda).$$

By Proposition 5.3, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\lambda^{-n} R^1(\lambda) = |D^1(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1^1(\lambda)|^2.$$

By Theorem 4.15, $D^1(\lambda) \neq 0$ on $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$. Hence, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$

$$\lambda^{-n} R^1(\lambda) + |E_1^1(\lambda)|^2 = |D^1(\lambda)|^2 \neq 0.$$

This implies that $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1$ and $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2$ which are on \mathbb{T} are distinct from σ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. By the construction in Theorem 5.17, for σ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^1$ and $\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^2$, the rational $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ can be defined by

$$\left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_1^{\sim n}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right)$$

for a suitable choice of $t_+ > 0$, $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$. Since E_1^1 and R^1 coincide with E_1 and R in the construction of Theorem 5.17 for a suitable choice of $t_+ > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, D^1 is a permissible choice for ωD for some choice $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, as a solution for equation (5.8). Hence the construction of Theorem 5.17 yields $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ for the appropriate choices of $t_+ > 0$, $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$.

6. CONVEX SUBSETS OF $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$ AND EXTREMALITY

In this section we study convex subsets of $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$. We show that, for a fixed $x_3 \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$, the subset $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$ is convex. Recall that the distinguished boundaries of the tridisc \mathbb{D}^3 and the ball \mathbb{B}_3 contain no line segments. Thus every inner function in the set of analytic functions $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D}^3)$ from \mathbb{D} to \mathbb{D}^3 is an extreme point of $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D}^3)$ and every inner function in the set of analytic functions $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{B}_3)$ from \mathbb{D} to \mathbb{B}_3 is an extreme point of $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{B}_3)$. However, this property contrasts sharply with the situation in the tetrablock. Despite the fact that the set \mathcal{J} of rational tetra-inner functions is not convex, the conventional notion of extreme point of \mathcal{J} is well defined and fruitful. In Theorem 6.19, we prove that for $x \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$ with $2k \leq n$, x is not an extreme point. A class of extreme points of the set \mathcal{J} is given in Proposition 6.21.

6.1. Convex subsets in the tetrablock.

Definition 6.1. *A set Ω in a vector space is convex if for all $z, w \in \Omega$ and all t such that $0 \leq t \leq 1$, the point $tz + (1-t)w$ belongs to Ω .*

Proposition 6.2. [1, page 8] $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$ is not convex.

Proof. Take $x = (i, 1, i)$ and $y = (-1, i, -i)$ in $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$. Let us take $t = 1/2$, then the point $w = tx + (1-t)y = \frac{1}{2}(-1 + i, 1 + i, 0)$. It is easy to show that w is not in $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$. Therefore $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$ is not convex.

Let us show that the set $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ is convex in (x_1, x_2) for a fixed $x_3 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, that is, the set

$$\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\}) = \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : |x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + |x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3| \leq 1 - |x_3|^2\}$$

is convex for every $x_3 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. In consequence, some associated sets have a similar property.

Proposition 6.3. *The following sets are convex:*

- (1) $\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$ for any $x_3 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$;
- (2) $b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$ for any $x_3 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Proof. (1) Let $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$, and so, by Theorem 2.5, x and y satisfy the inequalities

$$(6.1) \quad |x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + |x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3| \leq 1 - |x_3|^2$$

and

$$(6.2) \quad |y_1 - \overline{y_2}x_3| + |y_2 - \overline{y_1}x_3| \leq 1 - |x_3|^2$$

respectively. For all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} w = tx + (1-t)y &= t(x_1, x_2, x_3) + (1-t)(y_1, y_2, x_3) \\ &= (tx_1 + (1-t)y_1, tx_2 + (1-t)y_2, tx_3 + (1-t)x_3) \\ &= (tx_1 + (1-t)y_1, tx_2 + (1-t)y_2, x_3). \end{aligned}$$

Let us check that the point $w \in \mathbb{C}^3$ is in the set $\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$. By Theorem 2.5, $w \in \overline{\mathbb{E}}$ if and only if

$$\underbrace{|w_1 - \overline{w_2}x_3|}_{\text{first term}} + \underbrace{|w_2 - \overline{w_1}x_3|}_{\text{second term}} \leq 1 - |x_3|^2.$$

Let us consider the first term on the left hand side

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} |w_1 - \overline{w_2}x_3| &= |tx_1 + (1-t)y_1 - (\overline{tx_2 + (1-t)y_2})x_3| \\ &= |t(x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3) + (1-t)(y_1 - \overline{y_2}x_3)| \\ &\leq t|x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + (1-t)|y_1 - \overline{y_2}x_3|. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term of the left hand side we have

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |w_2 - \overline{w_1}x_3| &= |tx_2 + (1-t)y_2 - (\overline{tx_1 + (1-t)y_1})x_3| \\ &= |t(x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3) + (1-t)(y_2 - \overline{y_1}x_3)| \\ &\leq t|x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3| + (1-t)|y_2 - \overline{y_1}x_3|. \end{aligned}$$

Add inequalities (6.3) and (6.4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |w_1 - \overline{w_2}x_3| + |w_2 - \overline{w_1}x_3| &\leq \\ &t|x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + (1-t)|y_1 - \overline{y_2}x_3| + t|x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3| + (1-t)|y_2 - \overline{y_1}x_3|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by inequalities (6.1) and (6.2),

$$\begin{aligned} |w_1 - \overline{w_2}x_3| + |w_2 - \overline{w_1}x_3| &\leq t \left(|x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + |x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3| \right) \\ &\quad + (1-t) \left(|y_1 - \overline{y_2}x_3| + |y_2 - \overline{y_1}x_3| \right) \\ &\leq t(1 - |x_3|^2) + (1-t)(1 - |x_3|^2) \\ &= 1 - |x_3|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for all $t \in [0, 1]$, $w = tx + (1-t)y \in \overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$. Therefore $\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$ is convex for any fixed $x_3 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

(2) Let $x_3 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $x, y \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$, where $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, x_3)$. Note that, by Theorem 2.10 (1),

$$(6.5) \quad w \in \mathbb{C}^3 \text{ belongs to } b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \text{ if and only if } w_1 = \overline{w_2}w_3, \quad |w_2| \leq 1 \text{ and } |w_3| = 1.$$

Thus we have

$$x_1 = \overline{x_2}x_3, \quad |x_2| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_3| = 1,$$

and

$$y_1 = \overline{y_2}x_3, \quad |y_2| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_3| = 1.$$

For $t : 0 \leq t \leq 1$, let

$$w = (w_1, w_2, w_3) = tx + (1-t)y = (tx_1 + (1-t)y_1, tx_2 + (1-t)y_2, x_3).$$

To prove the convexity of $b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$, we need to check that, for all t such that $0 \leq t \leq 1$, w lies in $b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$, that is, it satisfies condition (6.5).

