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Abstract—Various optimal control strategies exist in the literature. Prominent approaches are Robust Control and Linear Quadratic Regulators, the first one being related to the $H^\infty$ norm of a system, the second one to the $H^2$ norm. In 1994, F. De Bruyne et al [1] showed that assuming knowledge of the poles of a transfer function one can derive upper bounds on the $H^\infty$ norm as a constant multiple of its $H^2$ norm. We strengthen these results by providing tight upper bounds also for the case where the transfer functions are restricted to those having a real valued impulse response. Moreover the results are extended by studying spaces consisting of transfer functions with a common denominator polynomial. These spaces, called rational modules, have the feature that their analytic properties, captured in the integral kernel reproducing them, are accessible by means of purely algebraic techniques.
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I. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that norms induced by inner products, such as the $H^2$ norm, are important because they lend themselves to computations and geometric interpretations. However in many applications, e.g., robust control, one is more interested in other norms like the supremum or $H^\infty$ norm. Thus, linking these two norms can lead to valuable insights for these applications. This problem has been first addressed in the engineering context in [1] where one derived results such as

$$|M(s)|^2 \leq \kappa(s) \cdot \|M\|_2^2, \quad \kappa(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n 2 \cdot \text{Re} a_i \left| \frac{s}{s + a_i} \right|^2, \quad (1)$$

where $M$ is the strictly proper transfer function of a stable continuous-time system $(s = j \omega, j^2 = -1)$ of the form

$$M(s) = \frac{b_1}{s + a_1} + \cdots + \frac{b_n}{s + a_n}, \quad (2)$$

where the $b_i$'s are arbitrary complex numbers and the $a_i$'s with $\text{Re}(a_i) > 0$ are distinct pole locations in the left half plane. Analogous results have been derived in the discrete-time setting with $M(z)$ and $z = e^{j\omega}$. Moreover $\| \cdot \|_2^2 \leq \| \cdot \|_\infty \cdot \| \cdot \|_2$, with $\kappa$ defined in (1), has been recognized as the tight bound, i.e., the best upper bound which holds for all functions satisfying (2). However in [1] it has been noted that the bound has its limitations as it is no longer necessarily tight in the real rational case, i.e., if one restricts the coefficients of the linear combination (2), i.e., the $b_i$'s, to be such that $M(s)$ is a transfer function of a system with real-valued impulse response. Complex coefficients then correspond to complex poles and, like the poles, come in complex conjugate pairs.

This paper provides a tight bound $\rho(j\omega_0) \|M\|_2^2$, for the value of $|M(j\omega_0)|^2$ for any fixed frequency $\omega_0$, as well as a tight bound $\|\rho\|_\infty \|M\|_2^2$ for $\|M\|_\infty$, in the real rational case. In the continuous-time case it is given by

$$\rho(s) = \frac{k(s, s)}{2} + \frac{|k(s, -s)|}{2}, \quad (3)$$

where $k(s, w)$ is the integral kernel reproducing the space of functions defined by (2). We provide an analogous result for discrete-time with $s$ replaced by $z$ and $-s$ replaced by $z^{-1}$. From this point of view the older bound $\kappa$ for complex rational functions is given by $\kappa(s) = k(s, s)$.

The link to reproducing kernels is of interest because these objects have been studied extensively in the mathematical literature, see e.g., [2] for an overview. Specifically for the space of all strictly proper rational functions with common denominator $q$, which we refer to as a rational module and denote it by $X^q$, the reproducing kernel (RK) takes a particularly simple form since $X^q$ is a coinvariant subspace of $H^2$, see e.g., [3], [4]. With this background, the bounds $\kappa$ and $\rho$ defined in (1) and (3), respectively, can be expressed in terms of the coefficients of the constant denominator term $q$ given by, e.g., $q(s) = \prod_{i=1}^n (s + a_i)$ for the space defined by (2), via

$$\kappa(s) = \frac{q(s)' q(s)}{q(s) q(s) + \kappa_0 s + \kappa_1}, \quad (4a)$$

$$\rho(s) = \frac{|q(s)' q(-s)}{q(s) q(s) + \kappa_0 s + \kappa_1} \cdot \frac{\kappa(s)}{2}, \quad (4b)$$

with similar results for discrete-time. The ideas derived with this machinery generalize seamlessly to the case of $C^n$ or $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ instead of $C$-valued functions. In the context of norm bounds a special vector-valued case has been studied in [5].

