

# Exact and approximate solutions to the minimum of $1 + x + \cdots + x^{2n}$

Aaron Hendrickson  
ahendr16@jh.edu

Claude F. Leibovici  
cfl-consultant@club-internet.fr

September 16, 2021

## Abstract

The polynomial  $f_{2n}(x) = 1 + x + \cdots + x^{2n}$  and its minimizer on the real line  $x_{2n} = \arg \inf f_{2n}(x)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  are studied. Results show that  $x_{2n}$  exists, is unique, corresponds to  $\partial_x f_{2n}(x) = 0$ , and resides on the interval  $[-1, -1/2]$  for all  $n$ . It is further shown that  $\inf f_{2n}(x) = (1 + 2n)/(1 + 2n(1 - x_{2n}))$  and  $\inf f_{2n}(x) \in [1/2, 3/4]$  for all  $n$  with an exact solution for  $x_{2n}$  given in the form of a finite sum of hypergeometric functions of unity argument. Perturbation theory is applied to generate rapidly converging and asymptotically exact approximations to  $x_{2n}$ . Numerical studies are carried out to show how many terms of the perturbation expansion for  $x_{2n}$  are needed to obtain suitably accurate approximations to the exact value.

## 1 Introduction

The inspiration for this work came from a question posted by Wang [11] on the *Mathematics Stack Exchange* discussion board March 13, 2021, which sought a solution to the minimum of the polynomial  $1 + x + \cdots + x^{2n}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In the question it was noted that the minimum appeared to correspond to a vanishing derivative and thus could be found by solving for the real roots of  $\partial_x(1 + x + \cdots + x^{2n})$ . When  $n = 1, 2$  these roots are algebraic with their exact forms being recovered using the standard formulae for linear and cubic equations. However for  $n \geq 3$ , the work of Abel and Galois shows no general algebraic solution exists; hence, motivating the need for more powerful methods [1]. Given

---

Keywords: Lagrange inversion, Tschirnhaus transformation, perturbation series, transcendental roots, hypergeometric function.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 65H04, Secondary 65Q30.

the broad and pervasive applications of geometric sums in the literature, further study of this polynomial and its minimum is a worthwhile venture.

## 2 Preliminaries

Throughout this work we define  $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and  $\mathbb{E} = \{2, 4, \dots\}$  to be the sets of positive integers, nonnegative integers, and positive even integers, respectively. For the sake of brevity we shall denote  $m = 2n$  so that the the polynomial of interest and its minimizer becomes

$$f_m(x) := 1 + x + \dots + x^m, \quad m \in \mathbb{E}$$

and

$$x_m := \operatorname{arg\,inf}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_m(x).$$

The following definitions and relations will also be used.

**Definition 1** (Gamma function).

$$\Gamma(s) := \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt, \quad \Re s > 0$$

**Definition 2** (Factorial power (falling factorial)).

$$(s)^{(n)} := \frac{\Gamma(s+1)}{\Gamma(s-n+1)}$$

**Definition 3** (Pochhammer symbol (rising factorial)).

$$(s)_n := \frac{\Gamma(s+n)}{\Gamma(s)}$$

**Definition 4** (Generalized hypergeometric series).

$${}_pF_q \left( \begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix}; z \right) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a_1)_k \cdots (a_p)_k}{(b_1)_k \cdots (b_q)_k} \frac{z^k}{k!}$$

**Definition 5** ( $k$ -gamma function and Pochhammer  $k$ -symbol [2]). *The  $k$ -gamma function and Pochhammer  $k$ -symbol are given by*

$$\Gamma_k(x) := k^{\frac{x}{k}-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{x}{k}\right)$$

and

$$(x)_{n,k} := \frac{\Gamma_k(x+nk)}{\Gamma_k(x)},$$

respectively.

**Relation 1.** *If  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  then  $(\alpha)_{n,k} = k^n (\alpha/k)_n$  [7, Prop. 3.1].*

With these definitions at hand we are ready to begin studying the properties of  $f_m$  and  $x_m$ .

