

Characterization of Matrix K -Positivity Preserver for $K = \mathbb{R}^n$ and for Compact Sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$

Philipp J. di Dio^{1,a,b,c} and Lars-Luca Langer^{2,a,c}

^a*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Konstanz, Universitätsstraße 10, D-78464 Konstanz, Germany*

^b*Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Konstanz, Universitätstraße 10, D-78464 Konstanz, Germany*

^c*Zukunftscolleg, University of Konstanz, Universitätsstraße 10, D-78464 Konstanz, Germany*

Abstract

For any closed $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, in [P. J. di Dio, K. Schmüdgen: *K -Positivity Preserver and their Generators*, SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom. **9** (2025), 794–824] all K -positivity preserver have been characterized, i.e., all linear maps $T : \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that $Tp \geq 0$ on K for all $p \geq 0$ on K . An important extension of polynomials $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with real coefficients are polynomials $\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with matrix coefficients. Non-negativity on K for matrix polynomials with Hermitian coefficients Herm_m is then $p(x) \succeq 0$ for all $x \in K$. In the current work, we investigate linear maps $T : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. We focus on matrix K -positivity preserver, i.e., $Tp \succeq 0$ on K for all $p \succeq 0$ on K . For $K = \mathbb{R}^n$ and compact sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we give characterizations of matrix K -positivity preservers. We discuss the difference between the real and the matrix coefficient case and where our proof fails for general sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with $K \neq \mathbb{R}^n$ and K non-compact.

Keywords: linear operators, positivity preserver, generator, moments

2020 MSC: Primary 44A60, 47A57; Secondary 47B38, 60E07.

1. Introduction

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and denote by $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ the set of polynomials in n variables with real coefficients. Let $T : \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be linear. It is long known that every T has a unique representation

$$T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} q_\alpha \cdot \partial^\alpha \quad (1)$$

¹Corresponding author, email: philipp.didio@uni-konstanz.de

²Email: lars-luca.langer@uni-konstanz.de

with unique $q_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, see e.g. [Net10, Lem. 2.3]. If $Tp \geq 0$ on $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ for any $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with $p \geq 0$ on K , then T is said to be a K -positivity preserver. K -positivity preservers were characterized in [Bor11, Thm. 3.1] for $K = \mathbb{R}^n$ and in [dDS25, Thm. 3.5] for all closed $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. The aim of this work is to extend these characterization to linear operators on matrix polynomials $\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

This paper is structured as follows. In the next section (Section 2) we collect preliminaries which are needed to prove the main results to make the paper as self contained as possible. In Section 3 we give a characterization of linear operators

$$T : V[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

similar to (1). In Section 4 we give our main result (Theorem 4.2) which is a generalization of [Bor11, Thm. 3.1] to the polynomial matrix case. In Example 4.3 we will explain the problem of writing the coefficients Q_α from Lemma 3.1 as moment sequences. In Section 5 we restrict ourselves to compact sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ where these problems do not occur.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Hermitian Matrices

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\text{Herm}_m \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ be the set of all $m \times m$ Hermitian matrices, let $\text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the set of all polynomials in n variables x_1, \dots, x_n with Hermitian matrix coefficients, and denote by $\text{Herm}_{m,+}$ the subset of positive semi-definite matrices. The set $\text{Herm}_{m,+} \subseteq \text{Herm}_m$ is a full-dimensional convex cone and hence every $M \in \text{Herm}_m$ can be written as $M = M^+ - M^-$ with $M^+, M^- \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$. A matrix polynomial $P \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is positive on $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, written $P \succeq 0$ on K , if $P(x) \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$ for all $x \in K$. We define

$$\text{Pos}(K) := \{P \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \mid P(x) \succeq 0 \text{ for all } x \in K\}.$$

The space of Hermitian matrices is a finite-dimensional real Hilbert space, see e.g. [MS24, Sect. 2]. Let $E_{k,l} := (\delta_{i,k} \cdot \delta_{j,l})_{i,j=1}^m$ where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta function. Then, for $k, l = 1, \dots, m$, the

$$H_{k,l} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_{k,l} + E_{l,k}) & \text{for } k < l, \\ E_{k,k} & \text{for } k = l, \\ \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(E_{k,l} - E_{l,k}) & \text{for } k > l. \end{cases}$$

form an orthonormal basis of Herm_m . The inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on Herm_m is given by

$$\langle A, B \rangle := \text{tr}(A^* B) = \text{tr}(AB) \in \mathbb{R}$$

for all $A, B \in \text{Herm}_m$. Positive semi-definiteness can be characterized by the following.

Lemma 2.1 (see e.g. [Sch17, Prop. A.21]). *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $M \in \text{Herm}_m$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M \succeq 0$.
- (ii) $\langle M, X \rangle \geq 0$ for all $X \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$.

2.2. Hermitian Matrix Valued Measures

Definition 2.2. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a measurable space. We say μ is a *matrix-valued measure* on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ if

$$\mu = (\mu_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\dots,m}$$

for some finite signed complex measures $\mu_{i,j}$ on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $\mu(S) \in \text{Herm}_m$ for all $S \in \mathcal{A}$. A matrix-valued measure μ is called *positive* if $\mu(S) \in \text{Herm}_+$ for all $S \in \mathcal{A}$.

The definition of positive matrix-valued measures coincides with the definition of positive operator-valued measures from [CZ13, Rem. 2] and [Ber09, Def. 1]. Integrals with respect to these measures are defined in the following way.

