

Fast Approximation of Polynomial Zeros and Matrix Eigenvalues

Victor Y. Pan , Soo Go, Qi Luan, Liang Zhao

¹ Department of Computer Science
Lehman College of CUNY
the City University of New York
NY 10468, USA

² Ph.D. Programs in Mathematics and Computer Science
The Graduate Center of the City University of New York
New York, NY 10036 USA

victor.pan@lehman.cuny.edu
<http://comet.lehman.cuny.edu/vpan>
sgo@gradcenter.cuny.edu
qi_luan@yahoo.com
Liang.Zhao1@lehman.cuny.edu

Abstract. Given a black box (oracle) for the evaluation of a univariate polynomial $p(x)$ of a degree d , we seek its zeros, that is, the roots of the equation $p(x) = 0$. At FOCS 2016 Louis and Vempala approximated a largest zero of such a real-rooted polynomial within $1/2^b$, by performing at *NR cost* of the evaluation of Newton's ratio $\frac{p(x)}{p'(x)}$ at $O(b \log(d))$ points x . They readily extended this root-finder to record fast approximation of a largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix under the Boolean complexity model. We apply distinct approach and techniques to obtain more general results at the same computational cost.

Let a square on the complex plane be reasonably well isolated from the external roots of $p(x) = 0$ and let it contain at most m roots counted with multiplicities, for a fixed $m \leq d$. Then we approximate all internal roots at NR cost $O(m^3 b \log(d))$ and extend this to approximation of all eigenvalues of a matrix in such a square at record Boolean cost.

For any fixed pair of a real $\gamma \geq 1$ and an integer $v \geq 1$, our alternative Las Vegas randomized root-finder runs at NR cost in $O(m^2 \gamma v b \log(d))$, and outputs errors with a probability at most $1/\gamma^v$.

We prove that $O(\log(d))$ bit-precision is sufficient in our root-finders provided that oracle evaluates $p(x)$ with relative error of order $\log(d)$ at points x sufficiently isolated from the zeros of $p(x)$.

For a constant m we match the cost bounds of Louis and Vempala for approximation of roots and eigenvalues but relax the restrictions on input and output.

Our use of Cauchy integrals and randomization are pioneering and non-trivial as well as our fast approximation of the root radii (that is, the distances to the roots) from any fixed complex point.

1 Introduction

1.1. The classical problem of univariate polynomial root-finding can be stated as follows: given real or complex coefficients of a polynomial

$$p = p(x) := \sum_{i=0}^d p_i x^i := p_d \prod_{j=1}^d (x - x_j), \quad p_d \neq 0, \quad (1)$$

approximate within a fixed positive tolerance $\epsilon = 1/2^b$ all d complex roots x_j of the equation $p(x) = 0$, that is, all the zeros of $p(x)$, or just those lying in a fixed region (e.g., disc or square) of the complex plane. According to [15], univariate polynomial root-finding had been the central problem of Mathematics and Computational Mathematics for about 4,000 years, since Sumerian times and well into the 19th century. It is still a popular research subject with various applications to scientific computing [13,14,22]. Its intensive study in the 1980s and 1990s has culminated at STOC 1995 with a solution in nearly optimal Boolean time (see [16,17,19], and the bibliography therein).

1.2. Black box polynomial root-finding: the problem and the State of the Art. The cited root-finders operate with the coefficients of p and do not apply to the important class of *black box polynomials* – given with an oracle (black box) for their evaluation. One can evaluate p at $d_+ > d$ points and then interpolate to it, albeit at the price of destroying sparsity and blowing up the precision of computing; these are paramount problems of devising polynomial root-finders that operate with the coefficients. Our Remark 4 as well as [12, Thm. 3.4] specify quantitatively a small upper bound $O(\log(d))$ on the precision of computing sufficient to support our black box polynomial root-finders and that of [12], respectively, provided that a black box (oracle) evaluates polynomial $p(x)$ with relative error of order $\log(d)$ at points x sufficiently isolated from the zeros of p (see specifics in Sec. 6.1); $O(\log(d))$ is far below the precision bound supporting known root-finders for polynomials given with their coefficients.

Moreover, one must use at least $2d$ arithmetic operations (*ops*) to evaluate a general polynomial p of (1) given with its $d + 1$ coefficients [29,10], whereas $O(\log(d))$ ops are sufficient to evaluate *Newton's ratio* (aka *Newton's correction*) $\text{NR}(x) := \frac{p(x)}{p'(x)}$ or its inverse $\text{NIR}(x) := \frac{p'(x)}{p(x)}$ for a large and important class of d th degree polynomials, e.g., Mandelbrot's polynomial $p(x) = p_k(x)$, where $p_0 := 1$, $p_1(x) := x$, $p_{i+1}(x) := xp_i^2(x) + 1$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, and $d = 2^k - 1$, sparse polynomials, and sums of shifted monomials such as $p := \alpha(x - a)^d + \beta(x - b)^d + \gamma(x - c)^d$ for six constants a, b, c, α, β , and γ . Interpolation to such polynomials would *dramatically slow down fast polynomial root-finders* in a region that contains a small number of roots.

Finally, black box polynomial root-finders, unlike the customary ones operating with the coefficients, can be readily extended at a low computational cost to the highly important classical problem of matrix eigen-solving.

In [12] Louis and Vempala recall the history and the State of the Art of black box polynomial root-finding and devise high order Newton's iterations to

approximates an absolutely largest root of a real-rooted black box polynomial p within $\epsilon = \Delta/2^b$, for a fixed $\Delta \geq \max_j |x_j|$, at the *NR cost* of the evaluation of Newton's ratio $\text{NR}(x)$ at $O(b \log(d))$ points.

One can approximate $p'(x)$ by the first order divided difference³ to obtain

$$\text{NIR}(x) \approx \text{NIR}_\delta(x) := \frac{p(x) - p(x - \delta)}{p(x)\delta} = \frac{p'(y)}{p(x)} \quad (2)$$

by doubling the arithmetic cost of computing $p(x)$ alone. Here y lies in the line segment $[x - \delta, x]$ by virtue of Taylor-Lagrange's formula, and so $y \approx x$ for $\delta \approx 0$.

