

The D-plus Discriminant and Complexity of Root Clustering*

Jing Yang[†] and Chee K. Yap[‡]

Abstract. Let $p(x)$ be an integer polynomial with $m \geq 2$ distinct roots $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ whose multiplicities are $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$. We define the **D-plus discriminant** of $p(x)$ to be $D^+(p) := \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)^{\mu_i + \mu_j}$. Unlike the classical discriminant, $D^+(p)$ never vanishes. We first prove a conjecture that $D^+(p)$ is a $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -symmetric function of its roots $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$. Our main result gives an explicit formula for $D^+(p)$, as a rational function of its coefficients. A basic tool used by our proof is the “symbolic Poisson resultant”. The D-plus discriminant first arose in the complexity analysis of a root clustering algorithm from Becker et al. (ISSAC 2016). The bit-complexity of this algorithm is proportional to a quantity $\log(|D^+(p)|^{-1})$. As an application of our main result, we give an explicit upper bound on this quantity in terms of the degree of p and its leading coefficient.

Key words. D-plus discriminant, μ -symmetric polynomial, multiple roots, complexity analysis, root clustering

AMS subject classifications. 68W30, 11R29, 68Q25

1. Introduction. Consider a polynomial

$$p = p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^{n-i} \in \mathbb{Z}[x], \quad a_0 > 0$$

with $m \geq 1$ distinct complex roots $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$ and each α_i has multiplicity $\mu_i \geq 1$. Thus $n = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i$. By reordering the roots, we may assume that $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_m \geq 1$, and call $\boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ the **multiplicity vector** of p , denoted by $\boldsymbol{\mu}(p)$. We are interested in the following **μ -discriminant function**,

$$(1.1) \quad D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(r_1, \dots, r_m) := \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (r_i - r_j)^{\mu_i + \mu_j}.$$

The **D-plus discriminant** of $p(x)$ is the value obtained by evaluating the $\boldsymbol{\mu}(p)$ -discriminant function at the distinct roots of $p(x)$, that is

$$D^+(p) := D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{C}.$$

We see that $D^+(p) \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ where $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the algebraic closure of \mathbb{Z} . Although $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+$ is defined as a function of the roots, the main result in this paper gives an explicit rational function

* Submitted to arXiv.org on May 9, 2021.

Funding: Jing’s work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant #11801101) and Guangxi Science and Technology Program (Grant #2017AD23056). Chee’s work is supported by National Science Foundation (Grants CCF-1423228 and CCF-1564132). Chee is further supported under Chinese Academy of Science President’s International Fellowship Initiative (2018), and Beihang International Visiting Professor Program No. Z2018060.

[†] SMS-KLSE School of Mathematics and Physics, Guangxi University for Nationalities, Nanning, China. (yangjing0930@gmail.com).

[‡] Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, NYU, New York, USA. (yap@cs.nyu.edu).

$h_{\mu}(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{Q}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ such that

$$D_{\mu}^{+}(r_1, \dots, r_m) = h_{\mu}(-a_1/a_0, \dots, (-1)^n a_n/a_0).$$

Thus proves that $D^{+}(p) \in \mathbb{Q}$. Unlike the classical discriminant of a polynomial, $D^{+}(p)$ cannot vanish. The non-vanishing property is critical in some applications of discriminants. For example, Mahler [4] shows that the minimum distance between any two roots of $p(x)$ is proportional to $|D(p)|$ where $D(p)$ is the classical discriminant of p . Intuitively, it means that the bit-complexity of algorithms to isolate roots of p is (at least) proportional to $\log(|D(p)|^{-1})$. The bound becomes trivial when $D(p) = 0$. For a recent account various generalizations of the Mahler bound, especially on ways to overcome the case $D(p) = 0$, see Sharma [6].

EXAMPLE 1. We illustrate the concept of D -plus discriminant. If the polynomial $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^3 a_{3-i}x^i$ has a double root α_1 and a simple root α_2 , then $D^{+}(p) = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^3$. It turns out that $D^{+}(p)$ is the following rational function in a_0, \dots, a_3 :

$$(1.2) \quad D^{+}(p) = \frac{1}{a_0^3} [a_1^3 - (9/2)a_0a_1a_2 + (27/2)a_0^2a_3].$$

To see a numerical instance, let $p(x) = (x-1)^2(x-3) = x^3 - 5x^2 + 7x - 3$, and so $D^{+}(p) = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^3 = (1-3)^3 = -8$. Without knowing the roots, (1.2) gives the same answer, $D^{+}(p) = [(-5)^3 - (9/2)(-35) + (27/2)(-3)] = -8$.

History. The root function D_{μ}^{+} was first¹ introduced by Becker et al [1] in their complexity analysis of a root clustering algorithm. For simplicity, we may assume² that their algorithm accepts as input the pair (p, ε) where $p \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, and outputs a set $\{C_i : i = 1, \dots, m\}$ where $C_i = (\Delta_i, \mu_i)$ represents a cluster of roots. Here, the Δ_i 's are pairwise-disjoint discs of \mathbb{C} of radius $< \varepsilon$, and $\mu_i \geq 1$ is the total multiplicity of the roots of p in Δ_i , and $n = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i$ is the degree of p . To compare the efficiency of root isolation algorithms, it is standard to use the worst-case bit-complexity $T(n, L)$ for isolating all the roots of a polynomial p of degree n with L -bit integer coefficients: this is the so-called ‘‘benchmark problem’’ [5]. For the root clustering algorithm in [2], p is not necessarily square-free, and the coefficients may be Gaussian integers. If we choose ε to be less than $\sigma(p)/2$, where $\sigma(p)$ is the minimum separation between distinct roots of $p(x)$, we will achieve root isolation, i.e., each Δ_i contains exactly one distinct root. What is $T(n, L)$ in this case? It was shown [2] that that this complexity is ‘‘near-optimal’’ in the sense of Pan, i.e., $T(n, L) = \tilde{O}(n^2(n+L))$. This is also the first near-optimal complex root isolation algorithm to be implemented [3]. Furthermore, [1, 2] show that the implicit ‘‘constant’’ in the big-Oh bound on $T(n, L)$ is proportional to a quantity $\log(|D^{+}(p)|^{-1})$ where $D^{+}(p)$ places the role of the classical discriminant. Hence it is important to give an explicit upper bound on this quantity. As an application of our Main Result, we provide such a bound. Note that Sharma’s work [6] is also motivated by the clustering analysis in [1].

¹In [1], the D -plus discriminant was called a ‘‘generalized discriminant’’ and denoted by ‘‘ $D^{*}(p)$ ’’.

²The original algorithm also accepts an input box $B_0 \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ specifying a region-of-interest for the roots. Our simplification amounts to fixing $B_0 = [-H, H]^2$ where $H \geq 1 + \|p\|_{\infty}$; this ensures that B_0 contains all the roots of $p(x)$.