The paper is structured as follows. In Section III we study the bound for general linear subspaces over the reals whose elements are complex valued functions. In Section IV we turn to real rational complex valued functions whose domain is the imaginary axis for continuous-time systems and the unit circle for discrete-time systems. In Section V we specialize to real rational modules. We give conditions for the complex and real bound to coincide in Section V and several examples illustrating this in Section VI. After some remarks on the general vector-valued case in Section VII we conclude in Section VIII.

II. REAL LINEAR SUBSPACES OF $\mathbb{C}$-VALUED FUNCTIONS

Let $\Omega$ denote an abstract set such as, e.g., the unit circle or the imaginary axis in the complex plane. Consider a finitely generated linear space $X$ over the reals consisting of bounded...
complex valued functions \( f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C} \) equipped with an inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) which is \( \mathbb{R} \)-linear in both arguments.

In the following we will embed the linear space \( X \) over \( \mathbb{R} \) in the smallest linear space \( \tilde{X} \) over \( \mathbb{C} \) containing it. Assume that \( X \cap iX = \{0\} \) and let

\[
\tilde{X} = X + iX
\]

(5)
denotes the complexification of \( X \). Any \( f \in X \) then has a unique representation as \( f = f_1 + if_j \in X \).

The proof of Theorem 2 together with \( k \) of a reproducing kernel \( X \) in order to link these two norms on \( f \) is tight since it becomes an equality for \( f = f_0 \) and this bound is tight. In particular

\[
\|f\|_\Omega \leq \|f\|_2 \cdot \|\cdot\|_\infty
\]

In other words the bound in the real case is at most two times smaller than the bound for the complexification.

The second part of the theorem, i.e., (15), follows by supremaizing over \( X \) and supremizing over \( X_w \), which holds for all \( f \in X \) and \( w \in \Omega \). In other words \( k \) is independent of the particular choice of ONB [2]. Note that \( k(z,z) = k(z,w) \).

The statement of Theorem 1 is the abstract version of concrete inequalities such as (1) found in [1].

Theorem 1 Let \( k(w) = k(w,w) \). For all \( w \in \Omega, f \in X \), there holds \( \|f(w)\|^2 \leq \kappa(w) \|f\|_2^2 \) and this bound is tight. In particular

\[
\kappa = \sup_{w \in \Omega} \kappa(w)
\]

is a tight bound on \( X \). \( \Box \)

Proof: The Cauchy-Bunyakovskyy-Schwarz inequality

\[
|f(w)|^2 \leq \kappa(w) \|f\|_2^2,
\]

(11)
is tight since it becomes an equality for \( f = k(w) \in X \). Utilizing \( \langle k, k \rangle = k(w,w) \) we obtain

\[
\|f\|_\infty^2 \leq \kappa \|f\|_2^2
\]

(12)
which is obviously tight on \( X \) because (11) was tight. \( \Box \)

The inequality (11) fails to be tight on \( X \subseteq \mathbb{C} \) since \( k \) being an element in \( X \) does not suffice for \( k \in X \). Actually it is easy to check that \( k_w = k_{w,1} + jk_{w,3} \) with \( k_{w,3} \neq 0 \) in general. We expand \( k_w \) into \( k_{w,1} + jk_{w,3} \) and note that

\[
\begin{align*}
|f(w)|^2 &= |\langle f, k_w \rangle|^2 \\
&= \langle f, k_w \rangle + j(\langle f, f \rangle - k_w)^2 \\
&= \langle f, k_{w,1} \rangle^2 + (\langle f, k_{w,3} \rangle)^2,
\end{align*}
\]

(13)
where the last equality holds if and only if \( f \in X \).

We maximize (13) over the unit ball in \( X \) to obtain a new tight bound on \( X \) given by \( \rho(w) \) as defined in Theorem 2 which is the abstract version of our main result presented as Theorem 9 below.

Theorem 2 Let \( k_w = k_{w,1} + jk_{w,3} \) with \( k_{w,1}, k_{w,3} \in X \) for all \( w \in \Omega \). Moreover define

\[
\rho(w) = \frac{k_{w}}{\|k_{w,1}\|_2^2 - \|k_{w,3}\|_2^2} \left(2 - \|k_{w,1}\|_2^2 \right)
\]

(14)
Then for all \( w \in \Omega, f \in X \) there holds \( |f(w)|^2 \leq \rho(w) \|f\|_2^2 \) and this bound is tight. In particular

\[
\|f\|_\infty^2 \leq \|\rho\| \cdot \kappa \|f\|_2^2
\]

(15)
is a tight bound on \( X \).