By applying their algorithm to the characteristic polynomial $p(x) = \det(xI - M)$ of a $d \times d$ symmetric matrix M and combining it with Storjohann's of [27] for computing the determinant of an integer matrix, Louis and Vempala approximated within ϵ a largest eigenvalue of M at the record expected Boolean complexity $O(d^\omega \log^5(d)(b^2 + \log^2(\|M\|_F)))$. Here ω denotes an exponent of matrix multiplication [2,9], $b = \log(\|M\|_F/\epsilon)$, ϵ is a fixed tolerance to output errors and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius matrix norm. The algorithm runs much faster than the known ones that compute coefficients of $p(x) = \det(xI - M)$ (cf. [23]).

Extension of [12] to approximation of all d roots of a black box polynomial p and all d eigenvalues of a $d \times d$ matrix or all roots and eigenvalues in a fixed region of interest on the complex plane (such as a disc or a square) has remained a natural research challenge with no progress since [12].

1.3. Our results. Like [12], we measure the complexity of our polynomial root-finders by their NR cost; it dominates the cost of other ops involved (see Observation 10, Thm. 13, and Cor. 6). Based on our novel techniques, however, we solve more general computational problems at the cost bounds of [12].

Given a black box polynomial p of a degree d , we approximate all its m roots lying in a fixed square on the complex plane⁴ at NR cost in $O(m^3 b \log(d))$ (cf. Cor. 1 and Observation 10). By applying this root-finder to the characteristic polynomial $p(x) = \det(xI - M)$ of a $d \times d$ symmetric matrix M and combining it with Storjohann's algorithm of [27], we approximate all m eigenvalues of a $d \times d$ matrix M that lie in a fixed square on the complex plane; we do this in record expected Boolean time $O(m^3 b^2 d^\omega \log^2(d))\mu(\log(d))$ for b and ω of the previous subsection and $\mu(s) = O(s \log(s) \log(\log(s)))$.

In Sec. 6.1 we estimate that, as in [12], computational precision of $O(\log(d))$ bits is sufficient to support our root-finders provided that a black box (oracle) outputs the values of a polynomial $p(x)$ within a relative error of order $\log(d)$ for x sufficiently isolated from the zeros of $p(x)$ (we specify this assumption quantitatively in Sec. 6.1). This bounds the Boolean complexity of our root-finder by $O(m^3 b \log(d)\mu(\log(d)))$ for $\mu(s) = O(s \log(s) \log(\log(s)))$ [10].

For a constant m we match the cost bounds of [12] but relax its restrictions on the input and output.

³ Louis and Vempala have supported their high order Newton's iterations with high order divided differences.

⁴ We count roots with their *multiplicities* and can readily extend our study to various other convex domains on the complex plane such as a disc or a polygon.

For any pair of an integer $\gamma \geq 1$ and a real $v \geq 1$ such that $m \gg v\gamma$, we decrease our NR cost bounds for the approximation of roots and eigenvalues by a factor of $\frac{m}{v\gamma}$ – by applying Las Vegas randomization, allowing output errors with a probability at most $1/\gamma^v$, and verifying correctness of the output at a dominated cost (cf. Cor. 1, Thm. 13, and Remark 3).

Our techniques, auxiliary results, and algorithmic extras can be of independent interest. In particular, we significantly accelerate the known algorithms for *exclusion/inclusion (e/i) tests*, which decide whether a fixed disc on the complex plane contains any zero of $p(x)$, and for approximation of the ℓ th smallest root radius (that is, the distance to an ℓ th closest root) from a fixed point on the complex plane for a fixed integer ℓ from 1 to m . Both of these problems are long-studied. Our randomized acceleration of root-finding and application of Cauchy integrals to e/i test are also nontrivial and pioneering in the field.

1.4. Classical subdivision (aka *quad tree*) polynomial root-finders, traced back to [31,4], seek all m roots lying in a fixed square on the complex plane. A subdivision iteration divides every suspect square into four congruent sub-squares and to each of them applies e/i test: we either discard the square if the test certifies that it contains no roots or call it *suspect* and process it in the next iteration otherwise (see Fig. 1).




Fig. 1: Four roots are marked by asterisks; sub-squares containing them are suspect; the other sub-squares are discarded.

Observation 1 *At every subdivision iteration (i) at most $4m$ suspect squares are processed (since any root lies in 1, 2, or 4 suspect squares); (ii) the centers of these suspect squares approximate all m roots within the half-diameter of the squares, (iii) which decreases by twice at every iteration.*

Corollary 1. *Subdivision iterations applied to a square with m roots and side length Δ approximate these roots within $\epsilon = \Delta/2^b$ by applying e/i test to at most $4mk$ suspect squares for $k \leq \lceil \log_2(\frac{\Delta}{\epsilon}\sqrt{2}) \rceil = \lceil b + 0.5 \rceil$.*

1.5. Soft exclusion/inclusion tests. To complete classical subdivision root-finding we devise *soft e/i tests* for a black box polynomial. They certify that the

minimal disc $D(c, \rho) := \{x : |x - c| \leq \rho\}$ covering a fixed square S contains no roots, and then we report *exclusion* and discard S , or that a little larger concentric disc $D(c, \sigma\rho)$ for a fixed $\sigma > 1$ contains a root or roots, and then we report *inclusion*, call the square S *suspect*, and subdivide it. Both assumptions for exclusion and inclusion can be fulfilled simultaneously, but we stop as soon as we verify any of them. The estimate $4mk$ of Cor. 1 increases to at most $\alpha(\sigma)mk$ for $\alpha(\sigma)$ exceeding 4 but bounded by a constant for a constant σ .

1.6. E/i tests in the known subdivision root-finders and recent progress. E/i tests in the known subdivision root-finders operate with the coefficients of an input polynomial, e.g., they are stated in terms of the auxiliary polynomials $\sum_{i=k+1}^d \frac{p_i}{p_d} |x^i - \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{p_i}{p_d} |x^i$ for $0 < k < d$ (Pellet’s theorem), involve all higher order derivatives $p^{(i)}(x)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ [4,25], or Newton’s identities and fast root-squaring algorithms based on convolution [18].