The key concept in this investigation is the concept of a μ -symmetric root function, first introduced in our companion paper [7]. We conjectured that the root function $D_\mu^+(r_1, \dots, r_m)$ is μ -symmetric. It follows from this conjecture (see Proposition 1 below) that $D^+(p)$ is a rational function in the coefficients of $p(x)$. Using the algorithms developed in [7] for detecting μ -symmetric polynomials, we previously confirmed the conjecture in many instances. In this paper, we will fully prove this conjecture. Moreover, the main result of this paper is an explicit formula for D_μ^+ as the $(n - m)$ -th derivative of the classical discriminant of p , up to a constant factor that depends on μ .

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the concepts of μ -symmetry and μ -gist and recall some preliminary properties of D_μ^+ . In Section 3 we develop the tool of symbolic Poisson resultant for establishing a connection between resultant expressions in roots and in coefficients. This tool has independent interest. In Section 4, we prove our Main Result that $D_\mu^+(r_1, \dots, r_m)$ is μ -symmetric. This follows from an explicit formula for $D_\mu^+(r_1, \dots, r_m)$ in terms of the polynomial coefficients. In Section 5, we apply the Main Result to provide the desired explicit upper bound on $\log(|D^+(p)|^{-1})$ in terms of the degree and coefficients of p . We conclude in Section 6.

2. Preliminaries. Throughout this paper, we fix K to be a domain of characteristic 0 (in particular, $\mathbb{Z} \subseteq K$). Consider three sequences of indeterminates:

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad \mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n), \quad \mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_m)$$

where $n \geq m \geq 1$. Throughout the paper, we use bold fonts for sequences. Also we write $|\mathbf{a}|$ to denote the length of a sequence \mathbf{a} . In particular, $|\mu| = |\mathbf{r}| = m$. If S is a set, we write $\#(S)$ for the number of elements in S .

In our application, these indeterminates are related through a particular interpretation (or specialization) as functions of the roots of an arbitrary polynomial $p(x) \in K[x]$ of degree n with m distinct roots. More precisely, suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are all the roots of $p(x)$ in \overline{K} (the algebraic closure of K). Then each x_i specializes to α_i , and z_i specializes to the i th elementary symmetric function of the α_i 's. Finally, each r_j 's specializes to a distinct α_i .

2.1. μ -Symmetry and μ -Gist. Recall the concepts of μ -symmetry and μ -gist from [7]. Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ where $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_m \geq 1$. If $n = \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_m$, we call μ a partition of n with m parts, or m -partition. A **specialization** σ is any function of the form $\sigma : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$. We say σ is of **type μ** if $\#(\sigma^{-1}(r_i)) = \mu_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. We say σ is **canonical** if it has the property $\sigma(x_i) = r_j$ and $\sigma(x_{i+1}) = r_k$ implies $j \leq k$ (for all i, j, k). For any μ , the canonical specialization of type μ is unique; we denote it by σ_μ .

Now we consider the polynomial rings $K[\mathbf{x}]$ and $K[\mathbf{r}]$. Any specialization

$$\sigma : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$$

can be extended naturally into a K -homomorphism

$$\sigma : K[\mathbf{x}] \rightarrow K[\mathbf{r}]$$

where $P = P(\mathbf{x}) \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ is mapped to $\sigma(P) = P(\sigma(x_1), \dots, \sigma(x_n))$. When σ is understood, we may write " \overline{P} " for the homomorphic image $\sigma(P)$.

We denote the i -th elementary symmetric functions ($i = 1, \dots, n$) in $K[\mathbf{x}]$ by $e_i = e_i(\mathbf{x})$. For instance, $e_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ and $e_n = \prod_{i=1}^n x_i$. Also define $e_0 := 1$. Typically, we write \bar{e}_i for the σ_μ specialization of e_i when μ is understood from the context; thus $\bar{e}_i = \sigma_\mu(e_i) \in K[\mathbf{r}]$.

DEFINITION 1. A polynomial $F \in K[\mathbf{r}]$ is said to be μ -symmetric if there exists a symmetric polynomial $\hat{F} \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $\sigma_\mu(\hat{F}) = F$.

When F is μ -symmetric, we can define a related polynomial as follows: since $\hat{F} \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ is symmetric, the Fundamental Theorem of Symmetric Functions tells us that there exists a polynomial $\mathring{F} \in K[\mathbf{z}]$ such that $\mathring{F}(e_1, \dots, e_n) = \hat{F}(\mathbf{x})$. We call \mathring{F} the μ -gist of F . Moreover,

$$(2.1) \quad \mathring{F}(\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n) = F(\mathbf{r})$$

where $\bar{e}_i = \sigma_\mu(e_i)$. E.g., let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_4)$, $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$, $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_4)$ and $\mu = (2, 1, 1)$. Consider $F(\mathbf{r}) = (2r_1 + r_2 + r_3)^2 + r_1^2 r_2 r_3$. It is μ -symmetric since there is a symmetric polynomial $\hat{F}(\mathbf{x}) = (\sum_{i=1}^4 x_i)^2 + \prod_{i=1}^4 x_i = e_1^2 + e_4$ such that $F(\mathbf{r}) = \bar{e}_1^2 + \bar{e}_4 = \sigma_\mu(\hat{F}(\mathbf{x}))$. The μ -gist of $F(\mathbf{r})$ is $\mathring{F}(\mathbf{z}) = z_1^2 + z_4$ since $F(\mathbf{r}) = \mathring{F}(\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_4)$.

The following proposition from [7, Proposition 1] shows that if F is $\mu(p)$ -symmetric function of the distinct roots of $p(x)$, then F is a rational function in the coefficients of $p(x)$:

PROPOSITION 1. Let $F(\mathbf{r}) \in K[\mathbf{r}]$ be μ -symmetric with gist $\mathring{F}(\mathbf{z}) \in K[\mathbf{z}]$. For any polynomial

$$p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^{n-i} \in K[x]$$

with m distinct roots $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$ of multiplicity μ ,

$$F(\alpha) = \mathring{F}(-a_1/a_0, a_2/a_0, \dots, (-1)^n a_n/a_0)$$

Thus, $F(\alpha)$ is a polynomial in $(a_1/a_0, \dots, a_n/a_0)$.

2.2. Basic Propositions on the D-plus function. Recall the definition of $D_\mu^+ = D_\mu^+(\mathbf{r})$ in (1.1). We say D_μ^+ is injective if for all $\mu' \neq \mu$, $D_\mu^+ \neq D_{\mu'}^+$. Clearly, D_μ^+ is not injective if $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and $n = \mu_1 + \mu_2 \geq 3$: in this case, $D^+ = (r_1 - r_2)^n$ for any $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ where $\mu_1 + \mu_2 = n$. The next proposition shows that D_μ^+ is injective in all other cases:

PROPOSITION 2. D_μ^+ is injective whenever $|\mu| \geq 3$.

