Reachability Analysis of Linear Systems

Chen shiping

Sichuan Trade School, Yaan, 625107, Sichuan, China

Ge Xinyu

Chengdu Institute of Computer Application, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chengdu, 610000, Sichuan, China University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100049, Beijing, China

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a decision procedure of reachability for linear system $\xi' = A\xi + u$, where the matrix A's eigenvalues can be arbitrary algebraic number and the input u is a vector of trigonometric-exponential polynomials. If the initial set contains only one point, the reachability problem under consideration is resorted to the decidability of the sign of trigonometricexponential polynomial and then achieved by being reduced to verification of a series of univariate polynomial inequalities through Taylor expansions of the related exponential functions and trigonometric functions. If the initial set is open semi-algebraic, we will propose a decision procedure based on openCAD and an algorithm of real roots isolation derivated from the sign-deciding procedure for the trigonometric-exponential polynomials. The experimental results indicate the efficiency of our approach. Furthermore, the above procedures are complete under the assumption of Schanuel Conjecture.

Keywords: Linear Systems, Trigonometric-exponential Polynomial, Reachability Analysis, Real Roots Isolation, Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition(CAD)

1. Introduction

Hybrid system(HS) combines discrete event systems with differential equations in a manner that is ideal for the modeling, analysis, and design of embedded systems. To guarantee the correctness of these systems is vital so that we can bet our lives on them (see [26]). The safety criticality of many applications requires the use of formal methods to ensure that an unsafe region of the state space is not reachable from a set of initial conditions. This makes the reachability problem for hybrid systems very important. It should be pointed out that the reachability problem of most of HSs is undecidable (see [14]) except for some simple cases.

[15] investigated vector fields of the following linear system

$$\xi' = A\xi + u \tag{1}$$

é

April 4, 2022

Email addresses: chinshiping@sina.com (Chen shiping), geeexy@163.com (Ge Xinyu) *URL:* URL 1 (Chen shiping), URL 2 (Ge Xinyu)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

where $\xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state of the system at time $t, A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the system matrix, and $u : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a piecewise continuous function which is called the input.

Given an initial state $\xi(0) = x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, the solution to (1) at time $t \ge 0$ is denoted by $\xi(t) = \phi(x, t)$. Then the forward reachable set Post(X) of (1) from a given initial set X is defined as:

$$\operatorname{Post}(X) = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists x \exists t : x \in X \land t \ge 0 \land \phi(x, t) = y \}.$$

$$\tag{2}$$

Now, the problem under consideration is formulated as follows: Given a linear system, an initial set X and an unsafe set Y, the problem is to verify whether any unsafe state in Y is not reachable by any trajectory starting from X, i.e., whether $Post(X) \cap Y = \emptyset$, or $F(X, Y) = \exists x \exists y \exists t : x \in X \land y \in Y \land t \ge 0 \land \phi(x, t) = y$. If the unsafe set Y is semi-algebraic, the problem can be transformed to decide whether all the inequalities in Y hold.

A set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said semi-algebraic if it is defined as $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid p_1(x)\Delta 0, \dots, p_n(x)\Delta 0\}$, for some polynomials $p_1(x), \dots, p_n(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, where $\Delta \in \{\geq, >\}$. A semi-algebraic set X is said to be open if all Δ s are instantiated to >.

[15] obtained the decidability of the reachability problems for the following three families of vector fields:

- 1. A is nilpotent, i.e. $A^n = 0$, and each component of u is a polynomial;
- 2. A is diagonalizable with rational eigenvalues, and each component of u is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i e^{\lambda_i t}$, where λ_i s are rational and c_i s are subject to semi-algebraic constraints;
- 3. A is diagonalizable with purely imaginary rational eigenvalues, and each component of u is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{m} (c_i \sin(\lambda_i t) + d_i \cos(\lambda_i t))$, where λ_i s are rationals and c_i s and d_i s are subject to semi-algebraic constraints.

[7] and [12] generalize the case 2 above by different schemes independently as following:

A is diagonalizable with real eigenvalues, and each component of u is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i e^{\lambda_i t}$, where λ_i s are reals and c_i s are subject to semi-algebraic constraints.

For λ_i s are real algebraic numbers (Denoted as \mathbb{R}_{alg} , the same below), and under the assumption of Schanuel's Conjecture, their algorithms are complete. To the best of our knowledge, these results are the strongest ones on the decidability of the reachability problems of HSs obtained so far.

In this paper, we will generalize the linear system by follows.

The matrix A's eigenvalues can be arbitrary algebraic numbers, and the the input u is a vector of real trigonometric-exponential polynomials, the initial set X contains only one point or is semi-algebraic, the unsafe set Y is semi-algebraic. Meanwhile, we care the reachability of system within a specific bounded interval only.

A term with the following form is called a trigonometric-exponential polynomial(TEP), $\sum_{i=1}^{s} e^{u_i x} (f_i(x) \sin(v_i x) + g_i(x) \cos(r_i x))$, where $f_i(x), g_i(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x], u_i, v_i, r_i \in \mathbb{A}$. If a TEP is real-valued, it is called real trigonometric-exponential polynomial(RTEP).

For initial point $\xi(0) = x_0 = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, the solution of system (1) is $\xi_k(t) = \Phi_k(x_0, t) = \sum_{i}^{s} e^{u_i t} (f_i(x_0, t) \sin(v_i t) + g_i(x_0, t) \cos(r_i t))$, where $f_i(x_0, t), g_i(x_0, t)$ are polynomials of t with parameter $(x_1, \dots, x_n), u_i, v_i, r_i$ are real algebraic numbers. That is to say, $\xi_k(t)$ is a RTEP with parameter $x_0 = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

As each polynomial of the semi-algebraic unsafe set $q_k(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}[y_1, \dots, y_n]$, so $q_k(\phi_1(x_0, t), \dots, \phi_n(x_0, t))$ is a RTEP with parameter $x_0 = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. So, to obtain the decidability, we can resort to the sign decidability of the transcendental function of a class of trigonometric-exponential polynomials with parameters.

In recent years, the sign deciding of transcendental function, or the automatic proof of transcendental inequalities is one of the key points and difficulties pursued by scholars.

Lately, a so-called Taylor-substitution method is employed to deal with problems of transcendental functions. [4,6] solved the problem of automated proof of mixed trigonometricpolynomial inequalities defined by the formula $f(x) = \sum a_i x^{p_i} \sin^{q_i}(x) \cos^{r_i}(x)$

> 0 and the exponential polynomial inequalities of form $f(x, e^{-x}) > 0$, reducing the proof of the original inequality to a series of verification of univariate polynomial inequality by Taylor expansion of the inverse tangent function $\arctan(x)$ or exponential function e^{-x} , without discussing the existence of real roots of transcendental functions directly. Of course, isolating the real zeros of mixed trigonometric-polynomial and exponential polynomial can be easily implemented based on the above method.

A general transcendental function may contain more than one transcendental factors, and the function after Taylor-substitution once may still contain transcendental factors, so Taylorsubstitution need to be performed again or even many times. [5] proposed a procedure named Successive Taylor-substitution to solve the automatic proof of a class of generalized polynomial of the form $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)) > 0$, containing more than one transcendental factors.

The essence of the sign-deciding of a given real function is the existence and classification of real zeros of the function. There are some wonderful achievements for isolating real roots of certain classes of transcendental functions.

[17] presented a decision procedure for a certain class of sentences of first order logic involving integral polynomials and a certain specific analytic transcendental function trans(x) in which the variables range over the real numbers (See also [1]). The list of transcendental functions to which the decision method directly applies includes e^x , the exponential function with respect to base e, $\ln(x)$, the natural logarithm of x, and $\arctan(x)$, the inverse tangent function. In the case $trans(x) = e^x$, the decision procedure has been implemented in the computer logic system REDLOG. The decision method is based upon an algorithm for isolating the real zeros of a certain kind of generalised integral polynomial in trans(x), f(x, trans(x)), where f(x, y) is a given polynomial in y whose coefficients are elements of the ring of fractions of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ with respect to powers of a specific integral polynomial d(x), which uses pseudo-differentiation and Rolle's Theorem, and also relies upon a classical result of Lindemann Theorem.

Based on a generalized Budain-Fourier Theorem, [4] presented a real root isolation procedure, which is easily adapted to decide the sign of the corresponding function, for more expressive exp-log-arctan functions obtained by composition and rational operations from *exp*, *ln*, arctan and real constants. By Strzebonski's result, we can conclude that there exists algorithm to decide the sign of trigonometric-exponential polynomial on a given interval. But the procedure employed an algorithm of [10] to determine signs of exp-log-arctan functions at simple roots of other exp-log-arctan functions, and the proof that the algorithm of [10] terminates relies on Schanuel's Conjecture. It is also pointed out that it is possible to create problems involving very large or very small numbers which will require such large precision that their solution will be infeasible. Furthermore, the implementation of [24]'s procedure does not use the zero testing algorithm defined in [10], a zero testing heuristic is used instead.

[11] proposes an algorithm to isolate all real roots for a exponential polynomial of the form $f(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{s} f_i(t)e^{v_i t}$ based on Differential-mean-value Theorem (i.e., Rolle's Theorem), where $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are pairwise different. The algorithm's completeness depends on Schanuel's Conjecture.

[7] consider a class of univariate real functions, poly-powers, with the normal form f(x) =

 $\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^{\alpha_1} + \dots + \beta_n x^{\alpha_n}$, where $\alpha_i (1 \le i \le n)$ and $\beta_i (0 \le i \le n)$ are real algebraic numbers with $0 < \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n$ and n > 0. They perform factorization to simplify the input poly-power and classify poly-powers into simple and non-simple ones, depending on the number of linearly independent exponents in an irreducible poly-power. For the former, they present two complete isolation algorithms, exclusion and differentiation. For the latter, they repeatedly differentiate poly-powers until the resulting poly-power has at most two terms, and lifts isolation intervals of derivatives to those of the original poly-power. The whole procedures are established on algebraic manipulation, and hence are absolutely exact. The completeness is ensured by Gelfond-Schneider Theorem for simple poly-powers, and by Schanuel Conjecture for non-simple ones.

[8] presents a solution to the continuous Skolem Problem whether a real-valued function satisfying a linear differential equation, $f^{(n)} + a_{n-1}f^{(n-1)} + \cdots + a_0f = 0$, has a zero in a given interval. For general cases, the characteristic roots of the linear differential equation have the form $\lambda_j = r_j + I\omega_j$, where $r_j, \omega_j \in \mathbb{R}$, and $I^2 = -1$, then f(t) can be wrote in the form $f(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} e^{r_j t} (Q_{1,j}(t) \sin(\omega_j t) + Q_{2,j}(t) \cos(\omega_j t))$, where the polynomials $Q_{1,j}, Q_{2,j}$ have real-algebraic coefficients. Chonev's procedure is based on the analysis of the exponential polynomial $f(t) = P(t, e^{a_1 t}, \cdots, e^{a_r t}, e^{Ib_1 t}, \cdots, e^{Ib_s t})$ and the M-Lipschitz condition of real function. The completeness also relies on Schanuel Conjecture.

In this paper, we will follow the idea of [4-6] and combine the methods of the above papers. A so-called Successive Taylor-substitution procedure to decide the sign of the trigonometricexponential polynomials will be proposed by performing Taylor-Substitution repeatedly to reduce the problem to a series of verification of polynomial inequalities with only one variable. Similar to [24], [7] and [11], the algorithm is complete under Schanuel Conjecture. And then the sign-deciding algorithm will be employed to isolation of real roots of trigonometric-exponential polynomial and the reachability analysis of linear systems. If the initial set of linear system contains only one point, the sign-deciding algorithm can decide the reachability of linear system directly. If the initial set of linear system is an open semi-algebraic set, we give a decision procedure with the help of openCAD (see [13]) and an algorithm of real root isolation of trigonometric-exponential polynomial derivated from the sign-deciding algorithm.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 studies the properties of exponential polynomial under the assumption of Schanuel Conjecture and presents a procedure to factorize the trigonometric-exponential polynomials without multiple roots. Section 3 proposes the Successive Taylor-substitution algorithm for deciding the sign of transcendental function polynomial and discuss its completeness. Section 4 presents deciding procedure of reachability analysis of linear systems on two situations depending on whether the initial set of linear system contains only one point or the initial set is an open semi-algebraic set. We will conclude the paper in Section 5.

2. Exponential polynomials

2.1. Exponential polynomials with simple roots

For an (n + 1)-ary polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[x, x_1, \dots, x_n]$ on a given field \mathbb{K} , define a mapping hom : $f(x, x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_n(x))$, substituting x_i with a transcendental function $trans_i(x)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Definition 2.1. For an (n + 1)-ary polynomial $f(x, x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in a given filed \mathbb{K} , its image under mapping hom $F(x) = hom(f) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_n(x))$ is called a transcendental polynomial, and $trans_i(x)$ is called transcendental factor.

For example, $x + \sin(x)$, $x + \cos(\sqrt{x})$, $x + e^{\sin(x)}$, $x + \arctan(x) - \arcsin(x)$ are transcendental polynomials, $\sin(x)$, $\cos(\sqrt{x})$, $e^{\sin(x)}$, $\arctan(x)$, $\arcsin(x)$ are their transcendental factors.