### 3 Properties of $f_m$ and $x_m$

Our first goal is to establish the existence and uniqueness of  $x_m$ . To accomplish this it will be helpful to use the closed-form for geometric sums and write  $f_m$  in the form

$$f_m(x) = \frac{1 - x^{m+1}}{1 - x}. \quad (1)$$

**Lemma 1.** *The polynomial  $f_m(x)$  is strictly convex on  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{E}$ .*

*Proof.* To establish strict convexity it is sufficient to show  $f_m''(x) > 0$  everywhere on  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is trivial to show  $f_m''(x) > 0$  holds for  $x \geq 0$  so all that is left to do is to consider the complementary case  $x < 0$ . Equating the second derivative with zero we find  $f_m''(x) = 0 \iff h_m(x) = 0$ , where

$$h_m(x) = (m-1)mx^{m+1} - 2(m^2-1)x^m + m(m+1)x^{m-1} - 2.$$

The signs of the coefficients of  $h_m(-x)$  in order of descending variable exponent yields the sequence  $(-1, -1, -1, -1)$ , which are all negative. It follows from Descartes' rule of signs that  $f_m''(x)$  has zero roots on the interval  $x \in (-\infty, 0)$ . But,  $f_m''(-1) = \frac{1}{2}m^2 > 0$ ; thus, we conclude  $f_m''(x) > 0$  also holds for all  $x < 0$ . The proof is now complete.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.** *The minimizer  $x_m$  exists, is unique, and resides on the interval  $[-1, -1/2]$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{E}$ .*

*Proof.* We begin by establishing that  $f_m'(x)$  has exactly one real root. It is immediately obvious that  $f_m'(x) > 0$  for all  $x \geq 0$ . Now assuming  $x < 0$ , we deduce  $f_m'(x) = 0 \iff g_m(x) = 0$ , where  $g_m(x) = mx^{m+1} - (m+1)x^m + 1$ . The signs of the coefficients of  $g_m(-x)$  in order of descending variable exponent gives the sequence  $(-1, -1, +1)$ ; revealing a single variation in sign. Again appealing to Descartes' rule of signs we conclude  $f_m'(x)$  must have exactly one real root on the interval  $x \in (-\infty, 0)$ . However,  $f_m'(-1) = -\frac{1}{2}m$  and  $f_m'(-1/2) = \frac{1}{9}2^{1-m}(2^{m+1} - 3m - 2) \geq 0$  with the latter inequality following from induction on  $m \in \mathbb{E}$ . Consequently,  $f_m'(x)$  has a single root on the real line contained in the interval  $[-1, -1/2]$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{E}$ . Furthermore, the strict convexity of  $f_m$  proven in Lemma 1 implies that the solution to  $f_m'(x) = 0$  also corresponds to the unique global minimum of  $f_m$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

With the existence and uniqueness of  $x_m$  established, we turn to finding a simple formula for the minimum of  $f_m$  as a function of  $x_m$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $x_m \in [-1, -1/2]$  denote the unique minimizer of  $f_m$  such that  $f_m(x_m) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_m(x)$ . Then,*

$$f_m(x_m) = \frac{1+m}{1+m(1-x_m)}$$

and  $f_m(x_m) \in [1/2, 3/4]$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{E}$  with  $f_2(x_2) = 3/4$  and  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_m(x_m) = 1/2$ .