Definition 2.3. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed, $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and let μ be a matrix-valued measure. We define the integral

$$\int_K \langle p(x), d\mu(x) \rangle := \sum_{i,j=1}^m \int_K p_{i,j}(x) d\mu'_{i,j}(x) \in \mathbb{R}$$

with $p_{i,j} = \langle p, H_{i,j} \rangle \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mu'_{i,j} = \langle \mu, H_{i,j} \rangle$ a signed measure.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A = (a_{k,l})_{k,l=1}^m \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$. Then

$$|a_{k,l}|^2 \leq a_{k,k} \cdot a_{l,l} \leq \text{tr}(A)^2$$

for all $k, l = 1, \dots, m$. This extends to positive matrix-valued measures.

Lemma 2.4 (see [Sch87, Lem. 1.1]). *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathcal{X} be a locally compact Hausdorff space equipped with some σ -algebra \mathcal{A} . Let μ on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a positive matrix-valued measure with components $\mu_{i,j}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, m$. We define the trace measure $\text{tr}(\mu)$ by*

$$\text{tr}(\mu) := \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,i}.$$

Then $\text{tr}(\mu)$ is a real-valued positive measure and $\mu_{i,j} \ll \text{tr}(\mu)$, i.e., $\mu_{i,j}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\text{tr}(\mu)$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, m$.

Remark 2.5 (see [Sch87, Lem. 1.1 and 1.2], [MS24, Section 2]). Using the Radon–Nikodym derivative

$$\varphi_{i,j} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi_{i,j} := \frac{d\mu_{i,j}}{d\text{tr}(\mu)},$$

for positive matrix-valued measures μ , the integral from Definition 2.3 becomes

$$\int_K \langle p(x), d\mu(x) \rangle = \int_K \langle p(x), \rho(x) \rangle \, d\text{tr}(\mu)(x)$$

where

$$\rho : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{m \times m} \quad \text{with} \quad \rho(x) := \sum_{i,j=1}^m \varphi_{i,j}(x) E_{i,j}$$

is positive semi-definite and Hermitian $\text{tr}(\mu)$ -almost everywhere. Hence,

$$\int_K \langle p(x), d\mu(x) \rangle \geq 0$$

for positive matrix-valued measures μ and $p \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. \circ

Another useful property of the integral from Definition 2.3 is the following.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed. Let μ be a matrix-valued measure on K . Let $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_m$. Then*

$$\int_K \langle M \cdot p(x), d\mu(x) \rangle = \left\langle \int_K p(x) \, d\mu(x), M \right\rangle.$$

Proof. By $\mu = \sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{i,j} \cdot \mu'_{i,j}$ with $\mu'_{i,j} := \langle \mu, H_{i,j} \rangle$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K \langle Mp(x), d\mu(x) \rangle &= \sum_{i,j=1}^m \int_K \langle Mp(x), H_{i,j} \rangle \, d\langle \mu, H_{i,j} \rangle(x) \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^m \langle M, H_{i,j} \rangle \int_K p(x) \, d\mu'_{i,j}(x) \\ &= \left\langle M, \sum_{i,j=1}^m \int_K p(x) \, d\mu'_{i,j}(x) H_{i,j} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle M, \int_K p(x) \, d\mu(x) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We will use the following matrix version of Haviland's Theorem.

Theorem 2.7 (see [CZ13, Thm. 3]). *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed, and let*

$$L : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a linear functional. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) *L is a K -moment functional, i.e., there exists a positive matrix-valued measure μ on K such that*

$$L(p) = \int_K \langle p(x), d\mu(x) \rangle$$

for all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

(ii) $L(p) \geq 0$ for all $p \in \text{Pos}(K)$.

The proof of Theorem 2.7 in [CZ13] is analog to the proof of Haviland's theorem. Using the M. Riesz Extension Theorem, the functional L can be extended to a space containing continuous functions with compact support and by a version of the Riesz–Markov–Kakutani Theorem, this gives a suitable measure. The difference to the case with real coefficients is, that for Hermitian matrix coefficients the spaces will be tensor products. $\text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for example, can be written as a tensor product $\text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] = \text{Herm}_m \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. We will look deeper into the theory behind this in Section 2.3.

If we not only work with

$$L : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

but with

$$L : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m$$

in Section 5, then we need the following.

Theorem 2.8 (see [CZ13, Thm. 4 and 5]). *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be compact, and let*

$$L : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m$$

be linear. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) L preserves positivity on K , i.e., $L(\text{Pos}(K)) \succeq 0$.
- (ii) There exists a unique positive Borel operator-valued measure

$$\mu : \mathfrak{B}(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{Herm}_m, \text{Herm}_m)$$

on K such that

$$L(p) = \int_K p(x) \, d\mu(x)$$

for all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

In the next subsection we want to discuss the M. Riesz Extension Theorem on tensor products such as the polynomial matrices

$$\text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] = \text{Herm}_m \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n],$$

which is used to prove Theorem 2.7 in [CZ13]. The authors of [CZ13] use cone extensions on tensor products but only shortly mention the details. Hence, because of the importance of the result, we want to look at it in more detail.