For $F(x) = hom(f) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_n(x)), f \in \mathbb{C}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$, if all $trans_i(x)s$ are exponential like $e^{v_i x}$, where $v_i \in \mathbb{A}$, F(x) is called an exponential polynomial (short for EP), on this occasion, the mapping *hom* is also denoted more accurately by $hom[v_1, \dots, v_n]$, i.e. $hom[v_1, \dots, v_n](f(x, x_1, \dots, x_n)) = f(x, e^{v_1}, \dots, e^{v_n}).$

For $F(x) = hom(f) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_n(x)), f \in \mathbb{C}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$, if all $trans_i(x)$ s are exponential like $e^{u_i x}$, or sine like $\sin(v_i x)$, or cosine like $\cos(r_i x)$, where $u_i, v_i, r_i \in \mathbb{R}_{alg}$, F(x) is called a trigonometric-exponential polynomial (short for TEP). For general, a TEP has the formal form $f(x, e^{u_1 x}, \dots, e^{u_r x}, \sin(v_1 x), \dots, \sin(v_s x), \cos(r_1 x), \dots, \cos(r_t x))$, where $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_s, w_1, \dots, w_t)$ is a (r + s + t + 1)-ary polynomial in field K. Of course, this definition for trigonometric-exponential polynomial is consistent with that in the previous section.

Definition 2.2. The complex numbers a_1, \dots, a_n are called linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , if for all $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^k c_i a_i = 0$, we have $c_1 = \dots = c_k = 0$.

Definition 2.3. The complex numbers set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ is an integral basis of complex numbers set $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$, if A is linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} and for each $i, 1 \le i \le m$, there exits $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $b_i = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j a_j$.

Definition 2.4. $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ is called a basis of exponential polynomial F(x), if there exists a polynomial $f(x, x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{K}[x, x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that $F(x) = hom[v_1, \dots, v_n](f)$. If $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{A}$ is linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ is called a regular basis of F(x).

Obviously, if B is a basis of an exponential polynomial F(x) and A is an integral basis of B, then A is a regular basis of F(x).

An exponential polynomial $F(x) = f(x, e^{v_1 x}, \dots, e^{v_n x})$ can also be expressed as $F(x) = \sum_{0}^{m} f_i(x)e^{\lambda_i x}$, where $f_i(x) \in \mathbb{K}[x]$. Furthermore, there may be different expressions for the same exponential polynomial. For example, $F(x) = x + e^{(\sqrt{2}+1)x} = hom[\sqrt{2}+1](f_1) = hom[\sqrt{2},1](f_2)$, where $f_1 = x + y_1, f_2 = x + y_1y_2$.

Definition 2.5. For $F(x) = \sum_{0}^{m} f_i(x)e^{\lambda_i x}$, $gcd(f_0(x), f_1(x), \dots, f_n(x))$ is called the content of F(x), denoted by cont(F).

Definition 2.6. The complex numbers a_1, \dots, a_n are algebraically independent if there is no non-zero n-ary polynomial $f \in \mathbb{A}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$.

Lemma 2.1. If $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{A}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$, $F(x) = f(x, e^{v_1 x}, \dots, e^{v_n x})$ and $\operatorname{cont}(F(x)) = 1$, $v_1, \dots, v_n \in A$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , then for each rational $x_0 \neq 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$, $F(x_0) \neq 0$.

Proof. Let $g(y_1, \dots, y_n) = f(x_0, y_1, \dots, y_n)$, then $g \in \mathbb{A}[y_1, \dots, y_n]$ and is not identically zero due to the assumption that $\operatorname{cont}(F) = 1$. Meanwhile, $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{A}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , so $v_1x_0, \dots, v_nx_0 \in \mathbb{A}$ are also linear independent over \mathbb{Q} . By Lindemayn-Weierstrass Theorem, $e^{v_1x_0}, \dots, e^{v_nx_0}$ are algebraical independent, i.e. $g(e^{v_1x_0}, \dots, e^{v_nx_0}) = F(x_0) \neq 0$.

Lemma 2.2. If $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{A}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ is not identically zero, $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{A}$ are linear independent over \mathbb{Q} , Then $F(x) = f(x, e^{v_1 x}, \dots, e^{v_n x})$ is not identically zero.

Proof. Let cont(F(x)) = $f_1(x)$, that is to say, $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) = f_1(x) \times f_2(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$, $f_1(x)$ is polynomial of x and cont($f_2(x, e^{v_1x}, \dots, e^{v_nx})$) = 1.

Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $0 \neq x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $f_1(x_0) \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.1 $f_2(x_0, e^{v_1 x_0}, \dots, e^{v_n x_0}) \neq 0$. So $F(x_0) \neq 0$.

Denote $\text{EXP}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n] = \{F(x) = hom[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n](f), f \in \mathbb{A}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]\}.$

Theorem 2.1. If $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{A}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , the mapping hom $[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n]$ is bijective from $\mathbb{A}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ to $\mathbb{EXP}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n]$, so it's inverse mapping hom $[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n]^{-1}$ exists.

For the same exponential polynomial F(x), $hom[B_1]^{-1}(F)$ and $hom[B_2]^{-1}(F)$ may be different if $B_1 \neq B_2$. For example, Let $F(x) = x + e^{\sqrt{2}x+x}$, $hom[\sqrt{2} + 1]^{-1}(F(x)) = x + y_1$, $hom[\sqrt{2}, 1]^{-1}(F(x)) = x + y_1y_2$.

Schanuel Conjecture If $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{C}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , then there are at least *n* algebraically independent numbers among $x_1, \dots, x_n, e^{x_1}, \dots, e^{x_n}$.

The Schanuel Conjecture was proposed by S.H.Schanuel in 1960, which is is generally considered to be correct but hasn't been proved. The following discussions are under the assumption of Schanuel Conjecture.

Lemma 2.3. Suppose $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{A}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} and $t \neq 0$, then there are at least *n* algebraically independent numbers among $t, e^{v_1 t}, \dots, e^{v_n t}$.

Proof. v_1, \dots, v_n are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , so are v_1t, \dots, v_nt . By Schanuel Conjecture, there are at least *n* algebraically independent numbers among $v_1t, \dots, v_nt, e^{v_1t}, \dots, e^{v_nt}$. As $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{A}$, there are at least *n* algebraically independent numbers among $t, e^{v_1t}, \dots, e^{v_nt}$.

Lemma 2.4. If $f_1(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$, $f_2(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{A}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ are co-prime, suppose $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{A}$ are linear independent over \mathbb{Q} , then $F_1(x) = f_1(x, e^{v_1 x}, \dots, e^{v_n x})$ and $F_2(x) = f_2(x, e^{v_1 x}, \dots, e^{v_n x})$ have no common roots other than 0.

Proof. Suppose $F_1(x)$ and $F_2(x)$ have common root x_0 and $x_0 \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.3, there are at least *n* algebraically independent numbers among $x_0, e^{v_1 x_0}, \dots, e^{v_n x_0}$. Without losing generality, suppose $\{x_0, e^{v_1 x_0}, \dots, e^{v_{n-1} x_0}\}$ is algebraically independent.

 $f_1(x_0, e^{v_1x_0}, \dots, e^{v_{n-1}x_0}, y_n)$ and $f_2(x_0, e^{v_1x_0}, \dots, e^{v_{n-1}x_0}, y_n)$ are two polynomials of y_n , which have common root $e^{v_nt_0}$. Let $g(x, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) = \text{resultant}(f_1(x, y_1, \dots, y_n), f_2(x, y_1, \dots, y_n), y_n)$, then $g \in \mathbb{A}[x, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}]$ and $g(x_0, e^{v_1x_0}, \dots, e^{v_{n-1}x_0}) = 0$. As $f_1(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and $f_2(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ $y_n)$ are co-prime, $g(x, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$ can not be identically zero. But $g(x_0, e^{v_1x_0}, \dots, e^{v_{n-1}x_0}) = 0$ contradicts with the fact that $\{x_0, e^{v_1x_0}, \dots, e^{v_{n-1}x_0}\}$ are algebraically independent. We conclude that Lemma 2.4 holds.

Theorem 2.2. If $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{A}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ is irreducible, suppose $v_1, \dots, v_n \in A$ are linear independent over \mathbb{Q} , then $F(x) = f(x, e^{v_1 t}, \dots, e^{v_n t})$ has no multiple roots other than 0.

Proof. Denote $f'(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) = hom[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n]^{-1}(F'(x))$, then $f'(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) = f'_x + \sum v_i y_i f'_{y_i}$, so $degree(f', x) \leq degree(f, x)$, $degree(f', y_i) \leq degree(f, y_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. As $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is irreducible, so $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and $f'(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ are co-prime. Then F(x) and F'(x) have no common roots other than 0. We conclude that Theorem 2.2 holds.

Corollary 2.1. If $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{A}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ is square-free, suppose $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{A}$ are linear independent over \mathbb{Q} , then $F(x) = f(x, e^{v_1 x}, \dots, e^{v_n x})$ has no multiple roots other than 0.

Definition 2.7. For $F(x) = f(t, e^{v_1 t}, \dots, e^{v_n t})$, if there exists one regular basis $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$ such that $hom[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r]^{-1}(F(x))$ is square-free, then F(x) is called square-free.

Corollary 2.2. If $F(t) = f(t, e^{v_1 t}, \dots, e^{v_n t})$ is square-free, then F(t) has no multiple roots other than 0.

2.2. The TEP's factorization without multiple roots

As the algorithms of the next two sections will work well if all roots are simple, we consider the problem of reducing root multiplicities for TEP in this section. It will be shown that each TEP can be replaced by another TEP with the same zeros such that all zeros are simple.

TEP can be replaced by another TEP with the same zeros such that all zeros are simple. By Euler Formula, $\sin(x) = \frac{e^{lx}-e^{-lx}}{2I}$, $\cos(x) = \frac{e^{lx}+e^{-lx}}{2}$, a TEP can be described in the form of $f(x, e^{u_1x}, \dots, e^{u_rx}, e^{lv_1x}, e^{-lv_1x}, \dots, e^{lv_sx}, e^{-lv_sx})$, where $f \in \mathbb{C}[x, y_1, \dots, y_r, z_{11}, z_{12}, \dots, z_{s1}, z_{s2}]$ and $u_1, \dots, u_r, v_1, \dots, v_s \in \mathbb{R}_{alg}$, $I^2 = -1$.

Let $y_i = e^{u_i x}$, $z_i = e^{lv_i x}$, then a TEP can be transformed to a Laurent polynomial with the form as $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, z_1^{-1}, \dots, z_s, z_s^{-1})$. Denotes $\mathbb{LR} := \mathbb{C}[x, y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, z_1^{-1}, \dots, z_s, z_s^{-1}]$, thus for any $P \in \mathbb{LR}$, there exists $Q \in \mathbb{C}[x, y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_s]$ such that $P = Q/Z^{\vec{p}}$, Q and $Z^{\vec{p}}$ are co-prime, where $\vec{p} = \langle p_1, \dots, p_s \rangle$ is a tuple of integers and $Z^{\vec{p}} = z_1^{p_1} \cdots z_s^{p_s}$, the same below. If factor(Q) is a factorization of the polynomial Q, we call $factor(Q)/Z^{\vec{p}}$ or $Z^{-\vec{p}} factor(Q)$ a factorization of $P \in \mathbb{LR}$, where $-\vec{p} = \langle -p_1, \dots, -p_s \rangle$.

factorization of $P \in \mathbb{LR}$, where $-\vec{p} = \langle -p_1, \dots, -p_s \rangle$. For $P(x, y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_s) = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(x) y_1^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_r^{v_{jr}} z_1^{w_{j1}} \cdots z_s^{w_{js}}$, if $a_j(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, $v_{j1}, \dots, v_{jr} \in \mathbb{Z}$, $w_{j1}, \dots, w_{js} \in \mathbb{Q}$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, P is called a generalized Laurent polynomial (GLR). For $P \in \mathbb{GLR}$, $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ and $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$ are real algebraic, denote

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LRhom}[u_1, \cdots, u_r; v_1, \cdots, v_s](P) &= P(x, e^{u_1 x}, \cdots, e^{u_r x}, e^{Iv_1}, \cdots, e^{Iv_s}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(x) e^{v_{j1}u_1 x} \cdots e^{v_{jr}u_r x} e^{Iw_{j1}v_1 x} \cdots e^{Iw_{js}v_s x} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(x) e^{v_{j1}u_1 x} \cdots e^{v_{jr}u_r x} (\cos(w_{j1}v_1 x) + I\sin(w_{j1}v_1 x)) \cdots (\cos(w_{js}v_s x) + I\sin(w_{js}v_s x)), \end{aligned}$$

in the case of not causing misunderstanding, abbreviated as LRhom(P). Obviously, LRhom(P) is a TEP.

For example, if $P = x + y_1 + z_1 + z_2^{-1}$, then LRhom $[\sqrt{2}; \sqrt{3}, \sqrt{5}](P) = x + e^{\sqrt{2}x} + e^{I\sqrt{3}x} + e^{-I\sqrt{5}x} = x + e^{\sqrt{2}x} + \cos(\sqrt{3}x) + I\sin(\sqrt{3}x) + \cos(\sqrt{5}x) - I\sin(\sqrt{5}x)$.