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{w_2}w_3 &= \overline{(tx_2 + (1-t)y_2)}x_3 \\ &= t\overline{x_2}x_3 + (1-t)\overline{y_2}x_3 \\ &= tx_1 + (1-t)y_1 = w_1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |w_2| &= |tx_2 + (1-t)y_2| \\ &\leq t|x_2| + (1-t)|y_2| \\ &\leq t + 1 - t = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $|w_3| = |x_3| = 1$. Therefore the set $b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \cap (\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{x_3\})$ is convex for any fixed $x_3 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, $x^1 = (x_1^1, x_2^1, x_3^1)$ and $x^2 = (x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2)$ be in $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ and satisfy $x = tx^1 + (1-t)x^2$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$. Then $x_3 = x_3^1 = x_3^2$.*

Proof. Since $x, x^1, x^2 \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$, by Theorem 2.10,

$$|x_3| = 1, \quad |x_3^1| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_3^2| = 1.$$

By assumption $x_3 = tx_3^1 + (1-t)x_3^2$. Since every point of \mathbb{T} is an extreme point of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, $x_3 = x_3^1 = x_3^2$.

6.2. Extremality in the set of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. In this section we show that, for a fixed inner function x_3 , the set of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ with third component x_3 is a convex set in \mathcal{J} . We prove that an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x is not an extreme point of the set \mathcal{J} if the number of the royal nodes of x on \mathbb{T} , counted with multiplicity, is less than or equal to half of the degree of x . In Proposition 6.21 we give a class of extreme rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions $x \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$ of the set \mathcal{J} for which $2k > n$.

Theorem 6.5. *For a fixed inner function x_3 , the set of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions (x_1, x_2, x_3) is convex.*

Proof. For the fixed inner function x_3 , let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, x_3)$ be $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$(tx + (1-t)y)(\lambda) = (tx_1 + (1-t)y_1, tx_2 + (1-t)y_2, x_3)(\lambda).$$

The function

$$w(\lambda) = (w_1, w_2, w_3)(\lambda) = (tx_1 + (1-t)y_1, tx_2 + (1-t)y_2, x_3)(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{D}$$

is analytic on \mathbb{D} and by Proposition 6.3 (1), $w(\mathbb{D}) \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{E}}$. By Proposition 6.3 (2), since for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, $x(\lambda)$ and $y(\lambda)$ are in $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$, $w(\lambda)$ has also to be in $b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Thus w is an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Therefore the set of $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is convex for any fixed inner function x_3 .

Definition 6.6. *A rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function x is an extreme point of \mathcal{J} if whenever x has a representation of the form $x = tx^1 + (1-t)x^2$ for $t \in (0, 1)$ and x^1, x^2 are rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions, $x^1 = x^2$.*

We will show below that \mathcal{J} is not convex, however the notion of extreme points still has the usual sense.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, $x^1 = (x_1^1, x_2^1, x_3^1)$ and $x^2 = (x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2)$ be rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. If $x = tx^1 + (1-t)x^2$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$ then $x_3 = x_3^1 = x_3^2$.*

Proof. Since $x = tx^1 + (1-t)x^2$, we have

$$(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (tx_1^1, tx_2^1, tx_3^1) + \left((1-t)x_1^2, (1-t)x_2^2, (1-t)x_3^2 \right).$$

Thus $x_3 = tx_3^1 + (1-t)x_3^2$. Hence, for every point $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$x_3(\lambda) = tx_3^1(\lambda) + (1-t)x_3^2(\lambda).$$

By assumption, x^1 and x^2 are rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions, and so, by Lemma 4.3 (2), x_3^1 and x_3^2 are rational inner functions, that is, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|x_3^1(\lambda)| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_3^2(\lambda)| = 1.$$

Every point of \mathbb{T} is an extreme point of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and therefore,

$$x_3(\lambda) = x_3^1(\lambda) = x_3^2(\lambda)$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Since x^1 and x^2 are rational functions, $x_3 = x_3^1 = x_3^2$.

Lemma 6.8. *The set of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions \mathcal{J} is not convex.*

Proof. Suppose that $x^1 = (x_1^1, x_2^1, x_3^1) \in \mathcal{J}$ and $x^2 = (x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2) \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $x_3^1 \neq x_3^2$. Then by Lemma 6.7, $x = tx^1 + (1-t)x^2$ is not in \mathcal{J} for all $t \in (0, 1)$. Therefore \mathcal{J} is not convex.

For an inner function p of degree n , let \mathcal{R}_p^n be the set of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions with third component p .

Proposition 6.9. *If p is an inner function of degree n then \mathcal{R}_p^n is convex. Let C be a collection of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. C is convex if and only if there exists an inner function p such that C is a convex subset of \mathcal{R}_p^n , where $n = \deg(p)$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 6.5 and Lemma 6.7.

Proposition 6.10. *If x is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function of degree n then x is a convex combination of at most $2n + 3$ extreme rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions of degree at most n .*

Proof. For the given rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ of degree n , x_3 is an inner function of degree n and $x \in \mathcal{R}_{x_3}^n$. By Remark 4.16, the convex set $\mathcal{R}_{x_3}^n$ is a subset of a $(2n + 2)$ -dimensional real subspace of the rational functions. Thus, by a theorem of Carathéodory [10, 18], x is a convex combination of at most $2n + 3$ extreme rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions of degree at most n .

