

**A constructive proof of the convergence of Kalantari's bound on  
polynomial zeros**

Matt Hohertz

Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University

mrh163@math.rutgers.edu

December 23, 2021

### Abstract

In his 2006 paper, Jin proves that Kalantari's bounds on polynomial zeros, indexed by  $m \geq 2$  and called  $L_m$  and  $U_m$  respectively, become sharp as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . That is, given a degree  $n$  polynomial  $p(z)$  not vanishing at the origin and an error tolerance  $\varepsilon > 0$ , Jin proves that there exists an  $m$  such that

$$\frac{L_m}{\rho_{min}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon,$$

where  $\rho_{min} := \min_{\rho:p(\rho)=0} |\rho|$ . In this paper we derive a formula that yields such an  $m$ , thereby constructively proving Jin's theorem. In fact, we prove the stronger theorem that this convergence is uniform in a sense, its rate depending only on  $n$  and a few other parameters. We also give experimental results that suggest an optimal  $m$  of (asymptotically)  $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^d}\right)$  for some  $d \ll 2$ . A proof of these results would show that Jin's method runs in  $O\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon^d}\right)$  time, making it efficient for isolating high-degree polynomial zeros.

**Keywords** polynomial roots, bounds on zeros, power series, polynomial reciprocals, analytic combinatorics, meromorphic functions

## 1 Introduction

We briefly review the bounds proved by Kalantari [2004, 2008] on the moduli of polynomial roots.

Let  $p(z) = a_n z^n + \dots + a_1 z + a_0$ ,  $a_n a_0 \neq 0$ , be an arbitrary polynomial of degree  $n$  and  $\rho$  be an arbitrary zero of  $p(z)$ . Moreover, let  $r_m$  be, as in Hohertz and Kalantari [2020], the unique positive root of  $f_m(x) := x^{m+1} + x - 1$ , a root that increases to 1 as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and necessarily lies on the interval  $[\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . Finally, let

$$D_m(z) := \det \begin{pmatrix} p'(z) & \frac{p''(z)}{2!} & \dots & \frac{p^{(m-1)}(z)}{(m-1)!} & \frac{p^{(m)}(z)}{m!} \\ p(z) & p'(z) & \dots & \ddots & \frac{p^{(m-1)}(z)}{(m-1)!} \\ 0 & p(z) & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \frac{p''(z)}{2!} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & p(z) & p'(z) \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

and

$$\widehat{D}_{m,j}(z) := \det \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p''(z)}{2!} & \frac{p'''(z)}{3!} & \dots & \frac{p^{(m)}(z)}{m!} & \frac{p^{(j)}(z)}{j!} \\ p'(z) & \frac{p''(z)}{2!} & \ddots & \frac{p^{(m-1)}(z)}{(m-1)!} & \frac{p^{(j-1)}(z)}{(j-1)!} \\ p(z) & p'(z) & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \frac{p''(z)}{2!} & \frac{p^{(j-m+2)}(z)}{(j-m+2)!} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & p'(z) & \frac{p^{(j-m+1)}(z)}{(j-m+1)!} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Kalantari (see Kalantari [2004], Kalantari [2008], and Jin [2006]) proves that

$$|\rho| \geq \frac{r_m}{\gamma_m} =: L_m \quad (3)$$

for  $m \geq 2$ , where

$$\gamma_m := \max_{k=m+1, \dots, m+n} \left| \frac{\widehat{D}_{m+1, k+1}(0)}{D_{m+1}(0)} \right|^{\frac{1}{k}}. \quad (4)$$

Using the equation

$$(-1)^m \frac{\widehat{D}_{m+1, k+1}(0)}{D_{m+1}(0)} = \sum_{j=\max\{0, k-n\}}^m a_{k-j} b_j, \quad (5)$$

where  $b_j$  is the coefficient of  $z^j$  in the Maclaurin series of  $\frac{1}{p(z)}$ , Jin [2006] proves that  $L_m$  converges, as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , to  $\rho_{\min} := \min_{\rho: p(\rho)=0} |\rho|$ ,<sup>2</sup> and thus is asymptotically sharp. In effect, he proves the following theorem:

**Theorem I (equivalent to Theorem 3.1, Jin [2006])** *For every polynomial  $p(z)$  and positive  $\varepsilon$  close to zero, there exists a positive number  $m_\varepsilon$  such that  $m \geq m_\varepsilon$  implies*

$$\frac{L_m}{\rho_{\min}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (6)$$

<sup>1</sup>Clearly, one obtains a dual upper bound  $U_m$  on  $|\rho|$  by applying the previous formulas to the reciprocal polynomial of  $p(z)$  and reciprocating both sides of the inequality of Equation (3).