Theorem 2.3. If $P \in \mathbb{LR}$, $P = Q/Z^{\vec{p}}$, where Q is a square-free polynomial, $\vec{p} = \langle p_1, \dots, p_s \rangle$ is a tuple of integers and $Z^{\vec{p}} = z_1^{p_1} \dots z_s^{p_s}$. $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$, $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$ are two real algebraic sets and linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , then LRhom $[u_1, \dots, u_r, v_1, \dots, v_s](P)$ has no multiple roots other than 0.

Proof. Assume that $x_0 \neq 0$ is a multiple root of $P_1(x) = \text{LRhom}[u_1, \dots, u_r, v_1, \dots, v_s](P)$ (short for LRhom(P), the same below), i.e. $P_1(x_0) = 0$ and $P'_1(x_0) = 0$.

LRhom(P) = LRhom($Q/Z^{\vec{p}}$) = LRhom(Q)/LRhom($Z^{\vec{p}}$), let $Q_1(x)$ = LRhom(Q) and $Z_P(x)$ = LRhom($Z^{\vec{p}}$), as $Z^{\vec{p}} = z_1^{p_1} \cdots z_s^{p_s}$, $Z_P(x) = e^{Iv_1p_1x} \cdots e^{Iv_sp_sx}$, so $Z_P(x) \neq 0$ and $Z'_P(x) \neq 0$ for $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$.

It is clear that $P_1(x_0) = 0$ implies that $Q_1(x_0) = 0$. As $P'_1(x) = (Q'_1(x)Z_P(x) - Q_1(x)Z'_P(x))/(2x_0)$ $Z_P(x)^2$, so $P'_1(x_0) = 0$ and $Q_1(x_0) = 0$ implies that $Q'_1(x_0) = 0$. We get that x_0 is a multiple root of $Q_1(x)$, which contracts Corollary 2.1.

Theorem 2.3 is also a direct inference of Proposition 5 in ref[8]. Let numerator(G(x)) denote the numerator of G(x).

Corollary 2.3. For $F(x) = f(x, e^{u_1 x}, \dots, e^{u_r x}, \sin(v_1 x), \dots, \sin(v_s x), \cos(r_1 x), \dots, \cos(r_t x))$, where $f \in \mathbb{C}[x, y_1, \cdots, y_r, z_{11}, \cdots, z_{1s}, z_{21}, \cdots, z_{2t}], u_1, \cdots, u_r, v_1, \cdots, v_s \in \mathbb{R}_{alg}, let \ G(x) = f(x, e^{u_1 x}, \cdots, e^{u_r x}, \frac{e^{lv_1 x} - e^{-lv_1 x}}{2l}, \cdots, \frac{e^{lv_1 x} - e^{-lv_1 x}}{2}, \cdots, \frac{e^{lv_1 x} + e^{-lr_1 x}}{2}), A = (a_1, \cdots, a_m) \text{ an integral basis of } \{u_1, \cdots, u_s\}, B = (b_1, \cdots, b_n) \text{ an integral basis of } \{v_1, \cdots, v_s r_1, \cdots, r_s\}, if the polynomial hom[a_1, \cdots, a_m]$ $Ib_1, \dots, Ib_n]^{-1}$ (numerator(G(x)) is square-free, then F(x) has no multiple roots other than 0.

We extend the operation of complex conjugation to \mathbb{LR} as follows.

Given $P = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(x) y_1^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_r^{v_{jr}} z_1^{w_{j1}} \cdots z_s^{w_{js}} \in \mathbb{LR}$, where $a_1(x), \cdots, a_n(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, define its formal conjugate to be $con(P) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \overline{a_j(x)} y_1^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_r^{v_{jr}} z_1^{-w_{j1}} \cdots z_s^{-w_{js}}$, where $\overline{a_j(x)}$ is the conjugate of the complex function $a_j(x)$, and the same below. Obviously, $con(Z^{\vec{p}}) = Z^{-\vec{p}}$.

Lemma 2.5. For $P = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(x) y_1^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_r^{v_{jr}} z_1^{w_{j1}} \cdots z_s^{w_{js}} \in \mathbb{LR}$ and two arbitrary real algebraic numbers sets $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ and $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$, $LRhom(con(P)) = \overline{LRhom(P)}$.

Proof. LRhom(*con*(*P*)) = LRhom($\sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{a_i(x)} y_1^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_r^{v_{jr}} z_1^{-w_{j1}} \cdots z_s^{-w_{js}}$)

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{j}(x) y_{1}^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_{r}^{v_{jr}} (\cos(-w_{j_{1}}v_{1}x) + I\sin(-w_{j_{1}}v_{1}x)) \cdots (\cos(-w_{j_{s}}v_{s}x) + I\sin(-w_{j_{s}}v_{s}x))$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \overline{a_{j}(x)} y_{1}^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_{r}^{v_{jr}} (\cos(w_{j_{1}}v_{1}x) - I\sin(w_{j_{1}}v_{1}x)) \cdots (\cos(w_{j_{s}}v_{s}x) - I\sin(w_{j_{s}}v_{s}x))$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \overline{a_{j}(x)} y_{1}^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_{r}^{v_{jr}} (\cos(w_{j_{1}}v_{1}x) + I\sin(w_{j_{1}}v_{1}x)) \cdots (\cos(w_{j_{s}}v_{s}x) - I\sin(w_{j_{s}}v_{s}x))$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \overline{a_{j}(x)} y_{1}^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_{r}^{v_{jr}} (\cos(w_{j_{1}}v_{1}x) + I\sin(w_{j_{1}}v_{1}x)) \cdots (\cos(w_{j_{s}}v_{s}x) - I\sin(w_{j_{s}}v_{s}x))$$

$$= \overline{LRhom(P)},$$
where $y_{1}^{v_{j1}} = e^{v_{jj}u_{i}x}$ is real-valued for $i = 1, \cdots, r$.

where $y_1^{v_{j1}} = e^{v_{ji}u_ix}$ is real-valued for $i = 1, \dots, r$.

For P = con(P), $\overline{LRhom(P)} = LRhom(con(P)) = LRhom(P)$ holds due to Lemma 2.5, so we get Lemma 2.6.

Lemma 2.6. For $P \in \mathbb{LR}$, if P = con(P), then LRhom(P) is real-valued.

Lemma 2.7. For $P, P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{LR}$, $con(P_1+P_2) = con(P_1) + con(P_2)$, $con(P_1P_2) = con(P_1)con(P_2)$, con(con(P)) = P.

Theorem 2.4. If $P = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(x) x^{u_j} y_1^{v_{j1}} \cdots y_r^{v_{jr}} z_1^{w_{j1}} \cdots z_s^{w_{js}} \in \mathbb{LR}$ such that P = con(P), P canbe factorized as $CZ^{\vec{p}}P_1^{r_1}\cdots P_n^{r_n}$, where $C \in \mathbb{C}$ and $P_1, \cdots, P_n \in \mathbb{C}[x, y_1, \cdots, y_r, z_1, \cdots, z_s]$ are square-free and pairwisely co-prime, $\vec{p} = \langle p_1, \dots, p_s \rangle$ is a tuple of integers and $Z^{\vec{p}} =$ $z_1^{p_1} \dots z_s^{p_s}$, then for each *i*,

1) there exist $C_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $\vec{p_i}$, a tuple of rational numbers, such that $P_i = C_i Z^{\vec{p_i}} con(P_i)$;

2) For two arbitrary real algebraic numbers sets $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ and $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$, $f_i(x) =$ LRhom $[u_1, \dots, u_r; v_1, \dots, v_s](P_i Z^{-\vec{p_i}/2} C_i^{-1/2})$ is real-valued or pure imaginary, furthermore, f_i has no multiple root other than 0 for $i = 1, \dots, n, f_i$ and f_j have no common root other than 0 for $i \neq j$;

3) LRhom $[u_1, \dots, u_r; v_1, \dots, v_s](P) = C_0 f_1^{r_1} \cdots f_n^{r_n}$, where $C_0 = C(C_1)^{r_1/2} \cdots (C_n)^{r_n/2}$.

Proof. 1)For n = 1, P = con(P) implies $CZ^{\vec{p}}(P_1)^{r_1} = \overline{C}Z^{-\vec{p}}con(P_1)^{r_1}$, thus $P_1 = (\overline{C}/C)^{1/r_1}Z^{-2\vec{p}/r_1}$ $con(P_1)$, the conclusion holds.

Suppose the conclusion holds for n = m - 1, that is to say, there exist C_i , $\vec{p_i}$ such that $P_i = C_i Z^{\vec{p_i}} con(P_i)$ for 1 < i < m. Let n = m,

 $P = CZ^{\vec{p}}(P_1)^{r_1} \cdots (P_{m-1})^{r_{m-1}} P_m^{r_m}$ $= CZ^{\vec{p}}(C_1)^{r_1}Z^{r_1\vec{p_1}}con(P_1)^{r_1}\cdots(C_{m-1})^{r_{m-1}}Z^{r_{m-1}\vec{p_{m-1}}}con(P_{m-1})^{r_{m-1}}(P_m)^{r_m}$ $= C_0 Z^{\vec{p_0}} con(P_1)^{r_1} \cdots con(P_{m-1})^{r_{m-1}} P_m^{r_m},$

where $C_0 = C(C_1)^{r_1} \cdots (C_{m-1})^{r_{m-1}}, \vec{p_0} = \vec{p} + r_1 \vec{p_1} + \cdots + r_{m-1} \vec{p_{m-1}}.$

On the other hand, $con(P) = \overline{C}Z^{-\overrightarrow{p}}con(P_1)^{r_1}\cdots con(P_{m-1})^{r_{m-1}}con(P_m)^{r_m}$.

So, by the assumption P = con(P), we get that if $con(P_1) \neq 0, \dots, con(P_{m-1}) \neq 0, P_m =$ $C_m Z^{\vec{p_m}} con(P_m)$, where $C_m = (\overline{C}/C_0)^{1/r_m}$, $\vec{p_m} = (-\vec{p} - \vec{p_0})/r_m$. As $con(P_1)$, \cdots , $con(P_{m-1})$ have finite zeros at most, P_m and $con(P_m)$ are both continuous, so $P_m = C_m Z^{\vec{p_m}} con(P_m)$ holds. 2) $P_i = C_i Z^{\vec{p_i}} con(P_i)$ implies $P_i^2 = C_i Z^{\vec{p_i}} con(P_i) P_i$, so $P_i^2 C_i^{-1} Z^{-\vec{p_i}} = con(P_i) P_i$. Let $Q_i = C_i Z^{\vec{p_i}} con(P_i) P_i$.

 $P_i Z^{-\vec{p_i}/2} C_i^{-1/2}$, then $Q_i^2 = con(P_i) P_i$, so that $Q_i^2 = con(Q_i^2)$.

Let $f_i(x) = \text{LRhom}[u_1, \dots, u_r; v_1, \dots, v_s](Q_i)$, then $f_i(x)^2$ is real-valued due to Lemma 2.6, i.e. $f_i(x)$ is real-valued or pure imaginary.

It is clearly that f_i has no multiple root other than 0 by Theorem 2.3, f_i and f_j have no common root other than 0 for $i \neq j$ by Corollary 2.3.

3) As P = con(P), $degree(P, z_j) = degree(P, z_j^{-1})$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$, denoted by q_j . It is trivial that $\vec{p}[j] = -q_j$ and $degree(Q = P_1^{r_1} \cdots P_n^{r_n}, z_j) = 2q_j$. Let $p_{ij} = degree(P_i, z_j) = degree(P_i, z_j^{-1})$, then $\vec{p_i} = < p_{i1}, \dots, p_{is} > \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n \text{ and } r_1 p_{1j} + \dots + r_n p_{nj} = degree(Q, z_j) = 2q_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$, so $\vec{p}[j] = -q_j = -(r_1 p_{1j} + \dots + r_n p_{nj})/2$ and $\vec{p} = degree(Q, z_j) = 2q_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$, so $\vec{p}[j] = -q_j = -(r_1 p_{1j} + \dots + r_n p_{nj})/2$ $-(r_1\vec{p_1}+\cdots+r_n\vec{p_n})/2.$

So, $C_0 \times f_1^{r_1} \cdots f_n^{r_n} = C(C_1)^{r_1/2} \cdots (C_n)^{r_n/2} (\text{LRhom}[u_1, \cdots, u_r; v_1, \cdots, v_s] (P_1 Z^{-\vec{p_1}/2} C_1^{-1/2}))^{r_1} \cdots$ $(\text{LRhom}[u_1, \cdots, u_r; v_1, \cdots, v_s](P_n Z^{-\vec{p_n}/2} C_n^{-1/2}))^{r_n}$

Corollary 2.4. For each trigonometric-exponential polynomial $F(x) = f(x, e^{u_1 x}, \dots, e^{u_r x}, \sin(v_1 x),$ \cdots , sin($v_s x$), cos($v_1 x$), \cdots , cos($v_s x$)), where $f \in \mathbb{R}_{alg}[x, y_1, \cdots, y_r, z_1, \cdots, z_s, w_1, \cdots, w_s]$, there exists $C \in \mathbb{R}$ and real-valued trigonometric-exponential polynomials $\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\}$ such that f_i has no multiple root other than 0, f_i and f_j have no common root other than 0 for $i \neq j$, $F(x) = Cf_1(x)^{r_1} \cdots f_n(x)^{r_n}.$

Proof. Making substitution for F(x), $e^{u_i x} = y_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, $\sin(v_i x) = \frac{z_i - 1/z_i}{2I}$, $\cos(v_i x) = \frac{z_i - 1/z_i}{2I}$ $\frac{z_i+1/z_i}{2}$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$, yields $P \in \mathbb{LR}$ such that $\operatorname{LRhom}[u_1, \dots, u_r; v_1, \dots, v_s](P) = F(x)$.

