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Abstract

A polynomial is expansive if all of its roots lie outside the unit circle. We define some special determinants involving the coefficients of the polynomial and formulate necessary and sufficient conditions for expansivity using these determinants. We show how these conditions can be turned into an algorithm, which, for integer polynomials, avoids exponential coefficient growth. We also examine the question how close the roots of an expansive polynomial can be to the unit circle if the coefficients are integers. We give several lower bounds on this distance in terms of different measures of the polynomial (e.g., its height). The simplest one is derived by Liouville’s inequality, but then we improve this result and give different bounds using our special determinants.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, \( f(x) \) denotes a polynomial of degree \( n \) with coefficients \( a_i \in \mathbb{C} \) and roots \( \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C} \):

\[
f(x) = a_n x^n + \ldots + a_1 x + a_0 = a_n (x - \alpha_1)(x - \alpha_2) \ldots (x - \alpha_n)
\]

with \( n \geq 1 \) and \( a_n \neq 0 \).

We mainly focus on polynomials with integer coefficients, but some results are stated more generally.

Our main interest is in the following type of polynomials:
Definition 1.1. The polynomial $f$ is expansive if all of its roots lie outside the unit circle, i.e. $\forall \alpha_i : |\alpha_i| > 1$.

Expansive polynomials (or matrices with expansive characteristic polynomial) often arise in a wide range of problems involving convergence, where the convergence is ensured by the expansivity of an operator (or rather the contractivity of its inverse). One of our main motivations comes from so-called matrix-based numeration systems [1, Def. 3.7] [2]. These systems form a matrix and vector-based generalization of ordinary numeral systems. Many relevant properties of these systems, e.g. if all vectors have a representation, the representation is unique, etc., depend on the expansivity of the matrix. The running time of some related algorithms also depends on how tightly the matrix fulfills the condition of expansivity.

In this paper we will use the following functions to measure the complexity of polynomials. Several results are stated in terms of these quantities.

Definition 1.2. Denote by $H(f)$, $L(f)$ and $M(f)$ the height, length and Mahler measure of the polynomial $f$, respectively:

$$H(f) := \max_{i=0}^{n} |a_i|,$$

$$L(f) := n \sum_{i=0}^{n} |a_i|,$$

$$M(f) := |a_n| \prod_{i=1}^{n} \max(1, |\alpha_i|).$$

Note that for an expansive polynomial, we simply have $M(f) = |a_0|$.

The paper is built up as follows. Section 2 reviews some former results about expansive polynomials. In Section 3, we introduce a determinant-based condition for the expansivity of polynomials, and derive some properties of these determinants and their generalizations. In Section 4, we give lower bounds on the distance between roots of integer expansive polynomials and the unit circle. Finally, in Section 5, further research directions are given.

2 Former results

We give several connections between the coefficients of expansive polynomials. First of all, the most trivial one is (since $a_0 = \pm a_n \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \ldots \alpha_n$):

Lemma 2.1. For an expansive polynomial $f$:

$$|a_n| < |a_0|.$$
The inner coefficients can be bounded using the constant and leading coefficients (proved in [4]):

**Lemma 2.2.** If \( f \) is expansive, then the coefficients have the following bounds:

\[
|a_k| < \left( \frac{n - 1}{k - 1} \right) |a_n| + \left( \frac{n - 1}{k} \right) |a_0| \quad (1 \leq k \leq n - 1),
\]

and this is the best possible bound generally.

Better bounds can be given if more coefficients are involved: [4] gives bounds on \( a_k \) and \( a_{n-k} \) in terms of \( a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1} \) and \( a_{n-k+1}, \ldots, a_n \) \((k \leq n/2)\). This gives a way to exhaustively search for all expansive polynomials with a given degree and constant term by generating the coefficients from outside towards the center.

The conditions above are only necessary but not sufficient. A natural question is how the expansivity of a polynomial can be decided algorithmically. A well-known method for this is the Schur–Cohn test [3], which uses the following transformation:

**Definition 2.3.** The Schur transform of \( f \) is the polynomial \( g \) with:

\[
g(x) = b_n x^n + \ldots + b_1 x + b_0,
\]

\[
b_k := a_0 a_k - a_n a_{n-k}.
\]

Note that \( b_n = 0 \), so \( \deg g \leq n - 1 \). Then we have:

**Lemma 2.4.**

- If \( |a_n| < |a_0| \), then \( f \) and \( g \) have the same number of roots inside the unit circle.
- If \( |a_n| > |a_0| \), then \( f \) has the same number of roots outside the unit circle as \( g \) has inside it.
- In both cases, \( f \) and \( g \) share their roots on the unit circle.

The roots are counted with multiplicities.

It follows that \( f \) is expansive if and only if \( |a_n| < |a_0| \) and \( g \) is expansive.

The algorithm itself (the Schur–Cohn test) works by recursively generating the Schur transform and checking the condition \( |a_n| < |a_0| \) for each polynomial in the sequence. Note that due to the decreasing degree, the algorithm terminates with a constant polynomial in at most \( n \) iterations.

There are other algorithms for deciding expansivity, for example [5]. It transforms the condition of expansivity to stability, i.e. that all roots have negative real parts, by a simple transformation on the polynomial. Then the stability of the resulting polynomial is checked by converting its Hurwitz alternant to continued fraction form, see the details in [5]. The main calculations in this algorithm involve a recurrence relation similar to the Schur transform. According to [5], this algorithm performs better in practice than the Schur–Cohn test if the polynomial is likely to be expansive.
3 Special determinants

3.1 The $D$-conditions

Definition 3.1. For a polynomial $f$ of degree $n$, define the determinant $D_k^\pm(f)$ for each $1 \leq k \leq n$ and both signs $+$ or $-$ as a function of the coefficients of $f$ as follows. The size of $D_k^\pm(f)$ is $k \times k$, and the element in the $i$th row and $j$th column is the following:

$$d_{ij} = a_{j-i} \pm a_{i+j+n-k-1}, \quad (1 \leq i, j \leq k)$$

with the convention that indices outside the allowed range indicate zero values, i.e. $a_i = 0$ for $i < 0$ and $i > n$.