Design and analysis of subdivision root-finders for a black box polynomial began in 2018 in preprint [22], extended to 139 pages by August 2022 and partly covered in [20,5,21,11,6,7], and in this and upcoming papers. That study has extended the NR cost estimates of the pioneering work [12] to a much more general input class and removed its restriction on the output. Furthermore, according to extensive tests of 2020, reported in [5,6], the new root-finders noticeably accelerated the previous best implementation [8] of subdivision root-finding in regions containing only a small number of roots. In the implementation of 2022, the acceleration became dramatic, and even for approximation of all d zeros of a polynomial p given with its coefficients the new root-finders became at least competitive with user’s choice package MPSolve [7].⁵

1.7. Our e/i tests: outline. The power sums of the roots in a complex domain \mathcal{D} are given by Cauchy integrals over its boundary contour \mathcal{C} (cf. [1]):

$$s_h = s_h(p, \mathcal{D}) := \sum_{x_j \in \mathcal{D}} x_j^h = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{p'(x)}{p(x)} x^h dx, \quad h = 0, 1, \dots \quad (3)$$

In particular $s_0 = \#(\mathcal{D})$, the number of roots in \mathcal{D} , and we can devise certified e/i tests by approximating $\Re(s_0)$ within less than $1/2$ and rounding the approximation to the nearest integer. We only deal with discs $\mathcal{D} = D(c, \rho)$ and can readily map them into the unit disc $D(0, 1)$ and vice versa:

$$x \mapsto \frac{x - c}{\rho}, \quad D(c, \rho) \mapsto D(0, 1), \quad \text{and } p(x) \mapsto t(x) = p\left(\frac{x - c}{\rho}\right). \quad (4)$$

Thus we reduce every e/i test to this special case and then approximate the integral s_0 with a finite sum $s_{0,q}$ at the q th roots of unity at NR cost q . Then we prove that $|s_{0,q} - s_0| < 1/2$ already for $q = O(\log(d))$ if no roots lie on or near

⁵ The complexity of a subdivision root-finder is proportional to the number of roots in a region, while MPSolve is about as fast and slow for all roots as for their fixed subset. MPSolve implements Ehrlich-Aberth’s root-finding iterations, which empirically converge to all d roots very fast right from the start but with no formal support and so far only under an initialization that operates with the coefficients of p (see [24]).

the boundary circle $C(0, 1)$. Such *boundary roots*, however, reveal inclusion, and so we can certify it if $|s_0| > 1/2$. Otherwise, an e/i test needs more work.

Suppose that $\#(D(0, 1)) \leq m$. Then we apply tentative e/i tests to $2m + 1$ concentric discs such that any root can affect e/i test just for a single disc, and hence m roots can affect at most m out of all $2m + 1$ tests. Therefore, the majority vote certifies that the innermost disc contains no roots or that the outermost disc contains roots. The ratio $\sigma > 1$ of the radii of these two discs defines softness of the resulting test, and we can readily keep σ below 1.2, say.

NR cost of $2m + 1$ applications of an e/i test is $2m + 1$ times the cost of a single test, but if m is large we bring the overall NR cost down by applying our alternative randomized e/i test w times for $w \ll m$. Namely, we apply our soft e/i test to a disc whose center is fixed (say, at the origin) and whose radius ρ is sampled at random in a fixed range. Then no m roots lie near the boundary circle with a probability $1 - \gamma > 0$ for γ inversely proportional to the NR cost q of our e/i test, which is correct in this case. We reapply our test for v *independent identically distributed (iid)* values ρ of the radius and certify inclusion unless all of them output $|s_{0,q}| < 1/2$. In the latter case we claim exclusion with a probability $1 - P$ for $P \leq \gamma^v$, decreasing exponentially in v at the expense of linear increase of NR cost by a factor of $w = v\gamma$.

1.8. Organization of the paper. We devote the next two sections to background. Secs. 4 and 5 cover our deterministic and randomized e/i tests, respectively. In Sec. 6 we estimate precision of computing in our root-finders and approximate matrix eigenvalues. In Sec. 7 we estimate the ℓ th smallest root radius from any complex point. In Sec. 8 we specify the smaller estimates for the complexity of our next accelerated subdivision root-finders in an upcoming paper.


2. Definitions, concepts, and some basic properties.

- NR cost (NR complexity) of a root-finder is the number of points x at which it evaluates *Newton's ratio* $\text{NR}(x)$ and *Newton's inverse ratio* $\text{NIR}(x)$.
- Define square, disc, circle (circumference), and annulus on the complex plane: $S(c, \rho) := \{x : |\Re(c - x)| \leq \rho, |\Im(c - x)| \leq \rho\}$, $D(c, \rho) := \{x : |x - c| \leq \rho\}$, $C(c, \rho) := \{x : |x - c| = \rho\}$, $A(c, \rho, \rho') := \{x : \rho \leq |x - c| \leq \rho'\}$.
- $\Delta(\mathbb{R})$, $X(\mathbb{R})$, and $\#(\mathbb{R})$ are the diameter, root set, and index (root set's cardinality) of a region \mathbb{R} on the complex plane, respectively.
- A disc $D(c, \rho)$, a circle $C(c, \rho)$, or a square $S(c, \rho)$ is θ -isolated for $\theta > 1$ if $X(D(c, \rho)) = X(D(c, \theta\rho))$, $X(C(c, \rho)) = X(A(c, \rho/\theta, \rho/\theta))$, or $X(S(c, \rho)) = X(S(c, \theta\rho))$, respectively.
- The largest upper bound on such a value θ is said to be the *isolation* of the disc $D(c, \rho)$, the circle $C(c, \rho)$, or the square $S(c, \rho)$, respectively, and is denoted $i(D(c, \rho))$, $i(C(c, \rho))$, and $i(S(c, \rho))$, respectively.
- $r_1(c, t) = |y_1 - c|, \dots, r_d(c, t) = |y_d - c|$ in non-increasing order are the d *root radii*, that is, the distances from a complex center c to the roots $y_1 \dots, y_d$ of a d th degree polynomial $t(x)$. $r_j(c) := r_j(c, p)$, $r_j := r_j(0)$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$.


– Differentiate factorization (1) of $p(x)$ to express $\text{NIR}(x)$ as follows:

$$\text{NIR}(x) := \frac{p'(x)}{p(x)} = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{x - x_j}. \quad (5)$$

Definition 1. For $p(x)$ of (1), $\sigma > 1$, and integers ℓ and m such that $1 \leq \ell \leq m \leq d$ and $\#(D(0,1)) \leq m$, a σ -**soft ℓ -test**, or just **ℓ -test** for short (1 -test being e/i test), either outputs 1 and stops if it detects that $r_{d-\ell+1} \leq \sigma$, that is, $\#(D(0,\sigma)) \geq \ell$, or outputs 0 and stops if it detects that $r_{d-\ell+1} > 1$, that is,⁶ $\#(D(0,1)) < \ell$. ℓ -test $_{c,\rho}$, aka ℓ -test for the disc $D(c,\rho)$, is an ℓ -test applied to the polynomial $t(y)$ of (4).



(a) The disc covers a maximal concentric square and is covered by a minimal concentric square.