By Theorem 2.4, there exists $C \in \mathbb{C}$ and trigonometric-exponential polynomials $\{f_i\}$ such that f_i has no multiple root other than 0, f_i and f_j have no common root other than 0 for $i \neq j$, $F(x) = Cf_1(x)^{r_1} \cdots f_n(x)^{r_n}$, each f_i is real-valued or pure imaginary.

If all f_i s are real-valued, then Corollary 2.4 holds. For each *i*, if f_i is pure imaginary, let $f'_i = \frac{f_i}{I}$ and $C' = CI^{r_i}$, then f'_i is real-valued and $F(x) = C'f_1(x)^{r_1} \cdots f'_i(x)^{r_i} \cdots f_n(x)^{r_n}$.

Now, F(x) and all $f_i(x)(orf'_i(x))$ s are real-valued, so the constant C (or C') must be a real number. That is to say the corollary holds.

Algorithm 1: algorithm caption

Input: A TEP $F(x) = f(x, e^{u_1 x}, \dots, e^{u_r x}, \sin(v_1 x), \dots, \sin(v_s x), \cos(r_1 x), \dots, \cos(r_t x)),$ where $f \in \mathbb{R}_{alg}[x, y_1, \cdots, y_r, z_1, \cdots, z_s, w_1, \cdots, w_t]$ **Output:** $F(x) = CF_1(x)^{n_1} \cdots F_m(x)^{n_m}$ such that $C \in \mathbb{R}_{alg}$ and $F_i(x)$ is a real-valued TEP which has no multiple roots other than 0 for $i = 1, \dots, m, F_i(x)$ and $F_i(x)$ have no common roots other than 0 for $i \neq j$ 1 $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \leftarrow$ an integral basis of $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ 2 $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \leftarrow \text{an integral basis of } \{v_1, \dots, v_s, r_1, \dots, r_l\};$ 3 $G \leftarrow f(x, e^{u_1 x}, \dots, e^{u_r x}, \frac{e^{b_1 x} - e^{-b_1 x}}{2I}, \dots, \frac{e^{l_r x} - e^{-l_r x x}}{2I}, \frac{e^{l_r x} + e^{-l_r x}}{2}, \dots, \frac{e^{l_r x} + e^{-l_r x}}{2})$ 4 $G_1 \leftarrow numerator(G)$ 5 $G_2 \leftarrow denominator(G)$ 6 $Q_1 \leftarrow hom[a_1, \dots, a_m, Ib_1, \dots, Ib_n]^{-1}(G_1)$, where $Q_1(x_1, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n)$ is an (m + n + 1)-ary polynomial and $y_i = e^{a_i x}$, $z_j = e^{lb_j x}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n$ 7 $Q_2 \leftarrow hom[a_1, \cdots, a_m, Ib_1, \cdots, Ib_n]^{-1}(G_2)$, where $Q_2 = Z^{\vec{p}} = z_1^{p_1} \cdots z_n^{p_n}$; 8 $P_lst \leftarrow factor(Q_1) = CP_1^{r_1} \cdots P_n^{r_n}$, where P_1, \cdots, P_n are square-free and pairwise co-prime 9 $P_lst \leftarrow Z^{-\vec{p}}P_lst$; i.e. $P_lst = Z^{-\vec{p}}factor(Q_1) = CZ^{-\vec{p}}P_1^{r_1}\cdots P_n^{r_n}$ 10 $F \leftarrow 1$ 11 $C_0 \leftarrow C$ 12 for i form 1 to n do $g \leftarrow P_i$ 13 $h \leftarrow g/con(g)$, where h is of form $C_i z_1^{-p_1} \cdots z_n^{-p_n}$, 14 $LRhom(g^2/h) = LRhom(g \times con(g))$ is real-valued $f_i \leftarrow \text{LRhom}[a_1, \cdots, a_m, b_1, \cdots, b_n](g/(C_i^{\frac{1}{2}} z_1^{-\frac{p_1}{2}} \cdots z_n^{-\frac{p_n}{2}}))$, where f_i is real-valued or 15 pure imaginary by Theorem 2.4. if f_i is pure imaginary then 16 $\begin{array}{c} f_i \leftarrow \frac{f_i}{I} \\ C_0 \leftarrow C_0 I^{r_i} \end{array}$ 17 18 19 end $F \leftarrow F \times f_i^{r_i}$ $C_0 \leftarrow C_0 \times (C_i^{1/2})^{r_i}$ 20 21 22 end 23 return $C_0 \times F$

The following example shows the process of Algorithm 1.

Example 1. Factorize the trigonometric polynomial $F(x) = 1 - \cos^3(x) - \sin^3(x)$. Let $z = e^{Ix}$, so that $\cos(x) = \frac{z+z^{-1}}{2}$ and $\sin(x) = \frac{z-z^{-1}}{2I}$, then we can get a Laurent polynomial of F(x) on complex field, $P = 1 - (\frac{z+z^{-1}}{2})^3 - (\frac{z-z^{-1}}{2I})^3$. Factorization yields that $P = \frac{(-\frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{8})(z^2 + 2z + 2Iz + I)(z-1)^2(-z+I)^2}{z^3}$. Let $P_1 = z^2 + 2z + 2Iz + I$, then $con(P_1) = \frac{1}{z^2} + \frac{2}{z} - \frac{2I}{z} - I$, and $P_1 = c_1 z^2 con(P_1)$, where $c_1 = 1$.

$$f_{1} = \text{LRhom}[; 1](P_{1}/(I^{\frac{1}{2}}z))$$

$$= \text{LRhom}[; 1](I^{-\frac{1}{2}}z + 2I^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 2I^{\frac{1}{2}} + I^{\frac{1}{2}}z^{-1})$$

$$= e^{-I\frac{\pi}{4} + Ix} + 2e^{-I\frac{\pi}{4}} + 2e^{I\frac{\pi}{4}} + e^{I\frac{\pi}{4} - Ix}$$

$$= \cos(x - \frac{\pi}{4}) + I\sin(x - \frac{\pi}{4}) + 2(\cos(-\frac{\pi}{4}) + I\sin(-\frac{\pi}{4})) + 2(\cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) + I\sin(\frac{\pi}{4})) + \cos(x - \frac{\pi}{4}) - I\sin(x - \frac{\pi}{4})$$

$$= \cos(x - \frac{\pi}{4}) + 4\cos(\frac{\pi}{4})$$

$$= \sqrt{2}(\cos(x) + \sin(x) + 2)$$

Let $P_2 = z - 1$, $con(P_2) = \frac{1}{z} - 1$, $P_2 = c_2 z con(P_2)$, where $c_2 = -1 = e^{l\pi}$.

$$f_{2} = \text{LRhom}[; 1](P_{2}/(c_{2}z)^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \text{LRhom}[; 1](z^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1/(c_{2}z)^{\frac{1}{2}})$$

$$= e^{I(\frac{x}{2} - \frac{\pi}{2})} - e^{-I(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{\pi}{2})}$$

$$= \cos(\frac{x}{2} - \frac{\pi}{2}) + I\sin(\frac{x}{2} - \frac{\pi}{2}) - (\cos(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{\pi}{2}) - I\sin(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{\pi}{2}))$$

$$= \sin(\frac{x}{2}) - I\cos(\frac{x}{2}) - (-\sin(\frac{x}{2}) - I\cos(\frac{x}{2})) = 2\sin(\frac{x}{2}).$$

Let $P_3 = -z + I$, $con(P_3) = -\frac{1}{z} - I$, $P_3 = c_3 z con(P_3)$, where $c_3 = -I = e^{-I\frac{\pi}{2}}$,

$$\begin{split} f_{3} &= \text{LRhom}[; 1](P_{3}/(-Iz)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \text{LRhom}[; 1](-z+I)/(-Iz)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= (-e^{Ix} + e^{I\frac{\pi}{2}})/e^{-I\frac{\pi}{4} + I\frac{x}{2}} = -e^{I\frac{x}{2} + I\frac{\pi}{4}} + e^{I\frac{3\pi}{4} - I\frac{x}{2}} \\ &= -\cos(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}) - I\sin(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}) + \cos(\frac{3\pi}{4} - \frac{x}{2}) + I\sin(\frac{3\pi}{4} - \frac{x}{2}) \\ &= -\cos(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}) - I\sin(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}) - \cos(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{x}{2}) + I\sin(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{x}{2}) \\ &= -2\cos(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}) = -\sqrt{2}(\cos(\frac{x}{2}) - \sin(\frac{x}{2})) = \sqrt{2}(\sin(\frac{x}{2}) - \cos(\frac{x}{2})), \\ C_{0} &= Cc_{1}^{\frac{1}{2}}c_{2}c_{3} = (-\frac{1}{8} - \frac{I}{8})(I^{\frac{1}{2}})(-1)(-I) = -(\frac{1}{8} + \frac{I}{8})I^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= \frac{(1+I)I^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{8} = \frac{I^{-\frac{1}{2}} + I^{\frac{1}{2}}}{8} = \frac{e^{-I\frac{\pi}{4}} + e^{I\frac{\pi}{4}}}{8} \\ &= \frac{\cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) - I\sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) + \cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) + I\sin(\frac{\pi}{4})}{8} \\ &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8}. \end{split}$$

Therefore, $F(x) = C_0 \times f_1 \times f_2^2 \times f_3^2$, where $C_0 = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8}$, $f_1 = \sqrt{2}(\cos(x) + \sin(x) + 2)$, $f_2 = 2\sin(\frac{x}{2})$, $f_3 = \sqrt{2}(\sin(\frac{x}{2}) - \cos(\frac{x}{2}))$, and f_1 , f_2 , f_3 are pairwise co-prime and have no multiple roots, i.e. $f_1 \times f_2 \times f_3$ have no multiple roots.

Example 2. Decide whether trigonometric-exponential polynomial $f(x) = -\sqrt{3} - 24\sqrt{3}e^{-x} - 4\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-\frac{3}{2}x} - 12\sqrt{3}e^{-\frac{5}{2}x} + 108\sqrt{3}e^{-2x} - 8e^{-3x}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x) + 36e^{-\frac{5}{2}x}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)$ has real multiple roots.

As $\{-1, -\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{5}{2}, -2, -3, -\frac{5}{2}\}$ has an integral basis $\{-\frac{1}{2}\}$, let $y_1 = e^{-\frac{1}{2}x}$ and $z_1 = e^{I\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x}$, then f(x) can be transformed to a Laurent polynomial $P(x, y_1, z_1) = -\sqrt{3} - 24\sqrt{3}y_1^2 - 4 \times \frac{z_1 - \frac{1}{z_1}}{2I} \times y_1^3 - 12\sqrt{3}y_1^5 + 108\sqrt{3}y_1^4 - 8y_1^6 \times \frac{z_1 - \frac{1}{z_1}}{2I} \times \frac{z_1 + \frac{1}{z_1}}{2} + 36y_1^5 \times \frac{z_1 - \frac{1}{z_1}}{2I}$. $factor(P) = -\frac{1}{7} \times \frac{1}{z_1^2} \times (\sqrt{3} - 2I) \times (-y_1^6 - (6I)\sqrt{3}y_1^5 z_1 - (2I)\sqrt{3}z_1^2 - (2I)\sqrt{3}y_1^3 z_1^3 + (2I)\sqrt{3}y_1^3 z_1 - (2I6I)\sqrt{3}y_1^4 z_1^2 + (48I)\sqrt{3}y_1^2 z_1^2 + (4I)\sqrt{3}y_1^6 - 3z_1^2 + 72y_1^2 z_1^2 + 7y_1^6 z_1^4 + 6y_1^6 z_1^2 - 18y_1^5 z_1^3 + 54y_1^5 z_1 - 324y_1^4 z_1^2 + (4I)\sqrt{3}y_1^6 z_2^3 + 4y_1^3 z_2^3 - 4y_1^3 z_1)$

(4I) $\sqrt{3}y_1^{6}z_1^2 + (30I)\sqrt{3}y_1^{5}z_1^3 + 4y_1^{3}z_1^3 - 4y_1^{3}z_1)$. So factor(P) can be wrote as $-\frac{1}{7} \times \frac{1}{z_1^2} \times Q$, where Q is square-free, then we get that f(x) has no real multiple roots by Theorem 2.3.

3. Succusive Taylor Substitution

In this section, we are to discuss the sign-deciding of transcendental polynomials by Successive Taylor-substitution.

Definition 3.1. For a transcendental function F(x), on a certain interval I, if there are two algebraic functions sequences $\{T_{\min}(n, F)\}$ and $\{T_{\max}(n, F)\}$, and an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \ge n_0$,

1) $T_{\min}(n+1, F) > T_{\min}(n, F)$, and for $n \to \infty$, $T_{\min}(n, F) \to F(x)$,

2) $T_{\max}(n+1, F) < T_{\max}(n, F)$, and for $n \to \infty$, $T_{\max}(n, F) \to F(x)$.