For example for $n = 7$ and $k = 6$:

$$D_6^+(f) = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 - a_2 & a_1 - a_3 & a_2 - a_4 & a_3 - a_5 & a_4 - a_6 & a_5 - a_7 \\ -a_3 & a_0 - a_4 & a_1 - a_5 & a_2 - a_6 & a_3 - a_7 & a_4 \\ -a_4 & -a_5 & a_0 - a_6 & a_1 - a_7 & a_2 & a_3 \\ -a_5 & -a_6 & -a_7 & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 \\ -a_6 & -a_7 & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ -a_7 & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 \end{vmatrix}.$$

Then we have the following characterisation of the expansivity of $f$:

Theorem 3.2. Assume that $f$ has real coefficients, i.e. all $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, and $a_0 > 0$. Then:

1. $f$ is expansive if and only if for all $k$ between $1 \leq k \leq n$ and for both signs $+$ and $-$: $D_k^\pm(f) > 0$ ($D$-conditions).
2. The $D$-conditions for $k = n$ can be replaced by the simpler $f(\pm 1) > 0$.
3. Furthermore, the $D$-conditions are required only for every second $k$ counting back from their maximal value, i.e. $k = n, n-2, n-4, \ldots$ for statement 1 and $k = n-1, n-3, n-5, \ldots$ for statement 2.

Note that the assumption $a_0 > 0$ makes no real restriction, since if $a_0 < 0$, the polynomial can be multiplied by $-1$ without changing its roots, and if $a_0 = 0$, the polynomial is not expansive.

Proof. In the proof, we use the Schur–Cohn test described in Section 2 with a small simplification: we assume that the Schur transform reduces the degree by exactly one. More precisely, instead of using the actual degree which may fall in larger steps, we use a pseudo-degree that always decreases by exactly one. It does not change the result of the test, because if the pseudo-leading coefficient were zero, then the next few steps would not change the polynomial except multiplying it by a nonzero constant until the pseudo-degree reaches the real degree. Moreover,
this proof never uses $a_n \neq 0$, so it is also true if $n > \deg f$. Because of this, in the proof we indicate $n$ on the $D$-conditions by writing $D_{n,k}^{\pm}$ instead of $D_{k}^{\pm}$.

The first statement is proved by induction on $n$.

For any $n$, the first condition of the Schur–Cohn test is $|a_n| < |a_0|$, which is, due to $a_0 > 0$, equivalent to $D_{n,1}^{\pm}(f) = a_0 \pm a_n > 0$.

For $n = 1$, this is the only condition.

For $n = 2$, the Schur–Cohn test performs two steps, and the second condition expands to $|a_0 a_1 - a_1 a_2| < |a_0^2 - a_2^2|$. Assuming the first condition, the right-hand side is simply $a_0^2 - a_2^2$, so the condition is easily seen to be equivalent to $D_{2,2}^{\pm}(f) > 0$.

Generally, it is sufficient to show that assuming $|a_n| < |a_0|$, the $D$-conditions for $f$ are equivalent to the $D$-conditions for its Schur transform, $g$. More specifically, we prove that for $k \geq 2, D_{n,k}^{\pm}(f) > 0 \iff D_{n-1,k-1}^{\pm}(g) > 0$.

Recall from Definition 2.3 that the coefficients of $g$ are $b_k = a_0 a_k - a_n a_{n-k}$. Formally we will also use the zero coefficient $b_n$. For example for $n = 5, k = 4$ and sign $(-)$, the $D$-expression for $g$ is the following:

$$D_{4,3}^{\pm}(g) = \begin{vmatrix} b_0 - b_2 & b_1 - b_3 & b_2 - b_4 \\ -b_0 & b_2 & b_1 - b_3 \\ -b_1 & -b_0 & b_4 \\ b_4 & b_1 - b_3 & b_0 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 - a_2 & a_5 - a_3 & a_1 - a_3 & a_4 - a_2 & a_2 - a_4 & a_3 - a_1 \\ a_0 & a_5 - a_3 & a_1 - a_3 & a_4 - a_2 & a_2 - a_4 & a_3 - a_1 \\ -a_3 - a_2 & a_0 - a_4 & a_5 - a_1 & a_1 - a_5 & a_4 - a_0 \\ -a_4 - a_1 & a_5 - a_0 & a_0 - a_5 & a_4 - a_0 \\ a_5 & a_0 & a_0 & a_5 & a_0 \end{vmatrix}.
$$

It can be easily shown that this kind of hyperdeterminant with only one different rows in the inner determinants can be expanded to one big determinant by removing the inner determinant signs, and clearing the repeated rows everywhere except in the block-diagonal. We continue the example case for illustration, and also describe the general case formally:

$$D_{4,3}^{\pm}(g) = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 - a_2 & a_5 - a_3 & a_1 - a_3 & a_4 - a_2 & a_2 - a_4 & a_3 - a_1 \\ a_5 & a_0 & a_0 & a_5 & a_0 & a_0 \\ -a_3 - a_2 & a_0 - a_4 & a_5 - a_1 & a_1 - a_5 & a_4 - a_0 & a_4 - a_0 \\ -a_4 - a_1 & a_5 - a_0 & a_0 - a_5 & a_4 - a_0 & a_4 - a_0 & a_4 - a_0 \\ a_5 & a_0 & a_0 & a_5 & a_0 & a_0 \end{vmatrix}.
$$

$$D_{n-1,k-1}^{\pm}(g): \begin{cases} d_{2i-1,2j-1} = a_{j-i} \pm a_{n+i+j-k-1} \\
 d_{2i-1,2j} = a_{n-j+i} \pm a_{-i-j+k+1} \\
 d_{2i,2j-1} = a_n \delta_{i,j} \\
 d_{2i,2j} = a_0 \delta_{i,j} \end{cases} (1 \leq i, j \leq k-1),$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is 1 if $i = j$, otherwise 0.