(b) The roots are marked by asterisks. The red circle $C(c, \rho\theta)$ and the disc $D(c, \rho\theta)$ have isolation θ . The disc $D(c, \rho)$ has isolation θ^2 .

Fig. 2

Observation 2 Given a complex c and $\rho > 0$, then (i) $i(S(c,\rho))/\sqrt{2} \leq i(D(c,\rho)) \leq i(S(c,\rho\sqrt{2}))/\sqrt{2}$ (see Fig. 2a), (ii) $i(C(c,\rho)) \leq i(D(c,\rho))$ and if $i(D(c,\rho)) \geq \theta^2 \geq 1$, then $i(C(c,\rho\theta)) \geq \theta$ (see Fig. 2b).

3. The power sums of the roots and Cauchy sums.

3.1. The power sums of the roots and Cauchy sums in the unit disc.

For a positive integer q define Cauchy sums by means of discretization of Cauchy integral (3) in the case where \mathcal{D} is the unit disc $D(0,1)$:

$$s_{h,q} := \frac{1}{q} \sum_{g=0}^{q-1} \zeta^{(h+1)g} \frac{p'(\zeta^g)}{p(\zeta^g)}, \text{ for } h = 0, 1, \dots, q-1 \text{ and } \zeta := \exp\left(\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}{q}\right) \quad (6)$$

denoting a primitive q -th root of unity.

⁶ Both bounds $r_{d-\ell+1} \leq \sigma$ and $r_{d-\ell+1} > 1$ can hold simultaneously, but as soon as an ℓ -test verifies any of them, it stops without checking if the other bound also holds.

Remark 1. We call the values $s_{h,q}$ *Cauchy sums* by following [22]. Schönhage used these values in [26] for $h > 0$ to deflate a factor of p , but we only use them in the case of $h = 0$, ignored by Schönhage, and only for e/i tests, not considered in [26]; we know of no subsequent application of the Cauchy sums until [22]. By following [22] we certify inclusion if $p(\zeta^g) = 0$ for any g in the range $[0, q - 1]$.

The following non-trivial result has been proved in [22] and included in [5].

Theorem 3. *For a polynomial $p(x)$ of (1) and an integer $q \geq 1$ let $\prod_{j=1}^d (x_j^q - 1) \neq 0$. Then $s_{h,q} = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{x_j^h}{1-x_j^q}$ for $s_{h,q}$ of (6) and $h = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1$.*

3.2. Approximation errors and root-counting in the unit disc.

Corollary 2. *[26,22,5].⁷ Let q be a positive integer and let the unit circle $C(0, 1)$ be θ -isolated for $\theta > 1$. Then $|s_{h,q} - s_h| \leq \frac{d\theta^h}{\theta^q - 1}$ for $h = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1$.*

Algorithm 4 Root-counting in the unit disc at NR cost $q = O(\log_\theta(d))$.

INPUT: a black box polynomial p of a degree d and $\theta > 1$.

INITIALIZATION: Compute the integer $q = \lceil \log_\theta(4d + 2) \rceil > \log_\theta(2d + 1)$.

COMPUTATIONS: Compute Cauchy sum $s_{0,q}$ and output an integer \bar{s}_0 closest to it,⁸ which is also closest to its real part $\Re(s_{0,q})$.

Observation 5 (i) Alg. 4 runs at NR cost $q = \lceil \log_\theta(4d + 2) \rceil$. (ii) It outputs $\bar{s}_0 = \#(D(0, 1))$ if the circle $C(0, 1)$ is θ -isolated for $\theta > 1$. (iii) If the algorithm outputs $\bar{s}_0 > 0$, then $\#(D(0, \theta)) > 0$.

Proof. Cor. 2 immediately implies claim (ii) but also implies that $\#(D(0, 1)) > 0$ if $\bar{s}_0 > 0$ unless $\#(A(0, 1/\theta, \theta)) > 0$. In both cases $\#(D(0, \theta)) > 0$.

3.3. Extension to any disc. Map (4) reduces the computation of Cauchy sum $s_{h,q}$ in any disc $D(c, \rho)$ to the case of the unit disc $D(0, 1)$ as follows.

Definition 2. *For a disc $D(c, \rho)$, polynomials $p(x)$ and $t(y) = p(\frac{y-c}{\rho})$, a positive integer q , $\zeta = \zeta_q := \exp(\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}{q})$, and $h = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1$, define Cauchy sums $s_{h,q}(p, c, \rho)$ as $s_{h,q}(t, 0, 1)$, that is,*

$$s_{h,q}(p, c, \rho) := \frac{\rho^{h+1}}{q} \sum_{g=0}^{q-1} \zeta^{(h+1)g} \frac{p'(c + \rho\zeta^g)}{p(c + \rho\zeta^g)} \text{ for } h = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1. \quad (7)$$

Observation 6 (4) maps the roots x_j of $p(x)$ into the roots $y_j = \frac{x_j - c}{\rho}$ of $t(y)$, for $j = 1, \dots, d$, and preserves the index $\#(D(c, \rho))$ and the isolation $i(D(c, \rho))$.

⁷ [26] proved this corollary directly, while [22] and then [5] deduced it from Thm. 3.

⁸ Given the coefficients of $p(x)$ one can fix $q := 2^k$ for $k = \lceil \log_2 \lceil \log_\theta(4d + 2) \rceil \rceil$ and then evaluate $p(x)$ and $p'(x)$ at all q th roots of unity by applying FFT.

Refer to Alg. 4 applied to the polynomial $t(y)$ of (4) as *Alg. 4_{c,ρ}* and also as *Alg. 4 applied to the disc $D(c, ρ)$ and the circle $C(c, ρ)$* ; recall Observation 6 and extend Observation 5 as follows.

Observation 7 (i) *Alg. 4_{c,ρ} runs at NR cost $q = \lfloor \log_\theta(4d + 2) \rfloor$. (ii) It outputs $\bar{s}_0 = \#(D(c, \rho))$ if the circle $C(c, \rho)$ is θ -isolated for $\theta > 1$. (iii) If the algorithm outputs $\bar{s}_0 > 0$, then $\#(D(c, \theta\rho)) > 0$.*

Remark 2. Alg. 4 reduces computation of $s_{0,q}$ to evaluation of $\text{NIR}(\zeta^g)$ for $g = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1$. If $v := \min_{g=0}^{q-1} |\text{NIR}(\zeta^g)|$ is small for a reasonably large q , then $\#(D(0, 1)) = 0$ for a large class of polynomials $p(x)$. Indeed, $\text{NIR}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{x-x_j}$ (see (5)), and this sum vanishes only on an algebraic variety of a smaller dimension in the space of the zeros x_1, \dots, x_d of $p(x)$. Extensive experiments in [5,7] with both synthetic and real world inputs for q of order $\log(d)$ and the unit input disc $D(0, 1)$ contained no roots, with no single exception, under a reasonably small upper bound on q .⁹ This highly efficient heuristic e/i test fails on specially concocted polynomials $p(x) = x^{q+1} - (q+1)x + w$ of degree q where $|w|$ is small. The extensive tests of [5,7] have never failed and hence have never encountered such inputs, but our e/i tests of the next sections never fail on any input at the expense of some increase of NR cost.