We call $\{T_{\min}(n, F)\}$ and $\{T_{\max}(n, F)\}$ the lower limit polynomials sequence and upper limit polynomials sequence of F(x) on interval I respectively, $T_{\min}(n, F)$ is the lower limit polynomial of F(x), and $T_{\max}(n, F)$ is the upper limit of F(x). n_0 is called the threshold.

Obviously, the lower limit polynomials and the upper limit polynomials of F(x) satisfy:

 $T_{\min}(n_0, F)(x) < T_{\min}(n_0 + 1, F)(x) < T_{\min}(n_0 + 2, F)(x) < \dots < F(x) < \dots < T_{\max}(n_0 + 2, F)(x) < T_{\max}(n_0 + 1, F)(x) < T_{\max}(n_0, F)(x).$

Therefore, there are nested polynomials to approximate F(x):

 $(T_{\min}(n_0, F)(x), T_{\max}(n_0, F)(x)) \supset (T_{\min}(n_0 + 1, F)(x), T_{\max}(n_0 + 1, F)(x)) \supset (T_{\min}(n_0 + 2, F)(x), T_{\max}(n_0 + 2, F)(x)) \supset \cdots \supset \{F(x)\}.$

Next, we are to discuss how to obtain the lower limit polynomials and upper limit polynomials for a specific class of transcendental polynomial with the form F(x) = f(x, trans(x)), where f(x, y) is a binary polynomial.

For convenience, we take the sum of the first *n* terms in Taylor expansion of function f(x) at 0 as taylor(f, n). Obviously, if taylor(f, n) converges to f(x), $f(x) = Taylor(f, n) + o(x^p)$, where $p \ge n$.

Definition 3.2. If the transcendental function f(x) meets the following conditions on a certain intervals [0, T],

1) For $x \in [0, T]$, $f(x) \ge 0$ and for $x \in (0, T]$, f(x) > 0;

2) Taylor expansion of f(x) at 0 is a staggered series and converges to f(x), i.e. $taylor(f, n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{i-1} f_i(x)$, where $f_i(x) = a_i x^{m_i}$, $0 < a_i \le 1$, $m_{i-1} < m_i$;

3) there exists a constant $n_0(f,T)$, for $n \ge n_0(f,T)$, taylor(f,n) > 0 and $f_n(x) > f_{n+1}(x) > 0$.

We say that f(x) can be regularly expanded on the interval [0, T], and the constant $n_0(f, T)$ is called its threshold.

Most of the common basic elementary transcendental functions can be regularly expanded on the corresponding intervals.

 $\arctan(x) = x - \frac{x^3}{3} + \frac{x^5}{5} - \frac{x^7}{7} + \dots + \frac{(-1)^{n-1}x^{2n-1}}{2n-1} + \dots (|x| \le 1)$, can be regularly expanded on (0, 1], and the threshold $n_0 = 1$.

(0, 1], and the threshold $n_0 = 1$. $e^{-x} = 1 - x + \frac{x^2}{2!} - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \dots + \frac{(-x)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} + \dots$, can be regularly expanded on (0, T], where T > 0and the threshold $n_0 = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}, for \ 0 < x \le T, taylor(e^{-x}, n) > 0 \text{ and } taylor(e^{-x}, n+1) > 0\}$. $\ln(1+x) = x - \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{x^3}{3} - \dots + \frac{(-1)^{k-1}x^k}{k} + \dots (0 < x < 1)$, can be regularly expanded on (0, 1), and the threshold $n_0 = 1$. $\sin(x) = x - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^5}{5!} - \dots + \frac{(-1)^{k-1}x^{2k-1}}{(2k-1)!} + \dots$, can be regularly expanded on (0, T], where $0 < T < \pi$ and the threshold $n_0 = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}, for \ 0 < x \le T, taylor(\sin(x), n) > 0, taylor(\sin(x), n+1) > 0\}$.

0}, e.g. for $T = \frac{\pi}{2}$, $n_0 = 1$; for T = 3, $n_0 = 3$; for $T = \frac{314}{100}$, $n_0 = 5$. $\cos(x) = 1 - \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^4}{4!} - \dots + \frac{(-1)^k x^{2k}}{(2k)!} + \dots$, can be regularly expanded on (0, T], where $0 < T < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and the threshold $n_0 = 1$. When $x = \frac{\pi}{2}$, as $taylor(\cos(x), 2n) < \cos(x) = 0$, so $\cos(x)$ can not be regularly expanded on $(0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$.

There are also some elementary transcendental functions which can not be regularly expanded. e.g.

 $\operatorname{arcsin} x = x + \frac{1}{2} \frac{x^3}{3} + \frac{1 \times 3}{2 \times 4} \frac{x^5}{5} + \dots \quad (|x| < 1), \\ e^x = 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{21} + \frac{x^3}{31} + \dots + \frac{x^n}{n!} + \dots .$

Lemma 3.1. If f(x) can be regularly expanded on given interval I and the threshold is n_0 , then for $n \ge n_0$, on I,

1) taylor(f, 2n-2)) < taylor(f, 2n) < f(x), 2) taylor(f, 2n - 1) > taylor(f, 2n + 1) > f(x), 3) when $n \to \infty$, taylor $(f, n) \to f(x)$.

Denote the sums of the positive and negative terms of the expansion of polynomial f by f^+ and f^- respectively. Obviously, $f = f^+ + f^-$ and the following lemma clearly holds.

Lemma 3.2. If $T_1(y) > 0$, $T_2(y) > 0$ and $T_1(y) < x < T_2(y)$, then $f^+(T_1(y), y) + f^-(T_2(y), y) < 0$ $f(x, y) < f^+(T_2(y), y) + f^-(T_1(y), y).$

Theorem 3.1. If F(x) = f(x, trans(x)) and trans(x) can be regularly expanded on I, then $T_{max}(n,F) = f^+(x,taylor(trans(x),2n-1)) + f^-(x,taylor(trans(x),2n))$ is an upper limit

polynomial of F(x),

 $T_{\min}(n, F) = f^+(x, taylor(trans(x), 2n)) + f^-(x, taylor(trans(x), 2n - 1))$ is a lower limit polynomial of F(x).

In the above scheme, the upper and lower polynomials sequences of transcendental function can be obtained by Taylor expansion, and a series of nested unary polynomials to approximate the objective function are established, so that the sign decision of the objective function can be transformed to a series of verifications of the unary polynomial inequalities, and then the final work can be completed by means of algebraic inequality proving tools (such as xprove of BOTTEMA). We call this scheme Taylor-substitution.

A general transcendental polynomial may contain several transcendental factors, and the expression after Taylor substitution once may still contains transcendental factors, which need

Taylor substitution again or even many times. The transcendental polynomial with one more transcendental factors with the form $f(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_n(x)))$ will be discussed below.

Lemma 3.3. For $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$, expressions T_{1i} and T_{2i} such that $T_{2i} > y_i > T_{1i} > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $f^+(x, T_{11}, T_{12}, \dots, T_{1n}) + f^-(x, T_{21}, T_{22}, \dots, T_{2n}) < f(x_1, \dots, x_n) < f^+(T_{21}, T_{22}, \dots, T_{2n}) + f^-(x, T_{11}, T_{12}, \dots, T_{1n}).$

Theorem 3.2. For $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_t) \in \mathbb{R}[x, y_1, \dots, y_t]$, transcendental functions $trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)$ can be regularly expanded on (0, T), the thresholds are n_1, \dots, n_t respectively. $n_0 = \max\{n_1, \dots, n_t\}, F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x))$, when $n \ge n_0$,

 $T_{\max}(n, F) = f^+(x, taylor(trans_1(x), 2n-1), \cdots, taylor(trans_t(x), 2n-1)) + f^-(x, taylor(trans_1(x), 2n), \cdots, taylor(trans_t(x), 2n-1)) + f^-(x, taylor(trans_t(x), 2n)) + f^-(x, ta$

 $T_{\min}(n, F) = f^+(x, taylor(trans_1(x), 2n), \cdots, taylor(trans_t(x), 2n)) + f^-(x, taylor(trans_1(x), 2n-1), \cdots, taylor(trans_t(x), 2n-1))$ is a lower limit polynomial of F(x).

For $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} f_i(x) \prod_{i=1}^{t} (y_i)^{d_{ij}}$,

 $T_{\max} = \sum_{i=1}^{s} (f_i^+(x)) (\prod_{j=1}^{t} (taylor(trans_j(x)),$

 $(2n-1)^{d_{ij}}$ + $f_i^-(x)(\prod_{j=1}^t (taylor(trans_j(x), 2n)^{d_{ij}}))$ is an upper limit polynomial of F(x),

 $T_{\min}(n, F) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} (f_i^+(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (taylor(trans_j(x), 2n))^{d_{ij}}) + f_i^-(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (taylor(trans_j(x), 2n - 1))^{d_{ij}}))$ is a lower limit polynomial of F(x).

We call the above scheme Successive Taylor-substitution. In the subsequent discussion, unless otherwise specified, all the upper and lower limit polynomials $T_{max}(n, F)$ and $T_{min}(n, F)$ of F(x) refer to the definitions in Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2. If transcendental function F(x) has lower limit polynomials sequence and upper limit polynomials sequence, the decision of the sign of F(x) can be fulfilled by the following Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: Deciding_transcendental_polynomial

Input: $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x))$ and an interval *I* **Output:** The sign of F(x) on $I n \leftarrow \max\{n_1, \dots, n_t\}$, where n_i is the threshold of $trans_i(x)$ for being regularly expanded; compute the upper limit polynomial $T_{max}(n, f)$ and the lower limit polynomial $T_{min}(n, f)$ 1 if $T_{\min}(n, f) \ge 0$ holds on *I* then 2 return 1 // F(x) > 0 holds 3 end 4 if $T_{max}(n, f) \le 0$ holds on I then 5 **return** -1 // F(x) < 0 holds 6 end 7 if neither $T_{max}(n, f) \ge 0$ nor $T_{min}(n, f) \le 0$ holds on I then return 0 // F(x) has no constant sign on I 8 9 else 10 $n \leftarrow n + 1$, goto 2) 11 end

[4,6] proved that for $trans(x) = \arctan(x)(0 < x \le 1)$ or $trans(x) = e^{-x}$, $f(x, y) \in \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$, Algorithm 2 is correct and will definitely terminate. It is also pointed that for more general transcendental polynomials, the conclusion about the root multiplicities of transcendental polynomials may not hold, and the algorithm may not terminate. Fortunately, Algorithm 1 in this paper can reduce the root multiplicities of TEP. **Theorem 3.3.** $\{T_{\min}(n, F)\}$ and $\{T_{\max}(n, F)\}$ are the lower and upper polynomials sequences of transcendental polynomial F(x) on the interval I, for any $x_0 \in I$, $f(x_0) < 0$ if and only if there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_{\max}(n_0, F)(x_0) < 0$, $f(x_0) > 0$ if and only if there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_{\min}(n_0, f)(x_0) > 0$.

Proof. We are to prove the former part firstly.

Denote the threshold for $T_{max}(n, F)$ is the upper polynomial of F(x) by n(I). Obviously, for $n \ge n(I)$, $T_{max}(n, F) > F$, so the sufficiency obviously holds.

Assume that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_{\max}(n, F)(x_0) \ge 0$ holds, then $n \to \infty$, $T_{\max}(n, F)(x_0) \to F(x_0)$, we get that $F(x_0) \ge 0$, which contradicts the known conditions, so the necessity holds.

In the same way, $F(x_0) > 0$ if and only if there exists n_0 such that $T_{\min}(n_0, F)(x_0) > 0$.

Lemma 3.4. If $trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)$ can be regularly expanded on (0, T], $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_t) \in \mathbb{R}[x, y_1, \dots, y_t]$, $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x))$, then there exists constants M and N independent of n such that the sum of absolute values of all coefficients of the polynomial $T_{\min}(n, f)(x)$ after expansion is less than $M \times n^N$.

Proof. For a real polynomial f, denote the sum of the absolute value of the coefficients by ||f||. As for each $trans_i(x)$, the absolute value of each coefficient of $taylor(trans_i(x), n)$ is less than or equal to 1, so $||taylor(trans_i(x), n)|| \le n$.

Let $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} f_i(x) (\prod_{j=1}^{t} (y_j)^{d_{ij}})$, then $F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} f_i(x) (\prod_{j=1}^{t} (trans_j(x))^{d_{ij}})$, thereby,

 $T_{\min}(n, F)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} (f_i^+(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (taylor(trans_j(x), 2n))^{d_{ij}}) + f_i^-(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (taylor(trans_j(x), 2n-1))^{d_{ij}})).$

So, $\|\mathbf{T}_{\min}(n, F)\|$

 $\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s} (\|f_i^+(x)\|(\prod_{j=1}^{t}(\|taylor(trans_j(x), 2n)\|)^{d_{ij}}) + \|f_i^-(x)\|(\prod_{j=1}^{t}(\|taylor(trans_j(x), 2n-1)\|)^{d_{ij}})) \\ \leq \sum_{i=1}^{s} (\|f_i^+(x)\|(\prod_{j=1}^{t}(2n)^{d_{ij}}) + \|f_i^-(x)\|(\prod_{j=1}^{t}(2n-1)^{d_{ij}}))$

- $<\sum_{i=1}^{s} (\|f_i^+(x)\|(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (2n)^{d_{ij}}) + \|f_i^-(x)\|(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (2n)^{d_{ij}}))$
- $\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s} (\|f_i(x)\| ((2n)^{d_{i1} + \dots + d_{it}}))$

Let $M_i = ||f_i(x)||, N_i = d_{i1} + \dots + d_{it}, M' = \max\{M_i \times 2^{N_i} | i = 1 \dots s\}, N = \max\{N_i | i = 1 \dots s\},$ then $||T_{\min}(n, F)|| \le M' \sum_{i=1}^s n^{N_i} \le s \times M' \times n^N.$

Let $M = s \times M'$, then $||T_{\min}(n, F)|| \le M \times n^N$ and M, N are independent of n.