<sup>2</sup>resp.,  $U_m$  to  $\rho_{\max} := \max_{\rho: p(\rho)=0} |\rho|$

Jin's proof, however, does not provide an algorithm for finding  $m_\varepsilon$ . In this paper we provide such an algorithm in the form of an equation, thus proving the following theorem:

**Theorem II** *For every positive integer  $n$  and triple  $(\varepsilon, \alpha, \beta)$  of positive reals with  $\varepsilon$  close to zero, there exists a positive number  $m_\varepsilon$  such that  $m \geq m_\varepsilon$  implies*

$$\frac{L_m}{\rho_{\min}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad (7)$$

for any polynomial  $p(z)$  with degree  $n$ ,  $\alpha := \max\{|a_0|, \dots, |a_n|\}$ , and  $\beta := \max\{1, \rho_{\min}^n\} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho_{\min}^j$ .

Note that this theorem implies Theorem I.

We acknowledge a few drawbacks of our formula: in particular, the value of  $m_\varepsilon$  it provides, though sufficient, does not appear to be optimal. We therefore devote a section of this paper to experimental results on optimal  $m_\varepsilon$ ; in particular, we conjecture that  $m_\varepsilon = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^d}\right)$  for some  $d \ll 2$ . Since Jin's method for calculating  $L_m$  runs in  $O(mn)$  time, the truth of our conjecture would imply that roots of degree  $n$  polynomials could be bounded with error tolerance  $\varepsilon$  in  $O\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon^d}\right)$  time.

(In this paper,  $p(z)$ ,  $n$ ,  $\alpha$ , etc., retain the definitions they are assigned in this introduction unless otherwise specified.)

## 2 Main results

From here on, we assume  $a_0 = p(0) = 1$  and  $n > 2$  without loss of generality.

By the proof of Theorem 3.1 of Jin [2006],

$$\gamma_m \leq \max_{k=1+m, \dots, n+m} [\alpha\beta Q(k)]^{1/k} \cdot \rho_{\min}^{-1}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\alpha := \max\{1, |a_1|, \dots, |a_n|\}, \quad (9)$$

$$\beta := \max\{1, \rho_{\min}^n\} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho_{\min}^j, \quad (10)$$

and  $Q(k)$  is a monotonically increasing function<sup>3</sup> such that

$$|b_k| \leq Q(k) \cdot \rho_{\min}^{-k}. \quad (11)$$

**Lemma 1** *Let  $d_k(n) := \binom{n+k-1}{k}$  be the number of  $k$ -multisets of members of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then*

$$d_k(n) < \frac{\left(k + \frac{n}{2}\right)^{n-1}}{\Gamma(n)}. \quad (12)$$

**PROOF** This is the first case of Lemma 2 of Grinshpan [2010]. ■

<sup>3</sup>in Jin [2006],  $Q(k)$  is a polynomial with positive coefficients, of degree one less than the maximum multiplicity of the roots of  $p(z)$ . However, the proof of his Theorem 3.1 requires only that  $Q(k)$  be increasing.

**Theorem III** Let  $p(z)$  be the degree  $n$  polynomial

$$p(z) := a_n \prod_{i=1}^n (z - z_i) = a_n z^n + a_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + 1, \quad (13)$$

and let  $\rho_{\min}$  be the least of the moduli of the roots of  $p(z)$ . Moreover, let

$$\frac{1}{p(z)} = 1 + b_1 z + \cdots \quad (14)$$

be the Maclaurin series of  $\frac{1}{p(z)}$ . Then

$$|b_k| \leq \rho_{\min}^{-k} \cdot \frac{\left(k + \frac{n}{2}\right)^{n-1}}{\Gamma(n)}. \quad (15)$$

PROOF Clearly,

$$b_k = \frac{1}{k!} \cdot \left[ \frac{d^k}{dz^k} \left( \frac{1}{p(z)} \right) \right]_{z=0}. \quad (16)$$