4. Deterministic ℓ -test under no isolation assumption. Alg. 4_{c,ρ} is a non-costly root-counter unless some roots lie near the circle $C(c, \rho)$. To exclude the adverse impact of such *boundary roots*, apply the algorithm for a fixed c and $2m + 1$ values $\rho = \rho_i, \rho_0 > \rho_1 > \dots > \rho_{2m} > 0$ such that the $2m + 1$ concentric circles $C_i = C(c, \rho_i), i = 0, 1, \dots, 2m$, are sufficiently well isolated pairwise, so that a single root could only corrupt Alg. 4_{c,ρ_i} for a single i . Now majority vote certifies that at least ℓ roots lie in the outermost disc of the family or less than ℓ roots lie in its innermost disc. This defines a σ -soft ℓ test for $\sigma > 1$ equal to the ratio of the radii of the latter two discs.

Next with no loss of generality (*wlog*) let $c = 0, \rho = 1$, and $C(c, \rho) = C(0, 1)$.

Algorithm 8 Deterministic ℓ -test.

INPUT: A black box polynomial $p(x)$ of a degree d and two positive integers ℓ and $m \geq \ell$ such that the unit disc $D(0, 1)$ contains at most m roots.

INITIALIZATION: Fix

$$\sigma > 1, \theta = \sigma^{\frac{1}{4m+1}}, q = \lfloor \log_\theta(4d + 2) \rfloor, \rho_i = \frac{1}{\theta^{2i+1}}, i = 0, 1, \dots, 2m. \quad (8)$$

OUTPUT: 0 if $\#(D(0, 1/\sigma)) < \ell$ or 1 if $\#(D(0, 1)) \geq \ell$.

COMPUTATIONS: Apply Alg. 4_{0,ρ_i} for q of (8) and $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2m$.

Output 1 if among all $2m + 1$ output integers \bar{s}_0 at least $m + 1$ integers are at least ℓ . Otherwise output 0. (We can output 1 already on a single output $\bar{s}_0 > 0$ if $\ell = 1$; we can output 0 already on a single output $\bar{s}_0 < m$ if $\ell = m$.)

⁹ Actually, [5,7] tested the assumption that $|s_{h,q}|$ were small for $h = 0, 1, 2$, but this follows if $v = \min_{g=0}^{q-1} |\text{NIR}(\zeta^g)|$ is small because $v \geq |s_{h,q}|$ for $h = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1$.

Theorem 9. *Alg. 8 is a σ -soft ℓ -test for $\sigma > 1$ of our choice (see (8)).*

Proof. Cor. 2 implies that for every i the output \bar{s}_0 of Alg. $4_{0,\rho_i}$ is equal to $\#(D(0, \rho_i))$ unless there is a root in the open annulus $A_i := A(0, \rho_i/\theta, \theta\rho_i)$.

The $2m+1$ open annuli $A_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, 2m$, are disjoint. Hence a single root cannot lie in two annuli A_i , and so Alg. $4_{0,\rho_i}$ can fail only for a single i among $i = 0, \dots, 2m$. Therefore, at least $m+1$ outputs of the algorithm are correct.

To complete the proof, combine this property with the relationships $\rho_{2m} = 1/\theta^{4m+1}$ (cf. (8)), $\rho_0 = 1/\theta < 1$, and $\#(D(0, \rho_{i+1})) \leq \#(D(0, \rho_i))$, which hold because $D(0, \rho_{i+1}) \subseteq (D(0, \rho_i))$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2m-1$.

Observation 10 *Alg. 8 runs at NR cost $\mathcal{A} = (2m+1)q$ for $q = \lfloor \log_\theta(4d+2) \rfloor = \lfloor (4m+1) \log_\sigma(4d+2) \rfloor$, which dominates the cost of the remaining ops involved, even in the cases of Mandelbrot's and sparse input polynomials, and which stays in $O(m^2 \log(d))$ if $\sigma - 1$ exceeds a positive constant.*

5. Randomized root-counting and ℓ -tests.

5.1. Solution with a crude bound on error probability. Next accelerate ℓ -test $_{c,\rho}$ in case of larger integers m by applying randomization and using fewer calls for Alg. $4_{c,\rho}$ at the price of only certifying the output with a high probability (*whp*) rather than deterministically. We fix the center c of a circle $C(c, \rho)$ but choose its radius ρ at random in a small range. Then whp $i(C(c, \rho))$ is sufficiently well separated from 1; this excludes the adverse impact of boundary roots, while a soft ℓ -test accepts a small variation of the radius ρ . Wlog let $c = 0$.

Algorithm 11 Basic randomized root-counter.

INPUT: $\gamma \geq 1$ and a d -th degree black box polynomial $p(x)$ having at most m roots in the disc $D(0, \sqrt{2})$.

INITIALIZATION: Sample a random value w in the range $[0.2, 0.4]$ under the uniform probability distribution in that range and output $\rho = 2^w$.

COMPUTATIONS: By applying Alg. $4_{0,\psi}$ compute the 0-th Cauchy sum $s_{0,q}$ in the disc $D(0, \rho)$ for $p(x)$ and $q = \lfloor 10m\gamma \log_2(4d+2) \rfloor$. Output an integer \bar{s}_0 closest to $s_{0,q}$.

Theorem 12. *For any $\gamma \geq 1$, Alg. 11, running at NR cost $q = \lfloor 10m\gamma \log_2(4d+2) \rfloor$, outputs $\bar{s}_0 = \#(D(0, \rho))$ with a probability at least $1 - 1/\gamma$.*

Proof. By assumption, the annulus $A(0, 1, \sqrt{2})$ contains at most m roots. Hence at most m root radii $r_j = 2^{e_j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, m' \leq m$, lie in the range $[1, \sqrt{2}]$, that is, $0 \leq e_j \leq 0.5$ for at most $m' \leq m$ integers j . Fix m' intervals, centered at e_j , for $j = 1, \dots, m'$, each of a length at most $1/(5m'\gamma)$. Then the overall length of these intervals is at most $1/(5\gamma)$. Let \mathbb{U} denote the union of these intervals.