Denote the lowest degree of the univariate polynomial g by td(g), and the coefficient of the lowest degree term by tc(g).

Lemma 3.5. If transcendental functions $trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)$ can be regularly expanded on a given interval (0, T], $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_t) \in \mathbb{R}[x, y_1, \dots, y_t]$, suppose that $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)) > 0$ holds on (0, T), then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $td(T_{\min}(n_0, F)) < 2n_0 - 1$.

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $d_n = td(T_{\min}(n, F))$, $c_n = tc(T_{\min}(n, F))$, that is to say, $T_{\min}(n, F) = c_n x^{d_n} + g(x)$, the degree of each item of g(x) is bigger than d_n , by Lemma 3.4, the absolute value of c_n and each coefficient of g(x) are less than $M \times n^N$, where M and N are constants independent of n.

Let $\lambda = \min\{T, 1\}$, then for $0 < x < \lambda$, $|T_{\min}(n, F)| < M \times n^N \times x^{d_n} \times (1 + x + x^2 + \cdots) < M \times n^N \times x^{d_n}/(1 - x)$.

Assume that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d_n \ge 2n-1$, then $|T_{\min}(n, F)| \le M \times n^N \times x^{2n-1}/(1-x)$. It is easy to prove that when $n \to \infty$, $||T_{\min}(n, f)(x)|| \to 0$, which contradicts the fact that $T_{\min}(n, f) \to F$

and the assumed condition that F(x) > 0 on $(0, \lambda) \subset (0, T)$. So there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $td(T_{\min}(n_0, f)) < 2n_0 - 1.$

Let $o(x^p)$ be the higher order infinitesimal of x^p for $x \to 0$.

Lemma 3.6. For $T \in (0, 1)$, if $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)) > 0$ holds on (0, T), then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta \in (0, T)$ such that for $x \in (0, \delta)$, $T_{\min}(n_0, F)(x) > 0$.

Proof. $F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} f_i(x) (\prod_{j=1}^{t} (trans_j(x))^{d_{ij}})$

 $= \sum_{i=1}^{s} (f_i^+(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (taylor(trans_j(x), 2n) + o(x^{p_j}))^{d_{ij}}) + f_i^-(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (taylor(trans_j(x), 2n - 1) + o(x^{p_j}))^{d_{ij}}) + f_i^-(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t} (taylor(trans_j(x), 2n - 1)))^{d_{ij}}) + f_i^-(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t}$ $o(x^{q_j}))^{d_{ij}}))$

 $= \sum_{i=1}^{s} (f_i^+(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t}(taylor(trans_j(x), 2n))^{d_{ij}}) + f_i^-(x)(\prod_{j=1}^{t}(taylor(trans_j(x), 2n-1))^{d_{ij}})) + o(x^{dd_n}),$ where for $j = 1 \cdots t, p_j \ge 2n, q_j \ge 2n - 1, dd_n \ge \min\{\min\{p_j, q_j\} | i = 1, \cdots\} \ge (2n - 1),$ that is to say, $F(x) = T_{\min}(n, F) + o(x^{dd_n}), \ dd_n \ge 2n - 1.$

By Lemma 3.5, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $td(T_{\min}(n_0, F)) < 2n_0 - 1$, in other words, $T_{\min}(n_0, F) = c_{n_0} x^{d_{n_0}} + o(x^{d_{n_0}}), \text{ where } d_{n_0} < 2n_0 - 1 \text{ and } c_{n_0} \neq 0.$ Let $n = n_0$, then $F(x) = T_{\min}(n_0, F) + o(x^{dd_{n_0}}), dd_{n_0} \ge 2n_0 - 1.$ We get that $F(x) = c_{n_0} x^{d_{n_0}} + o(x^{d_{n_0}}) + o(x^{dd_{n_0}}) = cn_0 x^{d_{n_0}} + o(x^m), \text{ where } m = \min\{d_{n_0}, dd_{n_0}\} = 0$

 d_{n_0} .

Let $\overline{F}(x) = F(x)/x^m = c_{n_0} + o(x^m)/x^m$, then for $x \to 0^+$, $F(x) \to c_{n_0}$. As F(x) > 0 holds on (0, T), so F(x) > 0 holds on (0, T), we have $c_{n_0} \ge 0$. as $c_{n_0} \ne 0$, we get that $c_{n_0} > 0$.

So $T_{\min}(n_0, F) = c_{n_0}x^m + o(x^m)$, where $c_{n_0} > 0$. Then for $x \to 0^+$, $H(x) = T_{\min}(n_0, F)/x^m = 0$ $c_{n_0} + o(x^m)/x^m \rightarrow c_{n_0} > 0$, thus there exists $\delta \in (0, T)$, for $x \in (0, \delta)$, $H(x) = T_{\min}(n_0, F)/x^m > 0$, so $T_{\min}(n_0, F) = H(x)x^m > 0$.

We claim that the lemma holds.

Lemma 3.7. Let $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)) > 0$, $trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)$ can be regularly expanded on (0, b], then F(x) > 0 holds on [a, b] if and only if there exists an n_0 such that $T_{\min}(n_0, F)(x) > 0$ holds on [a, b], where b > a > 0.

Proof. Let ε be the minimum value of F(x) on the close interval [a, b], then $\varepsilon > 0$ obviously.

When $n \to \infty$, taylor(trans_i(x), n) converges uniformly to trans_i(x) on [a, b] for j =1,..., t, thereby $T_{\min}(n, F)(x)$ converge uniformly to F(x) on [a, b]. So there exists n_0 such that $|F(x) - T_{\min}(n_0, F)(x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ on [a, b]. Then we get that $T_{\min}(n_0, F)(x) > F(x) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.

Theorem 3.4. Let $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)) > 0$, $trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)$ can be regularly expanded on (0,T], then F(x) > 0 holds on (0,T] if and only if there is n_0 such that $T_{\min}(n_0, F)(x) > 0$ holds on (0, T].

Proof. The sufficiency holds obviously.

By Lemma 3.6, there exist n_1 and $\delta \in (0, T)$ such that $T_{\min}(n, F)(x) > 0$ holds on $(0, \delta)$ for $n \geq n_1$.

By Lemma 3.7, there exists n_2 such that $T_{\min}(n, F)(x) > 0$ holds on $[\frac{\delta}{2}, T]$ for $n \ge n_2$.

Let $n_0 = \max\{n_1, n_2\}$, then $T_{\min}(n, F)(x) > 0$ holds on (0, T] for $n \ge n_0$.

Corollary 3.1. Let $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)) > 0$, $trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)$ can be regularly expanded on (0, T], then F(x) < 0 holds on (0, T] if and only if there is n_0 such that $T_{max}(n_0, F)(x) < 0$ holds on (0, T].

Lemma 3.8. For a real differentiable function F(x) and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, if $F(x_0) = 0$ and F(x) is greater or less than 0 in a deleted neighborhood of x_0 , then $F'(x_0) = 0$.

A deleted neighborhood of x_0 is a neighborhood of x_0 with the point x_0 removed.

Lemma 3.9. For real differentiable function F(x), if F(x) has no multiple real root, then F(x) > 0 and $F(x) \ge 0$ are equivalent, F(x) < 0 and $F(x) \le 0$ are equivalent.

Proof. Assume that $F(x) \ge 0$ holds but F(x) > 0 doesn't, then there exists x_0 such that $F(x_0) = 0$ and F(x) > 0 on a deleted neighborhood of x_0 , then $F'(x_0) = 0$, which contradicts with the assumption.

Similarly, F(x) < 0 is equivalent to $F(x) \le 0$.

Theorem 3.5. For $F(x) = f(x, trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)) > 0$, if $trans_1(x), \dots, trans_t(x)$ can be regularly expanded on (0, T] and F(x) has no multiple real root, then Algorithm 2 must terminate.

Proof. If F(x) > 0 or F(x) < 0 holds, then the algorithm will terminate due to Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.1.

If neither F(x) > 0 nor F(x) < 0 holds, then neither $F(x) \ge 0$ nor $F(x) \le 0$ holds by Lemma 3.9. So there exist x_1 such that $F(x_1) < 0$ and x_2 such that $F(x_2) > 0$. By Theorem 3.3, there exist n_1 such that $T_{max}(n_1, f)(x_1) \le 0$ and n_2 such that $T_{min}(n_2, f)(x_2) \ge 0$, so the algorithm is bound to terminate when $n = max\{n_1, n_2\}$.

4. Reachability Analysis of Linear Systems

In this section we aim to:

- 1. decide the reachability of linear system whoes initial set contains only one point;
- 2. decide the reachability of linear system whoes initial set is an open semi-algebraic set.

For the first case, we will decide the sign of the respective trigonometric-exponential polynomial directly by Successive Taylor-substitution. For the second case, we will propose a decision procedure based on openCAD (See ref[13]) and an algorithm of real root isolation derivated from Successive Taylor-substitution.

4.1. Decision procedure for the initial set containing only one point

From the above discussion, if the initial set contains only one point, to decide the safety of linear system we can resort to the sign-deciding of the transcendental function of a class of trigonometric-exponential polynomial.

As e^x can not be regularly expanded on (0, T) for $\forall T > 0$, while e^{-x} can, we need the following form of trigonometric-exponential polynomial.

 $F(x) = f(x, e^{-u_1 x}, \dots, e^{-u_r x}, \sin(v_1 x), \dots, \sin(v_s x), \cos(r_1 x), \dots, \cos(r_t x)), \text{ where } u_i, v_i, r_i \in \mathbb{R}_{Alg} \text{ and } u_i > 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r.$

As sin(x) can not be regularly expanded on (0, T) for $T \ge \pi$, cos(x) can not be regularly expanded on (0, T) for $T \ge \frac{\pi}{2}$, we assume that $max\{v_1, \dots, v_s\} < \frac{\pi}{T}$, $max\{r_1, \dots, r_t\} < \frac{\pi}{2T}$

with the help of Duplication Formulae $\cos(x) = 1 - 2\sin(\frac{x}{2})^2$ and $\sin(x) = 2\sin(\frac{x}{2})\cos(\frac{x}{2})$ to guarantee that all $\sin(v_i x)$ s and $\cos(r_i x)$ s can be expanded regularly on (0, T).

Algorithm 3: Decide_trigonometric_exponential_polynomial

Input: $F(x) = f(x, e^{-u_1 x}, \dots, e^{-u_r x}, \sin(v_1 x), \dots, \sin(v_s x), \cos(r_1 x), \dots, \cos(r_t x))$, and a constant T such that $T \times \max\{v_1, \dots, v_s\} < \pi$ and $T \times \max\{r_1, \dots, r_t\} < \frac{\pi}{2}$ **Output:** The sign of F(x) on I1 $n_1 \leftarrow \max\{n_0(e^{-u_i x}, T) | i = 1, \cdots, r\}$ 2 $n_2 \leftarrow \max\{n_0(\sin(v_i x), T) | i = 1, \cdots, s\}$ $3 n_3 \leftarrow \max\{n_0(\cos(r_i x), T)|i=1, \cdots, t\}$ 4 $n_0 \leftarrow \max\{n_1, n_2, n_3\}$ 5 $n \leftarrow [n_0/2] + 1$, where [x] denotes the biggest integer less than or equal to x 6 $T_{\max}(n, F) \leftarrow$ $f^+(x, taylor(e^{-u_1x}, 2n-1), \cdots, taylor(e^{-u_rx}, 2n-1), taylor(sin(v_1x), 2n-1), \cdots,$ 7 $taylor(sin(v_s x), 2n - 1), taylor(cos(r_1 x), 2n - 1), \dots, taylor(cos(r_t x), 2n - 1)) +$ $f^{-}(x, taylor(e^{-u_1x}, \mathbf{x}$ 2n, \cdots , $taylor(e^{-u_rx}, 2n)$, $taylor(\sin(v_1x), 2n)$, \cdots , $taylor(\sin(v_sx), 2n)$, $taylor(\cos(r_1x), 2n)$, \cdots , $taylor(\cos(r_tx), 2n)$) 8 $T_{\min}(n, F) \leftarrow$ $f^+(x, taylor(e^{-u_1x}, 2n), \cdots, taylor(e^{-u_rx}, 2n), taylor(\sin(v_1x), 2n), \cdots, taylor(\sin(v_sx), 2n), taylor(\cos(r_1x), 2n), \cdots, taylor(\sin(v_sx), 2n), taylor(\cos(r_1x), 2n), \cdots, ta$ $f^{-}(x, taylor(e^{-u_1x}, 2n-1), \cdots, taylor(e^{-u_rx}, 2n-1), taylor(\sin(v_1x), 2n-1))$ 1), \cdots , taylor(sin($v_s x$), 2n - 1), taylor(cos($r_1 x$), 2n - 1), \cdots , taylor(cos($r_t x$), 2n - 1)) 9 if $T_{\min}(n, F) \ge 0$ holds on (0, T] then 10 return 1 // F(x) > 0 holds on (0, T]11 end 12 if $T_{max}(n, F) \leq 0$ holds on (0, T] then 13 return -1 // F(x) > 0 holds on (0, T]14 end 15 if neither $T_{max}(n, F) \ge 0$ nor $T_{min}(n, F) \le 0$ holds on (0, T] then 16 **return** 0 // F(x) has no constant sign on (0,T]17 else 18 $n \leftarrow n + 1$, go to 6) 19 end

Algorithm 3 is the application of Algorithm 2 to trigonometric-exponential polynomial, so we have the following corollary from Theorem 3.5.