By the general Leibniz Product Rule,

$$\frac{d^k}{dz^k} \left( \frac{1}{p(z)} \right) = \frac{1}{a_n} \cdot \sum_{k_1 + \cdots + k_n = k} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_n} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{d^{k_i}}{dz^{k_i}} (z - z_i)^{-1} \quad (17)$$

$$= \frac{1}{a_n} \cdot \sum_{k_1 + \cdots + k_n = k} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_n} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{k_i} k_i!}{(z - z_i)^{k_i+1}} \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{(-1)^k k!}{a_n} \cdot \sum_{k_1 + \cdots + k_n = k} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(z - z_i)^{k_i+1}} \quad (19)$$

$$= \frac{(-1)^k k!}{p(z)} \cdot \sum_{k_1 + \cdots + k_n = k} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(z - z_i)^{k_i}}. \quad (20)$$

Dividing both sides by  $k!$ , setting  $z = 0$ , and taking absolute values and applying the Triangle Inequality, we obtain

$$|b_k| \leq \sum_{k_1 + \cdots + k_n = k} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|z_i|^{k_i}} \quad (21)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k_1 + \cdots + k_n = k} \rho_{\min}^{-k}. \quad (22)$$

Since the sum is taken over all size  $k$  multisets of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , this last inequality reduces to

$$|b_k| \leq \binom{n+k-1}{k} \rho_{\min}^{-k}, \quad (23)$$

from which it follows, by Lemma 1, that

$$|b_k| \leq \frac{\left(k + \frac{n}{2}\right)^{n-1}}{\Gamma(n)} \cdot \rho_{\min}^{-k}. \quad (24)$$

■

By Theorem III, we may set

$$Q(k) := \frac{\left(k + \frac{n}{2}\right)^{n-1}}{\Gamma(n)}, \quad (25)$$

which, as required, is manifestly an increasing function of  $k$ . We therefore seek integral  $k$  from  $1 + m$  to  $n + m$  that maximizes

$$\left[ \alpha \beta \cdot \frac{\left(k + \frac{n}{2}\right)^{n-1}}{\Gamma(n)} \right]^{1/k} \cdot \rho_{\min}^{-1}. \quad (26)$$

**Lemma 2** Let  $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ . Then, for large  $m$ , the function

$$f(m) := [c_1 \cdot (m + c_2)^{c_3}]^{1/m} \quad (27)$$

is decreasing.

PROOF We take the logarithm of  $f(m)$ , multiply both sides by  $m$ , and derive:

$$\log(f(m)) = \frac{\log(c_1) + c_3 \cdot \log(m + c_2)}{m} \quad (28)$$

$$m \log(f(m)) = \log(c_1) + c_3 \cdot \log(m + c_2) \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{m \cdot f'(m)}{f(m)} + \log(f(m)) = \frac{c_3}{m + c_2}. \quad (30)$$

Thus

$$\frac{m \cdot f'(m)}{f(m)} = \frac{c_3}{m + c_2} - \frac{\log(c_1) + c_3 \cdot \log(m + c_2)}{m} \quad (31)$$

$$f'(m) = \frac{f(m)}{m} \cdot \left( \frac{c_3}{m + c_2} - \frac{\log(c_1) + c_3 \cdot \log(m + c_2)}{m} \right). \quad (32)$$

Asymptotically, the term  $-c_3 \cdot \log(m + c_2)$  dominates, so that  $f'(m)$  is negative for large  $m$ . ■

**Lemma 3** For large  $m$ ,

$$r_m \geq (m + 2)^{-\frac{1}{m+1}}. \quad (33)$$

PROOF Since  $f_m(x)$  is increasing for small positive  $x$ , it suffices to show that

$$\left( (m + 2)^{-\frac{1}{m+1}} \right)^{m+1} + (m + 2)^{-\frac{1}{m+1}} - 1 \leq 0. \quad (34)$$

Setting  $u(t) := (t + 2)^{-\frac{1}{t+1}}$  and  $f(u) := u^{t+1} + u - 1$ , it suffices to prove that

1.  $\frac{df}{dt} > 0$  and
2.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t) = 0$ .

Now,

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \cdot \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}, \quad (35)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} = (t + 1)u^t + 1 \quad (36)$$

$$= (t + 1)(t + 2)^{-\frac{t}{t+1}} + 1 \quad (37)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = u^{t+1} \cdot \log(u) \quad (38)$$

$$= \frac{1}{t + 2} \cdot \frac{\log(t + 2)}{t + 1}. \quad (39)$$

To calculate  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ , we take the logarithm of both sides of the equation

$$u = (t+2)^{-\frac{1}{t+1}}, \quad (40)$$

obtaining

$$\log u = -\frac{\log(t+2)}{t+1} \quad (41)$$

$$\frac{1}{u} \cdot \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -\frac{(t+1) \cdot \frac{1}{t+2} - \log(t+2)}{(t+1)^2}. \quad (42)$$

As  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \rightarrow 2$ ,  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$  is positive, and  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \rightarrow 0$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{dt} > 0$  for sufficiently large  $t$ .