Proof: Let \( G \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \) be the Gramian defined via

\[
G = \begin{pmatrix} k_{w,1} & k_{w,2} \\ k_{w,3} & k_{w,4} \end{pmatrix}.
\]

The maximum eigenvalue of \( G \) is given by \( \rho(w) \) which follows by a simple calculation. So it remains to check

\[
\lambda_{\max}(G) = \sup_{f \in X} \{\langle f, k_{w,1} \rangle^2 + \langle f, k_{w,3} \rangle^2 \ | \ |f\|_2 = 1 \} = \kappa(w).
\]

Supremaizing over \( X \) and supremizing over \( X_w \) yields to the same value \( \kappa \) where \( X_w \) denotes the 2-dimensional subspace generated by \( k_{w,1}, k_{w,3} \in X \). Let

\[
x^T = [(f, k_{w,1}),(f, k_{w,3})] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2} \quad \text{with} \quad f \in X_w,
\]

denote the coordinates of \( f \) in the \( \{k_{w,1}, k_{w,3}\} \) basis. Then

\[
\lambda_{\max}(G) = \sup \{x^T G y \ | \ x \in \mathbb{R}^2, x^T G^{-1} x = 1 \} = \lambda_{\max}(G).
\]

The second part of the theorem, i.e., (15), follows by supremaizing over \( \Omega \) and supremizing over \( X_w \). In other words the bound in the real case is at most two times smaller than the bound for the complexification.

Remark 3 The proof of Theorem 2 together with

\[
\lambda_1(G) + \lambda_2(G) = \|k_{w,1}\|_2^2 + \|k_{w,3}\|_2^2 = \langle k, k \rangle
\]

and

\[
\lambda_{\max}(G) = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2 \quad \text{replaces that}
\]

\[
\kappa(w)/2 \leq \rho(w) \leq \kappa(w).
\]

(16)
(17)
III. REAL RATIONAL TRANSFER FUNCTIONS OF LINEAR TIME INVARIANT SYSTEMS

In this section we first introduce the real rational subspace \( RL^2_{2} \) denoted by \( RL^2_{d} \) for discrete-time and \( RL^2_{c} \) for continuous-time. Since every single-input single-output linear time invariant (LTI) system admits an input-output decomposition, its controllable part is represented by its transfer function which is a real rational function [6]. In the following we establish the fact that the second summand in (14) is given by the absolute value of \( k(w, w^{-1})/2 \) for discrete-time and \( k(w, -w)/2 \) for continuous-time: see (21) and (24) below.

A. Discrete Time

Let \( \mathbb{L}^2_d = L^2(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}) \) be the space of all complex valued functions on the unit circle \( \mathbb{D} = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = 1 \} \) with

\[
\| f \|^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(e^{i\omega})|^2 \, d\omega < \infty. 
\] (18)

The starting point for an algebraic theory is the real rational subspace and its complexification \( RL^2_{d} \subseteq \mathbb{R}L^2_{d} \subseteq \mathbb{L}^2_d \)

\[
RL^2_{d} = \{ f \in \mathbb{R}(z) \mid f \text{ has no pole in } \mathbb{D} \} \quad (19a)
\]

\[\mathbb{R}L^2_{d} = \{ f \in \mathbb{C}(z) \mid f \text{ has no pole in } \mathbb{D} \}, \quad (19b)\]

The following fact is elementary; so we skip its proof.

**Lemma 4** Let \( f \in \mathbb{R}L^2_{d} \) and

\[
f_1(z) = \frac{f(z) + f^*(z^{-1})}{2}, \quad f_j(z) = \frac{f(z) - f^*(z^{-1})}{2j}, \quad (20)
\]

then \( f = f_1 + \sum f_j \) with \( f_1, f_j \in \mathbb{R}L^2_{d} \). In particular the following three statements are equivalent: 1) \( f \in \mathbb{R}L^2_{d} \),

2) \( f^* \in \mathbb{R}L^2_{d} \) and 3) \( f^*(z^{-1}) = f(z) \).

**Theorem 5** Let \( k : \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C} \) be the kernel which reproduces the complexification of a finitely generated subspace \( X \subseteq \mathbb{R}L^2_{d} \). Then

\[k(w, w^{-1})/2 = ||k_{w,1}||^2_2 - ||k_{w,1}||^2_2 - 2(k_{w,1}, k_{w,1}) \quad (21)\]

and \( k(z, w) \) possesses the properties:

1) \( k(z, w) = k(w^{-1}, z^{-1}) \),

2) \( k(w, w) = k(w^{-1}, w^{-1}) \),

3) \( |k(w^{-1}, w^{-1})| \leq |k(w, w)| \),

with equality in 3) if and only if \( k_w = k_{w^{-1}} \).