Corollary 4.1. If F(x) has no multiple real root, Algorithm 3 must terminate.

For the general trigonometric-exponential polynomial, we designed the following algorithm based on Algorithm 3 and with the help of Algorithm 1.

The following example is to show how to decide the reachability of linear system by Algorithm 3.

Example 3. (Adapted from ref[11]) There are three reservoirs No.1, No.2 and No.3, which are connected by water pipes. There is an external pollution source connected with No.1 pool, which continuously diffuses pollutants into No.1 pool, and the pollutants diffused into No.2 and No.3 pools through connecting water pipes. Denote the amount of pollutants in No.1, 2 and 3 reservoirs by $x_1(t)$, $x_2(t)$ and $x_3(t)$ respectively, with the unit as pounds. t represents time in minutes. It is assumed that the pollutants in each pool are evenly mixed, and the external pollution source diffuses pollutants to the No.1 pool at a speed of 0.01 pounds per minute. It is also assumed that the diffusion equation of pollutants in the three pools is as follows:

 $x_1'(t) = 0.001x_3(t) - 0.001x_1(t) + 0.01,$ $x_2'(t) = 0.001x_1(t) - 0.001x_2(t),$ $x_3'(t) = 0.001x_2(t) - 0.001x_3(t)),$ $x_1(0) = x_2(0) = x_3(0) = 0.$ The unsafe set $Y = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3)^T | y_2 - y_3 + 6 < 0\}.$ The eigenvalues of the matrix are $0, \frac{3}{2000} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2000}I, -\frac{3}{2000} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2000}I$, the solution of the system is: $x_1(t) = \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{9}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000}) - \frac{10}{9}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000}) + \frac{t}{300} + \frac{10}{3};$

$$x_2(t) = -\frac{20\sqrt{3}}{2000}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000}) + \frac{t}{2000}$$

 $\begin{aligned} x_2(t) &= -\frac{20\sqrt{3}}{9}e^{-\frac{2000}{500}}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3t}}{2000}) + \frac{t}{300};\\ x_3(t) &= \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{9}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3t}}{2000}) - \frac{10}{9}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000}) + \frac{t}{300} - \frac{10}{3}.\\ Thus, the problem is transformed to decide whether the inequality <math>F(t) = y_2 - y_3 + 6 = -\frac{10\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3t}}{2000}) - \frac{10}{3}e^{-\frac{2t}{2000}}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3t}}{2000}) + \frac{28}{3} > 0 \text{ holds on } (0,T). \text{ That the inequality holds implies the system is safe, otherwise the system is unsafe.} \end{aligned}$ $(1) \text{ Assume that } T = 1000, \text{ the thresholds } n_0(e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}, 1000) = 2, n_0(\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3t}}{2000}), 1000) = 1, 1000 = 1. \end{aligned}$

 $n_0(\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000}), 1000) = 1$, where $xprove(T_{\min}(F, 2) > 0, [t < 1000]) = true$, where xprove is an inequality-proving tool in BOTEMMA-package, that is to say, F(t) > 0 holds on (0, 1000) and then the system is safe for t < 1000.

We have implemented the algorithm on Maple 16, which have been run on a 64-bit Hp computer with an Intel(R) Core(TM)2 Quad CPU @ 2.66GHz 2.67GHz and 3GB of RAM. The time consumption is 0.14 seconds (The algorithms' running environment is the same and time consumption in seconds is denoted by TC in the sequel).

(2) Assume that T = 2000, the thresholds $n_0(e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}, 2000) = 4$, $n_0(\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000}), 2000) = 1$, but

 $\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000}) \text{ cannot be expanded regularly on } (0, 2000).$ By Duplication Formula $\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000} = 1 - (\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{4000}))^2, \text{ we have that } F(t) = y_2 - y_3 + 6 = -\frac{10\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{2000}) + \frac{10}{3}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}}(\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{4000}))^2 - \frac{10}{3}e^{-\frac{3t}{2000}} + \frac{28}{3} > 0 \text{ and } n_0(\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}t}{4000}), 2000) = 1.$ Then as xprove(T_{min}(F, 4) > 0, [t < 2000]) = true, we get that, F(t) > 0 holds on (0, 2000)

and then the system is safe for t < 2000.

TC = 0.013.

4.2. Decision procedure for the open semi-algebraic initial set

When the initial set is a semi-algebraic set, Algorithm 3 is an optional heuristic scheme.

Example 4. Let us continue Example 3 with the initial set revised as $T = \{(t_1, t_2, t_3)^T | (t_1 - 1)^2 + t_2 \}$ $(t_2 - 1)^2 + (t_3 - 1)^2 < 1$, and the other contents remaining the same.

In this case, we need to show whether the following trigonometric-exponential polynomial inequality with parameters t_1, t_2, t_3 holds on the condition that $(t_1 - 1)^2 + (t_2 - 1)^2 + (t_3 - 1)^2 < 1$, $F(t) = -\frac{10}{3}\sqrt{3}ab + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{3}t_1ab + t_2ac - t_3ac - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}t_3ab - \frac{10}{3}ac - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}t_2ab + \frac{28}{3} > 0$, where $a = e^{-\frac{3}{2000}t}$, $b = \sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2000}t)$, $c = \cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2000}t)$.

By BOTTEMA-package, we have $xprove(T_min(f, 2) > 0, [(t_1 - 1)^2 + (t_2 - 1)^2 + (t_3 - 1)^2 < 1, t < 1000]) = true and then we get that the system is safe for <math>t < 1000$.

TC = 14.765.

For more general cases, Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition (CAD) is needed.

The basic idea of CAD is as follows: given a set *S* of polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$, CAD can be used to partition \mathbb{R}^n into connected semi-algebraic sets, called cells, such that each polynomial in *S* keeps constant sign (either +, - or 0) on each cell. When constraints are open sets, GCAD (ref[23]) or openCAD (ref[13]) is enough, which partitions the space \mathbb{R}^n into a set of open cells instead of cells (i.e., takes sample points from open cells only), such that on each of which every polynomial in *S* keeps constant non-zero sign (either + or -).

The CAD procedure needs the real root isolation of TEP as its basic algorithm. We give a real root isolation algorithm based on the sign-deciding procedure Algorithm 3 or Algorithm 4. The basic idea is as follows:

If F(x) > 0 or F(x) < 0 holds on (a, b), we get that F(x) has no real root. Otherwise, if F(x) is monotonous on (a, b), then F(x) has one and only one root on (a, b), else dividing the interval (a, b) repeatedly by dichotomy until on each interval there is either a unique real root or no real root.

The most effective way to decide the monotonicity of F(x) is to determine weather F'(x) > 0or F'(x) < 0 holds. What should be pointed out is that the derivative of the trigonometricexponential polynomial is also a trigonometric-exponential polynomial. We need modify Algorithm 3 slightly as follow.

Algorithm 5: Decide_trigonometric_exponential_polynomial(DTEP)

Input: $F(x) = f(x, e^{-u_1 x}, \dots, e^{-u_r x}, \sin(v_1 x), \dots, \sin(v_s x), \cos(r_1 x), \dots, \cos(r_t x))$, and an interval (a, b], where $b > a \ge 0$, $b \times \max\{v_1, \dots, v_s\} < \pi$ and $b \times \max\{r_1, \cdots, r_t\} < \frac{\pi}{2}$ **Output:** The sign of F(x) on (a, b]1 $n_1 \leftarrow \max\{n_0(e^{-u_i x}, b) | i = 1, \cdots, r\}$ 2 $n_2 \leftarrow \max\{n_0(\sin(v_i x), b) | i = 1, \cdots, s\}$ 3 $n_3 \leftarrow \max\{n_0(\cos(r_i x), b)|i=1, \cdots, t\}$ 4 $n_0 \leftarrow \max\{n_1, n_2, n_3\}$ $5 \ n \leftarrow [\frac{n_0}{2}] + 1$ 6 if $T_{\min}(n, F) \ge 0$ holds on (a, b] then 7 **return** 1 / / F(x) > 0 holds on (a, b]8 end 9 if $T_{max}(n, F) \leq 0$ holds on (a, b] then 10 return -1 // F(x) < 0 holds on (a, b]11 end 12 if neither $T_{max}(n, F) \ge 0$ nor $T_{min}(n, F) \le 0$ holds on (a, b] then 13 **return** 0 / / F(x) < 0 holds on (a, b]14 else 15 $n \leftarrow n + 1$, goto 6) 16 end

The computations of $T_{min}(n, F)$ and $T_{max}(n, F)$ are the same as Algorithm 3. Based on Algorithm 5, we present an algorithm for the real roots isolation of trigonometric-exponential polynomial.

Algorithm 6: Isolation_trigonometric_exponential_polynomial(ITEP)

Input: A trigonometric-exponential polynomial F(x) and an interval (a, b), where $0 \le a < b$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$ **Output:** $L = \{(a_n, b_n)\}$, where $\{(a_i, b_i) | i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are pairwise disjoint, F(x) has one real root on each (a_i, b_i) , and L contains all the real roots of F(x) on (a, b)1 $sgn \leftarrow DTEP(F, (a, b))$ **2** if sgn = 1 or sgn = -1 then 3 return Φ 4 end 5 if sgn = 0 then $dF \leftarrow diff(F, x)$ 6 $dsgn \leftarrow DTEP(dF, (a, b))$ 7 if dsgn = 1 or dsgn = -1 then 8 **return** {(*a*, *b*)} 9 end 10 11 else 12 **return** $ITEP(F, (a, \frac{a+b}{2})) \lor ITEP(F, (\frac{a+b}{2}, b))$ 13 end

Obviously, the endpoints of all intervals appearing in Algorithm 6 are rational. By Lemma 2.1, for cont(F(x)) = 1 and $0 \neq x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$, $F(x_0) \neq 0$, so whether the intervals are open or close is

not cared by the Algorithm 6.

To describe the process of Algorithm 6, we propose the following Example 5.

Example 5. Let us continue Example 2 to isolate the real roots of $f(x) = -\sqrt{3} - 24\sqrt{3}e^{-x} - 4\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-\frac{3}{2}x} - 12\sqrt{3}e^{-\frac{5}{2}x} + 108\sqrt{3}e^{-2x} - 8e^{-3x}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x) + 36e^{-\frac{5}{2}x}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x) on (0, 3).$ 1) As $\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)$ can not be regularly expanded on (0, 3), by Duplication Formula $-\sqrt{3} - 24\sqrt{3}e^{-x} - 4\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-\frac{3}{2}x} - 12\sqrt{3}e^{-\frac{5}{2}x} + 108\sqrt{3}e^{-2x} - 8\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-3x} + 16\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}x)^2 e^{-3x} + 36e^{-\frac{5}{2}x}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)$ 2) The derivative of f(x) is $df(x) = 24\sqrt{3}e^{-x} - 2\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-\frac{3}{2}x} + 6\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-\frac{3}{2}x} + 30\sqrt{3}e^{-\frac{5}{2}x} - 216\sqrt{3}e^{-2x} + 24\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-3x} - 4\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-3x} - 4\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-3x} + 8\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}x)^2 e^{-3x} + 8\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}x)\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}x)e^{-3x} - 4\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-3x} + 8\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}x)e^{-3x} - 3\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)e^{-3x} + 8\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}x)\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}x)e^{-3x} - 90e^{-\frac{5}{2}x}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x) + 18e^{-\frac{5}{2}x}\sqrt{3}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}x)$ 3) Run Algorithm 5, we have that DTEP(f, (0, 3)) = 0 and DTEP(df, (0, 3)) = 0. Dichotomy yields that $DTEP(f, (0, \frac{3}{2})) = 0$ and $DTEP(df, (0, \frac{3}{2})) = 0$ and $DTEP(df, (0, \frac{3}{2})) = 0$. Dichotomy one real root on $(0, \frac{3}{2})$. $DTEP(f, (\frac{3}{2}, 3)) = -1$, which means that f(x) < 0 and f(x) has no real root on $(\frac{3}{2}, 3)$. So, we conclude that f(x) has one and only one real roots on $(0, \frac{3}{2})$.

The total time consumption is 34.67*s*.

To show how to decide the reachability of a linear system, we present Example 6.

Example 6. Consider the following linear system

$$\xi' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xi + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The initial set $X = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T | x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 2x_3^2 < 1\}$, the unsafe set $Y = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3)^T | y_2 - y_1 + 5 < 0\}$, and we assume that $t \in (0, 3)$.