*Proof.* From Theorem 1 we know that  $x_m$  satisfies  $mx_m^{m+1} - (m+1)x_m^m + 1 = 0$ , which can be rewritten as  $x_m^{m+1} = x_m/(1 + m(1 - x_m))$ . Substituting this expression for  $x_m^{m+1}$  into (1) yields the desired form for  $f_m(x_m)$ . The bounds on  $f_m(x_m)$  are then found by minimizing and maximizing  $f(m, x) = (1 + m)/(1 + m(1 - x))$  on  $(m, x) \in \mathbb{E} \times [-1, -1/2]$ . We find  $\inf f(m, x) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f(m, -1) = 1/2$  and  $\sup f(m, x) = f(2, -1/2) = 3/4$ , which are equivalent to  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_m(x_m)$  and  $f_2(x_2)$ , respectively. The proof is now complete.  $\square$

## 4 Explicit expression for $x_m$

In the previous section we showed that the minimizer  $x_m$  exists, is unique, and resides on the interval  $[-1, -1/2]$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{E}$ . Furthermore, we were able to establish a very simple expression for  $\inf f_m$  as a function of this minimizer so that the problem of evaluating  $\inf f_m$  is equivalent to finding  $x_m$ . For  $m = 2, 4$  we may apply the standard equations for roots of linear and cubic equations to derive exact algebraic expressions for  $x_m$ . Furthermore, as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  we find for  $|x| < 1$ :  $f_m(x) \rightarrow (1 - x)^{-1}$ , which is strictly increasing on  $x \in (-1, -1/2]$ . Bringing these observations together we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_2 &= -\frac{1}{2} \\ x_4 &= -\frac{1}{4} \left( 1 + \sqrt[3]{5/9} \left( \sqrt[3]{9 + 4\sqrt{6}} - \sqrt[3]{4\sqrt{6} - 9} \right) \right) \\ &\vdots \\ x_\infty &= -1. \end{aligned}$$

While a general algebraic solution for  $x_m$  with  $m \geq 6$  does not exist, methods for expressing exact solutions to higher-order polynomial roots have been thoroughly studied [10]. For example, the work of Hermite shows that  $x_6$  can be solved exactly in terms of nonelementary functions [5]. One way this is accomplished is by reducing the quintic equation  $\partial_x f_6(x) = 0$  to its Bring–Jerrard normal form and then using series reversion to express  $x_6$  in terms of hypergeometric functions. Using this approach as a clue, Theorem 2 presents an exact and general solution for  $x_m$  based on an adaptation of the method used for solving trinomial equations [4, 3, 8].

**Theorem 2.** For all  $m \in \mathbb{E}$

$$x_m = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{(-m)^{k-2}}{(1+m)^{\frac{m+k}{m}-1}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{m+k}{m} - 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m+k}{m}\right) \Gamma(k)} {}_{m+2}F_{m+1} \left( 1, \left\{ \frac{k}{m} + \frac{\ell-1}{m+1} \right\}_{\ell=0}^m, \frac{m+k}{m}, \left\{ \frac{k+\ell}{m} \right\}_{\ell=0}^{m-1}; 1 \right).$$

*Proof.* From Theorem 1 we know  $x_m$  satisfies

$$mx_m^{m+1} - (m+1)x_m^m + 1 = 0, \quad m \in \mathbb{E}.$$

Performing the substitution  $x_m \mapsto -\zeta^{-\frac{1}{m}}$  we obtain the transformed expression

$$\zeta = 1 + m + m\phi(\zeta), \quad (2)$$

with  $\phi(\zeta) = \zeta^{-\frac{1}{m}}$ . By Lagrange's inversion theorem it follows for a function  $F$  analytic in a neighborhood of the root of (2) that

$$F(\zeta) = F(1+m) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{m^n}{n!} [\partial_w^{n-1} F'(w) \phi^n(w)]_{w=1+m}.$$

Choosing  $F(\zeta) = -\zeta^{-\frac{1}{m}}$  we subsequently obtain

$$x_m = -(1+m)^{-\frac{1}{m}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{m^{n-1}}{n!} [\partial_w^{n-1} w^{-\frac{m+n+1}{m}}]_{w=1+m},$$

which upon further noting that  $\partial_w^{n-1} w^{-s} = (-1)^{n-1} (s)_{n-1} w^{-s-n+1}$  yields after some algebraic manipulation

$$x_m = -\frac{(1+m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}}{m} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{mn+n+1}{m})}{\Gamma(\frac{m+n+1}{m})} \frac{(-m(1+m)^{-\frac{m+1}{m}})^n}{n!}. \quad (3)$$