Definition 6.11. A real or complex-valued function f on a real interval I is said to take a value y to order $m \geq 1$ at a point $t_0 \in I$ if $f \in C^m(I)$, $f(t_0) = y$, $f^{(j)}(t_0) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, m-1$ and $f^{(m)}(t_0) \neq 0$. We say that f vanishes to order $m \geq 1$ at a point $t_0 \in I$ if f takes the value 0 to order m at t_0 .

Lemma 6.12. Let $f \in C^m(I)$, $f(t_0) = y$ at $t_0 \in I$, and let $y \neq 0$. If f^2 takes the value y^2 to order $m \geq 1$ at t_0 , then f takes the value y to order m at t_0 .

Proof. Let I be a real interval and let $f \in C^m(I)$. Suppose that f^2 takes the value y^2 to order m at t_0 . Then, by Definition 6.11

$$(6.6) \quad f^2(t_0) = y^2, [f^2]^{(1)}(t_0) = [f^2]^{(2)}(t_0) = \dots = [f^2]^{(m-1)}(t_0) = 0, [f^2]^{(m)}(t_0) \neq 0.$$

One can check that

$$f(t_0) = y, \quad f^{(j)}(t_0) = 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, m-1 \quad \text{and} \quad f^{(m)}(t_0) \neq 0.$$

Definition 6.13. A function f is analytic on \mathbb{T} if there exists a function g analytic in a neighbourhood $U_{\mathbb{T}}$ of \mathbb{T} such that $f = g|_{\mathbb{T}}$.

Lemma 6.14. Let $\tau = e^{it_0}$ and let $f(t) = (e^{it} - \tau)^{2v}G(e^{it})$ in a neighbourhood of t_0 where $G(z)$ is analytic on \mathbb{T} and $G(\tau) \neq 0$. Then

$$(6.7) \quad f^{(j)}(t_0) = 0 \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, 2v-1 \quad \text{and} \quad f^{(2v)}(t_0) \neq 0.$$

Proof. Since G is analytic on \mathbb{T} , by Definition 6.13, there exists $U_{\mathbb{T}}$ a neighbourhood of \mathbb{T} and there exists \tilde{G} analytic on $U_{\mathbb{T}}$ such that $G = \tilde{G}|_{\mathbb{T}}$. Let $z = e^{it}$, $\varphi(z) = (z - \tau)^{2v}G(z)$ and $\tilde{\varphi}(z) = (z - \tau)^{2v}\tilde{G}(z)$. Define $\gamma(\tau, r)$ to be an anticlockwise circle centred at τ with radius r

$$\gamma(\tau, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \tau| = r\},$$

where r is taken sufficiently small such that $\gamma \subset U_{\mathbb{T}}$. Hence the function $\tilde{\varphi}$ is analytic inside the curve γ . Therefore, by Cauchy's integral formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varphi}^{(j)}(\tau) &= \frac{j!}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\tilde{\varphi}(z)}{(z - \tau)^{j+1}} dz, \\ &= \frac{j!}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{(z - \tau)^{2v}\tilde{G}(z)}{(z - \tau)^{j+1}} dz \\ (6.8) \quad &= \frac{j!}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} (z - \tau)^{2v-j-1}\tilde{G}(z) dz. \end{aligned}$$

For $0 \leq j \leq 2v-1$, the function $(z - \tau)^{2v-j-1}\tilde{G}(z)$ is analytic on $U_{\mathbb{T}}$. Therefore, by Cauchy's Theorem,

$$(6.9) \quad \tilde{\varphi}^{(j)}(\tau) = \frac{j!}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} (z - \tau)^{2v-j-1}\tilde{G}(z) dz = 0.$$

If $j = 2v$, then equation (6.8) becomes

$$\tilde{\varphi}^{(2v)}(\tau) = \frac{(2v)!}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\tilde{G}(z)}{(z - \tau)} dz.$$

By Cauchy's integral formula,

$$(6.10) \quad \tilde{\varphi}^{(2v)}(\tau) = \frac{(2v)!}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\tilde{G}(z)}{(z - \tau)} dz = (2v)! G(\tau) \neq 0.$$

Hence $\varphi^{(2v)}(\tau) \neq 0$ because $\tilde{\varphi}$ agrees with φ on \mathbb{T} . Note that,

$$f(t) = (e^{it} - e^{it_0})^{(2v)}G(e^{it}) = \varphi(e^{it}).$$

By the chain rule,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{df}{dt} &= \frac{d\varphi}{dz} \frac{dz}{dt} \\ \frac{d^2f}{dt^2} &= \frac{d^2\varphi}{dz^2} \left(\frac{dz}{dt}\right)^2 + \frac{d\varphi}{dz} \frac{d^2z}{dt^2} \\ \dots &= \dots \\ \frac{d^{2v-1}f}{dt^{2v-1}} &= \frac{d^{2v-1}\varphi}{dz^{2v-1}} \left(\frac{dz}{dt}\right)^{2v-1} + \dots + \frac{d\varphi}{dz} \frac{d^{2v-1}z}{dt^{2v-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By equation (6.9) and since $\tilde{\varphi}$ and φ agree on \mathbb{T} ,

$$\frac{d^j \tilde{\varphi}}{dz^j}(\tau) = 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, 2v - 1,$$

and so,

$$\frac{d^j \varphi}{dz^j}(\tau) = 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, 2v - 1.$$

Therefore, $f^{(j)}(t_0) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, 2v - 1$. For the $(2v)$ th derivative of f , we have

$$\frac{d^{2v}f}{dt^{2v}} = \frac{d^{2v}\varphi}{dz^{2v}} \left(\frac{dz}{dt}\right)^{2v} + \dots + \frac{d\varphi}{dz} \frac{d^{2v}z}{dt^{2v}}.$$

By equations (6.9) and (6.10),

$$\frac{d^j \varphi}{dz^j}(\tau) = 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, 2v - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d^{2v}\varphi}{dz^{2v}}(\tau) \neq 0.$$

Hence $f^{(2v)}(t_0) = \frac{d^{2v}\varphi}{dz^{2v}}(\tau) \left(\frac{dz}{dt}\right)^{2v}(t_0) \neq 0$.