Now we arrange the odd rows and columns to the top and left halves, and multiply the other rows and columns by $\pm 1$, depending on the sign parameter of
\( D_{n-1,k-1}(g) \). Note that the sign of the determinant is preserved since the same number of actions are performed on the rows and the columns.

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
a_0 - a_2 & a_1 - a_3 & a_2 - a_4 & a_3 - a_5 & a_2 - a_4 & a_1 - a_3 \\
-3 & a_0 - a_4 & a_1 - a_5 & a_2 & a_1 - a_5 & a_0 - a_4 \\
-a_4 & a_0 & a_1 & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 \\
a_0 & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 \\
\end{array}
\end{vmatrix}
\]

\( D_{n-1,k-1}^\pm : d_{ij} = \)

\[
\begin{cases}
    a_{j-i} \pm a_{n+i+j-k-1}, & 1 \leq i, j \leq k - 1 \\
a_{i-j+2k} \pm a_{n+i+j-k-1}, & 1 \leq i \leq k - 1, k \leq j \leq 2k - 2 \\
\pm a_n \delta_{i-k+1,j}, & k \leq i \leq 2k - 2, 1 \leq j \leq k - 1 \\
ap_{i,j} \mp a_n \delta_{i-k+1,2k-j}, & k \leq i, j \leq 2k - 2
\end{cases}
\]

In this determinant, the \( j \)th column is the same as the \((2k-j)\)th in the first \( k \) rows. Now subtract the \( 2 \leq j \leq k - 1 \) columns from the appropriate similar columns:

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
a_0 - a_2 & a_1 - a_3 & a_2 - a_4 & a_3 - a_5 & a_2 - a_4 & a_1 - a_3 \\
-3 & a_0 - a_4 & a_1 - a_5 & a_2 & a_1 - a_5 & a_0 - a_4 \\
-a_4 & a_0 & a_1 & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 \\
a_0 & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 \\
\end{array}
\end{vmatrix}
\]

\( D_{n-1,k-1}^\pm : d_{ij} = \)

\[
\begin{cases}
    a_{j-i} \pm a_{n+i+j-k-1}, & 1 \leq i, j \leq k \\
0, & 1 \leq i \leq k, k + 1 \leq j \leq 2k - 2 \\
\pm a_n \delta_{i-k+1,j}, & k + 1 \leq i \leq 2k - 2, 1 \leq j \leq k \\
ap_{i,j} \mp a_n \delta_{i-k+1,2k-j}, & k + 1 \leq i, j \leq 2k - 2
\end{cases}
\]

This splits into the product of two determinants, the top left \( k \times k \) being exactly \( D_{n,k}^\pm(f) \), and the bottom right is the following:

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
\begin{array}{cccc}
a_0 & a_0 & \mp a_n & \mp a_n \\
\mp a_n & a_0 & a_0 & a_0 \\
\end{array}
\end{vmatrix} = \begin{cases}
(a_0^2 - a_n^2)^{k-2}, & 2 \mid k \\
(a_0^2 - a_n^2)^{k-2} (a_0 + a_n), & 2 \not\mid k
\end{cases}
\]

This determinant is positive because of \(|a_n| < |a_0|\), which proves that the whole determinant \( (D_{n-1,k-1}^\pm(g)) \) and \( D_{n,k}^\pm(f) \) has the same sign, and therefore proves the first statement of the theorem.

For the second statement, we prove that \( D_{n,n-1}^\pm(f) = f(\pm1)D_{n,n-1}^\pm(f) \). Then, since \( D_{n,n-1}^\pm(f) > 0 \) is one of the remaining \( D \)-conditions, the other two expressions have the same sign. We perform a similarity transformation on the matrix of
$D_{n,n}^\pm(f)$ to get another matrix with the same determinant, from which the desired factorization is obvious. First we illustrate it by an example, which shows that $D_{4,4}^\pm(f) = f(-1)D_{4,3}^\pm(f)$:

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\
0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{array} = 
\begin{array}{cccc}
a_0 - a_1 & a_1 - a_2 & a_2 - a_3 & a_3 - a_4 \\
-2 & a_0 - a_3 & a_1 - a_4 & a_2 \\
-a_3 & -a_4 & a_0 & a_1 \\
-a_4 & -a_4 & a_0 & a_0 \\
\end{array} = 
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{array}.
$$

Generally, the similarity matrix on the right is an upper bidiagonal matrix whose main diagonal entries are 1, and the diagonal above it contains $\mp 1$ (i.e. the opposite sign than that of $D_{n,n}^\pm(f)$). Its inverse (on the left) is an upper triangular matrix whose entries are $t_{i,j} = (\pm 1)^{j-i}$ for $i \leq j$. The entries of the transformed matrix (in the middle) are, by Definition 3.1, $d_{i,j} = a_{j-i} \pm a_{i+j-1}$. Then, the top left entry of the resulting matrix is indeed $f(\pm 1)$:

$$d_{1,1} = \sum_{l=1}^{n} (\pm 1)^{l-1} d_{l,1} = a_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{n} (\pm 1)^{l} a_l = f(\pm 1).$$

We can also prove that the resulting matrix contains $D_{n,n-1}^-(f)$ in the bottom right corner, by calculating the elements from the second column ($j \geq 2$):

$$d_{i,j} = \sum_{l=1}^{n} (\pm 1)^{l-1}(d_{l,j} \mp d_{l,j-1}) = 
\sum_{l=1}^{n} ((\pm 1)^{l-i}(a_{j-l} - a_{l+j-2}) - (\pm 1)^{l-i+1}(a_{j-l-1} - a_{i+j-1})) = 
(\pm 1)^{i-j}(a_{j-i} - a_{i+j-2}) - (\pm 1)^{n-i+1}(a_{j-n-1} - a_{n+j-1}) = 
a_{j-i} - a_{i+j-2},$$

which is indeed the appropriate element of $D_{n,n-1}^-(f)$ for $i \geq 2$, and it also shows that the first row is 0 for $j \geq 2$. By the rules of determinants, it follows that $D_{n,n}^\pm(f) = f(\pm 1)D_{n,n-1}^-(f)$.