Proof. Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ where $m \geq 3$. Suppose $\mu' = (\mu'_1, \dots, \mu'_{m'})$ such that $D_\mu^+ = D_{\mu'}^+$. We must prove that $\mu = \mu'$. By definition of D^+ , it is clear that m' is equal to m . Define $\delta_i := \mu'_i - \mu_i$. The equality $D_\mu^+ = D_{\mu'}^+$ implies that $\mu_i + \mu_j = \mu'_i + \mu'_j$ for all $i \neq j$. It follows $\delta_i = -\delta_j$ for all i, j . Since $m \geq 3$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu'_2 + \mu'_3 &= (\mu_2 + \delta_2) + (\mu_3 + \delta_3) \\ &= (\mu_2 - \delta_1) + (\mu_3 - \delta_1) \\ &= (\mu_2 + \mu_3) - 2\delta_1 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\delta_1 = 0$. Hence $\delta_i = -\delta_1 = 0$ for all i . This is equivalent to $\mu = \mu'$.

Q.E.D.

In [7], we proved the μ -symmetry of D_μ^+ for the following two special cases.

PROPOSITION 3. Assume $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ satisfying $\mu_1 + \mu_2 = n$. Then $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+$ is $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -symmetric with gist

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\mathbf{z}) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{(n-1)z_1^2 - 2nz_2}{\mu_1\mu_2} \right)^{n/2} & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ \left(\frac{(n-1)z_1^2 - 2nz_2}{\mu_1\mu_2} \right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \left(k_1z_1^3 + k_2z_1z_2 + k_3z_3 \right) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

where $k_1 = \frac{-(n-1)(n-2)}{d}$, $k_2 = \frac{3n(n-2)}{d}$, $k_3 = \frac{-3n^2}{d}$ and $d = \mu_1\mu_2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)$.

PROPOSITION 4. If all μ_i 's are equal to μ , then $D^+(P(x))$ is $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -symmetric with gist given by

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\mathbf{z}) = \left(\frac{1}{\mu^m} \cdot S_{n-m}^n \right)^\mu$$

where S_{n-m}^n is the $(n-m)$ th subdiscriminant of P of degree n .

3. The Symbolic Poisson Resultant. Our proof of the $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -symmetry of D^+ involves two technical tools: differentiation in a quotient ring and the symbolic version of the Poisson resultant:

- (I) Let R be a ring and c an indeterminate. We treat the polynomial $R[c]$ as a differential ring with a differential operator $\partial_c : R[c] \rightarrow R[c]$ where $\partial_c(c) = 1$ and $\partial_c(a) = 0$ ($a \in R$). We will need to extend ∂_c to the quotient ring $R[c]/I$ where $I \subseteq R[c]$ is an ideal. Let the equivalence class of $a \in R[c]$ modulo I be denoted as $[a] \in R[c]/I$. Let us define $\partial_c([a])$ to be $[\partial_c(a)]$. It is easy to check that $\partial_c([a])$ is well-defined iff I is closed under ∂_c .
- (II) The resultant $\mathbf{res}(A, B)$ of polynomials $A, B \in K[x]$ has an algebraic-geometric dual nature in the following sense: as an algebraic object, $\mathbf{res}(A, B)$ is defined as an expression in terms of the coefficients of A and B . Hence $\mathbf{res}(A, B) \in K$. As a geometric object, it is defined as an expression $\overline{\mathbf{res}}(A, B)$ in terms of α_i 's and β_j 's which are the roots of A and B in \overline{K} (the algebraic closure of K). Hence $\overline{\mathbf{res}}(A, B) \in \overline{K}$. We may call $\overline{\mathbf{res}}(A, B)$ the **Poisson resultant**. Naturally, the algebraic and geometric concepts coincide: $\overline{\mathbf{res}}(A, B) = \mathbf{res}(A, B)$. In reference to this equality, we may call $\overline{\mathbf{res}}(A, B)$ the **Poisson formula** for $\mathbf{res}(A, B)$. See [8, Chap. VI.4] for this classical approach. In this paper, in order to give a rigorous proof of our D^+ -theorem (Theorem 4.1 below), we introduce a symbolic version of the Poisson formula in which the α_i 's and β_j 's are just symbols.

We now state and prove the symbolic Poisson formula. Assume $n, m \geq 1$. Let $A = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i x^{m-i}$, and $B = \sum_{j=0}^n b_j x^{n-j}$ where x , $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_m)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_0, \dots, b_n)$ are $m+n+3$ indeterminates. We define $\mathbf{res}(A, B) = \mathbf{res}_x(A, B)$ (eliminating x) as the determinant of the Sylvester matrix $M(A, B)$ [8, Chap. III.3]. The non-zero entries of $M(A, B)$ contain the coefficients of A, B . Therefore $\mathbf{res}(A, B) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}]$.

Next we introduce two sets of indeterminates, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$ and the corresponding Viète relations expressing them as roots of A and B :

$$\begin{aligned} V^a(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) & := \{a_i - (-1)^i e_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha})a_0 : i = 1, \dots, m\}, \\ V^b(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) & := \{b_j - (-1)^j e_j(\boldsymbol{\beta})b_0 : j = 1, \dots, n\} \end{aligned}$$

where $e_i(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is the i -th elementary symmetric function in k variables; note that $k = m$ in V^a , and $k = n$ in V^b . For any ring R and subset $S \subseteq R$, let $\langle S \rangle = \langle S \rangle_R$ denote the ideal generated by S in R . If $p, q \in R$, we say p is **equivalent to q modulo S** (written as “ $p \equiv q \pmod{S}$ ”) if $p - q \in \langle S \rangle$. We are ready to state the symbolic Poisson formula for the resultant:

Theorem 3.1 (Symbolic Poisson Formula).

Let k be a symbol in $\{a, b, ab\}$. Define Q_k, R_k and J_k as in the following table:

	Polynomial	Ring	Ideal
(a)	$Q_a := a_0^n \prod_{i=1}^m B(\alpha_i)$	$R_a := \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}]$	$J_a := \langle V^a \rangle$
(b)	$Q_b := (-1)^{mn} b_0^m \prod_{j=1}^n A(\beta_j)$	$R_b := \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\beta}]$	$J_b := \langle V^b \rangle$
(c)	$Q_{ab} := a_0^n b_0^m \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (\alpha_i - \beta_j)$	$R_{ab} := \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}]$	$J_{ab} := \langle V^a \cup V^b \rangle$

Then the resultant polynomial $\text{res}(A, B) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}]$ is equivalent to Q_k modulo J_k in the ring R_k .