As for the second prong,

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{t+2} + (t+2)^{-\frac{1}{t+1}} - 1 \quad (43)$$

$$\rightarrow 0 + 1 - 1 = 0. \quad (44)$$

■

Suppose  $m$  sufficiently large that the conclusions of Lemmas 2 and 3 apply. By Lemma 2, the quantity of Equation (26) is maximized for  $k = 1 + m$ . Thus

$$\gamma_m \leq \left[ \alpha \beta \frac{(m+1+\frac{n}{2})^{n-1}}{\Gamma(n)} \right]^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \cdot \rho_{min}^{-1}, \quad (45)$$

implying, by Lemma 3, that

$$L_m := \frac{r_m}{\gamma_m} \geq \left[ \frac{\Gamma(n)}{\alpha \beta (m+2) (m+1+\frac{n}{2})^{n-1}} \right]^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \cdot \rho_{min} \quad (46)$$

$$\frac{L_m}{\rho_{min}} \geq \left[ \frac{\Gamma(n)}{\alpha \beta (m+1+\frac{n}{2})^n} \right]^{\frac{1}{m+1}} =: g(m; n, \alpha, \beta). \quad (47)$$

Therefore, Equation (7) of Theorem II holds provided that  $m \geq \max\{m_\varepsilon, m_\ell\}$ , where  $m_\varepsilon$  solves the equation

$$g(m_\varepsilon; n, \alpha, \beta) = 1 - \varepsilon \quad (48)$$

and  $m_\ell$  is the least  $m$  that is ‘‘sufficiently large’’ for the conclusions of Lemmas 2 and 3 to hold. Since  $g(m; n, \alpha, \beta)$  is the reciprocal of the  $m^{\text{th}}$  root of a polynomial in  $m$ , it has a limit of 1 as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ ; and since both  $m_\varepsilon$  and  $m_\ell$  depend only on  $n, \alpha, \beta$ , and  $\varepsilon$ , Theorem II is proved. (We hereafter assume  $m_\varepsilon \geq m_\ell$ .)

### 3 Discussion

We anticipate three primary objections to our method:

1. Equation (48) does not yield an obvious asymptotic bound for  $m_\varepsilon$ . Indeed, we have not yet succeeded in rigorously proving such a bound. However, the experimental results we detail in Section 4 suggest that  $m_\varepsilon = O\left(\frac{C}{\varepsilon^d}\right)$  for some constant  $C \leq 1.1$  and  $d \in (1.28, 1.42)$ . Note that this estimate does not depend on  $n$ .

2. The function  $g(m_\varepsilon; n, \alpha, \beta)$  approximates  $\frac{L_{m_\varepsilon}}{\rho_{min}}$  yet depends on  $\beta$ , which is itself a function of  $\rho_{min}$ . This apparent circularity can be overcome by replacing  $\rho_{min}$  in the formula for  $\beta$  with the modulus of a known root, or a known upper bound of  $\rho_{min}$ . In particular, this allows the estimate  $\beta = n$  if at least one root of  $p(z)$  is known to lie in  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ .

Consider, for example,  $p(z) = 3z^7 - z^2 + 2$ . By Viète's formulas,  $p(z)$  has at least one zero in  $\mathbb{D}$ ; thus we may estimate  $\beta$  with  $n = 7$  to obtain the equation

$$\left[ \frac{\Gamma(7)}{\frac{3}{2} \cdot 7 \cdot (m_\varepsilon + 1 + \frac{7}{2})^7} \right]^{\frac{1}{m_\varepsilon+1}} = 1 - \varepsilon \quad (49)$$

for  $m_\varepsilon$ . For  $\varepsilon = 0.05$ , the solution is  $m_\varepsilon = 828$ ; indeed,  $L_{828} \approx 0.876282$  and  $\rho_{min} \approx 0.88$ , yielding

$$\frac{L_{828}}{\rho_{min}} \approx 0.995817 \gg 0.95. \quad (50)$$

3. The function  $g(m_\varepsilon; n, \alpha, \beta)$  tends to overestimate the minimum  $m$  necessary for error tolerance  $\varepsilon$ . Returning to the previous example, for  $p(z) = 3z^7 - z^2 + 2$  only  $m = 20$  calculations, and not  $m_\varepsilon = 828$ , are required to approximate  $\rho_{min} \approx 0.88$  to 95% accuracy. In the next section we suggest a formula for an  $m$  (generally less than  $m_\varepsilon$ ) that tends to suffice in practice.