Therefore $f^{(j)}(t_0) = 0$ for $j = 0, \dots, 2v - 1$ and $f^{(2v)}(t_0) \neq 0$.

Lemma 6.15. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. For $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$,*

- (1) $|x_1(\tau)| = 1 \Leftrightarrow \tau$ is a royal node of x .
- (2) $|x_2(\tau)| = 1 \Leftrightarrow \tau$ is a royal node of x .

Moreover,

- (3) $\tau = e^{it_0}$ is a royal node of x of multiplicity v if and only if $|x_1(e^{it})| = 1$ to order $2v$ at $t = t_0$.
- (4) $\tau = e^{it_0}$ is a royal node of x of multiplicity v if and only if $|x_2(e^{it})| = 1$ to order $2v$ at $t = t_0$.

Proof. (1) If $\tau = e^{it_0}$ is a royal node of x of multiplicity v , by Definition 5.8,

$$(6.11) \quad (x_3 - x_1x_2)(\lambda) = (\lambda - \tau)^{2v}F(\lambda)$$

where F is a rational function, analytic on \mathbb{T} and $F(\tau) \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.11, since x is an $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, $x_2 = \overline{x_1}x_3$ on \mathbb{T} . Therefore, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (6.12) \quad (x_3 - x_1x_2)(\lambda) &= (x_3 - x_1\overline{x_1}x_3)(\lambda) \\ &= x_3(\lambda) - x_3(\lambda)|x_1(\lambda)|^2 \\ &= x_3(\lambda)(1 - |x_1(\lambda)|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|x_1(\lambda)| = 1 \quad \iff \quad (x_3 - x_1x_2)(\lambda) = 0,$$

that is, if and only if λ is a royal node of x . Hence $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$ is a royal node of x if and only if $|x_1(\tau)| = 1$.

(2) Since x is rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, by Theorem 2.10, $x_1 = \overline{x_2}x_3$ on \mathbb{T} . The rest of the proof is similar to the above proof of (1).

(3) Suppose that $\tau = e^{it_0}$ is a royal node of x of multiplicity $v \geq 1$. Then on combining equations (6.11) and (6.12), we have, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$x_3(e^{it})(1 - |x_1(e^{it})|^2) = (e^{it} - \tau)^{2v}F(e^{it}).$$

This gives

$$1 - |x_1(e^{it})|^2 = (e^{it} - \tau)^{2v} \frac{F(e^{it})}{x_3(e^{it})}.$$

The rational function $G = \frac{F}{x_3}$ is analytic on \mathbb{T} and is not equal to zero at $\tau = e^{it_0}$. Thus we have

$$1 - |x_1(e^{it})|^2 = (e^{it} - \tau)^{2v}G(e^{it}).$$

Since x is rational and $|x_1(e^{it_0})| = 1$, the function $f(t) = 1 - |x_1(e^{it})|^2$ is C^∞ on a neighbourhood of t_0 . By Lemma 6.14,

$$f^{(j)}(t_0) = 0 \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, 2v - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f^{(2v)}(t_0) \neq 0.$$

Therefore f takes the value 0 to order $2v$ at t_0 , which implies, by Lemma 6.12, $|x_1(e^{it})| = 1$ to order $2v$ at t_0 .

(4) The proof of this statement follows from (2) and is similar to the above proof of (3).

For an inner function p of degree n and $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$, let

$$(6.13) \quad \mathcal{R}_p^{n,k} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k} : x_3 = p\}.$$

Lemma 6.16. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{R}_{x_3}^{n,k}$ and let $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_k \in \mathbb{T}$ be royal nodes of x . Suppose $x = tx^1 + (1-t)x^2$ for some t such that $0 < t < 1$, where $x^1 = (x_1^1, x_2^1, x_3^1)$ and $x^2 = (x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2)$ are rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. Then $x_3 = x_3^1 = x_3^2$,*

$$x_1^i(\tau_j) = x_1(\tau_j) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k \text{ and } i = 1, 2,$$

and

$$x_2^i(\tau_j) = x_2(\tau_j) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k \text{ and } i = 1, 2.$$

Moreover, $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_k \in \mathbb{T}$ are royal nodes of x^1 and x^2 .

Proof. By Lemma 6.7, $x_3 = x_3^1 = x_3^2$. By Lemma 6.15, $|x_1(\tau_j)| = 1$ and $|x_2(\tau_j)| = 1$ at each royal node $\tau_j \in \mathbb{T}$. By assumption,

$$x_1(\tau_j) = tx_1^1(\tau_j) + (1-t)x_1^2(\tau_j)$$

for t such that $0 < t < 1$ and $|x_1^i(\tau_j)| \leq 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $i = 1, 2$. Similarly,

$$x_2(\tau_j) = tx_2^1(\tau_j) + (1-t)x_2^2(\tau_j)$$

for t such that $0 < t < 1$ and $|x_2^i(\tau_j)| \leq 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $i = 1, 2$. Since every point on the circle \mathbb{T} is an extreme point of \mathbb{D} we have $x_1^i(\tau_j) = x_1(\tau_j)$ and $x_2^i(\tau_j) = x_2(\tau_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $i = 1, 2$. Therefore $|x_1^i(\tau_j)| = 1$, $|x_2^i(\tau_j)| = 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $i = 1, 2$. By Lemma 6.15, $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_k \in \mathbb{T}$ are royal nodes of x^1 and x^2 .