The third statement, i.e. that only every second $D$-condition is required, is inherited by induction from $g$ to $f$ as in the first part of the proof. The only problem is that the induction requires $|a_n| < |a_0|$, i.e. the $D$-condition for $k = 1$, but that is only explicitly included for a certain parity of $n$ (depending on which
version of this statement is considered). Otherwise, we prove that the first included
$D$-condition, i.e. $D_{n,2}^{\pm}(f) > 0$, implies $D_{n,1}^{\pm}(f) > 0$:

$$D_{n,2}^{\pm}(f) = a_0(a_0 \pm a_{n-1}) - a_n(a_n \pm a_1) > 0 \iff$$
$$\iff a_0^2 - a_n^2 > |a_0a_{n-1} - a_na_1| \implies$$
$$\implies a_0^2 - a_n^2 > 0 \iff |a_n| < |a_0| \iff D_{n,1}^{\pm}(f) > 0.$$  

\[
\square
\]

### 3.2 Complexity of the algorithm

Theorem 3.2 can be turned into an algorithm that decides the expansivity of a polynomial, by calculating the determinants $D_k^\pm(f)$ and checking their sign. Normally, with numerical calculation (i.e. with standard floating-point numbers) the Schur–Cohn test is faster. The latter however has problems when the coefficients are integers and exact calculation is performed (i.e. with multi-precision arithmetic). Then, the Schur transform $b_k := a_0a_k - a_na_{n-k}$ may double the length of the coefficients in each step, which may lead to exponential coefficient growth and therefore running time. On the contrary, we show that our algorithm with the $D$-conditions runs in polynomial time.

We use the Bareiss algorithm [6] to calculate the determinants involving integer coefficients. It is an exact (not numerical) algorithm based on Gaussian elimination, which does not allow coefficient explosion (similar to the Schur–Cohn test) nor perform costly gcd-calculations to simplify exact rational entries, but instead it performs smart simplifications to ensure moderate (polynomial) growth of the entries and therefore polynomial running time. More specifically, its running time for an $n \times n$ matrix with integer entries is $O(n^5 \log(nB)^2)$, where each element is $|a_{ij}| \leq B$.

For deciding expansivity of a polynomial, the Bareiss algorithm is performed on $D_1^\pm(f), D_2^\pm(f), \ldots, D_{n-1}^\pm(f)$ as the second statement of Theorem 3.2 ensures (and also $f(\pm1)$ is calculated, but it is negligible). The entries of the matrices are at most $2H$ in absolute value (where $H := H(f)$, the height of $f$). The running time of the algorithm is therefore:

$$T_{D\text{-exp}}(n, H) = O(n^6 \log(nH)^2).$$

This is the worst-case complexity, and it is realized when every condition needs to be checked, e.g. when the polynomial is expansive. On the contrary, when an easy condition fails, the check terminates quickly. It is therefore advisable to start with the simpliest conditions $D_1^\pm(f) > 0$, which are simply $|a_n| < |a_0|$, then continue with $f(\pm1) > 0$, then continue with larger and larger $D$-conditions. And
also, due to the third statement of Theorem 3.2, every other $D$-condition may be skipped (i.e. $k = \ldots, n - 5, n - 3, n - 1$ is sufficient), but still, for the first few $k$, it is suggested to check them all regardless of parity, because they may give a quick negative result.

3.3 The $D$-polynomials

We can extend Theorem 3.2 from expansivity to the property that all roots have greater absolute value than a given constant, by replacing the expressions $D_k^\pm (f)$ by polynomials:

**Definition 3.3.** Define $\tilde D_k^\pm (f)(x)$ as $D_k^\pm (f)$ in Definition 3.1 except that all $a_j$ are replaced by $a_j x^j$.

For example for $n = 7$ and $k = 6$:

$$\tilde D_k^\pm(\tilde f)(x) = \begin{vmatrix}
   a_0 - a_2 x^2 & a_1 x - a_3 x^3 & a_2 x^2 - a_4 x^4 & a_3 x^3 - a_5 x^5 & a_4 x^4 - a_6 x^6 & a_5 x^5 - a_7 x^7 \\
   -a_3 x^3 & a_0 - a_4 x^4 & a_1 x - a_5 x^5 & a_2 x^2 - a_6 x^6 & a_3 x^3 - a_7 x^7 & a_4 x^4 \\
   -a_4 x^4 & -a_5 x^5 & a_0 - a_6 x^6 & a_1 x - a_7 x^7 & a_2 x^2 & a_3 x^3 \\
   -a_5 x^5 & -a_6 x^6 & -a_7 x^7 & a_0 & a_1 x & a_2 x^2 \\
   -a_6 x^6 & -a_7 x^7 & a_0 & a_1 x & a_2 x^2 & a_3 x^3 \\
   -a_7 x^7 & a_0 & a_1 x & a_2 x^2 & a_3 x^3 & a_4 x^4
\end{vmatrix}.$$  

Note that there is a direct connection between $D$ and $\tilde D$: first, $\tilde D_k^\pm (f)(1) = D_k^\pm (f)$, and in the other direction, let $f_y(x) := f(xy)$, then $D_k^\pm (f_y) = \tilde D_k^\pm (f)(y)$.

Then we have:

**Corollary 3.4.** If $f$ has real coefficients with $a_0 > 0$, then for any $s > 0$, $f$ has all its roots $|\alpha_i| > s$ if and only if similar conditions hold as in Theorem 3.2, but the expressions $D_k^\pm (f)$ are replaced by $\tilde D_k^\pm (f)(s)$, and $f(\pm 1)$ is replaced by $f(\pm s)$.

**Proof.** Apply Theorem 3.2 for $f_s(x) := f(sx)$, then the condition $|\alpha_i| > s$ for the roots of $f$ is equivalent to expansivity of $f_s$. □

Some properties of the $D$-polynomials:

**Lemma 3.5.**

1. $\tilde D_k^\pm (f)(x)$ has constant term $a_0^k$ and leading term $a_n^k x^{kn}$, the latter having a sign dependent on the parameters $(k$ and $\pm)$.