## 4 Experimental results

**Conjecture I** Equation (7) holds for  $m = m_c$ , where

$$m_c = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^c}\right) \quad (51)$$

for some fixed  $1 < c \ll 2$ . In particular,  $m_c$  does not depend on  $n$ .

To arrive at Conjecture I, we performed two experiments:

1. Took the average value of  $m_c$  for 100 polynomials with random degree between 2 and 256, constant term 1, and non-constant coefficients of random maximum absolute value between 2 and 256, setting for each polynomial  $\varepsilon = 0.2 \cdot 2^{-j}$  for some random integer  $j$  between 0 and 7 inclusive.
2. For each  $j = 0, \dots, 19$ , took the average value of  $m_c$  for 200 polynomials with degree 10 and coefficients of absolute value no more than 99, setting  $\varepsilon = 0.2 \cdot (0.8)^j$ .

In Experiment 1 we performed linear regression on  $m_c$  with independent variables  $\alpha$ ,  $n$ , and  $\varepsilon$ ; our models and the corresponding values of  $r^2$  are shown in Table 1. Most strikingly, the results of Experiment 1 suggest no correlation between  $m_c$  and the degree of polynomial, attributing less than 1% of variation in  $\log m_c$  to changes in variables other than  $\varepsilon$ . Using these results, we might infer the following approximate formula for  $m_c$  (ignoring variables for degree and  $\alpha$ , whose correlation coefficients are small):

$$m_c = \frac{C}{\varepsilon^d}, \quad (52)$$

where  $C \in (1.071929, 1.095269)$  and  $d \in (1.286622, 1.287167)$ .



By contrast, linear regression on the results of Experiment 2 yields the formula of Equation (52) with  $C \approx 0.540619$  and  $d \approx 1.412172$  ( $r^2 = 0.9961$ ). Taking  $C$  from Experiment 1 and  $d$  from Experiment 2, we define

$$m_{exp} := \frac{1.095269}{\varepsilon^{1.412172}} \quad (53)$$

as an approximation of suitable  $m$  for purposes of the next section.

## 5 Examples

In Hohertz and Kalantari [2020] we introduced the Collatz polynomials  $P_N(z)$ , defined<sup>4</sup> as

$$P_N(z) := \sum_{j=0}^{h(N)} c^j(N) \cdot z^j \quad (54)$$

where

$$c(N) := \begin{cases} \frac{3N+1}{2}, & N \text{ odd} \\ \frac{N}{2}, & N \text{ even,} \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

$c^{j+1}(N) := c(c^j(N))$ , and  $h(N) := \min\{j : c^j(N) = 1\}$ . Defining  $M(N) := \max_{j \geq 0} c^j(N)$ , we have that

$$\alpha = \frac{M(N)}{N}, \quad (56)$$

$$\beta \approx 2^{h(N)}, \quad (57)$$

and

$$n = h(N). \quad (58)$$

Using the expected value  $h(N) = \frac{2}{\log(\frac{4}{3})} \cdot \log N \approx 6.952118 \cdot \log N$  proposed in Applegate and Lagarias [2002] and the value  $\alpha = 8N$  conjectured in Silva [1999] to bound  $\frac{M(N)}{N}$  above, we obtain the formula

$$\left[ \frac{\Gamma(6.952118 \cdot \log N)}{8N \cdot (2m_\varepsilon + 2 + 6.952118 \cdot \log N)^{6.952118 \cdot \log N}} \right]^{\frac{1}{m_\varepsilon + 1}} = 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (59)$$

For  $P_5(z) = 5 + 8z + 4z^2 + 2z^3 + z^4$  and  $\varepsilon = 0.05$ , Equation (59) has solution  $m_\varepsilon = 1518$  (rounded up to the nearest integer). This value gives the estimate  $L_{1434} \approx 0.995717$ , within 0.5% of  $\rho_{min} = |-1| = 1$ . On the other hand,  $\lceil m_{exp} \rceil = 76$ ; the corresponding estimate is  $L_{76} \approx 0.947933$ , just over 5% less than  $\rho_{min}$ .