Lemma 6.17. *Let $n \geq 1$. Any $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{R}^{n,0}$ is not an extreme point of \mathcal{J} .*

Proof. Since x has no royal nodes on \mathbb{T} , by Lemma 6.15, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|x_1(\lambda)| < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_2(\lambda)| < 1.$$

Since \mathbb{T} is compact, the supremum of x_1 and x_2 is attained on \mathbb{T} , that is, there exist $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$(6.14) \quad \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{T}} |x_1(\lambda)| = |x_1(\lambda_1)| < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{T}} |x_2(\lambda)| = |x_2(\lambda_2)| < 1.$$

Choose $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that

$$(6.15) \quad |x_1(\lambda_1)|(1 + \varepsilon_1) < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_2(\lambda_2)|(1 + \varepsilon_2) < 1.$$

Take $\varepsilon = \min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$. If $x_1(\lambda_1) = 0$, then

$$x_1(\lambda) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Likewise, if $x_2(\lambda_2) = 0$ then

$$x_2(\lambda) = 0, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Define x^1 and x^2 to be

$$x^1 = ((1 + \varepsilon)x_1, (1 + \varepsilon)x_2, x_3) \quad \text{and} \quad x^2 = ((1 - \varepsilon)x_1, (1 - \varepsilon)x_2, x_3).$$

Since $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$(6.16) \quad x_1(\lambda) = \overline{x_2}(\lambda)x_3(\lambda), \quad |x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_3(\lambda)| = 1.$$

Let us check that x^1 and x^2 are rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. By Theorem 2.10 (1), this will follow if we show that

$$(1 + \varepsilon)x_1(\lambda) = (1 + \varepsilon)\overline{x_2}(\lambda)x_3(\lambda), \quad (1 + \varepsilon)|x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_3(\lambda)| = 1,$$

and $x^1(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathbb{E}$. By equations (6.16), we have to show only that

$$(1 + \varepsilon)|x_2(\lambda)| \leq 1 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}.$$

This statement follows from inequalities (6.14) and (6.15). Thus $x^1(\mathbb{T}) \subset b\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. By Theorem 2.10 (2), for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$x^1(\lambda) \in b\overline{\mathbb{E}} \Leftrightarrow \Psi(\cdot, x^1(\lambda)) \text{ is an automorphism of } \mathbb{D}.$$

By the maximum principle, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, $\|\Psi(\cdot, x^1(\lambda))\|_{H^\infty} < 1$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.4, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, $x^1(\lambda) \subseteq \mathbb{E}$. This completes the proof that x^1 is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function.

In a similar way we can show that x^2 is a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Moreover, by Lemma 6.15, x^1, x^2 have no royal nodes on \mathbb{T} and therefore $x^1, x^2 \in \mathcal{R}^{n,0}$. However $x = \frac{1}{2}x^1 + \frac{1}{2}x^2$, which implies that x cannot be an extreme point of \mathcal{J} since $x^1 \neq x^2$.

Proposition 6.18. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be superficial and $x = tx^1 + (1 - t)x^2$ for some $0 < t < 1$, where $x^1 = (x_1^1, x_2^1, x_3^1)$ and $x^2 = (x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2)$ are rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. Then x^1 and x^2 are superficial and $x_3 = x_3^1 = x_3^2$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.7, $x_3 = x_3^1 = x_3^2$. Suppose, for a contradiction, x^1 is not superficial. Then there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $x^1(\lambda_0) \in \mathbb{E}$. Let us show that in this case $x(\lambda_0) \in \mathbb{E}$, and so x is not superficial.

By Theorem 2.4, it is enough to show that

$$(6.17) \quad |x_1(\lambda_0) - \overline{x_2}(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| + |x_2(\lambda_0) - \overline{x_1}(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| < 1 - |x_3(\lambda_0)|^2.$$

Since $x^1(\lambda_0) \in \mathbb{E}$ and x^2 is rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function, this implies that

$$(6.18) \quad |x_1^1(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_2^1(\lambda_0)x_3^1(\lambda_0)| + |x_2^1(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_1^1(\lambda_0)x_3^1(\lambda_0)| < 1 - |x_3^1(\lambda_0)|^2$$

and

$$(6.19) \quad |x_1^2(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_2^2(\lambda_0)x_3^2(\lambda_0)| + |x_2^2(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_1^2(\lambda_0)x_3^2(\lambda_0)| \leq 1 - |x_3^2(\lambda_0)|^2.$$

Let us begin with the first term on the left hand side of inequality (6.17).

$$(6.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & |x_1(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_2(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| \\ &= |tx_1^1(\lambda_0) + (1-t)x_1^2(\lambda_0) - (t\bar{x}_2^1(\lambda_0) + (1-t)\bar{x}_2^2(\lambda_0))x_3(\lambda_0)| \\ &\leq |t(x_1^1(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_2^1(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0))| + |(1-t)(x_1^2(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_2^2(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0))| \end{aligned}$$

The second term on inequality (6.17)

$$(6.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & |x_2(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_1(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| \\ &= |tx_2^1(\lambda_0) + (1-t)x_2^2(\lambda_0) - (t\bar{x}_1^1(\lambda_0) + (1-t)\bar{x}_1^2(\lambda_0))x_3(\lambda_0)| \\ &\leq |t(x_2^1(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_1^1(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0))| + |(1-t)(x_2^2(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_1^2(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0))|. \end{aligned}$$

Add inequalities (6.20) and (6.21), and use inequalities (6.18) and (6.19) to obtain

$$(6.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & |x_1(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_2(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| + |x_2(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_1(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| \\ &\leq t \left(|x_1^1(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_2^1(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| + |x_2^1(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_1^1(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| \right) \\ &\quad + (1-t) \left(|x_1^2(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_2^2(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| + |x_2^2(\lambda_0) - \bar{x}_1^2(\lambda_0)x_3(\lambda_0)| \right) \\ &< t(1 - |x_3(\lambda_0)|^2) + (1-t)(1 - |x_3(\lambda_0)|^2) = 1 - |x_3(\lambda_0)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.19. *Let $x \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$. If $2k \leq n$, then x is not an extreme point of the set \mathcal{J} of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$. By Definition 5.8, x has n royal nodes in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and k royal nodes that lie in \mathbb{T} . By Theorem 4.15, there exist polynomials E_1 , E_2 and D of degree at most n such that

$$x = \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_1^{\sim n}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right)$$

where, for all $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, $D(\lambda) \neq 0$ and $E_2(\lambda) = E_1^{\sim n}(\lambda)$. Let $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ be the royal nodes of x in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ repeated according to multiplicity. By Proposition 5.14, the royal polynomial of x is

$$R = r \prod_{j=1}^k Q_{\tau_j} \prod_{j=k+1}^n Q_{\alpha_j},$$

for some $r > 0$. Thus for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$(6.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) &= r\lambda^{-n} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)(1 - \bar{\tau}_j\lambda) \prod_{j=k+1}^n (\lambda - \alpha_j)(1 - \bar{\alpha}_j\lambda) \right\} \\ &= r \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^n |\lambda - \alpha_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.3 and equation (6.23), for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$(6.24) \quad |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1(\lambda)|^2 = \lambda^{-n}R(\lambda) = r \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^n |\lambda - \alpha_j|^2.$$