To evaluate the series (3) we write  $x_m = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n = \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{mn+k-1}$ ; resulting in  $m$  new series containing Pochhammer symbols of the form  $(\cdot)_{(m+1)n}$  and  $(\cdot)_{mn}$ . Then using the identity [7, Eq. 2.13]

$$(\alpha)_{rn} = r^{rn} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \left( \frac{\alpha+j}{r} \right)_n, \quad r \in \mathbb{N}$$

we arrive at

$$x_m = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{(-m)^{k-2}}{(1+m)^{\frac{mk+k}{m}-1}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{mk+k}{m}-1)}{\Gamma(\frac{m+k}{m}) \Gamma(k)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1)_n \prod_{\ell=0}^m (\frac{k}{m} + \frac{\ell-1}{m+1})_n}{(\frac{m+k}{m})_n \prod_{\ell=0}^{m-1} (\frac{k+\ell}{m})_n} \frac{1}{n!},$$

which is the desired result.  $\square$

To demonstrate the validity of the closed-form for  $x_m$  given by Theorem 2 we substitute  $m = 2$  and find

$$x_2 = \frac{1}{9} {}_3F_2 \left( \begin{matrix} 1, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{4}{3} \\ 2, \frac{3}{2} \end{matrix}; 1 \right) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} {}_2F_1 \left( \begin{matrix} \frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{6} \\ \frac{3}{2} \end{matrix}; 1 \right).$$

The  ${}_3F_2(\cdot)$  term is reduced to  ${}_2F_1(\cdot)$  by way of [6, Eq. 07.27.03.0120.01]

$${}_3F_2 \left( \begin{matrix} 1, \beta, \gamma \\ 2, \epsilon \end{matrix}; z \right) = \frac{\epsilon-1}{(\beta-1)(\gamma-1)z} \left( {}_2F_1 \left( \begin{matrix} \beta-1, \gamma-1 \\ \epsilon-1 \end{matrix}; z \right) - 1 \right).$$

Gauss's hypergeometric summation theorem

$${}_2F_1\left(\begin{matrix} \alpha, \beta \\ \gamma \end{matrix}; 1\right) = \frac{\Gamma(\gamma)\Gamma(\gamma - \alpha - \beta)}{\Gamma(\gamma - \alpha)\Gamma(\gamma - \beta)}, \quad \Re(\gamma - \alpha - \beta) > 0$$

then permits us to write the remaining  ${}_2F_1(\cdot)$  terms as ratios of gamma functions. After some simplification we find

$$x_2 = -\frac{1}{2},$$

which is the exact value of  $x_2$ .

For  $m \geq 4$ , reducing the closed-form for  $x_m$  to more elementary functions in this manner becomes very cumbersome if not impossible. Without the ability to reduce the hypergeometric functions present in  $x_m$ , this expression also becomes difficult to implement numerically, especially as  $m$  becomes large. To obtain approximations we could turn to the series given by (3); however, the slow convergence of this series renders it impractical. For example, substituting  $m = 2$  and adding up the first one-hundred terms of (3) we obtain  $x_2 \approx -0.499885$ , which corresponds to an absolute relative error of  $2.3 \times 10^{-4}$ . Given that numerical root finding methods can achieve more accurate approximations in just a few iterations we find this means of approximation to be less than satisfactory.

## 5 Perturbation series expansion of $x_m$

In the previous section we were able to find an exact expression for  $x_m$  but this expression was not useful for the purpose of computing numerical approximations. Here, we apply the methods of perturbation theory to obtain a faster converging series expansion for this purpose.