Sample a random u in the range $[0.2, 0.4]$ under the uniform probability distribution in that range and notice that $\text{Probability}(u \in \mathbb{U}) \leq 1/\gamma$.

Hence with a probability at least $1 - 1/\gamma$ the circle $C(0, w)$ is θ -isolated for $\theta = 2^{\frac{1}{10m\gamma}}$, in which case Alg. 11 outputs $\bar{s}_0 = s_0 = \#(D(0, w))$ by virtue of claim (ii) of Observation 7.

5.2. Refining the bound on error probability. If we increase the number of evaluation points in Alg. 11 by a factor of v we only decrease the bound $1/\gamma$ on error probability by the same factor. Next, however, we decrease the error probability below $1/\gamma^v$ by properly reapplying the algorithm v times.

At first, readily reduce the root radius approximation problem to the decision problem of ℓ -test. Namely, *narrow Alg. 11 to an ℓ -test* for a fixed ℓ in the range $1 \leq \ell \leq m$, so that with a probability at least $1 - 1/\gamma$ this ℓ -test outputs 0 if $\#(D(0, 1)) < \ell$ and outputs 1 if $\#(D(0, 2^{0.5})) \geq \ell$.

Moreover, the output 1 is certified by virtue of claim (iii) of Observation 7 if $\ell = 1$; similarly the output 0 is certified if $\ell = m$.

Next extend the ℓ -test by means of applying Alg. 11 for v iid random variables w in the range $0.2 \leq w \leq 0.4$. Call this ℓ -test **Alg. 11v, ℓ** .

Specify its output g for $\ell = 1$ as follows: let $g = 1$ if Alg. 11v, 1 outputs 1 at least once in its v applications; otherwise let $g = 0$. Likewise, let $g = 0$ if Alg. 11v, m outputs 0 at least once in its v applications; otherwise let $g = 1$. Recall Thm. 12 and then readily verify the following theorem.

Theorem 13. (i) For two integers $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ and $v \geq 1$ and a real $\gamma \geq 1$, Alg. 11v, ℓ runs at NR cost $\lfloor 10m\gamma \log_2(4d+2) \rfloor v$, which dominates the cost of the other ops involved, even in the cases of Mandelbrot's and sparse input polynomials.
(ii) The output 1 of Alg. 11v, 1 and the output 0 of Alg. 11v, m are certified.
(iii) The output 0 of Alg. 11v, 1 and the output 1 of Alg. 11v, m are correct with a probability at least $1 - 1/\gamma^v$.

The theorem bounds the cost of ℓ -tests for $\ell = 1$ (e/i tests) and $\ell = m$, but next we extend it to ℓ -tests for any integer ℓ in the range $1 < \ell < m$; this will enable us to estimate the root radius $r_{d-\ell+1}$ for any ℓ from 1 to m in the next section. We assign the values 0 or 1 to the output integers g as follows: compute the average of the v outputs in v independent applications of the test and output g denoting the integer closest to that average; if the average is $1/2$, write $g = 0$ to break ties. This extension of Alg. 11v, ℓ is only interesting for $1 < \ell < m$; otherwise its cost/error estimates are inferior to those of Thm. 13.

Theorem 14. For an integer ℓ such that $1 < \ell < m \leq d$ and real $v \geq 1$ and $\gamma > 1$, Algs. 11v, ℓ runs at NR cost $\lfloor 10m\gamma \log_2(4d+2) \rfloor v$, and its output is correct with a probability at least $1 - (4/\gamma)^{v/2}$.

Proof. Since $D(0, 1) \subset D(0, \sqrt{2})$, we only consider the following three cases:

- (i) $\#(D(0, 1)) < \ell$ and $\#(D(0, 2^{0.5})) \geq \ell$,
- (ii) $\#(D(0, 2^{0.5})) < \ell$, and then also $\#(D(0, 1)) < \ell$,
- (iii) $\#(D(0, 1)) \geq \ell$, and then also $\#(D(0, 2^{0.5})) \geq \ell$.

In case (i) the output g is always correct.

In case (ii) the output 0 is correct, while the output 1 is wrong and occurs if and only if more than $v/2$ tests go wrong, by outputting 1.

Likewise, in case (iii) the output 1 is correct, while the output 0 occurs if and only if more than $v/2$ tests go wrong, by outputting 0.

In both cases (ii) and (iii) we deal with the binomial distribution having failure probability $1/\gamma$, and so (cf. [3]) the probability P of at least $v/2$ failures among v tests is at most $\sum_{j=\bar{v}}^v \binom{v}{j} T_j$ for $T_j = \gamma^{-j}(1 - 1/\gamma)^{v-j} \leq \gamma^{-j}$.

Therefore, $P \leq \sum_{j=0}^v \binom{v}{j} = T_{\bar{v}} 2^v \max_j T_j$. Substitute $\sum_{j=0}^v \binom{v}{j} = 2^v$ and $\bar{v} = \lceil v/2 \rceil$ and obtain $P < 2^v T_{\bar{v}} \leq 2^v / \gamma^{v/2} = (4/\gamma)^{v/2}$.

Remark 3. Root-finding with error detection and correction, see more in the Appendix. A randomized root-finder can lose some roots, albeit with a low probability, but we can detect such a loss at the end of root-finding process, simply by observing that among the m roots in an input disc only $m - w$ tame roots have been closely approximated,¹⁰ while $w > 0$ wild roots remain at large. Then we can recursively apply the same or another root-finder until we approximate all m roots.¹¹

6. Precision, Boolean complexity, and matrix eigenvalues.

6.1. Precision and Boolean cost of computing. Arithmetic cost \mathcal{A} of a root-finder is roughly the product of its NR cost and ops count for the evaluation of $p(x)$ and $p(x - \delta)$ of (2). Their Boolean cost is bounded by the product $\mathcal{A}\mu(s)$ for our precision s of computing and $\mu(s) = O(s \log(s) \log(\log(s)))$ [10].

Next we estimate that precision. Unlike [12] we involve neither recursion nor higher order derivatives and only need to certify that the output errors of our e/i tests in Algs. 8 and 11 are less than $\frac{1}{2}$ provided that the algorithms are performed with a proper precision of $O(\log(d))$ bits for NR cost q of order $m \log(d)$ and that the input discs are θ -isolated for $\theta - 1 > 0$ of order $\frac{1}{m}$.