Assume first that n is even and write $n = 2m$. This implies that $k \leq m$. Define a polynomial g by

$$g(\lambda) = \overline{\tau_1} \dots \overline{\tau_k} \lambda^{m-k} \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2.$$

Clearly, the polynomial g has degree $m + k \leq n$. Moreover, g is n -symmetric since

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\sim n}(\lambda) &= \lambda^n \overline{g\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)} = \lambda^n \left\{ \overline{\overline{\tau_1} \dots \overline{\tau_k} \frac{1}{(\lambda)^{m-k}} \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \tau_j\right)^2} \right\} \\ &= \lambda^{2m} \left\{ \tau_1 \dots \tau_k \frac{1}{\lambda^{m-k}} \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \overline{\tau_j}\right)^2 \right\} \\ &= \overline{\tau_1} \dots \overline{\tau_k} \lambda^{m-k} \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2 = g(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$E_1^t = E_1 + tg \quad \text{and} \quad E_2^t = E_1^{\sim n} + tg \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The polynomial E_1^t has degree at most n . We also have, for all $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (E_2^t)^{\sim n}(\lambda) &= (E_1^{\sim n} + tg)^{\sim n}(\lambda) \\ (6.25) \quad &= (E_1^{\sim n})^{\sim n}(\lambda) + (tg)^{\sim n}(\lambda) = (E_1^t + tg)(\lambda) = E_1^t(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, on \mathbb{T} ,

$$\begin{aligned} |D|^2 - |E_1^t|^2 &= |D|^2 - |E_1 + tg|^2 \\ &= |D|^2 - (E_1 + tg)\overline{(E_1 + tg)} \\ (6.26) \quad &= |D|^2 - |E_1|^2 - t^2|g|^2 - 2\operatorname{Re}(tg\overline{E_1}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\|E_1\|_\infty$ denote the supremum of $|E_1|$ on \mathbb{T} . Then, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}(tg(\lambda)\overline{E_1}(\lambda)) \leq |tg(\lambda)E_1(\lambda)| &= |tE_1(\lambda)| \left| \overline{\tau_1} \dots \overline{\tau_k} \lambda^{m-k} \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2 \right| \\ &= |tE_1(\lambda)| \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \\ (6.27) \quad &\leq |t| \|E_1\|_\infty \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|g(\lambda)|^2 = \left| \overline{\tau_1} \dots \overline{\tau_k} \lambda^{m-k} \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2 \right|^2 = \left| \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2 \right|^2.$$

Combine equations (6.24) and (6.26) and inequality (6.27), for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1^t(\lambda)|^2 \\
= & |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1(\lambda)|^2 - |t|^2 |g(\lambda)|^2 - 2\operatorname{Re}(tg(\lambda)\overline{E_1}(\lambda)), \quad (\text{by equation (6.26)}) \\
= & r \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^n |\lambda - \alpha_j|^2 - |t|^2 |g(\lambda)|^2 - 2\operatorname{Re}(tg(\lambda)\overline{E_1}(\lambda)), \quad (\text{by equation (6.24)}) \\
\geq & r \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^n |\lambda - \alpha_j|^2 - |t|^2 |g(\lambda)|^2 - 2|t| \|E_1\|_\infty \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2, \quad (\text{by inequality (6.27)}) \\
= & \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 r \prod_{j=k+1}^n |Q_{\alpha_j}(\lambda)| - |t|^2 \left| \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \right|^2 - 2|t| \|E_1\|_\infty \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \\
\geq & \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \left\{ rM - \left(|t|^2 \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 + 2|t| \|E_1\|_\infty \right) \right\} \\
\geq & \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \left\{ rM - |t| (|t| \|g\|_\infty + 2\|E_1\|_\infty) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $M = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{T}} \prod_{j=k+1}^n |Q_{\alpha_j}(\lambda)| > 0$.

Let us show that, for $|t|$ sufficiently small, $|D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1^t(\lambda)|^2 \geq 0$ on \mathbb{T} . It suffices to find $|t|$ such that

$$rM - |t| (|t| \|g\|_\infty + 2\|E_1\|_\infty) > 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$|t| \left(|t| + 2 \frac{\|E_1\|_\infty}{\|g\|_\infty} \right) - \frac{rM}{\|g\|_\infty} < 0.$$

If we take $|t| \leq \min \left\{ \frac{2\|E_1\|_\infty}{\|g\|_\infty}, \frac{rM}{8\|E_1\|_\infty} \right\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
|t| \left(|t| + 2 \frac{\|E_1\|_\infty}{\|g\|_\infty} \right) - \frac{rM}{\|g\|_\infty} & \leq |t| \left(2 \frac{\|E_1\|_\infty}{\|g\|_\infty} + 2 \frac{\|E_1\|_\infty}{\|g\|_\infty} \right) - \frac{rM}{\|g\|_\infty} \\
& \leq \frac{rM}{8\|E_1\|_\infty} \left(4 \frac{\|E_1\|_\infty}{\|g\|_\infty} \right) - \frac{rM}{\|g\|_\infty} \\
(6.28) \qquad \qquad \qquad & = \frac{rM}{2\|g\|_\infty} - \frac{rM}{\|g\|_\infty} = -\frac{rM}{2\|g\|_\infty} < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$|D|^2 - |E_1^t|^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T},$$

and, by Theorem 5.17, the functions

$$x_{+t} = \left(\frac{E_1^{+t}}{D}, \frac{E_2^{+t}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad x_{-t} = \left(\frac{E_1^{-t}}{D}, \frac{E_2^{-t}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right)$$

are rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function. Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}x_{+t} + \frac{1}{2}x_{-t} &= \left(\frac{E_1^{+t} + E_1^{-t}}{2D}, \frac{E_2^{+t} + E_2^{-t}}{2D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{E_1 + tg + E_1 - tg}{2D}, \frac{E_1^{\sim n} + tg + E_1^{\sim n} - tg}{2D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_1^{\sim n}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right) = x. \end{aligned}$$

Hence x is not an extreme point of \mathcal{J} .