2.3. Convex Cones on Tensor Products

Definition 2.9. Let V_1, V_2 be two real vector spaces and let $C_1 \subseteq V_1, C_2 \subseteq V_2$ be two convex cones. Define the *minimal tensor product* as

$$C_1 \otimes C_2 = \text{conv} \{c_1 \otimes c_2 \mid c_1 \in C_1, c_2 \in C_2\}.$$

The tensor product of convex cones $C_1 \otimes C_2$ then gives a convex cone in the tensor product of the overlying vector spaces $V_1 \otimes V_2$. Then

$$\text{Herm}_{m,+} \subseteq \text{Herm}_m \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+ \subseteq \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

are convex cones. Hence,

$$\text{Herm}_{m,+} \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+$$

is a convex cone in

$$\text{Herm}_m \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n] = \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n].$$

Then

$$\text{Herm}_{m,+} \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+ \subseteq \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

For the M. Riesz Extension Theorem, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.10. Let V, F be real vector spaces and let $C \subseteq F$ be a convex cone. Let $E \subseteq F$ be a linear subspace with $F = E + C$ and let $V_+ \subseteq V$ be a full-dimensional cone. Then

$$V \otimes F = (V \otimes E) + (V_+ \otimes C).$$

Proof. Since $V_+ \subseteq V$ is a full-dimensional cone, there exists a basis $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ of V for some Index set I such that $M_i \in V_+$ for all $i \in I$. Now let $f \in V \otimes F$. Then there exist

$$k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \widetilde{M}_1, \dots, \widetilde{M}_k \in \{M_i\}_{i \in I}, \quad \text{and} \quad f_1, \dots, f_k \in F$$

such that

$$f = \widetilde{M}_1 \otimes f_1 + \dots + \widetilde{M}_k \otimes f_k.$$

Now, for $f_1, \dots, f_k \in F$, there exist $e_1, \dots, e_k \in E$ and $c_1, \dots, c_k \in C$ such that

$$f_i = e_i + c_i$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \widetilde{M}_1 \otimes f_1 + \dots + \widetilde{M}_k \otimes f_k \\ &= \widetilde{M}_1 \otimes e_1 + \dots + \widetilde{M}_k \otimes e_k + \widetilde{M}_1 \otimes c_1 + \dots + \widetilde{M}_k \otimes c_k \\ &\in V \otimes E + V_+ \otimes C. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f \in V \otimes F$ was chosen arbitrarily,

$$V \otimes F \subseteq V \otimes E + V_+ \otimes C.$$

The reverse inclusion holds trivially, since $V_+ \subseteq V$ and $E, C \subseteq F$. Therefore,

$$V \otimes F = (V \otimes E) + (V_+ \otimes C).$$

□

Note that this lemma states that if $E \subseteq F$ is a cofinal subspace and $V_+ \subseteq V$ is full-dimensional, then $V \otimes E$ is cofinal in $V \otimes F$ with positivity cone $V_+ \otimes F_+$. The *M. Riesz Extension Theorem* now states that every linear functional

$$L : V \otimes E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

which is positive on $(V \otimes E) \cap (V_+ \otimes F_+)$ can be extended to a linear functional

$$\tilde{L} : V \otimes F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

which is positive on $V_+ \otimes F_+$.

Returning to the polynomial matrix case, let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and define

$$F := \{f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \exists p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n] : |f| \leq p \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

as well as

$$F_+ := \{f \in F \mid f \geq 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

Then the continuous functions with compact support $\mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are contained in F and

$$F = \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n] + F_+.$$

By Lemma 2.10,

$$\text{Herm}_m \otimes F = (\text{Herm}_m \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]) + (\text{Herm}_{m,+} \otimes F_+).$$

Notice that

$$\text{Herm}_{m,+} \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+ \subseteq (\text{Herm}_m \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]) \cap (\text{Herm}_{m,+} \otimes F_+)$$

as well as

$$(\text{Herm}_m \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]) \cap (\text{Herm}_{m,+} \otimes F_+) \subseteq \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

The latter is simply because elements $P \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] = \text{Herm}_m \otimes \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ are matrices with polynomials as entries and elements $f \in \text{Herm}_{m,+} \otimes F_+$ are positive semi-definite at every point on \mathbb{R}^n . Hence, every function in the intersection is a polynomial matrix which is positive semi-definite on \mathbb{R}^n , which is exactly the definition of $\text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Now every linear functional

$$L : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that L is positive on $\text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ can be extended to a linear functional

$$\tilde{L} : \text{Herm}_m \otimes F$$

such that \tilde{L} is positive on $\text{Herm}_{m,+} \otimes F_+$. With $\mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq F$ and by (a version of) the Riesz–Markov–Kakutani Theorem, there exists a measure which represents \tilde{L} . This is how Theorem 2.7 is proven in [CZ13].

3. The Canonical Representation of Linear Operators on Matrix Polynomials

At first we give an extension of the canonical representation (1) to any linear operator $T : V[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for an arbitrary real vector space V .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let V be a real vector space. Let*

$$T : V[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

be a linear operator, i.e., $T(af + g) = a \cdot Tf + Tg$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f, g \in V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, there exist unique linear operators

$$Q_\alpha : V \rightarrow V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

such that

$$T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot Q_\alpha \times \partial^\alpha \quad \text{with} \quad (Q_\alpha \times \partial^\alpha)(v \cdot x^\beta) := Q_\alpha(v) \cdot \partial^\alpha x^\beta \quad (2)$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and $v \in V$.

The representation (2) is called *canonical representation*. The proof is a straight-forward extension of the proof in [Net10, Lem. 2.3].

Proof. We will prove Lemma 3.1 using induction over $d = |\alpha| \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$T(vx^\beta) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot (Q_\alpha \times \partial^\alpha)(vx^\beta) = \sum_{\alpha \preceq \beta} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} \cdot Q_\alpha(v) \cdot x^{\beta-\alpha} \quad (3)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ with $|\beta| \leq d$ and $v \in V$.