**Proof:** Let \( \{b_i\}_{i=1}^n \) denote a basis of \( X \). Then, due to the equivalence of 2) and 3) in Lemma 4 we have \( b_i^* \in \mathbb{R}L^2_{d} \). This implies, again by Lemma 4 that

\[k(w^{-1}, z^{-1}) = \sum b_i(w^{-1}) b_i^*(z^{-1}) = \sum b_i^*(z^{-1}) b_i^*(w^{-1}) = \sum b_i(z) b_i^*(w) = k(z, w), \]

which proves 1) and 2).

From the Cauchy-Bunyakovsky-Schwarz inequality we have that \( |k(w, w^{-1})|^2 \) is bounded from above by

\[|k(w^{-1}, k_w)|^2 \leq (k_{w,1}, k_{w,1})(k_{w,1}, k_{w}) = k(w^{-1}, w^{-1})k(w, w) = k(w, w)^2, \]

with equality if and only if \( k_w = k_{w^{-1}} \). Thus we have checked 3).

Let \( u = k_{w,1} \) and \( v = k_{w,1} \) then \( k_{w^{-1}} = u - v \) since

\[2(k_{w^{-1},1}(z)) = k(z, w^{-1}) + k^*(z^{-1}, w^{-1}) = k^*(w^{-1}, z) + k(w^{-1}, z^{-1}) = k^*(z^{-1}, w) + k(z, w) = 2u(z), \]

and similarly \( k_{w^{-1},1} = -v \). From this it follows that

\[k(w, w^{-1}) = (u - v, u + v) = (u, u) - (v, v) - j(u, u) - j(u, v) = \|u\|^2 - \|v\|^2 - j2(u, v). \]

which proves (21). \( \square \)

B. Continuous Time

Let \( \mathbb{L}^2_c = L^2(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}) \) be the space of all complex valued functions on the imaginary axis with

\[\| f \|^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(\omega)|^2 \, d\omega < \infty. \] (22)

We define the real rational subspace \( \mathbb{R}L^2_{c} \) and its complexification \( \mathbb{C}L^2_{c} \)

\[\mathbb{R}L^2_{c} = \{ f \in \mathbb{R}(z) \mid f \text{ s.p., no pole in } j\mathbb{R} \} \quad (23a)\]

\[\mathbb{C}L^2_{c} = \{ f \in \mathbb{C}(z) \mid f \text{ s.p., no pole in } j\mathbb{R} \}, \quad (23b)\]

with s.p. meaning strictly proper.

**Theorem 6** Let \( k : j\mathbb{R} \times j\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C} \) be the kernel which reproduces the complexification of a finitely generated subspace \( X \subseteq \mathbb{R}L^2_{c} \). Then

\[k(w, -w)/2 = ||k_{w,1}||^2_2 - ||k_{w,1}||^2_2 - 2(k_{w,1}, k_{w,1}) \quad (24)\]

and \( k(s, w) \) possesses the properties:

1) \( k(s, w) = k(-w, -s) \),

2) \( k(w, w) = k(-w, w) \),

3) \( |k(w, -w)| \leq k(w, w) \),

with equality in 3) if and only if \( k_w = k_{w^{-1}} \).

So we have established the fact that \( p \), defined in (14), is given by \( p(z) = k(z, z)/2 + |k(z, z^{-1})|/2 \) discrete-time and \( p(s) = k(s, s)/2 + |k(s, s^{-1})|/2 \) for continuous-time.

IV. THE CHRISTOFFEL-DARBOUX KERNEL OF A REAL RATIONAL MODULE

In this section we specialize the subspace \( X \subseteq \mathbb{R}L^2_{c} \) to be a real rational module. This will allow us to compute the reproducing kernel of its complexification and then turn the previously derived abstract formulas into concrete closed form expressions. In the following we treat the continuous and discrete-time case in parallel in order to emphasize that they possess the same structural properties. We call a polynomial \( q \in \mathbb{R}[z] \) c-stable (resp. \( q \in \mathbb{R}[z] \) d-stable) if \( q(a) \neq 0 \) implies \( \Re a < 0 \) (resp. \( |a| < 1 \)). We define the
real rational Hardy spaces as subspaces of \( RL^2_c \) and \( RL^2_d \) respectively

\[
R^2_c = \{ f \mid f = p/q \text{ strictly proper, } q \text{ is c-stable} \}. \tag{25a}
\]

\[
R^2_d = \{ f \mid f = p/q \text{ strictly proper, } q \text{ is d-stable} \}. \tag{25b}
\]