The eigenvalues of the matrix are $1, -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}I, -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}I$ respectively, and the solution of the system is

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1 &= \left(\left(\frac{2}{3}e^t + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t)\right)x_1 - \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t)x_2 + \left(-\frac{2}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + \frac{2}{3}e^t\right)x_3 + \frac{4}{3}e^t + \frac{2}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) - 2, \\ \xi_2 &= \left(\frac{1}{3}e^t + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) - \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t)\right)x_1 + \left(-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t)\right)x_2 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) - \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t)\right)x_2 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) - \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos$$

Thus, the reachability problem becomes $\Gamma =$

 $\exists t \in (0,3), \exists x_1, \exists x_2, \exists x_3, \phi(t, x_1, x_2, x_3) = (-\frac{2}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) - \frac{1}{3}e^t)x_1 + (\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t))x_2 + (-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) + \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) - \frac{1}{3}e^t)x_3 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) - \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}\cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t) - \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1}{2}$

Denote $a = e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}$, $b = \sin(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t)$, $c = \cos(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}t)$, $d = e^t$, using Brown's projection operator to eliminate x_1, x_2, x_3 successively, we have

 $q_0(t, x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 2x_3^2 - 1)((-\frac{2}{3}ac - \frac{1}{3}d)x_1 + (\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}ab + ac)x_2 + (-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}ab + \frac{1}{3}ac - \frac{1}{3}d)x_3 + (\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}ab + \frac{1}{3}ac - \frac{1}{3}ab + \frac$ $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}ab - \frac{1}{3}ac - \frac{2}{3}d + 6),$ $q_1(t, x_1, x_2) = q_{11} \times q_{12} \times q_{13},$ $q_2(t, x_1) = q_{21} \times q_{22} \times q_{23} \times q_{24} \times q_{25} \times q_{26},$ $q_{3}(t) = a \times q_{31} \times q_{32} \times q_{33} \times q_{34} \times q_{35} \times q_{36} \times q_{37} \times q_{38} \times q_{39},$ where $q_{11} = x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1,$ $q_{12} = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}ac + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}d + ab,$ $q_{13} = 216 - 8a^2c^2x_1x_2 + 2acdx_1^2 - \frac{2}{3}acdx_2^2 + \frac{20}{3}acdx_1 - 8acdx_2 + 24\sqrt{3}abx_2 - \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}a^2bc - \frac{2}{3}a^2bc - \frac{2}{3}acdx_1 - \frac{2}{3}acdx_2 + \frac{2}{3}acdx_1 - \frac{2}{3}acdx_2 - \frac{2}{3}a^2bc - \frac{2}{3}acdx_1 - \frac{2}{3}acdx_1 - \frac{2}{3}acdx_2 - \frac{2}{3}acdx_1 - \frac{2}{$ $\frac{10\sqrt{3}}{3}abd - \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}x_{2} - \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{3}abdx_{1}x_{2} + 24\sqrt{3}ab - 48d - \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + a^{2}b^{2}x_{2}^{2} + \frac{3}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{3}abdx_{1}x_{2} + 24\sqrt{3}ab - 48d - \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + a^{2}b^{2}x_{2}^{2} + \frac{3}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + \frac{3}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + \frac{3}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + \frac{3}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + \frac{3}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + \frac{3}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1}^{2} + \frac{3}{3}a^{2}bcx_{2}^{2} + \frac{8}{3}a^{2}c^{2}x_{1} - 4a^{2}c^{2}x_{2} + \frac{10}{3}acd - 48acx_{1} + 72acx_{2} - 4acdx_{1}x_{2} + \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{3}a^{2}bcx_{2}^{2} - \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{3}a^{2}bcx_{1} + \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{3}a^{2}bcx_{2} + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}abdx_{1}^{2} + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}abdx_{1}^{2} - \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{3}abdx_{1} - \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{3}abdx_{2} + \frac{1}{3}a^{2}c^{2} + \frac{4}{3}a^{2}c^{2} + \frac{1}{3}a^{2}x_{2}^{2} + \frac{8}{3}a^{2}x_{1} + a^{2}b^{2} - 24dx_{1} - 24ac,$ $q_{21} = x_1 - 1$, $q_{22} = x_1 + 1$ $q_{23} = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}ac + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}d + ab,$ $q_{24} = \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{9}a^2bc + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9}abd + a^2b^2 + \frac{19}{9}a^2c^2 - \frac{2}{9}acd + \frac{1}{9}d^2,$ $q_{25} = 2\sqrt{3}a^2bcx_1^2 - \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{3}a^2bcx_1 + a^2b^2x_1^2 + \frac{13}{3}a^2c^2x_1^2 - \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{3}a^2bc - \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}abdx_1 + \frac{4}{3}a^2c^2x_1 + \frac{4}{3}a^2c^2x_1 + \frac{13}{3}a^2bc^2x_1 + \frac{13}{3}a^2bc$ $\frac{4}{3}acdx_{1}^{2} - \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{3}abd - \frac{8}{3}a^{2}c^{2} + \frac{10}{3}acdx_{1} + \frac{1}{3}d^{2}x_{1}^{2} + 12\sqrt{3}ab + \frac{4}{3}acd - 24acx_{1} + \frac{4}{3}d^{2}x_{1} - 12ac + \frac{4}{3}d^{2} - 12dx_{1} - 24d + 108,$ $q_{26} = \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{9}a^2bcx_1^2 - \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{9}a^2bcx_1 + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9}abdx_1^2 + a^2b^2x_1^2 + 3a^2c^2x_1^2 - \frac{14\sqrt{3}}{9}a^2bc - \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{9}abdx_1 + a^2b^2x_1^2 + a$ $\frac{8}{9}a^{2}c^{2}x_{1} + \frac{2}{3}acdx_{1}^{2} - \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{9}abd - \frac{1}{3}a^{2}b^{2} - \frac{17}{9}a^{2}c^{2} + \frac{20}{9}acdx_{1} + \frac{1}{3}d^{2}x_{1}^{2} + 8\sqrt{3}ab + \frac{10}{9}acd - 16acx_{1} + \frac{8}{9}d^{2}x_{1} - 8ac + \frac{7}{9}d^{2} - 8dx_{1} - 16d + 72,$ $q_{31} = \sqrt{3}c + b$ $q_{32} = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}ac + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}d + ab,$ $q_{33} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}ac - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}d + ab + 6\sqrt{3},$ $\begin{array}{l} & 133 \\ q_{34} = -\sqrt{3}ac - \sqrt{3}d + ab + 6\sqrt{3}, \\ q_{35} = 2\sqrt{3}a^2bc + a^2b^2 + \frac{13}{3}a^2c^2 + \frac{4}{3}acd + \frac{1}{3}d^2, \end{array}$ $q_{36} = \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{9}a^2bc + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9}abd + a^2b^2 + 3a^2c^2 + \frac{2}{3}acd + \frac{1}{3}d^2,$ $q_{37} = \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{9}a^2bc + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9}abd + a^2b^2 + \frac{19}{9}a^2c^2 - \frac{2}{9}acd + \frac{1}{9}d^2,$ $q_{37} = \frac{4}{3} a^{2} c^{2} + a^{2} bc + \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2} ac - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{8} d^{2} + \frac{1}{2} abd + 3\sqrt{3}d - \frac{9}{2} ab - \frac{27\sqrt{3}}{2},$ $q_{39} = \frac{14\sqrt{3}}{3} a^{2} bc + \frac{10\sqrt{3}}{3} abd + a^{2} b^{2} + \frac{25}{3} a^{2} c^{2} - 24\sqrt{3} ab - \frac{2}{3} acd + 24ac - \frac{5}{3} d^{2} + 48d - 216.$ Isolate all real roots of $q_{3}(t) = 0$ on (0, 3), we get that $q_{3}(t)$ has 6 roots which are located in $(\frac{7113}{4096}, \frac{1779}{1024}), (\frac{147}{2048}, \frac{1875}{1024}), (\frac{309}{1028}, \frac{39}{16}), (\frac{47403}{16384}, \frac{94809}{32768}), (\frac{23703}{8192}, \frac{47409}{16384})$ respectively.
Lift the real root isolation in the order t, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3} successively using the openCAD lifting respectively.

procedure, finally we obtain 95 sample points, and $(\frac{29}{16}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{512}, \frac{55}{128})$ satisfies $y_2 - y_1 + 5 < 0$, which implies that the safety property is not satisfied with the counter example starting from $(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{512}, \frac{55}{128}) \in X$, and ending at time $t = \frac{29}{16}$.

5. Conclusion

We propose a decision procedure of reachability for a class of linear system $\xi' = A\xi + u$, with restrictions that the matrix A has arbitrary algebraic eigenvalues, the input u is a vector of trigonometric-exponential polynomials. If the initial set of the linear system contains only one point, the reachability problem under consideration is resorted to the decidability of the sign of trigonometric-exponential polynomial and achieved by being reduced to verification of univariate polynomial inequalities through Taylor Expansion of the related exponential functions and trigonometric functions. If the initial set is open semi-algebraic, a decision procedure is proposed based on openCAD and an algorithm of real roots isolation derivated from the sign-deciding procedure. The experimental results indicate the efficiency of our approach. Furthermore, the procedure is complete under the assumption of Schanuel's Conjecture.

In addition, some algorithms presented in this paper, such as the factorization without multiple roots and Successive Taylor Substitution, are much useful for similar problems.

References

- M. Achatz, S. McCallum, and V. Weispfenning, 2008. Deciding Polynomial-Exponential Problems, ISSAC 2008, New York: ACM, pp. 215–222.
- [2] R. Alur, C. Courcoubetis, N. Halbwachs, T. A. Henzinger, P. Ho, X. Nicollin, A. Olivero, J. Sifakis, S. Yovine, 1995. The algorithmic analysis of hybrid systems. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 138(1), 3–34 (1995)
- [3] R. Alur, D. L. Dill, 1994. A theory of timed automata. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 126(2),183-235.
- [4] S. Chen, Z. Liu, 2017. Automated Proof of exponential polynomial inequality, Journal of Systems Science and Mathematical Sciences, 2017, 37(7):1692–1703
- [5] S. Chen, Z. Liu, 2019. Automated Proof of class of transcendental function inequalities, Journal of Systems Science and Mathematical Sciences.
- [6] S. Chen, Z. Liu, 2020. Automated Proof of Mixed Trigonometric-polynomial Inequalities, Journal of Symbolic Computation 101C (2020) pp. 318-329
- [7] C. Huang, J. Li, M. Xu, Z. Li, 2018. Positive root isolation for poly-powers by exclusion and differentiation, Journal of Symbolic Computation, 85 (2018) 148-169
- [8] V. Chonev, J. Ouaknine, J. Worrell, 2016. On the Skolem problem for continuous linear dynamical systems. In: Chatzigiannakis.
- [9] G. E. Collins, R. Loos, 1976. Polynomial real root isolation by differentiation. In: Proceedings of the 1976 Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation SYMSAC76. ACM: 15-25.
- [10] D. Richardson, 1997. How to recognize zero. J. Symb. Comput., 24:627-645.
- [11] T. Gan, 2016. Symbolic Numeric Approaches for Hybrid System Verification, Doctoral Dissertation, Peking University, Beijing.
- [12] T. Gan, M. Chen, L. Dai, B. Xia, N. J. Zhan, 2015. Decidability of the reachability for a family of linear vector fields. InATVA'15, volume9364 of LNCS, pages 482-499, 2015.
- [13] J. Han, L. Dai, B. Xia, 2014. Constructing fewer open cells by gcd computation in CAD projection. In: ISSAC 2014, pp. 240-247. ACM (2014)
- [14] T. A. Henzinger, P. W. Kopke, A. Puri, P. Varaiya, 1998. What's decidable about hybrid automata? J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 57(1), 94–124 (1998)
- [15] G. Lafferriere, G. J. Pappas, S. Yovine, 2001. Symbolic reachability computation for for families of linear vector fields. J. Symb. Comput. 32, 231-253 (2001)
- [16] G. Lafferriere, G. J. Pappas, S. Sastry, 2000. O-minimal hybrid systems. MCSS 13(1), 1-21 (2000)
- [17] S. McCallum, V. Weispfenning, 2012. Deciding polynomial-transcendental problems[J], Journal of Symbolic Computation. 2012, 47: 16-31.
- [18] M. Xu, L. Chen et al., 2010. Reachability Analysis of Rational Eigenvalue Linear Systems, International Journal of Systems Science 41(12):1411-1419(2010), DOI: 10.1080/00207720903480691
- [19] M. Xu, Z. Li, L. Yang, 2015. Quantifier elimination for a class of exponential polynomial formulas, Journal of Symbolic Computation, 68(2015), 146-168
- [20] A. B. Shidlovskii, 1989. Transcendental Numbers. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.
- [21] A. Strzeboski, 2000. Solving systems of strict polynomial inequalities. J. Symb. Comput. 29(3), 471-480

- [22] A. Strzeboski, 2012. Real root isolation for exp-log-arctan functions, J. of Symbolic Computation[J]. 2012, 47:282-314.
- [23] V. Chonev, J. Ouaknine, J. Worrell, 1994. On the Skolem Problem for Continuous Linear Dynamical Systems.
- [24] J. Wing, 2008. How can we provide people with cyber-physical systems they can bet their lives on? Computing Research News, 20(1).
- [25] M. Xu, 2010. Some Symbolic Computation Issues in Program Verification and System Analysis. Doctoral Dissertation, East China Normal University, Shanghai.