If n is odd, assume $n = 2m + 1$. This case requires a slight modification. By assumption, $2k \leq n$ thus $2k \leq 2m + 1$. This implies that $k \leq m$. Choose $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$\omega^2 = -\bar{\tau}_1 \prod_{j=1}^k \bar{\tau}_j^2.$$

Let

$$g(\lambda) = \omega \lambda^{m-k} (\lambda - \tau_1) \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Clearly, the polynomial g has degree $m+k+1 \leq n$. Let us check that the g is n -symmetric

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\sim n}(\lambda) &= \lambda^n \overline{g(1/\bar{\lambda})} = \lambda^n \overline{\left(\omega \frac{1}{\lambda^{m-k}} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \tau_1 \right) \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \tau_j \right)^2 \right)} \\ &= \lambda^n \left(\bar{\omega} \frac{1}{\lambda^{m-k}} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \bar{\tau}_1 \right) \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \bar{\tau}_j \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \bar{\omega} \lambda^{m-k} \bar{\tau}_1 (\tau_1 - \lambda) \prod_{j=1}^k \bar{\tau}_j^2 (\tau_j - \lambda)^2 \\ &= \bar{\omega} \left(-\bar{\tau}_1 \prod_{j=1}^k \bar{\tau}_j^2 \right) \lambda^{m-k} (\lambda - \tau_1) \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2 \\ &= \bar{\omega} \omega^2 \lambda^{m-k} (\lambda - \tau_1) \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2 \\ &= \omega \lambda^{m-k} (\lambda - \tau_1) \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2 = g(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

As in the even case, define the polynomials on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$

$$E_1^t = E_1 + tg \quad \text{and} \quad E_2^t = E_1^{\sim n} + tg \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Similar to equation (6.25), for all $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, $E_1^t(\lambda) = (E_2^t)^{\sim n}(\lambda)$ and similar to equation (6.26), for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$(6.29) \quad |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1^t(\lambda)|^2 = |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1(\lambda)|^2 - t^2 |g(\lambda)|^2 - 2\operatorname{Re}(tg(\lambda) \overline{E_1(\lambda)}).$$

For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}(tg\overline{E_1(\lambda)}) \leq |tgE_1(\lambda)| &= |tE_1(\lambda)| \left| \omega \lambda^{m-k} (\lambda - \tau_1) \prod_{j=1}^k (\lambda - \tau_j)^2 \right| \\ &\leq |t| \|E_1\|_\infty |\lambda - \tau_1| \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combine equations (6.24), (6.29) and inequality (6.30) to obtain, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1^t(\lambda)|^2 \\ &= |D(\lambda)|^2 - |E_1(\lambda)|^2 - |t|^2 |g(\lambda)|^2 - 2\operatorname{Re}(tg(\lambda)\overline{E_1(\lambda)}) \\ &= r \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^n |\lambda - \alpha_j|^2 - |t|^2 |g(\lambda)|^2 - 2\operatorname{Re}(tg(\lambda)\overline{E_1(\lambda)}), \text{ by equation (6.24)} \\ &\geq r \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^n |\lambda - \alpha_j|^2 - |t|^2 |g(\lambda)|^2 - 2|t| \|E_1\|_\infty |\lambda - \tau_1| \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2, \text{ by inequality(6.30)} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 r \prod_{j=k+1}^n |Q_{\alpha_j}(\lambda)| - |t|^2 |\lambda - \tau_1|^2 \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^4 - 2|t| \|E_1\|_\infty |\lambda - \tau_1| \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \\ &\geq \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \left\{ rM - \underbrace{|\lambda - \tau_1|}_{\leq 2} \left(\underbrace{|t|^2 |\lambda - \tau_1| \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 + 2|t| \|E_1\|_\infty}_{\leq |t|^2 \|g\|_\infty} \right) \right\} \\ &\geq \prod_{j=1}^k |\lambda - \tau_j|^2 \left\{ rM - 2(|t|^2 \|g\|_\infty + 2|t| \|E_1\|_\infty) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where $M = \inf_{\mathbb{T}} \prod |Q_{\alpha_j}| > 0$. By similar arguments as in equations (6.28), one can find $|t|$ such that

$$rM - 2(|t|^2 \|g\|_\infty + 2|t| \|E_1\|_\infty) > 0$$

Therefore,

$$|D|^2 - |E_1^t|^2 \geq 0, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 5.17, the functions

$$x_{\pm t} = \left(\frac{E_1^{\pm t}}{D}, \frac{(E_1^{\sim n})^{\pm t}}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} \right)$$

are rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. One can check that $x = \frac{1}{2}x_{+t} + \frac{1}{2}x_{-t}$ and therefore x is not an extreme point of \mathcal{J} .

Theorem 6.20. [5, Theorem 5.13] *A rational Γ -inner function $h \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma^{n,k}$ is extreme in the set of rational Γ -inner functions if and only if $2k > n$.*