For \( q \in \mathbb{R}[x] \) its polynomial module \( X_q = \{ p \in \mathbb{R}[x], \text{deg}(p) < \text{deg}(q) \} \) and its rational module

\[
X^q = \left\{ \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{R}(x) : p \in X_q \right\}, \tag{26}
\]

together with the corresponding complexifications \( X^q = X_q + jX_q \), \( X^q = X^q + jX^q \). Then \( X^q \subset \mathbb{R}H^2_c \) and \( X^q \subset \mathbb{R}H^2_d \) if \( q \in \mathbb{R}[s] \) is c-stable and \( q \in \mathbb{R}[z] \) is d-stable, respectively. Then Beurling’s theorem on invariant subspaces (cf. [3], [4]) states that \( X^q \) is coinvariant, i.e.,

\[
\mathcal{C} \mathcal{R} H^2_c \bigoplus X^q = q^\# \mathcal{C} \mathcal{R} H^2_c, \quad \mathcal{C} \mathcal{R} H^2_d \bigoplus X^q = q^\# \mathcal{C} \mathcal{R} H^2_d, \tag{27}
\]

respectively, where the para-adjoint \( q^\# \) is given by

\[
q^\#(s) = q(-s), \quad \text{and} \quad q^\#(z) = z^n q(z^{-1}), \tag{28}
\]

if \( q \) is c-stable and d-stable, respectively, and \( n = \text{deg}(q) \). The importance of (27) is the corollary that \( X^q \) is the reproducing kernel of \( X^q \).

\[
X^{pq} \bigcap X^q = \frac{q^\#}{q} X^p, \tag{29}
\]

whenever \( p, q \) are two c-stable or d-stable polynomials (cf. Corollary 5 in [7]). It is (29) that enables us to derive an explicit form for the reproducing kernel of \( X^q \) in discrete-time in Theorem 7 and continuous-time in Theorem 8. Due to the recursive structure of their computation these kernels are called Christoffel-Darboux kernels [8].

**Theorem 7** Let \( q = \prod_{i=1}^n(z-a_i) \in \mathbb{R}[z], \) d-stable, and \( k : \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C} \) be defined via

\[
k(z, w) = \frac{1}{q(z)q^\#(w)} \cdot \frac{q^\#(z)q(w) - q(z)q^\#(w)}{1 - zw} \tag{30}
\]

for \( z \neq w \) and

\[
k(z, z) = z \left( \frac{q^\#(z)}{q(z)} - \frac{q^\#(z)}{q^\#(z)} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1 - |a_i|^2}{|z - a_i|^2} \tag{28}
\]

for \( z = w. \) Then \( k \) is the reproducing kernel of \( X^q \).

**Proof:** Let \( q = q_3 \) with \( q_3 = q_1 \cdot q_2 \) and \( q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{R}[z]. \) Moreover let

\[
m_i(z, w) = \frac{q_i^\#(z)}{q_i(z)} \cdot \frac{q_i^\#(w)}{q_i(w)}, \tag{29}
\]

for \( i = 1, 2, 3 \). Let \( k_i \) be the reproducing kernel of \( X^{q_i} \). Then

\[
k(z, w) = \frac{m_1(z, w) - 1}{1 - zw} + \frac{m_3(z, w) - m_1(z, w)}{1 - zw} = \frac{m_3(z, w) - 1}{1 - zw} \tag{29}
\]

by induction hypotheses. Here we used the facts that \( k_3(z, w) = k_1(z, w) + m_1(z, w)k_2(z, w) \), due to (29). More precisely: due to the orthogonal decomposition (29) \( k_3 \) is the sum of \( k_1 \) and the RK, say \( k_2 \), of \( n_1 X^{q_2} \) with \( n_1 = q_1^\# / q_1 \).

Since \( n_1 \) is all-pass, i.e., \( n_1^2 n_1 = 1 \), it follows by (9) that \( k_2(z, w) = n_1(z)k_2(z, w)n_1^\#(w) \) which equals \( m_1k_2 \).

It is easy to check that (30) holds for \( q = z - a_1 \). Thus, by induction, we have proven (30). The diagonal readily follows from the fact that \( k(z, w) \) is continuous; apply l’Hospital’s rule to calculate \( k(w, w) \) via \( \lim_{z \to w} k(z, w) \).