Such a test amounts to computing the sum of the q values $\rho x \frac{p'(c+\rho x)}{p(c+\rho x)} = x \frac{t'(x)}{t(x)}$, for $t(x) = p(c + \rho x)$, $x = \zeta^g$, and $g = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1$, and dividing the sum by q . By slightly abusing notation we write $\text{NIR}(x) := \frac{t'(x)}{t(x)}$, for $t(x) = p(c + \rho x)$, and now say that it is sufficient to compute $\zeta^g \text{NIR}(\zeta^g)$ within, say, $\frac{3}{8}$ for every g . In that case the sum of the q error bounds is at most $\frac{3q}{8}$ and decreases below $\frac{1}{2}$ in division by q if rounding error of that division is less than $\frac{1}{8}$. Towards proving the overall precision bound $\frac{3}{8}$ we first deduce from Eqn. (5) that we can represent $x \text{NIR}(x)$ for $|x| = 1$ within $\frac{1}{8}$ by using a precision of $O(\log(d))$ bits.

Theorem 15. Write $C := C(c, \rho)$ and assume that $|x| = 1$ and the circle C is θ -isolated for $\theta > 1$. Then $|x \text{NIR}(x)| \leq \frac{d}{1-1/\theta} = \frac{\theta d}{\theta-1}$.

Proof. Eqn. (5) implies that $|\text{NIR}(x)| = |\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{|x-x_j|}| \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{|x-x_j|}$ where $|x - x_j| \geq (1 - 1/\theta)\rho$ for $|x_j| < 1$, while $|x - x_j| \geq (\theta - 1)\rho$ for $|x_j| > 1$

¹⁰ We call a complex point c a tame root for a fixed error tolerance ϵ if it is covered by an isolated disc $D(c, \epsilon)$. Given such a disc $D(c, \rho)$, we can readily compute $\#(D(c, \rho))$ by applying Cor. 2.

¹¹ These observations are valid for any root-finder. In the case of subdivision root-finders we can detect the loss of a root at a subdivision step if we notice that the indices of all suspect squares sum to less than m .

since $i(C) \geq \theta$. Combine these bounds, write $m := \#(D(c, \rho))$, and obtain $|x\text{NIR}(x)| \leq \frac{m}{1-1/\theta} + \frac{d-m}{\theta-1} \leq \frac{d}{1-1/\theta}$ for $|x| = 1$.

Corollary 3. *A precision of $3 + \lceil \log_2(\frac{d}{1-1/\theta}) \rceil = O(\log(d))$ bits is sufficient to represent $x\text{NIR}(x)$ within $\frac{1}{8}$ for $|x| = 1$.*

Actually, we approximate not $x\text{NIR}(x)$ but $x\text{NIR}_\delta(x)$ for $\text{NIR}_\delta(x)$ of (2), and so we shall increase the above bound $\frac{1}{8}$ by adding upper bounds $\frac{1}{8}$ on $\alpha := |x\text{NIR}_\delta(x) - x\text{NIR}(x)| = |\text{NIR}_\delta(x) - \text{NIR}(x)|$ for $|x| = 1$ and on β , which denotes the rounding error of computing $|x\text{NIR}_\delta(x)|$.

Next we estimate $|\alpha|$ in terms of d , θ , and δ – by extending the proof of [12, Lemma 3.6], then readily ensure that $|\alpha| < \frac{1}{8}$ by choosing δ with a precision $\log_2(1/|\delta|)$ of order $\log(d)$, and finally estimate β .

Theorem 16. *Under the assumptions of Thm. 15 it holds that*

$$|t(x)\alpha| = \left| \frac{t(x) - t(x-\delta)}{\delta} - t'(x) \right| \leq |t(x) \frac{(d\xi')^2 \delta}{1-d\xi'\delta}| \text{ for } |\xi'| = |\text{NIR}(x)| \leq \frac{\theta}{\theta-1}.$$

Proof. Obtain the claimed bound on $|\xi'|$ from Thm. 15. Then apply the first five lines of the proof of [12, Lemma 3.6] with f , α , n , and ξ replaced by t , $-\delta$, d , and $\xi' := \text{NIR}(x)$, respectively.

Corollary 4. *Under assumptions of Thm. 15, $|\alpha| < 1/8$ for $|\delta| \leq \frac{(\theta-1)^2}{10d^2\theta^2}$.*

To approximate $|x\text{NIR}_{c,\rho}(x)|$ within $\frac{3}{8}$ it remains to approximate β within $\frac{1}{8}$.

Theorem 17. *Suppose that the values $t(y)$ have been computed by a black box (oracle) within a relative error bounds $\nabla(y)$ for $y = x$, $y = x - \delta$, and δ of Cor. 4. Then $|\beta| < \frac{1}{8}$ for $\nabla(y)$ of order $1/d^{O(1)}$, represented with a precision of $O(\log(d))$ bits.*

Proof. Write $\psi := \frac{x\beta}{\delta} = \frac{t(x-\delta)(1+\nabla(x-\delta))}{t(x)(1+\nabla(x))} - \frac{t(x-\delta)}{t(x)} = \frac{t(x-\delta)}{t(x)} \frac{\nabla(x) - \nabla(x-\delta)}{1+\nabla(x)}$. Notice that $|1 - \frac{t(x-\delta)}{t(x)} - \frac{t'(x)}{t(x)}| \leq |\delta\alpha| \leq \frac{|\delta|}{8}$ (see Cor. 3) and recall that $|\frac{t'(x)}{t(x)}| \leq \frac{\theta d}{\theta-1}$ (see Thm. 15). Hence $|\frac{t(x-\delta)}{t(x)}| \leq w = 1 + \frac{\theta d}{\theta-1} + \frac{|\delta|}{8}$.

Choose $\nabla(y)$ such that $1/|\nabla(y)| = 20|w/\delta|$, say, and so $|\log(1/|\nabla(y)|)| = O(\log(d))$; then verify that $|\beta| < \frac{1}{8}$.