Proof. Note that $\text{res}(A, B)$ and Q_k are polynomials in the ring R_k , and J_k an ideal of R_k . The theorem makes three claims: for each $k \in \{a, b, ab\}$, we claim that $\text{res}(A, B) - Q_k \in J_k$ in R_k . Two types of arguments will be used in the proof: Type (I) depends on the Viète relations, and Type (II) is based on algebraic identities on determinants and the resultant polynomial. Type (II) justifications are summarized as follows (see [8, Lemmas VI.6.12, VI.6.14]):

$$\text{II(a): } \text{res}(\alpha, B) = \alpha^n.$$

$$\text{II(b): } \text{res}(A, B) = (-1)^{mn} \text{res}(B, A).$$

$$\text{II(c): } \text{res}(\alpha A, B) = \alpha^n \text{res}(A, B).$$

$$\text{II(d): } \text{res}((x - \alpha)A, B) = B(\alpha) \cdot \text{res}(A, B).$$

In the following proof, we write “ \equiv ” for a Type (I) justification, and “ $=$ ” for Type (II) justification:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{res}(A, B) &\equiv \text{res}\left(a_0 \prod_{i=1}^m (x - \alpha_i), B\right) && \text{(modulo } \langle V_a \rangle) \\
&= a_0^n \cdot \text{res}\left(\prod_{i=1}^m (x - \alpha_i), B\right) && \text{(by II(c))} \\
&= a_0^n B(\alpha_1) \cdot \text{res}\left(\prod_{i=2}^m (x - \alpha_i), B\right) && \text{(by II(d))} \\
&\vdots \\
&= a_0^n \prod_{i=1}^m B(\alpha_i) \cdot \text{res}(1, B) && \text{(by II(d))} \\
&= a_0^n \prod_{i=1}^m B(\alpha_i) && \text{(by II(a))}
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim when $k = a$; the proofs for $k = b$ and $k = ab$ are similar.

Q.E.D.


In the previous theorem, we proved three equivalences: that $\text{res}(A, B)$ is equivalent (respectively) to Q_a in $R_1 := R_{ab}/\langle V_a \rangle / [\langle V_b \rangle]$, to Q_b in $R_2 := R_{ab}/\langle V_b \rangle / [\langle V_a \rangle]$, and to Q_{ab} in $R_3 := R_{ab}/\langle V_a \cup V_b \rangle$. In the non-symbolic world, these three separate equivalents are simply identities over a common ring \overline{D} . To achieve a similar “flattening” in the symbolic setting, we use the fact that the three rings R_1, R_2, R_3 are isomorphic. This follows from the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *Consider a ring R_0 with ideals J_i ($i = 1, 2$). Let $R_i := R_0/J_i$ with the induced ideal $J_{ij} = \{b + J_i : b \in J_j\} \subseteq R_i$ ($i \neq j$). Then the following three rings are isomorphic:*

$$R_1/J_{12} \simeq R_0/(J_1 + J_2) \simeq R_2/J_{21}$$

See Figure 1, where we denote R_i/J_{ij} by R_{ij} and $R_0/(J_1 + J_2)$ by R_3 .

Figure 1. The commutative diagram of R_i and R_{ij}



Proof. By symmetry, it is enough to show that R_1/J_{12} and $R_0/(J_1 + J_2)$ are isomorphic. For any $a \in R_0$, define the cosets

$$\begin{aligned}
 [a] & := a + (J_1 + J_2) && \in R_0/(J_1 + J_2), \\
 [a]_1 & := a + J_1 && \in R_1, \\
 [a]_2 & := [a]_1 + J_{12} && \in R_1/J_{12}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that $[a]$ and $[a]_1$ are subsets of R_0 , but $[a]_2$ is a set of subsets of R_0 . If we flatten $[a]_2$ into $\overline{[a]_2} := \cup_{b \in J_2} [b]_1$, we have the equality $\overline{[a]_2} = [a]$. This gives a bijection between $R_0/(J_1 + J_2)$ and R_1/J_{12} . In other words, the maps $a \mapsto [a]$ and $a \mapsto [a]_2$ are homomorphisms from R_0 to $R_0/(J_1 + J_2)$ and R_1/J_{12} : we have $[a + a'] = [a] + [a']$ and $[aa'] = [a][a']$ and similarly for $[a + a']_2$ and $[aa']_2$. This proves the isomorphism $R_1/J_{12} \simeq R_0/(J_1 + J_2)$. **Q.E.D.**

Remark: Figure 1 shows two pathways from R_0 to an isomorphic copy of R_3 : either via R_0/J_1 or via R_0/J_2 . In the next section, our proof allows only one of the two pathways.

4. Main Result: A Gist Formula for D_μ^+ . Fix a multiplicity vector $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$, and the variables $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_m)$ and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ where $n = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i$.

In this section, we prove the main result of this paper: the μ -discriminant function $D_\mu^+(\mathbf{r})$ is a μ -symmetric function. By Proposition 1, $D_\mu^+(\mathbf{r})$ has a μ -gist function $\dot{D}_\mu^+(\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{z}]$.

This means that if $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^{n-i} \in K[x]$ has $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ as multiplicity vector, then

$$D^+(p) = D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\circ+}(-a_1/a_0, \dots, (-1)^n a_n/a_0).$$

We further provide an explicit formula for $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\circ+}(\mathbf{z})$. To do this, we need to introduce the symbolic counterpart of $p(x)$,

$$(4.1) \quad \check{p}(x) := \sum_{i=0}^n c_i x^{n-i} \in K[\mathbf{c}][x]$$

where $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n)$ are indeterminates. Then we take the discriminant of \check{p} ([8, Chapter VI.6]):

$$(4.2) \quad D(\check{p}) := \frac{(-1)^{\binom{n}{2}}}{c_0} \text{res}_x(\check{p}, \check{p}')$$

where \check{p}' denotes the differentiation of \check{p} with respect to x . Finally, we need to perform two types of operations on $D(\check{p})$, differentiation and specialization. These operations on $F \in K[\mathbf{c}][x]$ are defined as follows:

- Let $\partial_n F$ denote the partial derivative of $F \in K[\mathbf{c}][x]$ with respect to c_n . For $k \geq 0$, let

$$\partial_n^k F = \begin{cases} F & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \partial_n(\partial_n^{k-1} F) & \text{if } k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

- Consider the specialization

$$(4.3) \quad \{c_i \rightarrow (-1)^i z_i c_0 : i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

which introduces the variables $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$. It induces a homomorphism from $K[\mathbf{c}][x]$ to $K[c_0, \mathbf{z}][x]$ where $F \in K[\mathbf{c}][x]$ specializes to

$$F|_{c_i \leftarrow (-1)^i z_i c_0 \ (i=1, \dots, n)} \in K[c_0, \mathbf{z}][x].$$

We are ready to state our result.

Theorem 4.1 (Main Result).