**Theorem 8** Let \( q = \prod_{i=1}^n(s - a_i) \in \mathbb{R}[s], \) c-stable, and \( k : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C} \) be defined via

\[
k(s, w) = \frac{1}{q(s)q^\#(w)} \cdot \frac{q^\#(s)q(w) - q(s)q^\#(w)}{w - s} \tag{32}
\]

for \( s \neq w \) and

\[
k(s, s) = \frac{q'(s)}{q(s)} - \frac{q^\#(s)}{q^\#(s)} = - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2 \text{Re} a_i}{|s - a_i|^2} \tag{33}
\]

for \( s = w. \) Then \( k \) is the reproducing kernel of \( X^q \).

**Proof:** We obtain (33) by the same reasoning as we obtained (30) in the proof of Theorem 7. Since \( k(s, w) \) is continuous we can calculate \( k(w, w) \) via \( \lim_{z \to w} k(z, w) \) and l’Hospital’s rule, i.e., \( k(w, w) \) equals

\[
- \frac{q^\#(w)}{q^\#(w)} q'(w) + \frac{q(w)}{q^\#(w)} q'(w) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{w - a_i} \quad \text{if} \quad s \neq w
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{w - a_i} \quad \text{if} \quad s = w
\]

which, replacing \( w \) in \( k(w, w) \) by \( s \), concludes the proof. □

We summarize the results in Theorem 9 which is Theorem 2 specialized to rational modules, using Theorem 7 for continuous-time and Theorem 8 for discrete-time.

**Theorem 9** If \( X = \mathbb{R} \times j\mathbb{R} \) and \( X = X^q \) (equipped with \( L^2 \) norm) for some c-stable \( q \in \mathbb{R}[s], q = \prod_{i=1}^n(s - a_i) \), then Theorem 7 and Theorem 2 hold with

\[
k(s) = q(s) - q^\#(s), \quad n(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2 \text{Re} a_i}{|s - a_i|^2} \tag{34a}
\]

\[
\rho(s) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{1}{2} - \frac{(q(s))^{-1}}{|q(s)|^2} \right|^2 + \frac{\kappa(s)}{2} \tag{34b}
\]

Similarly, in the discrete-time case, Theorem 7 and Theorem 2 hold with

\[
k(z) = \frac{q(z)}{q^\#(z)} - \frac{q^\#(z)}{q^\#(z)}, \quad n(z) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|z - a_i|^2} \tag{35a}
\]

\[
\rho(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{1}{2} - \frac{(q^\#(z))^{-1}}{|q^\#(z)|^2} \right|^2 + \frac{\kappa(z)}{2} \tag{35b}
\]

if \( X = \mathbb{R} \times j\mathbb{R}, \) and \( X = X^q \) (equipped with \( L^2 \) norm) for some d-stable \( q = \prod_{i=1}^n(z - a_i) \in \mathbb{R}[z]. \)

1 Our results in (34) and (35) correspond to the results of De Bruyne at al (2.4, 3.4) as found in [1] since \( \beta_j = (1/(s - a), 1/(s - a)) \) implies

\[
k(s, w) = \left[ \frac{1}{w - a_1}, \cdots, \frac{1}{w - a_n} \right] \left[ \beta_1 \cdots \beta_n \right]^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{s - a_1} \cdots \frac{1}{s - a_n} \right].
\]

To see this, note that for \( q = \prod_{i=1}^n(s - a_i) \) an ONB of \( X^q \) is given by \( \{ \sum_i \frac{1}{w - a_i} \} \) with \( g = \beta_j^{-1/2} \) and thus \( k \) can be computed from (34a) and analogously for \( k(z, w) \).
V. ON CONDITIONS FOR BOUNDS ON A REAL RATIONAL MODULE AND ITS COMPLEXIFICATION TO COINCIDE

In this section we examine when the tight bound $\|\rho\|_\infty$ on a real rational module $X^q$ coincides with the tight bound $\|\kappa\|_\infty$ of its complexification $X^q$. Recall that $\kappa$ and $\rho$ are defined in (34), (35) for continuous- and discrete-time respectively.

Lemma 10 Let $q \in \mathbb{R}[z]$ be d-stable with $\deg(q) > 0$ and $k$ denote the reproducing kernel of $X^q$. Then $(k(z, \cdot) | z \in \mathbb{D})$ separates points in $\mathbb{D}$. That is for all $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{D}$ with $w_1 \neq w_2$ there exists $z \in \mathbb{D}$ with $k(z, w_1) \neq k(z, w_2)$. The same holds mutatis mutandis for $q \in \mathbb{R}[s]$ being c-stable.

Proof: Since $\deg(q) > 0$ there exists some $a \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $q(a) = 0$ and thus, by partial fraction expansion, $1/(z-a) \in X^q$. Since $1/(w_1 - a) \neq 1/(w_2 - a)$ implies $w_1 \neq w_2$ we can conclude that $k_{w_1} \neq k_{w_2}$ since they take different values on $1/(z-a) \in X^q$.