$d = 0$: For $\beta = 0$, clearly,

$$Q_0 : V \rightarrow V[x_1, \dots, x_n], \quad v \mapsto Q_0(v) := T(v \cdot 1)$$

is the unique linear Q_0 in (3).

$d \rightarrow d + 1$: Assume, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ with $|\alpha| \leq d$, there exist unique linear $Q_\alpha : V \rightarrow V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ in (3), i.e., for all $|\beta| \leq d$. Now let $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ with $|\gamma| = d + 1$. According to (3), we require $Q_\gamma : V \rightarrow V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ to fulfill

$$T(vx^\gamma) = Q_\gamma(v) + \sum_{\substack{\alpha \preceq \gamma \\ \alpha \neq \gamma}} \binom{\gamma}{\alpha} \cdot Q_\alpha(v) \cdot x^{\gamma-\alpha}$$

for all $v \in V$. Hence,

$$Q_\gamma : V \rightarrow V[x_1, \dots, x_n], \quad v \mapsto Q_\gamma(v) := T(vx^\gamma) - \sum_{\substack{\alpha \preceq \gamma \\ \alpha \neq \gamma}} \binom{\gamma}{\alpha} \cdot Q_\alpha(v) \cdot x^{\gamma-\alpha}$$

is unique. \square

Remark 3.2. The Q_α for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ from Lemma 3.1 are constructed recursively. Using the binomial transform, we get the explicit form

$$Q_\beta(v) = \sum_{\alpha \preceq \beta} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} \cdot (-1)^{\beta-\alpha} \cdot T(vx^\alpha) \cdot x^{\beta-\alpha}$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and $v \in V$. ○

We get the following immediate consequence.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let A be a unital algebra over \mathbb{R} , and let*

$$T : A[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

be a \mathbb{R} -linear map with

$$T(p \cdot a) = (Tp) \cdot a$$

for all $p \in A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $a \in A$. Then, for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, there exists a unique $q_\alpha \in A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that

$$T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot q_\alpha \cdot \partial^\alpha.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 and $T(p \cdot a) = (Tp) \cdot a$ for all $p \in A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $a \in A$, $Q_\alpha(a) = Q_\alpha(1 \cdot a) = Q_\alpha(1) \cdot a$ for all $a \in A$ and $q_\alpha := Q_\alpha(1) \in A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. □

The following example shows, that when $V = A$ is *not* a unital algebra, then in general the operators Q_α in Lemma 3.1 are *not* multiplication by polynomials $q_\alpha \in A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ like in Corollary 3.3. This happens already for $V = \text{Herm}_2$.

Example 3.4. Let $n = 1$ and let

$$T : \text{Herm}_2[x] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_2[x], \quad \begin{pmatrix} f & g \\ \bar{g} & h \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} h & g \\ \bar{g} & f \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $T = Q_0 \times \partial^0$, since $T(p \cdot x^k) = (Tp) \cdot x^k$ for all $p \in \text{Herm}_2[x]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. But

$$Q_0\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ \bar{b} & c \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} c & b \\ \bar{b} & a \end{pmatrix}$$

for all $a, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{C}$ implies that there exists no $q_0 \in \text{Herm}_2[x]$ such that

$$q_0 \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ \bar{b} & c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c & b \\ \bar{b} & a \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e., the Q_α are no multiplication operators as in Corollary 3.3. ○

While the previous example shows that there exist \mathbb{R} -linear maps on $\text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that the Q_α in Lemma 3.1 are not multiplication operators, the next result describes all \mathbb{R} -linear maps on $\text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ where all Q_α are multiplication operators.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let*

$$T : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

be given by

$$T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot q_\alpha \cdot \partial^\alpha$$

with $q_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. Then

$$q_\alpha = \text{id} \cdot p_\alpha$$

with $p_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and id is the $m \times m$ -identity matrix.

Proof. We prove the statement via induction over $d := |\alpha| \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Note, if $A \in \text{Herm}_m$ and $AB \in \text{Herm}_m$ for all $B \in \text{Herm}_m$, then $A = c \cdot \text{id}$ with $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

$d=0$: Since $TB = q_0 B \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all $B \in \text{Herm}_m$, $q_0 = \text{id} \cdot p_0$ with $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

$d \rightarrow d+1$: Let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ with $|\beta| = d+1$. Since

$$q_\beta B = \left(T - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n : |\alpha| \leq d} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot q_\alpha \cdot \partial^\alpha \right) (Bx^\beta) \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

for all $B \in \text{Herm}_m$, again $q_\beta = \text{id} \cdot p_\beta$ for some $p_\beta \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. \square

4. \mathbb{R}^n -Positivity Preservers on Matrix Polynomials

Before we can state and prove the main theorem of this section, we need the following.