The $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -discriminant function $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\mathbf{r})$ is $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -symmetric, and has a $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -gist given by

$$(4.4) \quad D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\circ+}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} H(\mathbf{z})$$

where

$$(4.5) \quad C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} := (n-m)! (-1)^{mn + \binom{n}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^m i\mu_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i},$$

$$(4.6) \quad H(\mathbf{z}) = H_{n,m}(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{1}{c_0^{m+n-2}} \cdot (\partial_n^{n-m} D(\check{p}))|_{c_i \leftarrow (-1)^i z_i c_0 \ (i=1, \dots, n)}.$$

Note that the constant C_μ is an integer, and the polynomial $H(\mathbf{z})$ depends only on n and m , and does not depend on the μ_i values. Before giving the proof of this theorem, we illustrate the gist formula of D_μ^+ :

EXAMPLE 2. Continue with $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^3 a_{3-i}x^i \in K[x]$ from Example 1 with multiplicity vector $\mu = (2, 1)$. Thus $n = 3, m = 2$.

- The symbolic counterpart of $p(x)$ is $\check{p}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^3 c_{3-i}x^i \in K[\mathbf{c}][x]$.
- $C_\mu = (-1)^{mn + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^m i\mu_i} \cdot (n-m)! \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i} = -4$
- $D(\check{p}) = \frac{(-1)^{\binom{3}{2}}}{c_0} \text{res}_x(\check{p}, \check{p}') = -4c_1^3c_3 + c_1^2c_2^2 + 18c_0c_1c_2c_3 - 4c_0c_2^3 - 27c_0^2c_3^2$
- $\partial_3^3 D(\check{p}) = \partial_3 D(\check{p}) = -4c_1^3 + 18c_0c_1c_2 - 54c_0^2c_3$

Then

$$H = \frac{(-4c_1^3 + 18c_0c_1c_2 - 54c_0^2c_3)|_{c_i = (-1)^i z_i c_0}}{c_0^{2+3-2}} = 4z_1^3 - 18z_1z_2 + 54z_3.$$

The substitution of $z_i = \bar{e}_i$ into H yields

$$\begin{aligned} H(\bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_2, \bar{e}_3) &= 4(2r_1 + r_2)^3 - 18(2r_1 + r_2)(r_1^2 + 2r_1r_2) + 54r_1^2r_2 \\ &= -4(r_1 - r_2)^3 = C_\mu D^+. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this derivation agrees with Example 1 in (1.2).

Setup for proof of the Main Result:

(S1) Our entire proof takes place inside the polynomial ring $R_0[x]$ where

$$R_0 := \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{c}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{r}]$$

where $\mathbf{c} := (c_0, \dots, c_n)$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} := (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})$ and $\mathbf{r} := (r_1, \dots, r_m)$ are indeterminates. Call R_0 the **underlying domain**.

(S2) We will introduce three quotient rings R_1, R_2, R_3 which are connected via canonical homomorphisms,

$$(4.7) \quad h_i : R_{i-1} \rightarrow R_i, \quad (i = 1, \dots, 3).$$

Also, let $h_0 : R_0 \rightarrow R_0$ be the identity. We unify these homomorphisms by focusing on the underlying domain R_0 , and define $\bar{h}_k : R_0 \rightarrow R_k$ ($k = 0, 1, 2, 3$) where

$$\bar{h}_k = \begin{cases} h_0 & \text{if } k = 0, \\ h_k \circ \bar{h}_{k-1} & \text{if } k \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

where \circ denotes function composition. Let $a, b \in R_0$. We usually prefer to write $[a]_k$ instead of $\bar{h}_k(a)$. We say a, b are \bar{h}_k -**equivalent**, denoted as $a \equiv_k b$, if $[a]_k = [b]_k$. Clearly, $a \equiv_k b$ implies $a \equiv_{k+1} b$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$. If $S \subseteq R_0$, we write $\langle S \rangle_k$ for the ideal in R_k generated by $\{[a]_k : a \in S\}$.

(S3) Definition of R_1 and R_2 : we establish $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ (resp., $\boldsymbol{\beta}$) as the roots of \check{p} (resp., $\check{p}'(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (n-i)c_i x^{n-1-i}$) using the Viète relations:

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{cases} V & := \{c_i - c_0 \cdot (-1)^i e_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) : i = 1, \dots, n\}, \\ V' & := \{(n-i)c_i - (nc_0)(-1)^i e'_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) : i = 1, \dots, n-1\}. \end{cases}$$

where e_i (resp., e'_i) is the i th elementary symmetric function on n (resp., $n - 1$) variables. This gives us two ideals $\langle V \rangle_0, \langle V' \rangle_0 \subseteq R_0$, as in Lemma 3.2 (see Figure 1). Although we may take successive quotients of R_0 by V and V' in either order, our proof requires that we first take quotient by V' , as follows:

$$(4.9) \quad R_1 := R_0 / \langle V' \rangle_0, \quad R_2 := R_1 / \langle V \rangle_1$$

(S4) Definition of R_3 : Finally, we define

$$(4.10) \quad R_3 := R_2 / \langle W \cup W' \rangle_2,$$

where W are relations asserting that α has m distinct (symbolic) roots $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_m)$, and W' are relations connecting the roots β to α . More precisely, let

$$(4.11) \quad \sigma_\mu : \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\} \rightarrow \{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$$

be any specialization that maps exactly μ_j of the α_i 's to each r_j ($j = 1, \dots, m$). Then

$$(4.12) \quad W := \{\alpha_i - \sigma_\mu(\alpha_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Next consider the relations that determine the multiplicity of those β_j 's that are equal to one of r_i 's. We know that $n - m = \sum_{i=1}^m (\mu_i - 1)$ of the β_j 's are mapped to r_1, \dots, r_m . The remaining $m - 1$ β_j 's are not equated with any root of p ; wlog, let³ $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{m-1}$ be these nonroots of p . These relations are captured by the specialization

$$(4.13) \quad \sigma'_\mu : \{\beta_m, \dots, \beta_{n-1}\} \rightarrow \{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$$

map exactly $\mu_j - 1$ of the β_i 's in $\beta \setminus \beta'$ to each r_j ($j = 1, \dots, m$). Thus our desired set of relations W' is given by

$$(4.14) \quad W' = \{\beta_i - \sigma'_\mu(\beta_i) : i = m, \dots, n - 1\}.$$

Proof of the Main Result: The arguments will be derived through a sequence of four lemmas (A,B,C and D). In Lemma A, we will show that the $(n - m)$ th derivative of the discriminant of \check{p} ,

$$(4.15) \quad G := \partial_n^{n-m} D(\check{p})$$

can be expressed in terms of the roots α, β by an application of the symbolic Poisson formula:

Lemma A *With G as defined in (4.15), we have*

$$(4.16) \quad G \equiv_2 (n - m)! C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{m-1}} \prod_{j \in S} p_\alpha(\beta_j)$$

³Of course, it does not mean that $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{m-1}$ are unrelated to r_1, \dots, r_m . But the connection is more subtle, and this is captured by Lemma C below.

where $\binom{[n-1]}{m-1}$ denotes the set of $(m-1)$ -sets contained in $[n-1] := \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, and

$$(4.17) \quad C := (-1)^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} n^n c_0^{n-1},$$

$$(4.18) \quad p_{\alpha}(x) := c_0 \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \alpha_i).$$