Consistent with Conjecture I and the results of Section 4,  $m_{exp}$  appears to bound  $\rho_{min}$  well for the polynomials  $P_N$ . Indeed, on the interval  $N \in [2, 703]$ , the degree of  $P_N$  ranges from 1 to 108, yet  $\frac{L_{m_{exp}}}{\rho_{min}} < 0.95$  for only six values of  $N$  (it performs worst for  $N = 137$ , for which  $\frac{L_{m_{exp}}}{\rho_{min}} \approx 0.927254$ ).

## 6 Conclusion

All of our experiments suggest the independence of the value  $m$  in Jin's method from the polynomial degree  $n$ : this striking conjecture would have powerful implications if true and warrants further study. In particular, we

<sup>4</sup>that is, defined at least for those positive integers for which the Collatz trajectory eventually terminates - conjectured to be all of them.

encourage research into proof or disproof of Conjecture I, as well as an asymptotic bound on the minimum  $m$  required for error tolerance  $\varepsilon$  (or a value for the exponent  $d$  if Conjecture I holds). Finally, acknowledging the theoretical significance of our Equation (48), we nevertheless hope to sharpen the resulting  $m_\varepsilon$ , for which we would like to find a closed formula.

## 7 Tables

Table 1: Results of Experiment 1. Average  $m_c$  for polynomials with random values of  $\alpha$ ,  $n$ , and  $\varepsilon$ .

VARIABLE MEANINGS			LINEAR MODELS	
$u$	$v$	$w$	$\log m_c =$	$r^2$
$\alpha$	-	-	$6.0405 - 0.0025u$	0.0063
-	DEGREE	-	$5.9261 - 0.0015v$	0.0028
-	-	$\log \varepsilon$	$0.0910 - 1.2866w$	0.9958
$\alpha$	DEGREE	-	$6.2239 - 0.0025u - 0.0015v$	0.0090
$\alpha$	-	$\log \varepsilon$	$0.0728 + 0.0001u - 1.2871w$	0.9958
-	DEGREE	$\log \varepsilon$	$0.0886 + 0.00002v - 1.2867w$	0.9958
$\alpha$	DEGREE	$\log \varepsilon$	$0.0695 + 0.0001u + 0.00002v - 1.2872w$	0.9958

Table 2: Results of Experiment 2. Average  $m_c$  for degree 10 polynomials with coefficients  $|a_i| \leq 99$  and  $\varepsilon = 0.2 \cdot (0.8)^j$ .

$j$	$m_{cavg}$	$j$	$m_{cavg}$	$j$	$m_{cavg}$	$j$	$m_{cavg}$
0	4.085	5	27.525	10	138.140	15	586.480
1	6.090	6	38.270	11	186.495	16	773.515
2	9.105	7	53.895	12	250.010	17	1018.430
3	13.125	8	74.775	13	333.670	18	1336.235
4	19.050	9	101.935	14	443.225	19	1748.345

## References

- [1] Bahman Kalantari. An infinite family of bounds on zeros of analytic functions and relationship to Smale's bound. *Mathematics of Computation*, 74(250):841–853, 2004. doi: 10.1090/s0025-5718-04-01686-2.
- [2] Bahman Kalantari. *Polynomial Root-finding and Polynomiography*. World Scientific, Hackensack, NJ, 2008.
- [3] Matt Hohertz and Bahman Kalantari. Collatz polynomials: an introduction with bounds on their zeros. 2020.
- [4] Yi Jin. On efficient computation and asymptotic sharpness of Kalantari's bounds for zeros of polynomials. *Mathematics of Computation*, 75:1905–1912, 2006.
- [5] Arcadii Z. Grinshpan. Weighted inequalities and negative binomials. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 45: 564–606, 2010.
- [6] David Applegate and Jeffrey C. Lagarias. Lower bounds for the total stopping time of  $3x + 1$  iterates. *Mathematics of Computation*, 72(242):1035–1050, 2002. doi: 10.1090/s0025-5718-02-01425-4.
- [7] Tomás Oliveira E Silva. Maximum excursion and stopping time record-holders for the  $3x + 1$  problem: Computational results. *Mathematics of Computation*, 68(225):371–385, 1999. doi: 10.1090/s0025-5718-99-01031-5.