Definition 4.1. Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot (Q_\alpha \times \partial^\alpha)$$

with linear $Q_\alpha : \text{Herm}_m \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. For $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define

$$T_y : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

by

$$T_y := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (Q_\alpha(\cdot)(y) \times \partial^\alpha),$$

i.e., $(Tp)(y) = (T_y p)(y)$ for all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Additionally, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_m$, we define

$$T_{y,M} : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n], \quad p \mapsto T_{y,M} p := \langle T_y p, M \rangle.$$

Now we state the main theorem of this section. It characterizes \mathbb{R}^n -positivity preservers of matrix polynomials similar to [Bor11, Theorem 3.1]. The main difference is that the coefficients Q_α in the canonical representation are not given as moments of a positive matrix-valued measure, but as moments of a finite signed matrix-valued measure constructed from positive matrix-valued measures.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let*

$$T : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n], \quad T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot (Q_\alpha \times \partial^\alpha)$$

be linear with linear $Q_\alpha : \text{Herm}_m \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $T\text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.
- (ii) For all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $T_y\text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.
- (iii) For all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$,

$$T_{y,M}\text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq \{f \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \mid f \geq 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

- (iv) For all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_m$, there exist matrix valued measures $\mu_{y,M}$ such that
 - (a) if $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$, then $\mu_{y,M}$ is positive,
 - (b) for all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$,

$$(T_{y,M}p)(x) = \int \langle p(x+t), d\mu_{y,M}(t) \rangle.$$

In this case, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $M \in \text{Herm}_m$,

$$Q_\beta(M)(y) = \int t^\beta d\tilde{\mu}_{y,M}(t) \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\mu}_{y,M} := \sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{i,j} \cdot \langle \mu_{y,H_{i,j}}, M \rangle. \quad (4)$$

Theorem 4.2 will be proven in the following manner. The proof of the equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) is an adapted version of the \mathbb{R} -case proof in [Bor11, Thm. 3.1]. The proof of the equivalence (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) follows from the characterization of positive semi-definiteness in Lemma 2.1. Lastly, the equivalence (iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv) will be proven in the same manner as the \mathbb{R} -case in [Bor11, Thm. 3.1], but replacing Haviland's Theorem with its matrix version Theorem 2.7.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): For all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, T_y commutes with the shift operator, i.e.,

$$T_y \circ e^{a \cdot \nabla} = e^{a \cdot \nabla} \circ T_y$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the shift operator $e^{a \cdot \nabla}$ preserves \mathbb{R}^n -positivity. Consequently, (i) implies

$$\begin{aligned}(T_y p)(a) &= (T_y p)(y + (a - y)) \\ &= \left(e^{(a-y)\nabla} T_y p \right)(y) \\ &= \left(T_y e^{(a-y)\nabla} p \right)(y) \\ &= \left(T e^{(a-y)\nabla} p \right)(y) \succeq 0\end{aligned}$$

for all $a, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $p \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Hence, (ii) is proven.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): For all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $p \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have $(Tp)(y) = (T_y p)(y) \succeq 0$.

(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii): This is Lemma 2.1.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$. Define

$$L_{y,M} : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad p \mapsto L_{y,M}(p) := (T_{y,M} p)(0).$$

Hence, by (iii), $L_{y,M}(p) \geq 0$ for all $p \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and therefore, by Theorem 2.7, $L_{y,M}$ is a moment functional and there exists a positive matrix-valued measure $\mu_{y,M}$ such that

$$L_{y,M}(p) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle p(t), d\mu_{y,M}(t) \rangle$$

for all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Additionally,

$$(T_{y,M} p)(x) = [(e^{x \cdot \nabla} T_{y,M}) p](0) = [(T_{y,M} e^{x \cdot \nabla}) p](0) = L_{y,M}(e^{x \cdot \nabla} p)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, i.e.,

$$(T_{y,M} p)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle p(x+t), d\mu_{y,M}(t) \rangle \tag{5}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$, and $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Since $\text{Herm}_{m,+} \subseteq \text{Herm}_m$ is full dimensional and by linearity of $T_{y,M}$ in M (Definition 4.1), for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_m$, there exists a matrix-valued measure $\mu_{y,M}$ in equation (5). $\mu_{y,M}$ is positive for $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$.

Now let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. then, by Lemma 2.6,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x+t)^\beta d\mu_{y,M_1}(t), M_2 \right\rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle M_2 \cdot (x+t)^\beta, d\mu_{y,M_1}(t) \rangle \\ &= T_{y,M_1}(M_2 \cdot x^\beta) \\ &= \langle T_y(M_2 \cdot x^\beta), M_1 \rangle\end{aligned}$$

for all $M_1, M_2 \in \text{Herm}_m$. Hence,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{i,j} \cdot \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x+t)^\beta d\mu_{y,H_{i,j}}(t), M \right\rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{i,j} \cdot \langle T_y(M \cdot x^\beta), H_{i,j} \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= T_y(M \cdot x^\beta) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha \preceq \beta} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} \cdot Q_\alpha(M)(y) \cdot x^{\beta-\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $M \in \text{Herm}_m$. With $x = 0$, it follows that

$$Q_\beta(M)(y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{i,j} \cdot \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} t^\beta \, d\mu_{y,H_{i,j}}(t), M \right\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} t^\beta \, d\tilde{\mu}_{y,M}(t)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $M \in \text{Herm}_m$ with $\tilde{\mu}_{y,M}$ from (4).

(iv) \Rightarrow (iii): Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$. By (iv), there exists a positive matrix-valued measure $\mu_{y,M}$ with

$$(T_{y,M}p)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle p(x+t), d\mu_{y,M}(t) \rangle$$

for all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Let $p \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, by Remark 2.5,

$$(T_{y,M}p)(x) \geq 0$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$ which proves (iii). \square

The condition (iv) of Theorem 4.2 allows Q_α to be written as moments of a measure $\tilde{\mu}_{y,M}$, i.e.,

$$Q_\beta(M)(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} t^\beta \, d\tilde{\mu}_{y,M}(t)$$

for $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, $M \in \text{Herm}_m$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The measure $\tilde{\mu}_{y,M}$ on $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ is a finite signed matrix-valued measure but was not proven to be positive. Problems can arise due to indeterminacy of the underlying moment problems.