Proof. Recall that the Symbolic Poisson Formula in Theorem 3.1 expresses $\mathbf{res}(A, B)$ in terms of the roots α_i 's of A (modulo V_a) and the roots β_j 's of B (modulo V_b). We now replace A by $\check{p} = \sum_{i=0}^n c_i x^{n-i}$, and B by $\check{p}' = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (n-i)c_i x^{n-i-1}$. Also, we replace V_a, V_b by V, V' from (4.8). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} D(\check{p}) &= (-1)^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} c_0^{-1} \mathbf{res}(\check{p}, \check{p}') && \text{(definition of discriminant, see (4.2))} \\ &\equiv_1 (-1)^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} c_0^{-1} \cdot (nc_0)^n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \check{p}(\beta_i). && \text{(Poisson Formula, Theorem 3.1(b), modulo } V') \\ (4.19) \quad &= C \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \check{p}(\beta_i). && \text{(by definition of } C, \text{ see (4.17)).} \end{aligned}$$

Before continuing, we make two observations:

- The differentiation ∂_n can be extended to the quotient ring $R_0/\langle V' \rangle_0$ because $\langle V' \rangle_0$ is closed⁴ under ∂_n (in fact, $\partial_n(V') = \{0\}$).
- $\partial_n \check{p}(\beta_i) = \partial_n(\sum_{j=0}^n c_j \beta_i^{n-j}) = 1$.

Continuing,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_n D(\check{p}) &\equiv_1 C \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \partial_n(\check{p}(\beta_i)) \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} \check{p}(\beta_j) && \text{(by differentiation (4.19))} \\ &= C \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j \neq i} \check{p}(\beta_j) && \text{(as observed, } \partial_n(\check{p}(\beta_i)) = 1) \\ &= C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{n-2}} \prod_{j \in S} \check{p}(\beta_j) \end{aligned}$$

⁴In contrast, the Viète ideal V for $\check{p}(x)$ is not closed under ∂_n .

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_n^2 D(\check{p}) &\equiv_1 C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{n-2}} \partial_n \left(\prod_{j \in S} \check{p}(\beta_j) \right) && \text{(differentiating again)} \\
&= C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{n-2}} \sum_{T \in \binom{S}{n-3}} \prod_{j \in T} \check{p}(\beta_j) \\
&= 2!C \cdot \sum_{T \in \binom{[n-1]}{n-3}} \prod_{j \in T} \check{p}(\beta_j) && \text{(each } T \text{ arises from two } S\text{'s)} \\
&\vdots \\
\partial_n^k D(\check{p}) &\equiv_1 (k-1)!C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{n-k}} \partial_n \left(\prod_{j \in S} \check{p}(\beta_j) \right) && \text{(by induction on } k-1\text{)} \\
&= (k-1)!C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{n-k}} \sum_{T \in \binom{S}{n-1-k}} \prod_{j \in T} \check{p}(\beta_j) \\
(4.20) \quad &= k!C \cdot \sum_{T \in \binom{[n-1]}{n-1-k}} \prod_{j \in T} \check{p}(\beta_j) && \text{(each } T \text{ arises from } k \text{ } S\text{'s)}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $G = \partial_n^{n-m} D(\check{p})$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
G &\equiv_1 (n-m)!C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{m-1}} \prod_{j \in S} \check{p}(\beta_j) && \text{(by (4.20))} \\
&\equiv_2 (n-m)!C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{m-1}} \prod_{j \in S} a_0 \prod_{i=1}^n (\beta_j - \alpha_i) && \text{(Poisson Formula, Theorem 3.1(a),} \\
&&& \text{modulo } \langle V \rangle_2) \\
&= (n-m)!C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{m-1}} \prod_{j \in S} p_\alpha(\beta_j) && \text{(by definition of } p_\alpha\text{),}
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed by the lemma. **Q.E.D.**

Note that the polynomial H in the Main Theorem (see (4.6)) is related to G by a substitution:

$$(4.21) \quad H = (c_0^{m+n-2})^{-1} \cdot G \Big|_{c_i \leftarrow (-1)^i z_i c_0 \ (i=1, \dots, n)}.$$

This shows that $H \in \mathbb{Z}(c_0)[\mathbf{z}]$. In fact, Lemma B shows that $H \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{z}]$, i.e., H is independent of c_0 .

Lemma B

The polynomial $H(\mathbf{z})$ is a polynomial of degree at most $n + m - 2$ in $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{z}]$.

Proof. We know from discriminant theory that $D(\check{p}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{c}]$ is homogeneous of total degree $2n - 2$ in c_0, \dots, c_n . From (4.15) we conclude that $G = G(c_0, \dots, c_n)$ is homogeneous of degree

$(2n - 2) - (n - m) = n + m - 2$ in c_0, \dots, c_n . After the specialization (4.3), $G(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n)$ becomes

$$(4.22) \quad G(c_0, -z_1 c_0, \dots, (-1)^i z_i c_0, \dots, (-1)^n z_n c_0)$$

where each term in (4.22) is a product of c_0^{m+n-2} with a monomial of degree at most $m+n-2$ in \mathbf{z} . Hence we may divide (4.22) by c_0^{m+n-2} to obtain the polynomial $H \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{z}]$ (see (4.21)).

Q.E.D.

So far, the symbolic roots α, β are unrelated. We now show a critical connection between them: we introduce a polynomial $Q(x)$ defined in terms of the β_j 's. Lemma C shows that, up to \equiv_3 -equivalence, $Q(x)$ can be expressed in terms of the r_j 's. In other words, we can "eliminate the β_i 's in favor of the r_j 's" in $Q(x)$.

Lemma C *Let $Q(x) := \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (x - \beta_j)$. Then*

$$Q(x) \equiv_3 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m \mu_k \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^m (x - r_j).$$

In particular,

$$(4.23) \quad Q(r_i) = \frac{\mu_i}{n} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^m (r_i - r_j).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \check{p}'(x) &\equiv_2 n c_0 \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (x - \beta_j) \\ &\equiv_3 n c_0 \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (x - \beta_j) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^m (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - 1} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(4.24) \quad Q(x) \equiv_3 \frac{\check{p}'(x)}{n c_0 \prod_{k=1}^m (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - 1}}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \check{p}'(x) &= (\check{p}(x))' \equiv_3 c_0 \left(\prod_{k=1}^m (x - r_k)^{\mu_k} \right)' \\ (4.25) \quad &= c_0 \sum_{k=1}^m \mu_k (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - 1} \left(\prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^m (x - r_j)^{\mu_j} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (4.24),

$$(4.26) \quad Q(x) \equiv_3 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m \mu_k \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^m (x - r_j)$$

This gives our “elimination result” on $Q(x)$. Furthermore, when we evaluate $Q(x)$ at $x = r_i$, the k th summand in (4.26) vanishes unless $k = i$. This yields $Q(r_i) \equiv_3 \frac{\mu_i}{n} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^m (r_i - r_j)$.