We begin by recalling from Theorem 1 that  $x_m$  satisfies

$$g_m(x_m) = 0, \quad \text{with} \quad g_m(x) = x^m \left(1 - x + \frac{1}{m}\right) - \frac{1}{m}$$

and  $x_m \rightarrow -1$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . The fact that  $x_m + 1$  vanishes as  $m$  becomes large suggests we instead study the perturbed problem

$$g_{m,\epsilon}(x_{m,\epsilon}) = 0, \quad \text{with} \quad g_{m,\epsilon}(x) = x^m \left(2 - (1+x)\epsilon + \frac{1}{m}\right) - \frac{1}{m},$$

where

$$x_{m,\epsilon} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \epsilon^k. \tag{4}$$

Upon inspection we observe  $g_{m,1}(x) = g_m(x)$  and so it follows that  $x_m$  can be recovered by evaluating the perturbation series (4) at  $\epsilon = 1$ . To determine the coefficients  $a_k$  we first consider the well-known result for integer powers of series to express powers of  $x_{m,\epsilon}$  as

$$x_{m,\epsilon}^p = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_{k,p} \epsilon^k, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}$$

with

$$c_{0,p} = a_0^p$$

$$c_{k,p} = \frac{1}{a_0 k} \sum_{\ell=1}^k ((p+1)\ell - k) a_\ell c_{k-\ell,p}.$$

Using Faá di Bruno's formula we may also obtain a closed-form for the coefficients  $c_{k,p}$  as

$$c_{k,p} = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\ell=1}^k (p)^{(\ell)} a_0^{p-\ell} B_{k,\ell}(1! a_1, \dots, (k-\ell+1)! a_{k-\ell+1}),$$

where  $B_{n,k}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-k+1})$  is the partial Bell-polynomial. Using these results we substitute  $x_{m,\epsilon}$  into  $g_{m,\epsilon}$  and collect terms by powers of  $\epsilon$  yielding

$$g_{m,\epsilon}(x_{m,\epsilon}) = \left(2 + \frac{1}{m}\right) a_0^m - \frac{1}{m} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[\left(2 + \frac{1}{m}\right) c_{k,m} - c_{k-1,m} - c_{k-1,m+1}\right] \epsilon^k.$$

Since  $g_{m,\epsilon}(x_{m,\epsilon}) = 0$  we equate the coefficients of  $\epsilon^k$  with zero to yield an infinite system of equations that recover the coefficients  $a_k$ . Setting the constant term equal to zero gives  $a_0^m = (1 + 2m)^{-1}$ . Knowing that  $x_m \in [-1, -1/2]$  and  $m \in \mathbb{E}$  we take the negative solution to this equation and set the higher-order coefficients of  $\epsilon^k$  to zero yielding

$$a_0 = -(1 + 2m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}, \quad (1 + 2m)c_{k,m} - m(c_{k-1,m} + c_{k-1,m+1}) = 0. \quad (5)$$

Evaluating the first several coefficients we are able to conjecture a closed-form for  $a_k$ , which leads to the following result.

**Theorem 3.** For all  $m \in \mathbb{E}$

$$x_m = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k,$$

where

$$a_0 = -(1 + 2m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}$$

$$a_k = \sum_{\ell=0}^k \frac{(\ell + m + 1)_{k-1,m}}{\ell!(k-\ell)!} a_0^{m k + \ell + 1}.$$

*Proof.* We begin by considering the closed-form for  $x_m$  claimed in the statement of Theorem 2, which consists of a sum of  $m$  hypergeometric functions. Denoting  $\{a_{j,k}\}_{j=1}^{m+2}$  as the top parameters and  $\{b_{j,k}\}_{j=1}^{m+1}$  as the bottom parameters of the hypergeometric function in the  $k$ th term we find  $\gamma_k = (b_1 + \dots + b_{m+1}) - (a_1 + \dots + a_{m+2}) = \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, m$ . Since  $\gamma_k > 0$ , each of the  $m$ -terms of  $x_m$  can be written as an absolutely convergent series; hence, the entire expression representing  $x_m$  must also be absolutely convergent. Now using the conjectured closed-form for  $a_k$  we write

$$x_m = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^k \frac{m^{k-1}}{\ell!(k-\ell)!} \frac{\Gamma(k + \frac{\ell+1}{m})}{\Gamma(1 + \frac{\ell+1}{m})} a_0^{m k + \ell + 1}.$$