2. For $k = n - 1, n - 3, n - 5, \ldots$, $\tilde D_k^\pm (f)(x)$ has only even powers of $x$.

3. For $k = n - 1$, the polynomial $\tilde D_{n-1}^\pm (f)(x^{1/2})$ has the following $\binom{n}{2}$ roots: $\alpha_i \alpha_j$ for all $i < j$. 
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Proof. Each row of the $k \times k$ determinant $\tilde{D}_k^\pm(f)(x)$ has a unique term with minimal and maximal $x$-power, namely $a_0$ and $\pm a_n x^n$. The formers are in the main diagonal, yielding the constant term $a_0^k$, and the latters are in the antidiagonal, yielding $(-1)^{|k/2|}(\pm 1)^k a_n^k x^{kn}$ as the leading term.

The determinant $\tilde{D}_k^\pm(f)(x)$ has entries $d_{ij} = a_j - i x^j - i \pm a_i + j + n - k - 1^{2i+n-k-1}$ by Definition 3.1. Multiplying the $i$th row by $x^{i-1}$ and dividing the $j$th column by $x^{j-1}$ gives an other representation of the same determinant: $d'_{ij} = a_j - i \pm a_i + j + n - k - 1^{2i+n-k-1}$, from which it is obvious that if $n - k - 1$ is even, it has only even powers of $x$. (Note that for $x = 0$, the transformation does not work, but then the two determinants are trivially equal.)

For the third statement, we construct another polynomial of degree $n^2$ whose roots are $\alpha_i \alpha_j$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ (it easily follows from the rules of resultants) [7, p. 159]:

$$F(x) = \text{res}_y \left( f(y), f \left( \frac{x}{y} \right) y^n \right) = a_n^2 \prod_{i=1}^{n} \prod_{j=1}^{n} (x - \alpha_i \alpha_j).$$

Up to sign, it can be represented by the following $2n \times 2n$ determinant, which is a slightly modified version of the Sylvester matrix corresponding to the resultant above:

$$(-1)^n F(x) = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_n & & & & \\ a_1 x & a_0 & a_{n-1} & a_n & & \\ a_2 x^2 & a_1 x & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \vdots & a_2 x^2 & \ddots & a_0 & a_1 & \ddots & a_n \\ a_n x^n & \ddots & a_1 x & a_0 & a_1 & \ddots & a_{n-1} \\ a_n x^n & a_2 x^2 & \ddots & a_0 & \ddots & \ddots & a_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & a_1 & \ddots & \ddots & a_0 \\ a_n x^n & \ddots & \ddots & a_1 & \ddots & \ddots & a_0 \end{vmatrix}$$

We will factor $F(x^2)$ by applying a similarity transformation on this matrix but with $x \to x^2$, first illustrated with an example ($n = 3$):
proves that $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{bmatrix}
  x^2 & x & 1 \\
  x & 1 & x \\
  x^2 & x^2 & x^{-1}
\end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix}
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3
\end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix}
  x^{-2} & x^{-1} & 1 \\
  x^{-2} & x^{-1} & 1 \\
  x^{-2} & x^{-1} & 1 \\
  x^{-2} & x^{-1} & 1
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
  a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

Generally, calling this product as $UMV = N$ with $U = V^{-1}$, their entries are:

$$m_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
  a_{i-j}x^{2i-2j} & 1 \leq j \leq n, \\
  a_{j-i} & n + 1 \leq j \leq 2n,
\end{cases}$$

$$u_{ij}; v_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
  x^{n-j}; x^{j-n} & 1 \leq i = j \leq n \\
  x^{n-j+1}; x^{j-n-1} & n + 1 \leq i = j \leq 2n \\
  x^{n-j+1}; -x^{n-j+1} & i = 2n - j + 1, 1 \leq j \leq n \\
  0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}$$

Then straightforward calculation gives:

$$(UM)_ij = \begin{cases} 
  a_{i-j}x^{n+i-2j} & 1 \leq i, j \leq n \\
  a_{j-i}x^{n-i} & 1 \leq i \leq n, n + 1 \leq j \leq 2n \\
  a_{i-j}x^{n+i+2j} + a_{2n-i-j+1}x^{3n-i-2j+2} & n + 1 \leq i \leq 2n, 1 \leq j \leq n \\
  a_{j-i}x^{n-i+1} + a_{i+j-2n-1}x^{i-n} & n + 1 \leq i, j \leq 2n
\end{cases}$$

$$(UMV)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
  a_{i-j}x^{i-j} - a_{2n-i-j+1}x^{2n-i-j+1} & 1 \leq i, j \leq n \\
  a_{j-i}x^{j-i-1} & 1 \leq i \leq n, n + 1 \leq j \leq 2n \\
  0 & n + 1 \leq i \leq 2n, 1 \leq j \leq n \\
  a_{j-i}x^{j-i} + a_{i+j-2n-1}x^{i+j-2n-1} & n + 1 \leq i, j \leq 2n
\end{cases}$$

This confirms what the example suggests about the resulting matrix, $N$: the bottom right quadrant is the exact copy of $\tilde{D}^+_n(f)(x)$, the top left quadrant is $\tilde{D}^-_n(f)(x)$ turned upside down, and the bottom left quadrant is empty. (Note that again for $x = 0$, the transformation fails, but then trivially det $M$ = det $N$.) This proves that $F(x^2) = (-1)^n \tilde{D}^+_n(f)(x) \cdot \tilde{D}^-_n(f)(x)$.

In the proof of Theorem 3.2 (second part), we found that $D^\pm_n(f) = f(\pm 1)D^\pm_{n-1}(f)$. Using the connection between $D$ and $\tilde{D}$, this factorization can
be generalized to $D$-polynomials, which gives a finer factorization of $F(x^2)$:

$$F(x^2) = (-1)^n f(x) f(-x) \left( \tilde{D}_{n-1}(f)(x) \right)^2.$$  

Examine the first few factors:

$$(-1)^n f(x) f(-x) = a_n \prod_{i=1}^{n} (x - \alpha_i) \cdot a_n \prod_{i=1}^{n} (x + \alpha_i) = a_n^2 \prod_{i=1}^{n} (x^2 - \alpha_i^2).$$

This shows that the polynomial $f(x^{1/2})f(-x^{1/2})$ has all $\alpha_i^2$ as roots. All other roots of $F(x)$ are double ($\alpha_i \alpha_j = \alpha_j \alpha_i$ with $i \neq j$), therefore $\tilde{D}_{n-1}(f)(x^{1/2})$ has half of them, i.e. all $\alpha_i \alpha_j$ with $i < j$. \hfill \Box

4 Bounds on the expansivity gap

In this section we examine the following question: given an expansive polynomial with integer coefficients, how close can the size of the roots be to 1?