Q.E.D.

In our final Lemma D, we exploit the “ β -elimination” property of Lemma C to prove that $H(\mathbf{z})$ is the $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -gist of $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\mathbf{r})$.

Lemma D *The polynomial $H(\mathbf{z})$ of Lemma B has the property*

$$H(\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n) \equiv_3 C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\mathbf{r}).$$

In other words, $(C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^{-1}H(\mathbf{z})$ is the $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -gist of $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\mathbf{r})$.

Proof. From the definition of $R_3 = R_2/\langle W \cup W' \rangle$ in (4.10), we see that the polynomial \check{p} has exactly m distinct roots, namely, $[r_1]_3, \dots, [r_m]_3$ in R_3 . Among the roots $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ of \check{p}' , exactly $m - 1$ roots are different from the $[r_j]_3$'s, namely, $[\beta_1]_3, \dots, [\beta_{m-1}]_3$. From (4.18),

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\beta_j) = c_0 \prod_{i=1}^n (\beta_j - \alpha_i) \equiv_3 c_0 \prod_{i=1}^m (\beta_j - r_i)^{\mu_i}.$$

Moreover, $p_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\beta_j) \equiv_3 0$ iff $j \geq m$. It follows that for $S \in \binom{[n-1]}{m-1}$,

$$(4.27) \quad \prod_{j \in S} p_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\beta_j) \equiv_3 \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } S \neq \{1, \dots, m-1\} \\ \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} p_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\beta_j) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$(4.28) \quad \begin{aligned} G &\equiv_2 (n-m)!C \cdot \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{m-1}} \prod_{j \in S} p_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\beta_j) && \text{(Lemma A)} \\ &\equiv_3 (n-m)!C \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} p_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\beta_j). && \text{(by (4.27))} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H(\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n) &= \frac{1}{c_0^{m+n-2}} G(c_0, -\bar{e}_1 c_0, \dots, (-1)^n \bar{e}_n c_0) && \text{(by definition of } H(\mathbf{z})\text{)} \\
&\equiv_3 \frac{(n-m)! C \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} p_{\alpha}(\beta_j)}{c_0^{m+n-2}} && \text{(by (4.28))} \\
&\equiv_3 \frac{(n-m)! C \cdot c_0^{m-1} \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \prod_{i=1}^m (\beta_j - r_i)^{\mu_i}}{c_0^{m+n-2}} \\
&= (n-m)! (-1)^{\binom{n}{2}} n^n \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \prod_{i=1}^m (\beta_j - r_i)^{\mu_i} && \text{(by expanding } C\text{)} \\
&= (n-m)! (-1)^{n(m-1) + \binom{n}{2}} n^n \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (r_i - \beta_j)^{\mu_i} && \text{(negate } (\beta_j - r_i)\text{)} \\
(4.29) \quad &= (n-m)! (-1)^{n(m-1) + \binom{n}{2}} \cdot n^n \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m (Q(r_i))^{\mu_i} && \text{(by definition of } Q(x)\text{)} \\
n^n \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m (Q(r_i))^{\mu_i} &\equiv_3 n^n \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{\mu_i}{n} \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^m (r_i - r_k) \right)^{\mu_i} && \text{(by Lemma C)} \\
&= n^n \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{\mu_i}{n} \right)^{\mu_i} \right) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^m (r_i - r_k) \right)^{\mu_i} \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i} \right) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq i < k \leq m} (r_i - r_k)^{\mu_i} (r_k - r_i)^{\mu_k} && \text{(since } n = \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_m\text{)} \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i} \right) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq i < k \leq m} (r_i - r_k)^{\mu_i + \mu_k} (-1)^{\mu_k} \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i} \right) \cdot (-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^m (k-1)\mu_k} \cdot \prod_{1 \leq i < k \leq m} (r_i - r_k)^{\mu_i + \mu_k} \\
&\quad \text{(since each } (-1)^{\mu_k} \text{ appears } k-1 \text{ times)} \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i} \right) (-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^m (k-1)\mu_k} \cdot D_{\mu}^+(\mathbf{r}). && \text{(by definition of } D_{\mu}^+\text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

In summary,

$$H(\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n) \equiv_3 C_{\mu} D_{\mu}^+(\mathbf{r})$$

where $C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (n-m)!(-1)^N \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} N &= n(m-1) + \binom{n}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^m (k-1)\mu_k \\ &\equiv nm + \binom{n}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^m k\mu_k \pmod{2}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude from Proposition 1 that $(C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^{-1}H(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ is the $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -gist of $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\mathbf{r})$. **Q.E.D.**

With Lemma D, we conclude the proof of the Main Result. The Main Result immediately yields:

COROLLARY 4.2.

Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ be two m -partitions of n . Then $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1}^+(\mathbf{r})$ and $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_2}^+(\mathbf{r})$ differ by a constant multiplier. More precisely,

$$C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1} D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1}^+(\mathbf{r}) = H_{n,m}(\bar{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \bar{\epsilon}_n) = C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_2} D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_2}^+(\mathbf{r}).$$

5. Application to the Complexity of Root Clustering. In this section we apply our determinantal formula for $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+$ to answering a question in the complexity analysis of root clustering algorithms. As described in the introduction, the root clustering algorithm in Becker et al. [1] has a bit-complexity which is proportional to $\log(|D^+(p)|^{-1})$. Here, $p = p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^{n-i} \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is the input polynomial. We will now derive an explicit upper bound on $\log|D^+(p)|^{-1}$ as a function of n and a_0 . In the following proof, assume \log is the natural logarithm $\log = \ln$.

Assume that $p(x)$ has distinct roots $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ with multiplicity structure $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$. From our Main Result,

$$|D^+(p)| = D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^+(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) = (C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^{-1}H(\bar{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \bar{\epsilon}_n).$$

By Lemma B, $H(\mathbf{z})$ is an integer polynomial of degree $\leq n+m-2$ in \mathbf{z} . Since $\bar{\epsilon}_i = (-1)^i a_i/a_0$, $H(\bar{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \bar{\epsilon}_n) = H(-a_1/a_0, a_2/a_0, \dots, (-1)^n a_n/a_0)$ is a rational number with denominator at most $|a_0|^{n+m-2}$. Thus $|D^+(p)| = \frac{1}{|C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}|} \cdot |H(-a_1/a_0, \dots, (-1)^n a_n/a_0)| \geq \frac{1}{|C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}|} |a_0|^{-n-m+2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |D^+(p)|^{-1} &\leq |C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}| \cdot |a_0|^{n+m-2} \\ (5.1) \quad &= (n-m)! \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i} \right) |a_0|^{n+m-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is not easily deduced from the input $p(x)$, our next goal is to bound the quantity

$$F_{n,m} := \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{\mu_i}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ range over all partitions of n with exactly m parts. We consider a closely related

maximization problem

$$(5.2) \quad \Phi_{n,m} := \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_{n,m}} \Phi(\mathbf{x})$$

where

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi(x) &:= x \log x, \\ \Phi(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi(x_1, \dots, x_m) &:= \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(x_i), \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.4) \quad \Omega_{n,m} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m : n - m + 1 \geq x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_m \geq 1\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Omega_{n,m}$ denote any maximum point of $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$, i.e., $\Phi(\mathbf{x}^*) = \Phi_{n,m}$. Since $\Phi_{n,m}$ is a maximization over the real set $\Omega_{n,m}$ while $F_{n,m}$ is a maximization over integer points (μ_1, \dots, μ_m) of $\Omega_{n,m}$, we have the inequality

$$(5.5) \quad \log(F_{n,m}) \leq \Phi_{n,m}.$$

But, in fact, we do have equality:

Theorem 5.1. *The value $\Phi_{n,m}$ is attained at the unique point $\mathbf{x}^* = (n - m + 1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \Omega_{n,m}$:*

$$\Phi_{n,m} = \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*) = (n - m + 1) \log(n - m + 1).$$

Hence $\log(F_{n,m}) = \Phi_{n,m}$.

Proof. We first prove that the function $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ achieves its maximum on the boundary of $\Omega_{n,m}$. Let $\partial_i \Phi = 1 + \log x_i$ be the partial derivative with respect to x_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$). The critical point \mathbf{x}_0 of $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ is where $\partial_i \Phi(\mathbf{x}_0) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. So $\mathbf{x}_0 = (e^{-1}, \dots, e^{-1})$ where $e^{-1} = 0.3679$. The second partial derivatives are given by $\partial_{ij} \Phi = \delta_{ij} \frac{1}{x_i}$ where δ_{ij} is Kronecker's delta. So the Hessian matrix is $H(\mathbf{x}) = (\partial_{ij} \Phi)_{i,j=1}^n$ is the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_n^{-1})$. Clearly $H(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is a positive definite matrix. This proves that \mathbf{x}_0 is a minimum point. Since there are no other critical points, we conclude that $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ attains its maximum value in $\Omega_{n,m}$ at some boundary point.

Let $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_m^*) \in \Omega_{n,m}$ be any maximum point. If $x_m^* > 1$ then $n - m + 1 > x_1^* \geq x_2^* \geq \dots \geq x_m^* > 1$, and so \mathbf{x}^* lies in the interior of $\Omega_{n,m}$, contradiction. Therefore $x_m^* = 1$. Let $\mathbf{x}' = (x_1^*, \dots, x_{m-1}^*)$, and observe that $\mathbf{x}' \in \Omega_{n-1, m-1}$. Moreover, $\Phi_{n,m} = \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(x_i^*) = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \varphi(x_j^*)$. Consider the injective map

$$\iota_m : \Omega_{n-1, m-1} \rightarrow \Omega_{n,m}$$

where $\iota_m(y_1, \dots, y_{m-1}) = (y_1, \dots, y_{m-1}, 1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{n,m} &= \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*) \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \iota_m(\Omega_{n-1, m-1})} \Phi(\mathbf{x}) && \text{(since } \mathbf{x}^* \in \iota_m(\Omega_{n-1, m-1})\text{)} \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega_{n-1, m-1}} \Phi(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \Phi_{n-1, m-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By induction on $k = 1, \dots, m - 1$, we conclude that $\Phi_{n,m} = \Phi_{n-k,m-k}$. When $k = m - 1$, we see that $\Phi_{n-m+1,1} = \varphi(n - m + 1)$ as claimed. The maximum point x^* in $\Omega_{n-m+1,1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is unique: $x^* = n - m + 1$. By taking the inverses of the ι_k 's, we conclude that the maximum point in $\Omega_{n,m}$ is $\mathbf{x}^* = (n - m + 1, 1, \dots, 1)$. **Q.E.D.**

Plugging the bound in Theorem 5.1 into (5.1), we obtain:

Theorem 5.2.

Let p be an integer polynomial of degree n with an L -bit leading coefficient a_0 . Then

$$\log(|D^+(p)|^{-1}) \leq 2n(\log n + L \log(2)) = \tilde{O}(nL)$$

Proof. From (5.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \log(|D^+(p)|^{-1}) &\leq \log((n - m)!) + \varphi(n - m + 1) + (n + m - 2) \log(2^L) \\ &\leq (n \log n) + (n \log n) + (2n)L \log(2). \end{aligned}$$

Q.E.D.

6. Final Remarks. This paper proves the conjecture that the root function D_μ^+ is μ -symmetric, by giving a determinantal formula for its gist. It follows that the D-plus discriminant of a polynomial is a rational number whose denominator can be explicitly bounded. All these concepts are quite natural and we believe they have wider application in the analysis of algorithms for root clusters and multiple roots. Our introduction of the symbolic Poisson formula also have independent interest. Finally, we show that the root clustering algorithm of Becker et al. [1] has an additional $\tilde{O}(nL)$ factor that comes D-plus discriminant of the input polynomial.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Professor Dongming Wang for his generous support and the use of the resources of the SMS International. This work is done during Chee's sabbatical year in China with the generous support of GXUN, Beihang University and Chinese Academy of Sciences in Beijing.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Becker, M. Sagraloff, V. Sharma, J. Xu, and C. Yap. Complexity analysis of root clustering for a complex polynomial. In *41st Int'l Symp. Symbolic and Alge. Comp.*, pages 71–78. ACM Press, 2016. ISSAC 2016. July 20-22, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Canada.
- [2] R. Becker, M. Sagraloff, V. Sharma, and C. Yap. A near-optimal subdivision algorithm for complex root isolation based on Pellet test and Newton iteration. *J. Symbolic Computation*, 86:51–96, May-June 2018.
- [3] R. Imbach, V. Pan, and C. Yap. Implementation of a near-optimal complex root clustering algorithm. In *Proc. Int'l Congress on Mathematical Software*, volume 10931 of *LNCS*, pages 235–244. Springer, 2018. 6th ICMS, Notre Dame University. July 24-27, 2018.
- [4] K. Mahler. An inequality for the discriminant of a polynomial. *The Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 11(3):257–262, 1964.
- [5] M. Sagraloff and C. K. Yap. A simple but exact and efficient algorithm for complex root isolation. In I. Z. Emiris, editor, *36th Int'l Symp. Symbolic and Alge. Comp.*, pages 353–360. ACM Press, 2011. June 8-11, San Jose, California.

-
- [6] V. Sharma. Generalizing the Davenport-Mahler-Mignotte bound. In *45th Int'l Symp. Symbolic and Alge. Comp.*, ISSAC '20, pages 410–417, New York, NY, USA, 2020. ACM. Jul 20-23, 2020.
 - [7] J. Yang and C. Yap. On μ -symmetric polynomials. *Submitted*, 2020. arXiv:2001.07403[cs.SC].
 - [8] C. K. Yap. *Fundamental Problems of Algorithmic Algebra*. Oxford University Press, 2000.