Using Lemma 10 and property 3) of Theorem 3 and Theorem 6, respectively, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition given by Corollary 12 and an easy sufficient condition given by Corollary 11.

Corollary 11 Let $q \in \mathbb{R}[z]$ be d-stable; then $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \|\rho\|_\infty$ if and only if $\|\kappa\|_\infty \in \{\kappa(-1), \kappa(1)\}$. Similarly for $q \in \mathbb{R}[s]$ being c-stable, $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \|\rho\|_\infty$ if $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \kappa(0)$.

Corollary 12 Let $q = \prod (x-a_i) \in \mathbb{R}[z]$ be d-stable $(x = z)$ or c-stable $(x = s)$. Then the condition $a_i = \text{Re} a_i$ for all $i$ is sufficient (but not necessary) for $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \|\rho\|_\infty$.

Proof: Let $q \in \mathbb{R}[s]$ be c-stable. Since all $a_i$ are assumed to be real, $|s - a_i|^2 = \text{Re}^2 z$ is minimized by $s = 0$. This is sufficient for $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \|\rho\|_\infty$ since $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \kappa(0)$. To check the claim for discrete-time, let $q \in \mathbb{R}[z]$ be d-stable. Then $\kappa$ is a convex function of $\text{Re} z$ on $z \in \mathbb{D}$ if $\text{Re} z > 0$ since each of its summands

$$\frac{1 - |a_i|^2}{|z|} = \frac{1 - a_i^2}{(\text{Re} z - a_i)^2},$$

is convex in that sense. So $\kappa$ attains its maximum on $\{-1, 1\}$, i.e., $\|\kappa\|_\infty \in \{\kappa(-1), \kappa(1)\}$ which implies the claim that $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \|\rho\|_\infty$.

VI. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

Let $B_2, B_\infty$ and $B_\infty$ denote the unit balls of $\|\cdot\|_2$, $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ in the space $X^q$ where the $\kappa$-norm is the scaled $H^2$ norm given by $\|f\|_{\kappa} = \|\kappa\|_\infty |f|_2$. Note that $B_2 \subseteq B_\infty$ is equivalent to the statement that $\|\kappa\|_\infty |f|_2^2 = 1$ implies $\|f\|_\infty^2 \leq 1$ and is thus equivalent to 10). Let $\partial B_\infty$ denote the border of $B_\infty$ then $B_\kappa \cap \partial B_\infty \neq \emptyset$ is equivalent to $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \|\rho\|_\infty$. We provide three examples: Example 1 and 2 are in discrete-time; Example 3 is continuous-time and similar to the one in Section 5 of [1].

Example 1 For $q = q_1 q_2$ with $q_1 = (z-1/3-j/3)$ and $q_2 = (z-1/3+j/3)$ we have $\|\kappa\|_\infty \approx \kappa(0.11) \approx 3.43382$ and $\|\rho\|_\infty = \rho(\kappa^2) = 2.8$; see Fig. 1 and 2.

Example 2 For $q = q_1 q_2$ with $q_1 = (z-1/20)$ and $q_2 = (z+3/4)$ the numerical result is $\|\kappa\|_\infty = \|\rho\|_\infty = \kappa(0.5) \approx 7.905$; see Fig. 3.

Example 3 For $q(s) = (s+a)(s+a^*)$ with $a = 1/2 - 2j$ we have $\|\kappa\|_\infty \approx \kappa(2.0) \approx 4.062$ and $\|\rho\|_\infty \approx \rho(1.94) \approx 2.13$. Let $g_0 = g_0/\|g_0\|_2$ then the unit ball $B_2$ in $X^q$ is given by $B_2 = \{f_0 | \theta \in \mathbb{D} \}$; see Fig. 4.
VII. REMARKS ON THE VECTOR VALUED CASE

In this section we provide a natural extension of the complex bound for the vector-valued case which shows the flexibility of the integral kernel approach. To keep the paper reasonably short we choose not to discuss issues of loosing tightness of the complex bound when dealing with linear spaces over the reals.

Let \((X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)\) denote a finite dimensional complex inner product space of \(A\)-valued functions defined on some set \(\Omega\) which are bounded in the sense that

\[
\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|f(\omega)\|_A = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|f(\omega)\|_{\alpha < \infty},
\]

for all \(f \in X\). Here \((A, [\cdot, \cdot])\) denotes a finitely generated complex inner product space, \(|\alpha|^2_A = \langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle\) the induced norm, and \(A_1\) the unit ball. For \(\alpha \in A\) let \(\alpha^*\) denote the functional defined by \(\alpha^*(\beta) = \langle \beta, \alpha \rangle\) for all \(\beta \in A\). In the scalar case \(A = \mathbb{C}\) and \(\alpha^*\) is the complex conjugate of \(\alpha\).