**Definition 4.1.** Let $f$ be an expansive polynomial (i.e. with roots $|\alpha_i| > 1$), then the expansivity gap is:

$$\varepsilon := \min_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_i| - 1.$$  

Our goal is to give a lower bound on $\varepsilon$ in terms of the degree $n$ and some other quantity measuring the complexity of $f$. For example, we can use the height and the length of the polynomial, as defined in Definition 1.2.

The expansivity gap is closely related to the distance of algebraic numbers (i.e. roots of integer polynomials) from 1. If the root $\alpha$ of an expansive polynomial is real, then $|\alpha| - 1$ is either $\alpha - 1$ or $(-\alpha) - 1$, otherwise $|\alpha| = \sqrt{\alpha \overline{\alpha}}$, so when $\alpha$ is close to 1, $|\alpha| - 1 \approx \frac{\alpha - 1}{2}$.

4.1 Liouville-type bounds

A common tool for bounding distances between algebraic numbers is Liouville’s inequality [8, Prop. 3.14]:

**Theorem 4.2.** If $f$ and $g$ are integer polynomials and $\alpha$ is a root of $f$ but not of $g$, the following bound holds:

$$\frac{1}{|g(\alpha)|} \leq L(g)^{n-1} M(f)^{\deg g},$$

where $L(g)$ is the length and $M(f)$ is the Mahler measure as defined in Definition 1.2.
Using Liouville’s inequality, we give the following bounds on the expansivity gap $\varepsilon$, or rather on $1/\varepsilon$ in order to keep the formulas simpler:

**Theorem 4.3.** For an expansive polynomial $f$ with integer coefficients, and any root $\alpha$ of $f$, we have:

$$\frac{1}{|\alpha| - 1} \leq \begin{cases} 2^{n-1}|a_0| & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \\ 2^{(n^2)}|a_0|^{n-1} + 1 & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* For real $\alpha$, applying Liouville’s inequality for $g(x) = x + 1$ and $g(x) = x - 1$ and using that $M(f) = |a_0|$ for expansive polynomials, we get:

$$\frac{1}{|\alpha - 1|} \leq 2^{n-1}|a_0|. \quad (4.1)$$

For non-real $\alpha$, we apply this inequality to $\alpha \bar{\alpha}$. Since $\bar{\alpha}$ is also a root of $f$, $\alpha \bar{\alpha}$ is a root of the polynomial $F(x) := D_{n-1}(f)(x^{1/2})$, because it has all $\alpha_i \alpha_j$ as roots for $i < j$ by Lemma 3.5. As $F$ is also an expansive polynomial, and it has degree $(\frac{n}{2})$ and constant term is $a_0^{n-1}$, we get from (4.1):

$$\frac{1}{|\alpha \bar{\alpha} - 1|} \leq 2^{(n^2)-1}|a_0|^{n-1}.$$ 

We can rearrange this as $|\alpha|^2 = \alpha \bar{\alpha} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{B}$ where $B$ is the right-hand side of the inequality above. The proof finishes by applying the fact that

$$\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{B}} > 1 + \frac{1}{2B + 1} \quad (4.2)$$

for any $B > 0$. \[\square\]

We are able to give slightly stronger bounds by using not only $|a_0|$, but also $|a_n|$:

**Theorem 4.4.** For any root $\alpha$ of an expansive integer polynomial $f$:

$$\frac{1}{|\alpha| - 1} \leq \begin{cases} 2^{n-2}(|a_0| + |a_n|) & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \\ 2^{(n^2-1)}(|a_0| + |a_n|)^{n-1} + 1 & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We give a better alternative to Liouville’s inequality in its special form (4.1). For this, first we present a simple proof of (4.1). We start by dividing the
factorized form \( f(x) = a_n(x - \alpha_1)(x - \alpha_2) \ldots (x - \alpha_n) \) by one of its root factors, then applying this for \(|f(\pm 1)|\):

\[
\frac{|f(\pm 1)|}{|\pm 1 - \alpha_1|} = |a_n| \prod_{i=2}^{n} |\pm 1 - \alpha_i| \leq |a_n| \prod_{i=2}^{n} (1 + |\alpha_i|) \leq \frac{1}{2} |a_n| \prod_{i=1}^{n} 2|\alpha_i| = 2^{n-1}|a_0|.
\]

Since \( f \) is expansive and has integer coefficients, \(|f(\pm 1)| \geq 1\), which finishes the proof of (4.1).

We will modify this proof as follows. Define the polynomial \( \hat{f} \) to have \(-|\alpha_i|\) as roots, more precisely:

\[
\hat{f}(x) = \hat{a}_nx^n + \ldots + \hat{a}_1x + \hat{a}_0 := |a_n|(x + |\alpha_1|)(x + |\alpha_2|) \ldots (x + |\alpha_n|).
\]

Now we can rewrite one consequence of the proof above as \( \frac{1}{|\alpha + 1|} \leq \frac{1}{2} \hat{f}(1) \), and the next task is to give a better bound on \( \hat{f}(1) \).

For this, we prove that for any expansive polynomial \( f \), the following holds:

\[
|f(x)| \leq (1 + |x|)^{n-1}(|a_n||x| + |a_0|).
\] (4.3)

Indeed, by using the the inequalities (2.2) between the coefficients of expansive polynomials:

\[
|f(x)| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} |a_k||x|^k \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left( \binom{n-1}{k-1} |a_n| + \binom{n-1}{k} |a_0| \right) |x|^k = \\
= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} |x|^k(|a_n||x| + |a_0|),
\]

and the binomial theorem gives (4.3).