Proposition 6.21. *Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$ be a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function such that $x_1 = x_2$ and $2k > n$. Then x is an extreme point of the set \mathcal{J} of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.8 (1), the function $h = (s, p) = (2x_1, x_3)$ is Γ -inner. By Theorem 4.15, there are polynomials E_1, E_2, D such that $x = (\frac{E_1}{D}, \frac{E_2}{D}, \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D})$. Here, since $x_1 = x_2$, necessarily $E_1 = E_2$. By Definition 3.7, the royal polynomial R_h of h is

$$\begin{aligned} R_h(\lambda) &= D^2(\lambda) \left(4x_3 - 4x_1^2 \right) (\lambda) \\ &= D^2(\lambda) \left(4 \frac{D^{\sim n}}{D} - 4 \frac{E_1^2}{D^2} \right) (\lambda) \\ &= 4(DD^{\sim n} - E_1^2)(\lambda) = 4R_x(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that if $x \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$, then h has degree n and k royal nodes on \mathbb{T} , counted with multiplicities, such that $2k > n$. Thus, by Theorem 6.20, h is an extreme point of the set of rational Γ -inner functions. That is, if $h^1 = (s^1, p^1)$ and $h^2 = (s^2, p^2)$ are Γ -inner functions such that

$$h = th^1 + (1-t)h^2 \quad \text{for some } t \in (0, 1),$$

then $h = h^1 = h^2$. Note that, in this case, we have

$$(6.30) \quad \begin{cases} s = ts^1 + (1-t)s^2 & \Rightarrow s = s^1 = s^2 \\ p = tp^1 + (1-t)p^2 & \Rightarrow p = p^1 = p^2. \end{cases}$$

Suppose

$$x = tx^1 + (1-t)x^2, \quad \text{for some } t \in (0, 1)$$

and for rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions $x^1 = (x_1^1, x_2^1, x_3^1)$ and $x^2 = (x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2)$. This implies that

$$\begin{cases} x_1 = tx_1^1 + (1-t)x_1^2 \\ x_2 = tx_2^1 + (1-t)x_2^2 \\ x_3 = p = tx_3^1 + (1-t)x_3^2. \end{cases}$$

Recall that $(s, p) = (2x_1, x_3)$, hence

$$(6.31) \quad \begin{cases} s = 2tx_1^1 + 2(1-t)x_1^2 \\ s = 2tx_2^1 + 2(1-t)x_2^2 \\ p = tx_3^1 + (1-t)x_3^2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$(s, p) = t(2x_1^1, x_3^1) + (1-t)(2x_1^2, x_3^2)$$

and

$$(s, p) = t(2x_2^1, x_3^1) + (1-t)(2x_2^2, x_3^2).$$

Since h is an extreme rational Γ -inner function, we have

$$\begin{cases} 2x_1^1 = 2x_1^2 = s \\ 2x_2^1 = 2x_2^2 = s \\ x_3^1 = x_3^2 = p. \end{cases}$$

Therefore $x = x^1 = x^2$. Hence x is extreme in the set \mathcal{J} .

Remark 6.22. It is not clear that a rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner function $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{R}^{n,k}$ such that $2k > n$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$, is an extreme point of the set \mathcal{J} of rational $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$ -inner functions. Could we claim that in Lemma 6.16, if $\tau_i \in \mathbb{T}$ is a royal node of x of multiplicity ν , then τ_i is a royal node of x^1 and x^2 of the same multiplicity ν ? Here

$x = tx^1 + (1 - t)x^2$ for some t such that $0 < t < 1$. If so then x is an extreme point of \mathcal{J} if and only if $2k > n$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. A. Abouhajar, M. C. White and N. J. Young, A Schwarz lemma for a domain related to μ -synthesis, *J. Geom. Anal.* **17** (2007) 717–750.
- [2] J. Agler and N. J. Young, A commutant lifting theorem for a domain in \mathbb{C}^2 and spectral interpolation, *J. Funct. Anal.* **161** (1999) 452–477.
- [3] J. Agler, Z. A. Lykova and N. J. Young, Extremal holomorphic maps and the symmetrized bidisc, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **106** (4) (2013) 781–818.
- [4] J. Agler, Z. A. Lykova and N. J. Young, The complex geometry of a domain related to μ -synthesis. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **422** (1) (2015) 508–543.
- [5] J. Agler, Z. A. Lykova and N. J. Young, Algebraic and geometric aspects of rational Γ -inner functions. *Adv. Math.* **328** (2018) 133–159.
- [6] L. V. Ahlfors. *Complex analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1978.
- [7] J. A. Ball and H. Sau. Rational dilation of tetrablock contractions revisited. *J. Funct. Anal.* **278** (1) (2020) 108275.
- [8] T. Bhattacharyya. The tetrablock as a spectral set. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **63** (6) (2014) 1601–1629.
- [9] D. C. Brown, Z. A. Lykova and N. J. Young. A rich structure related to the construction of analytic matrix functions. *J. Funct. Anal.* **272** (4) (2017) 1704–1754.
- [10] C. Carathéodory, Über den Variabilitätsbereich der Fourierschen Konstanten von positiven harmonischen Funktionen, *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo* **32** (1911) 193–217, doi:10.1007/BF03014795.
- [11] I. Chalendar, P. Gorkin and J. R. Partington, Inner functions and operator theory. *North-Western European J. of Math.* **1** (2015) 9–28.
- [12] J. C. Doyle, Analysis of feedback systems with structured uncertainties. *IEE Proceedings* **129** (6) (1982) 242–250.
- [13] G. Dullerud and F. Paganini, *A course in robust control theory: a convex approach*, Texts in Applied Mathematics **36**, Springer, 2000.
- [14] A. Edigarian, L. Kosiński and W. Zwonek, The Lempert theorem and the tetrablock. *J. Geom. Anal.* **23** (4) (2013) 1818–1831.
- [15] L. Kosiński and W. Zwonek, Extremal holomorphic maps in special classes of domains, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Scienze* **16** (1) (2016) 159–182.
- [16] L. Kosiński and W. Zwonek, Nevanlinna-Pick problem and uniqueness of left inverses in convex domains, symmetrized bidisc and tetrablock, *J. Geom. Anal.* **26** (2016) 1863–1890.
- [17] F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy. *Functional Analysis*. Dover, New York, 1990.
- [18] E. Steinitz, Bedingt konvergente Reihen und konvexe Systeme, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **143** (1913) 128–175.
- [19] N. J. Young, The automorphism group of the tetrablock, *J. London Math. Soc.* **77** (2) (2008) 757–770.

OMAR M. O. ALSALHI, Alleith University College, Umm-Alqura University, Al-Leith, Saudi Arabia; e-mail: omsalhi@uqu.edu.sa

ZINAIDA A. LYKOVA, School of Mathematics, Statistics and Physics, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, U.K.; e-mail: Zinaida.Lykova@newcastle.ac.uk