Example 4.3. Let

$$f(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(0,\infty)}(x) \cdot \frac{1}{x} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}\log(x)^2}$$

be the density of the log-normal distribution. Then

$$\int_0^\infty x^n \cdot f(x) \, dx = e^{\frac{1}{2}n^2}$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty x^n \cdot \sin(2\pi \log(x)) \cdot f(x) \, dx = 0$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The measures $\mu_{y,M}$ in Theorem 4.2 (iv) are not required to fulfill any linearity conditions like

$$\mu_{y,A+B} = \mu_{y,A} + \mu_{y,B} \quad \text{or} \quad \mu_{y,\lambda A} = \lambda \mu_{y,A}$$

for $A, B \in \text{Herm}_m$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. The values of these measures can differ on non-compact sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, where the polynomials can not approximate the indicator functions $\mathbf{1}_K$. The proof (iii) \Rightarrow (iv) of Theorem 4.2 can not preserve such information in cases of indeterminacy. Hence, let $m = 2$ and define

$$d\mu_{y,M}(x) := M f(x) dx$$

for $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_2$. The measure $\mu_{y,M}$ is a positive matrix-valued measure for all $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$. Let

$$X := H_{1,2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and define

$$\nu_{y,M} := \begin{cases} \mu_{y,M} & \text{for } M \neq X, \\ \mu_{y,X} + X \cdot 10 \sin(2\pi \log x) \cdot f(x) dx & \text{for } M = X \end{cases}$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_2$.

Then $\mu_{y,M}$ and $\nu_{y,M}$ are both positive matrix-valued measures for $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Both measures give rise to the same operators $T_{y,M}$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_2$, but

$$\tilde{\nu}_{y,M} := \sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{i,j} \cdot \langle \nu_{y,H_{i,j}}, M \rangle$$

is not a positive matrix-valued measure for all $M \in \text{Herm}_{2,+}$. This is because, for

$$Z := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{Herm}_{m,+},$$

it holds that

$$d\tilde{\nu}_{y,Z}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 + 10 \cdot \sin(2\pi \log x) \\ 1 + 10 \cdot \sin(2\pi \log x) & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot f(x) dx$$

where

$$\tilde{\nu}_{y,Z}((1, \infty)) \in \text{Herm}_2 \setminus \text{Herm}_{2,+}$$

is not a positive semi-definite matrix, despite $Z \in \text{Herm}_{2,+}$. \circ

Hence, through indeterminacy, the measures in condition (iv) of Theorem 4.2 can be chosen such that $Q_\beta(M)(y)$ are the moments of a matrix-valued measure $\tilde{\nu}_{y,M}$ which is not positive for all $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$. On the other hand, in Example 4.3 choosing

$$\tilde{\mu}_{y,M} := \sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{i,j} \cdot \langle \mu_{y,H_{i,j}}, M \rangle$$

is a positive matrix-valued measure for all $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$ with the same moments as $\tilde{\nu}_{y,M}$. Hence, the $Q_\beta(M)(y)$ can be given as moments of the positive matrix-valued measure $\tilde{\mu}_{y,M}$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$.

We were not able to prove that there is always a choice, such that the Q_β can be given by a positive matrix-valued measure. These problems do not arise for positivity preservers on compact sets, as moment sequences on compact sets are always determinate.

The difference in Theorem 5.4 with $m \geq 2$ to the case of real coefficients ($m = 1$) lies in being able to choose different measures with the same moments for different basis vectors of Herm_m . In the case $m = 1$, there is only one basis vector to choose a measure for and thus this problem does not arise.

For $m = 1$, Theorem 4.2 reduces to [Bor11, Thm. 3.1].

Corollary 4.4 ([Bor11, Thm. 3.1]). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let*

$$T : \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n], \quad T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot q_\alpha \cdot \partial^\alpha$$

be linear with polynomials $q_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. Let

$$\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+ := \{p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \mid p \geq 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $T\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+ \subseteq \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+$.
- (ii) For every $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $T_y\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+ \subseteq \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+$ where

$$T_y = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot q_\alpha(y) \cdot \partial^\alpha$$

for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

- (iii) For every $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a measure μ_y such that

$$(T_y p)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} p(x+t) \, d\mu_y(t)$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. In this case, for $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$q_\beta(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} t^\beta \, d\mu_y(t). \tag{6}$$

Proof. For $m = 1$, $\text{Herm}_1 = \mathbb{R}$, $\text{Herm}_{1,+} = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$, and $\text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+$. Additionally, the inner product

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \text{Herm}_1 \times \text{Herm}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

reduces to

$$\langle \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \rangle = \lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2$$

for all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \text{Herm}_1 = \mathbb{R}$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, every map

$$Q_\alpha : \text{Herm}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

is uniquely determined by its value $q_\alpha := Q_\alpha(1) \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Hence,

$$T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot (Q_\alpha \times \partial^\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot q_\alpha \cdot \partial^\alpha.$$

For $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, equivalently

$$T_y = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot Q_\alpha(1)(y) \cdot \partial^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot q_\alpha(y) \cdot \partial^\alpha.$$

By $\text{Pos}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_+$, Theorem 4.2 gives (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii).