As \( \hat{f} \) is also expansive, we can apply (4.3) to \( \hat{f}(1) \), which completes the proof of the theorem for real \( \alpha \).

For non-real \( \alpha \), we apply the same method but for \( \alpha \overline{\alpha} \) and \( F \), and define \( \hat{F} \) like \( \hat{f} \) but for \( F \). Now \( \hat{F}(1) \) can be written as:

\[
\hat{F}(1) = \prod_{m=2}^{n} \left( |a_n| \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} (1 + |\alpha_i||\alpha_m|) \right) = \prod_{m=2}^{n} \left( |\alpha_m|^{m-1} \hat{f}_{m-1} \left( \frac{1}{|\alpha_m|} \right) \right)
\]
with \( \hat{f}_m(x) := |a_n|(x + |\alpha_1|) \ldots (x + |\alpha_m|) \). This is an expansive polynomial, so we can use (4.3) and continue:

\[
\leq \prod_{m=2}^{n} ((1 + |\alpha_m|)^{m-2}|a_n|(1 + |\alpha_1| \ldots |\alpha_m|)) = \prod_{l=2}^{n} |a_n|(1 + |\alpha_1| \ldots |\alpha_l|)(1 + |\alpha_{l+1}|) \ldots (1 + |\alpha_n|)
\]

If we treat the product inside \( \prod \) as an expansive polynomial with \( x = 1 \), we can apply (4.3) to it:

\[
\leq \prod_{l=2}^{n} 2^n |a_n|(1 + |\alpha_1| \ldots |\alpha_n|) = 2^{\binom{n-1}{2}}(|a_n| + |a_0|)^{n-1}.
\]

We have \( \frac{1}{|\alpha_1| - 1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \hat{F}(1) \) like in the first part of the proof, and we can finish the proof as in Theorem 4.3.

**4.2 Bounds using the determinants**

The previous bounds (Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.4) relied on Liouville’s inequality and basic properties of expansive polynomials. They used only the size of the constant term and possibly the leading coefficient, but with quite large \( n \)-dependent factor. In this section we will use the determinant structure of the \( D \)-polynomials to give bounds with smaller factors but with all coefficients of the polynomial. We present two theorems, one using the height of the polynomial \((H(f))\) and one using the length \((L(f))\).

**Theorem 4.5.** For any root \( \alpha \) of an expansive integer polynomial \( f \):

\[
\frac{1}{|\alpha| - 1} \leq \begin{cases} 
\binom{n+1}{2} H(f) + \frac{n}{2} & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \\
\binom{n}{2} n! H(f)^{n-1} + \binom{n}{2} + 1 & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}.
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** Since \(|f(\pm 1)| \geq 1\), if we can show that \(|f(\pm(1+\varepsilon)) - f(\pm 1)| < 1\) for some positive \( \varepsilon \), then \( f \) has no real root with absolute value \( 1 + \varepsilon \).

The (finite) power series expansion of \( f(1 + \varepsilon) \) is:

\[
f(1 + \varepsilon) = f(1) + f'(1)\varepsilon + \frac{f''(1)}{2}\varepsilon^2 + \ldots + \frac{f^{(n)}(1)}{n!}\varepsilon^n,
\]

and that of \( f(-1 - \varepsilon) \) is similar but with some different signs. We can bound the coefficients as follows:

\[
\left| \frac{f^{(k)}(\pm 1)}{k!} \right| = \left| \sum_{j=0}^{n} (\pm 1)^{j-k} \binom{j}{k} a_j \right| \leq \binom{n + 1}{k + 1} H(f).
\]
Therefore:
\[
|f(\pm(1 + \varepsilon)) - f(\pm 1)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n+1}{k+1} \varepsilon^{k} H(f) < \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (n+1) \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{k} H(f).
\]

It is easy to show that for any \( A, B > 0 \):
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (A\varepsilon)^{k} B \leq 1 \iff \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{AB + 1}.
\]

From this, the statement for real \( \alpha \) follows.

For non-real \( \alpha \), we do a similar calculation but for \( F(x) \). Recall that \( F(x) \) has degree \( N := \binom{n}{2} \), and \( F(1) = D_{n-1}(f) \) can be written as a determinant of size \((n-1) \times (n-1)\) with entries like \( a_{i} - a_{j}, \pm a_{i} \) or 0 (see Definition 3.1). We can expand this determinant as:
\[
F(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{T_{n}} \left( \pm \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} a_{k(i,j)} \right).
\]

Note that not only the determinant itself is expanded, but also every \( a_{i} - a_{j} \) expression in that determinant. To give a bound on \( T_{n} \), i.e. the number of terms in the expansion, expand the determinant starting from the last row, going back to the first. This gives a bound for the number of possibilities as \( 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 4 \cdot \ldots \cdot n \), i.e. \( T_{n} \leq n! \).

Therefore \( |F(1)| \leq n! H(f)^{n-1} \), and similarly as for \( f \) above:
\[
\frac{|F^{(k)}(1)|}{k!} = \left| \sum_{j=0}^{N} \binom{j}{k} A_{j} \right| \leq \binom{N}{k} |F(1)| \leq \binom{N}{k} n! H(f)^{n-1}.
\]

However, we can improve the bound by a factor of two, noticing the symmetry of the determinant: reversing the coefficient sequence \( a_{0}, a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n} \) does not change the value except for the sign, so any \( \prod a_{i} \) term in the expansion has a pair \( \prod a_{n-i} \) (maybe itself) with probably different sign. This means, according to the definition of the \( D \)-polynomials (Definition 3.3), that in \( F(x) \), the coefficients of \( x^{j} \) and \( x^{N-j} \) have the same number of \( \prod a_{i} \) terms, so we can pair them up to get a better bound:
\[
\frac{|F^{(k)}(1)|}{k!} = \left| \sum_{j=0}^{N} \frac{1}{2} \left( \binom{j}{k} A_{j} + \binom{N-j}{k} A_{N-j} \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \max_{j=0}^{N} \left( \binom{j}{k} + \binom{N-j}{k} \right) n! H(f)^{n-1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{N}{k} n! H(f)^{n-1}.
\]
We can use this to calculate:

\[ |F(1 + \varepsilon) - F(1)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2} \binom{N}{k} n!H(f)^{n-1} \varepsilon^k < \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{N}{2} \varepsilon \right)^k n!H(f)^{n-1}. \]

By using (4.4), we get:

\[ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} = \frac{N}{2} (n!H(f)^{n-1} + 1), \]

and we can finish the proof as usual by using (4.2).