If this expression is equal to that given in the statement of Theorem 2, then it is also absolutely convergent and permits rearrangement of its terms. Interchanging the order of summation we find after some simplification

$$x_m = \frac{a_0}{m} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{m\ell+\ell+1}{m}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{\ell+1}{m}\right)} \frac{(ma_0^{m+1})^\ell}{\ell!} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{m\ell+\ell+1}{m}_k \frac{(ma_0^m)^k}{k!}.$$

The interior sum over  $k$  can now be evaluated in terms of  ${}_1F_0(\alpha; -; z) = (1-z)^{-\alpha}$ . Reintroducing  $a_0$  yields

$$x_m = -\frac{(1+m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}}{m} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{m\ell+\ell+1}{m}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m+\ell+1}{m}\right)} \frac{(-m(1+m)^{-\frac{m+1}{m}})^\ell}{\ell!},$$

which is the series expansion for  $x_m$  given in (3). By the uniqueness of Taylor series it follows that the conjectured form for  $a_k$  must be correct.  $\square$

So does the perturbation series for  $x_m$  converge faster than that given by (3)? Substituting  $m = 2$  and adding the first one-hundred terms we find for the absolute relative error  $5.6 \times 10^{-64}$ , which is a significant improvement on the absolute relative error of  $2.3 \times 10^{-4}$  obtained from the first one hundred terms of (3).

We conclude this section with an important property of approximations for  $x_m$  obtained via the perturbation series of Theorem 3.

**Corollary 1.** *If  $\tilde{x}_{m,n} = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k$ , then  $x_m \sim \tilde{x}_{m,n}$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Using the expression for  $a_k$  given in Theorem 3 we have  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_0 = -1$  and  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_k = 0$  for all  $k \geq 1$ ; thus,  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_{m,n} = -1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Since  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} x_m = -1$  the result follows.  $\square$

## 6 Numerical results

From Corollary 1 we know  $x_m \sim \tilde{x}_{m,n}$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and so we expect the number  $n$  needed to guarantee  $|x_m - \tilde{x}_{m,n}| < \epsilon$  should decrease as  $m$  increases. Since we have closed-forms for  $x_2$  and  $x_4$ , which can be computed to arbitrary precision, our first task will be to study the convergence of  $\tilde{x}_{m,n} \rightarrow x_m$  as a function of  $n$  for  $m = 2, 4$ . Given that we expect less terms will be needed for larger values of  $m$ , the results of this exercise should give us a worst case scenario for how large  $n$  must be to obtain the desired accuracy in our approximation.

Using MATHEMATICA software, we evaluated  $\tilde{x}_{m,n}$  for  $m = 2, 4$  and  $n = 0, 1, \dots, 100$ . To compare the approximation to the exact values we used the absolute relative error

$$R_m(n) = \left| \frac{\tilde{x}_{m,n}}{x_m} - 1 \right|,$$

the results of which are plotted in Figure 1. From the figure we see the error decreases exponentially with  $n$  and that  $R_4(n) < R_2(n)$  for each value of  $n$ .



Working with the data for  $R_4(n)$  we further determined

$$R_4(n) < 5 \times 10^{-(2+0.759n)},$$

which suggests setting  $n$  equal to

$$n^* = \max \left\{ 0, \left\lceil \frac{q-2}{0.759} \right\rceil \right\}$$

is sufficient to guarantee  $\tilde{x}_{m,n^*}$  agrees with  $x_m$  to at least  $q$  significant digits for all  $m \geq 4$ .