(i) \Rightarrow (iii): By Theorem 4.2, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist measures $\mu_{y,\lambda}$ such that

- (a) for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda \geq 0$, $\mu_{y,\lambda}$ is a positive measure and,
- (b) for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$T_{y,\lambda} p(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle p(x+t), d\mu_{y,\lambda}(t) \rangle$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

Since the inner product reduces to just multiplication, it follows, that $T_{y,\lambda} = \lambda T_y$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Additionally the integration reduces to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle p(t), d\mu_{y,\lambda}(t) \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} p(t) d\mu_{y,\lambda}(t)$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Hence,

$$T_y p(x) = T_{y,1} p(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle p(x+t), d\mu_{y,1}(t) \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} p(x+t) d\mu_{y,1}(t)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ which proves (iii).

The statement (6) for the polynomial coefficients $q_\alpha, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, follows from the fact, that the sum in (4) from Theorem 4.2 reduces to a single element due to having a 1-dimensional real vector space $\text{Herm}_1 = \mathbb{R}$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Define $\mu_{y,\lambda} := \lambda \mu_y$. Then (i) follows from Theorem 4.2. \square

5. Matrix K -Positivity Preserver for Compact K

Contrary to the previous section were we worked with collections of matrix-valued measures

$$(\mu_M)_{M \in \text{Herm}_m}$$

in Theorem 4.2 (iv), we work now with operator-valued measures

$$\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{Herm}_m, \text{Herm}_m),$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\text{Herm}_m, \text{Herm}_m)$ denotes the space of linear operators $\text{Herm}_m \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m$. For a given matrix $M \in \text{Herm}_m$, we can write μ_M as the measure

$$\mu(\cdot)(M) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m.$$

The difference is that collections of matrix-valued measures do not need to fulfill any linearity conditions, while operator-valued measures do. This solves the problem outlined in Example 4.3, but the existence of such operator-valued measures can only be proven so far only on compact sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 5.1 (see [CZ13, Sect. 2]). Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let \mathcal{A} be a σ -algebra. A set function

$$\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{Herm}_m, \text{Herm}_m)$$

is called a *positive operator-valued measure* if

$$\mu[M] := \mu(\cdot)(M) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m$$

is a positive matrix-valued measure for all $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$.

Integrals with respect to such measures are defined in the following way.

Definition 5.2. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed, $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and $\mu : \mathfrak{B}(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{Herm}_m, \text{Herm}_m)$ be a positive operator-valued measure. We define

$$\int_K p(x) \, d\mu(x) := \sum_{i,j=1}^m \int_K \langle p(x), H_{i,j} \rangle \, d\mu[H_{i,j}](x) \in \text{Herm}_m.$$

Integrals of positive matrix polynomials with respect to positive operator-valued measures are again positive due to the linearity conditions on operator-valued measures. Therefore, the following holds.

Lemma 5.3. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed,

$$\mu : \mathfrak{B}(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{Herm}_m, \text{Herm}_m)$$

be a positive operator-valued measure, and let $p \in \text{Pos}(K)$. Then

$$\int_K p(x) \, d\mu(x) \succeq 0.$$

Proof. Let $X \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$ and define the matrix-valued measure

$$\tilde{\mu}_X : \mathfrak{B}(K) \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m \quad \text{by} \quad \tilde{\mu}_X := \sum_{i,j=1}^m \langle \mu[H_{i,j}], X \rangle H_{i,j}.$$

Let $M \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$ and $S \in \mathfrak{B}(K)$. By linearity of operator-valued measures,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\mu}_X(S), M \rangle &= \sum_{i,j=1}^m \langle \mu(S)(H_{i,j}), X \rangle \langle M, H_{i,j} \rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mu(S) \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^m \langle M, H_{i,j} \rangle H_{i,j} \right), X \right\rangle = \langle \mu(S)(M), X \rangle \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\tilde{\mu}_X$ is a positive matrix-valued measure by Lemma 2.1 and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \int_K p(x) \, d\mu(x), X \right\rangle &= \sum_{i,j=1}^m \int_K \langle p(x), H_{i,j} \rangle \, d\langle \mu[H_{i,j}], X \rangle(x) \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^m \int_K \langle p(x), H_{i,j} \rangle \, d\langle \tilde{\mu}_X, H_{i,j} \rangle(x) \\ &= \int_K \langle p(x), d\tilde{\mu}_X(x) \rangle \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $p \in \text{Pos}(K)$, where the positive semi-definiteness follows from Remark 2.5. Since $X \in \text{Herm}_{m,+}$ is arbitrary and by Lemma 2.1, the assertion is proven. \square

This positivity from Lemma 5.3 can fail without the linear conditions of operator-valued measures. That is, if we would only look at collections of measures as in Theorem 4.2 (iv), then this positivity will not hold anymore, as shown in Example 4.3. For the characterization of operator-valued measures according to Theorem 4.2, we use Theorem 2.8.

Note, $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ does not need to be a compact set for Theorem 2.8 to hold. J. Cimprič and A. Zalar use a more general setting on arbitrary closed $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, which requires additional conditions on the functional L . This is because the proof of [CZ13, Thm. 4] uses Arveson's Extension Lemma, which replaces simple positivity with complete positivity. This is necessary, since there are positive but not completely positive functionals which can fail to have a linear extension for some finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, see e.g. [CDPR23].