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 4.6.** For any root \( \alpha \) of an expansive integer polynomial \( f \):

\[ \frac{1}{|\alpha| - 1} \leq \begin{cases} nL(f) + n & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \\ 2 \binom{n}{2} L(f)^{n-1} + 2 \binom{n}{2} + 1 & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \]

**Proof.** We use similar methods as in the proof of Theorem 4.5. For real \( \alpha \):

\[ \left| \frac{f^{(k)}(1)}{k!} \right| = \left| \sum_{j=0}^{n} (\pm 1)^{j-k} \binom{j}{k} a_j \right| \leq \binom{n}{k} L(f), \]

which gives the statement for real \( \alpha \) by similar calculation.

For non-real \( \alpha \), we show that \( |F(1)| \leq L(f)^{n-1} \). It is sufficient to notice that each column of the determinant \( D_{n-1}(f) \) contains each coefficient \( a_j \) at most once, so when each column is represented by \( L(f) = |a_0| + |a_1| + \ldots + |a_n| \), the product of these is an upper bound for the determinant. Therefore:

\[ \left| \frac{F^{(k)}(1)}{k!} \right| = \left| \sum_{j=0}^{N} \binom{j}{k} A_j \right| \leq \binom{N}{k} L(f)^{n-1}, \]

and the usual calculation finishes the proof. \( \square \)

### 4.3 Comparison

We summarize the bounds on \( \frac{1}{|\alpha| - 1} \) as follows (ignoring any negligible terms):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorem</th>
<th>( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} )</th>
<th>( \alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>( 2^{n-1}</td>
<td>a_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>( 2^{n-2}(</td>
<td>a_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>( \binom{n+1}{2} H(f) )</td>
<td>( \binom{n}{2} n!H(f)^{n-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>( nL(f) )</td>
<td>( 2^{(n-2)} L(f)^{n-1} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that all bounds have the form \( c_n A \) for real and \( c_n A^{n-1} \) for non-real roots, and in each case, the latter is the larger (at least for \( n \geq 3 \)).
We compare the four different bounds in each column. First, \( |a_0| \leq |a_0| + |a_n| \leq L(f) \), \( |a_0| + |a_n| \leq 2H(f) \) and \( H(f) \leq L(f) \), so neither is better than any one below it. Next, since \( |a_n| < |a_0| \) for expansive polynomials, the second row is strictly better than the first. For comparing \( |a_0| + |a_n| \) and \( H(f) \), we use the coefficient size relations (2.2) for expansive polynomials and Stirling’s approximation \( (\sqrt{2\pi n} \left( \frac{n}{e} \right)^n \leq n! \leq e\sqrt{n} \left( \frac{n}{e} \right)^n) \):

\[
H(f) = \max_{k=0}^{n} |a_k| \leq \max_{k=0}^{n} \left( \binom{n-1}{k-1} |a_n| + \binom{n-1}{k} |a_0| \right) \leq \left( \frac{n-1}{2} \right) (|a_n| + |a_0|) \leq \frac{e}{\pi} \frac{2^{n-1}}{\sqrt{n-1}} (|a_n| + |a_0|).
\]

From this, one can see that in general, the third row is not better than the second one. The following shows that neither is the fourth row:

\[
L(f) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} |a_k| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left( \binom{n-1}{k-1} |a_n| + \binom{n-1}{k} |a_0| \right) = 2^{n-1}(|a_n| + |a_0|).
\]

And also, since \( L(f) \leq (n+1)H(f) \), the fourth row is not better than the third either.

The conclusion is that in general, neither row is better than any other except that the second row is better than the first. It depends on the particular circumstances which of these bounds is the best. For example when the middle coefficients are much larger than the constant term and the leading coefficient (close to the extent that (2.2) permits), then \( |a_0| + |a_n| \) may be the best measure, but otherwise \( H(f) \) or \( L(f) \).

5 Further directions

There are still several open questions regarding expansive polynomials and the results of this paper. In the future, we will try to answer the following:

- The bounds of the form \( c_n A \) and \( c_n A^{n-1} \) given in Section 4 are probably not the best, at least in the \( c_n \) factors. We will try to find the best possible bounds, and prove sharpness by finding families of polynomials that have exactly the same expansivity gap asymptotically. Our conjecture is that the dependence on the coefficient size \( A \) for fixed \( n \) is asymptotically sharp. In the case of real roots, this is easily proven by e.g. the polynomials \( (A-1)x^n - A \).
- The \( D \)-conditions in Theorem 3.2 inherently used the assumption that the coefficients are real, when splitting conditions like \( |A| < B \) to \( B \pm A > 0 \).
This is sufficient for our purposes with integer coefficients, but it would be an interesting question to generalize these conditions to arbitrary complex coefficients.

- There are $2n$ $D$-polynomials $(\tilde{D}_k^\pm(f)(x)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ and for each sign), but we only fully understand 3 of them: $\tilde{D}_{n-1}^-(f)(x)$, and the related $\tilde{D}_n^+(f)(x)$ and $\tilde{D}_n^-(f)(x)$ (see Lemma 3.5). We tried in vain to find the meaning of the others, e.g. how their roots relate to the roots of $f$.

- The bound in Theorem 4.5 involved the factor $n!$, which is a bound on $T_n$, i.e. the number of terms in the expansion of $D_{n-1}^-(f)$. This is not the best bound, and it would be an interesting question on its own to find better bounds on $T_n$, or even find an exact formula. The first few values for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ are $T_n = 1, 2, 4, 12, 40, \ldots$
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