To test this hypothesis we first note that  $x_m \in (-1, -1/2]$  for all finite  $m \in \mathbb{E}$ . Since the leading exponent in the decimal expansion of  $x_m$  is always negative one it follows that  $\tilde{x}_{m,n}$  has  $p$  significant digits of  $x_m$  if  $|x_m - \tilde{x}_{m,n}| \leq 5 \times 10^{-(p+1)}$ . Furthermore, we know  $x_m$  is the unique real root of  $g_m(x) = x^m(1-x+\frac{1}{m}) - \frac{1}{m}$  with  $g_m(x_m - \epsilon)$  and  $g_m(x_m + \epsilon)$  differing in sign; hence a lower bound on the number of significant digits obtained by  $\tilde{x}_{m,n}$  is found by determining the largest nonnegative integer  $p$  such that

$$g_m(\tilde{x}_{m,n} - 5 \times 10^{-(p+1)})g_m(\tilde{x}_{m,n} + 5 \times 10^{-(p+1)}) \leq 0.$$

For the sake of example we chose  $q = 10$  for the number of desired significant digits resulting in  $n^* = 11$ . Using the above mentioned procedure, the value  $p$  was computed for  $m = 4, 6, \dots, 100$  with the results presented in Figure 2. From the figure we observe  $p > q$  for each value of  $m$  as is expected. Finally, Table 1 presents numerical values for  $x_m$  and  $f_m(x_m)$  computed using  $\tilde{x}_{m,n}$  and the formula in Lemma 2.




Figure 1: Absolute relative error incurred from the approximation  $\tilde{x}_{m,n}$  versus  $n$  for  $m = 2, 4$ . Plot produced with matlab2tikz [9].




Figure 2: Number of significant figures obtained by the approximation  $\tilde{x}_{m,n^*(q)}$  for  $q = 10$  versus  $m$ .

## 7 Conclusions

In this note, we were able to establish many useful facts about the polynomial  $f_m(x) = 1 + x + \dots + x^m$  and its minimum value on the real line. In particular, we were able to show  $\operatorname{arg\,inf} f_m(x) \in [-1, -1/2]$  and  $\inf f_m(x) \in [1/2, 3/4]$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{E}$  as well as provide a very simple formula for the minimum as a function of the minimizer  $x_m$ . Lagrange inversion and perturbation theory were applied to derive two different series expansions for  $x_m$ , which lead to a closed-form in terms of hypergeometric functions. Furthermore, numerical studies were conducted which gave a rule of thumb for how large  $n$  must be to achieve a desired accuracy in approximating  $x_m$  with  $\tilde{x}_{m,n}$ .

## References

- [1] N. H. Abel. Beweis der Unmöglichkeit, algebraische Gleichungen von höheren Graden als dem vierten allgemein aufzulösen. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 1:65–84, 1826.
- [2] Rafael Díaz and Eddy Pariguan. On hypergeometric functions and Pochhammer  $k$ -symbol. *Divulgaciones Matemáticas*, 15(2), 2007.
- [3] Albert Eagle. Series for all the roots of a trinomial equation. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 46(7):422–425, 1939.
- [4] M.L. Glasser. Hypergeometric functions and the trinomial equation. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 118(1):169–173, 2000.

- [5] Charles Hermite. Sur la résolution de l'équation du cinquieme degré. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, 46(1858):508–515, 1858.
- [6] Wolfram Research Inc. The Wolfram functions site. Visited on 2021-04-28.
- [7] Shahid Mubeen and Abdur Rehman. A note on  $k$ -gamma function and pochhammer  $k$ -symbol. *Journal of Informatics and Mathematical Sciences*, 6(2), 2014.
- [8] Daniele Ritelli and Giulia Spaletta. Trinomial equation: the hypergeometric way. *Open Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 5(1):236–247, 2021.
- [9] Nico Schlömer. matlab2tikz: A script to convert MATLAB/Octave into TikZ figures for easy and consistent inclusion into L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X. GitHub. URL: <https://github.com/matlab2tikz/matlab2tikz> (retrieved May 8, 2021).
- [10] Hiroshi Umemura. *Resolution of algebraic equations by theta constants*, pages 261–270. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2007.
- [11] Yiwei Wang. The minimum of  $f(x) = 1 + x + \dots + x^{2^n}$ . Mathematics Stack Exchange. URL: <https://math.stackexchange.com/q/4060608> (version: 2021-04-30).