However, on compact sets K this additional condition is not required anymore and we can formulate the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be compact, and let*

$$T : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

be a linear with canonical representation

$$T = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot (Q_\alpha \times \partial^\alpha).$$

Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) T is a K -positivity preserver, i.e., $T\text{Pos}(K) \succeq \text{Pos}(K)$.
- (ii) For each $y \in K$, there exists a positive operator-valued measure ν_y on $K - y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$Q_\beta(M)(y) = \int_{K-y} t^\beta \, d\nu_y[M](t)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. In this case,

$$(T_y p)(x) = \int_{K-y} p(x+t) \, d\nu_y(t)$$

for all $x \in K$ and $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

The proof is an adapted version of the proof of [dDS25, Thm. 3.5] using [CZ13, Thm. 4] on compact sets.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $y \in K$ and define

$$L_y : \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \text{Herm}_m, \quad p \mapsto L_y(p) := (Tp)(y).$$

Then $L_y(p) \succeq 0$ for all $p \in \text{Pos}(K)$. Theorem 2.8 asserts the existence of a positive Borel operator-valued measure $\mu_y : \mathfrak{B}(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{Herm}_m, \text{Herm}_m)$ such that

$$L_y(p) = \int_K p(x) \, d\mu_y(x)$$

for all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Additionally,

$$L_y(M \cdot p) = (T(M \cdot p))(y) = (T_y(M \cdot p))(y) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot Q_\alpha(M)(y) \cdot (\partial^\alpha p)(y)$$

for all $M \in \text{Herm}_m$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Let $M \in \text{Herm}_m$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. Set $\tilde{p}(x) := (x - y)^\beta$. Then

$$\partial^\alpha \tilde{p}(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \alpha \neq \beta \\ \beta! & \alpha = \beta \end{cases}$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and, hence,

$$L_y(M \cdot \tilde{p}) = Q_\beta(M)(y) = \int_K M \cdot (x - y)^\beta \, d\mu_y(x) = \int_K (x - y)^\beta \, d\mu_y[M](x).$$

for all $M \in \text{Herm}_m$. Define $\nu_y(\cdot) := \mu_y(\cdot + y)$ as the pushforward measure regarding to the translation in \mathbb{R}^n . Then

$$\nu_y : \mathfrak{B}(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{Herm}_m, \text{Herm}_m)$$

is a positive Borel operator-valued measure and

$$Q_\beta(M)(y) = \int_{K-y} t^\beta \, d\nu_y[M](t)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, $y \in K$, and $M \in \text{Herm}_m$. Furthermore, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $M \in \text{Herm}_m$, and $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, it follows from the multi-binomial theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} T_y(Mx^\beta) &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} \cdot Q_\alpha(M)(y) \cdot x^{\beta-\alpha} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} \cdot x^{\beta-\alpha} \cdot \int_{K-y} t^\alpha \, d\nu_y[M](t) \\ &= \int_{K-y} (x+t)^\beta \, d\nu_y[M](t) \\ &= \int_{K-y} M \cdot (x+t)^\beta \, d\nu_y(t) \end{aligned}$$

and, hence, by linearity,

$$(T_y p)(x) = \int_{K-y} p(x+t) \, d\nu_y(t)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $y \in K$ and let ν_y be a positive matrix-valued measure on $K - y$ such that

$$\int_{K-y} t^\beta \, d\nu_y[M](t) = Q_\beta(M)(y)$$

for all $M \in \text{Herm}_m$ and all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{K-y} M \cdot (t+y)^\beta \, d\nu_y(t) &= \sum_{\alpha \preceq \beta} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} \cdot y^{\beta-\alpha} \cdot \int_{K-y} t^\alpha \, d\nu_y[M](t) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \cdot Q_\alpha(M)(y) \cdot \partial^\alpha y^\beta \\ &= (T_y(M \cdot x^\beta))(y) \\ &= (T(M \cdot x^\beta))(y) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, $M \in \text{Herm}_m$, and $y \in K$. By linearity,

$$\int_{K-y} p(t+y) \, d\nu_y(t) = (Tp)(y)$$

for all $p \in \text{Herm}_m[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $y \in K$. Define $\mu_y(\cdot) := \nu_y(\cdot - y)$ as the pushforward measure. Then, by Lemma 5.3,

$$(Tp)(y) = \int_K p(t) \, d\mu_y(t) \succeq 0$$

for all $p \in \text{Pos}(K)$ and $y \in K$. Hence, T is a K -positivity preserver. \square

Funding

The authors are supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DFG with the grant DI-2780/2-1 and the research fellowship of the first author at the Zukunftskolleg of the University of Konstanz, funded as part of the Excellence Strategy of the German Federal and State Government.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

There is no associated data.

References

- [Ber09] S. K. Berberian, *Notes on spectral theory*, https://web.ma.utexas.edu/mp_arc/c/09/09-32.pdf, 2009, Last accessed July 2025.
- [Bor11] J. Borcea, *Classification of linear operators preserving elliptic, positive and non-negative polynomials*, J. reine angew. Math. **650** (2011), 67–82.
- [CDPR23] G. Chiribella, K. R. Davidson, V. I. Paulsen, and M. Rahaman, *Counterexamples to the extendability of positive unital norm-one maps*, Linear Algebra Appl. **663** (2023), 102–115.
- [CZ13] J. Cimprič and A. Zalar, *Moment problems for operator polynomials*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **401** (2013), 307–316.
- [dDS25] P. J. di Dio and K. Schmüdgen, *K-Positivity Preservers and their Generators*, SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom. **9** (2025), no. 4, 794–824.
- [MS24] C. Mädler and K. Schmüdgen, *On the truncated matricial moment problem. I*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **540** (2024), 128569.
- [Net10] T. Netzer, *Representation and Approximation of Positivity Preservers*, J. Geom. Anal. **20** (2010), 751–770.
- [Sch87] K. Schmüdgen, *On a generalization of the classical moment problem*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **125** (1987), 461–470.
- [Sch17] ———, *The Moment Problem*, Springer, New York, 2017.