 Mimicking the scalar case, given an ONB \(\{b_1\}_{i=1}^\infty\) of \(X\) let \(K(z, w) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty b_i(z)b_i^*(w)\) and \(K_{w,\alpha} = K(z, w)\alpha\). Then \(K\) is uniquely determined by its properties: 1) \(K_{w,\alpha} \in X\) and 2) \(f, K_{w,\alpha}\) is a \(\alpha^*\) functional defined by \(\alpha^*(\beta) = |\beta, \alpha|^2\) for all \(\alpha\in A, \beta \in X\); called the reproducing kernel of \((X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)\). In particular \(\Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow L(A)\) is independent of the chosen ONB and takes its values in the space \(L(A)\) of linear maps from \(A\) to \(A\).

Theorem 1 is a special case of the statement found in Theorem 13 for the vector-valued case.

**Theorem 13** Let \(R(w) = K(w, w)^{1/2}\), i.e., \(R(w) \in L(A)\) symmetric (Hermitian), such that \(R(w)R(w) = K(w, w)\) and let \(\|\cdot\|_{L(A)}\) denote the operator norm on \(L(A)\) induced by the norm on \(A\). For all \(w \in \Omega, f \in X\) there holds

\[
\|f(w)\|_{L(A)}^2 \leq \|R(w)\|_{L(A)}^2 \|f\|_2^2
\]

and this bound is tight. In particular

\[
\|f\|_\infty^2 \leq \|R\|_2^2 \|f\|_2^2,
\]

is a tight bound on \(X\).

**Proof:** For any \(\alpha \in A\), the Cauchy-Bunyakovsky-Schwarz inequality in \(X\) yields

\[
\|\alpha, f(\omega)\|_2^2 \leq \|K_{w,\alpha}\|_2^2 \|f\|_2^2.
\]

Utilizing \(\langle K_{w,\alpha}, K_{w,\alpha}\rangle = \|\alpha, K(w, w)\alpha\|\), which equals \(\|R(w)\alpha\|_2^2\), and supremizing over \(\alpha \in A\), yields

\[
\|f(w)\|_{A}^2 \leq \|R(w)\|_{L(A)}^2 \|f\|_2^2,
\]

(38)

The rest follows by the same reasoning as in the scalar case discussed in Theorem 1.

We conclude this section with a simple example where the computation of \(R(w) = K(w, w)^{1/2}\) can be reduced to the scalar case.

**Example 4** Let \((C^{n \times m}, [\cdot, \cdot])\) be defined by \([A, B] = \text{tr}(B^HA)\) for all \(A, B \in C^{n \times m}\), \(q \in \mathbb{R}[z]\) \(d\)-stable and \(X^q \otimes C^{n \times m} := \{P/q | P \in C^{n \times m}[z], \deg(P_j) < \deg(q)\}\), which is a subspace of \((L^2(\mathbb{D}, C^{n \times m}), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)\), inner product \((f, g) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(e^{i\omega}), g(e^{i\omega}) \, d\omega\). Let \(K\) denote the kernel reproducing the scalar space \(X^q\). Then \((f, K_{w, \alpha})\) equals \(\alpha^* f(w)\) because of \(I\)

\[
\int [f(e^{i\omega}), K_{w, \alpha}(e^{i\omega})] \, d\omega = \int [f(e^{i\omega}), \alpha^*] \cdot K_{w, \alpha}(e^{i\omega}) \, d\omega.
\]

In other words \(K(z, w) = k(z, w)I\) reproduces \(X^q \otimes C^{n \times m}\) where \(I\) denotes the identity in \(L(C^{n \times m})\). Using (38) this brings us to the conclusion that \(\|f\|_2^2 \leq \|K\|_\infty^2 \|f\|_2^2\) with \(K(w) = K(w, w)\) gives a tight bound on \(X^q \otimes C^{n \times m}\).

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have solved the problem of bounding the absolute value of a continuous-time or discrete-time system transfer function (and thus also its \(H^\infty\) norm) from above using its \(H^2\) norm and the reproducing kernel of the function class considered. We have shown how closed form expressions can be obtained by restricting the class of transfer functions to those forming real rational modules. Furthermore we have provided the basis for future work on this topic regarding vector and matrix-valued transfer functions.
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