Table 1: Numerical values for  $x_m$  and  $f_m(x_m)$ .

$m$	$x_m$	$f_m(x_m)$	$m$	$x_m$	$f_m(x_m)$
2	-0.5000000000	0.7500000000	78	-0.9376111258	0.5192801905
4	-0.6058295862	0.6735532235	80	-0.9388198625	0.5188795643
6	-0.6703320476	0.6350938940	82	-0.9399784542	0.5184964771
8	-0.7145377272	0.6115666906	84	-0.9410900592	0.5181297723
10	-0.7470540749	0.5955429324	86	-0.9421575717	0.5177783938
12	-0.7721416355	0.5838576922	88	-0.9431836485	0.5174413759
14	-0.7921778546	0.5749221276	90	-0.9441707340	0.5171178332
16	-0.8086048979	0.5678463037	92	-0.9451210804	0.5168069528
18	-0.8223534102	0.5620909079	94	-0.9460367670	0.5165079864
20	-0.8340533676	0.5573090540	96	-0.9469197164	0.5162202447
22	-0.8441478047	0.5532669587	98	-0.9477717091	0.5159430910
24	-0.8529581644	0.5498010211	100	-0.9485943966	0.5156759367
26	-0.8607238146	0.5467931483	102	-0.9493893132	0.5154182363
28	-0.8676269763	0.5441558518	104	-0.9501578860	0.5151694840
30	-0.8738090154	0.5418228660	106	-0.9509014444	0.5149292100
32	-0.8793814184	0.5397430347	108	-0.9516212282	0.5146969770
34	-0.8844333818	0.5378762052	110	-0.9523183955	0.5144723780
36	-0.8890371830	0.5361903986	112	-0.9529940289	0.5142550329
38	-0.8932520563	0.5346598151	114	-0.9536491420	0.5140445872
40	-0.8971270425	0.5332633990	116	-0.9542846846	0.5138407092
42	-0.9007031162	0.5319837878	118	-0.9549015479	0.5136430885
44	-0.9040147981	0.5308065300	120	-0.9555005690	0.5134514340
46	-0.9070913919	0.5297194951	122	-0.9560825347	0.5132654729
48	-0.9099579456	0.5287124219	124	-0.9566481855	0.5130849489
50	-0.9126360054	0.5277765690	126	-0.9571982191	0.5129096209
52	-0.9151442141	0.5269044410	128	-0.9577332933	0.5127392623
54	-0.9174987898	0.5260895727	130	-0.9582540286	0.5125736594
56	-0.9197139122	0.5253263565	132	-0.9587610115	0.5124126108
58	-0.9218020367	0.5246099035	134	-0.9592547961	0.5122559267
60	-0.9237741513	0.5239359311	136	-0.9597359069	0.5121034274
62	-0.9256399895	0.5233006711	138	-0.9602048403	0.5119549436
64	-0.9274082062	0.5227007942	140	-0.9606620669	0.5118103146
66	-0.9290865244	0.5221333471	142	-0.9611080328	0.5116693885
68	-0.9306818591	0.5215957008	144	-0.9615431615	0.5115320215
70	-0.9322004214	0.5210855067	146	-0.9619678551	0.5113980772
72	-0.9336478067	0.5206006599	148	-0.9623824957	0.5112674259
74	-0.9350290699	0.5201392683	150	-0.9627874469	0.5111399447
76	-0.9363487901	0.5196996259	$\infty$	-1.0000000000	0.5000000000