Combine Cors. 3 and 4 and Thm. 17 to obtain

Corollary 5. *Given a black box (oracle) for the evaluation of a polynomial $p(x)$ of a degree d with a relative error of order $d^{O(1)}$, we can extend it to support our black box subdivision root-finders performed with a precision of $O(\log(d))$ bits.*

Remark 4. We derived our precision bound $O(\log(d))$ based on operating entirely with $\text{NIR}(x)$. For comparison, if we relied on computing $p(x)$ and on the record bound $\min_{x: |x|=1} (|p(x)|/||p||_1) \geq (\frac{\theta-1}{2\theta})^d$, for $||p||_1 := \sum_{i=0}^d |p_i|$ (cf. [26, Eqn. (9.4)]), we would have to use computational precision of order md in our root-finders. The estimated precision $O(\log(d))$ would grow at the stage of the evaluation of a worst case polynomial $p(x)$ given with coefficients because root-finding for such a polynomial requires precision of order bd , which decreases by up to a factor of d if all the roots are well isolated from each other [19].

6.2. Approximation of matrix eigenvalues. Gershgorin's theorem bounds every eigenvalues λ of a matrix $A = (a_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^d$ as follows [28, Thm. 1.3.2]: $|\lambda - a_{i,i}| \leq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{i,j}|$ for some i , $1 \leq i \leq d$. Hence, clearly, $|\lambda| \leq \|A\|_F$. Combine our root-finders applied to $p(x) = \det(xI - A)$ with Storjohan's algorithm of [27], which approximates $\det(xI - A)$ for $|x| \leq \|A\|_F$ within a relative error ϵ at the expected Boolean cost $O(bd^\omega \log^2(d))$ for $b = \log(\|A\|_F/\epsilon)$ and obtain the record Boolean complexity bound of Sec. 1.3 for approximation of all eigenvalues of a matrix lying in a fixed square on the complex plane.

7. Root radius estimation based on ℓ -test. In this section we go back from the decision problem of ℓ -test to approximation of the ℓ th smallest root radius, assumed to lie in a fixed range $[a_-, a_+]$. Wlog let this be the range $[\epsilon, 1]$ for a fixed small positive $\epsilon = 1/2^b$. Accelerate the routine bisection by applying it to approximate the exponent of a target value; call the resulting algorithm *bisection of exponent* or *BoE*. Apply BoE to bracket the ℓ th smallest root radius $r_{d-\ell+1}$ in a range $[\rho_-, \rho_+]$ such that $0 < \rho_- - \rho_+ \leq \epsilon$ or $0 < \rho_+ < \beta\rho_-$ for two fixed tolerance values $\epsilon = 1/2^b$ and $\beta = 2^\phi > 1$.

Assume that the unit disc $D(0, 1)$ contains at most m roots for $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ and that besides the above tolerance values the input of BoE includes a softness bound $\sigma = 1 + \alpha$ for a fixed small positive parameter $\alpha < 1/2$ and a σ -soft ℓ -test $_{c,\rho}$ of Def. 1, to be used as the pivot of BoE.

Since the test is soft, so is BoE as well: for a range $[b_-, b_+]$ with midpoint $\widehat{b} = 0.5(b_+ + b_-)$ regular rigid bisection continues the search in the range $[b_-, \widehat{b}]$ or $[\widehat{b}, b_+]$, but our soft BoE continues it in the range $[b_-, (1+\alpha)\widehat{b}]$ or $[(1-\alpha)\widehat{b}, b_+]$ for a fixed small positive α . The approximations still converges linearly and just a little slower than the regular bisection: the approximation error decreases by a factor of $\frac{2}{1+\alpha}$ rather than by twice.¹²

Algorithm 18 Bracketing the ℓ -th smallest root radius based on ℓ -test.

INPUT: Two integers ℓ and m such that $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ and $\#(D(0, 1)) \leq m$, $\sigma = 1 + \alpha$ for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, a σ -soft ℓ -test $_{0,\rho}$, and two tolerance values $\beta := 2^\phi > 1$ and $\epsilon = 1/2^b$, $b \geq 1$.

OUTPUT: A range $[\rho_-, \rho_+]$ such that $[\rho_-, \rho_+] = [0, \epsilon]$ or $\rho_- \leq r_{d-\ell+1} \leq \rho_+ \leq \beta\rho_-$.

INITIALIZATION: Write $\bar{b} := \log_2(\frac{\sigma}{\epsilon})$, $b_- := -\bar{b}$, and $b_+ := 0$.

COMPUTATIONS: Apply ℓ -test $_{0,\frac{\sigma}{\epsilon}}$. Stop and output $[\rho_-, \rho_+] = [0, \epsilon]$ if it outputs 1. Otherwise apply ℓ -test $_{0,\rho}$ for

$$\rho_- = 2^{b_-}, \rho_+ = 2^{b_+}, \rho := 2^{\widehat{b}}, \text{ and } \widehat{b} := \lceil (b_- + b_+)/2 \rceil. \quad (9)$$

Write $b_- := (1 - \alpha)\widehat{b}$ if the ℓ -test outputs 0; write $b_+ := (1 + \alpha)\widehat{b}$ if the test outputs 1. Then update \widehat{b} and ρ according to (9).

¹² If we applied BoE to the range $[0, 1]$, we would have to bisect the infinite range $[-\infty, 0]$, but we deal with the narrower range $[-b, 0]$ since we have narrowed the range $[0, 1]$ to $[\epsilon, 1]$.

Continue recursively: stop and output the current range $[\rho_-, \rho_+] = [2^{b_-}, 2^{b_+}]$ if $b_+ - b_- \leq \phi$, that is, if $\rho_+ \leq \beta\rho_-$; otherwise update \bar{b} and ρ and reapply the computations.

The disc $D(0, \epsilon)$ contains at least ℓ roots, that is, the range $[0, \epsilon]$ brackets the ℓ th smallest root radius $r_{d-\ell+1}$ if the σ -soft ℓ -test applied to the disc $D(0, \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma})$ outputs 1. Otherwise, the disc $D(0, \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma})$ contains less than ℓ roots, and so the root radius $r_{d-\ell+1}$ lies in the range $[\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma}, 1]$, in which we shall continue our search.

Readily verify that our policy of recursively updating the range $[b_-, b_+]$ maintains this property throughout and that updating stops where $b_+ - b_- \leq \phi$, that is, where $\rho_+ \leq \beta\rho_-$. This implies *correctness* of Alg. 18.

Let us estimate the number \mathbb{I} of its invocations of an ℓ -test.

Theorem 19. *Alg. 18 invokes an ℓ -test \mathbb{I} times where $\mathbb{I} \leq \lceil \log_\nu(\frac{\bar{b}}{\phi}) \rceil + 1$ for $\nu = \frac{2}{1+\alpha}$, $\mathbb{I} = O(\log(b/\phi))$.*

Proof. The computations in Alg. 18 stop after the first application of an ℓ -test if it outputs 1. It remains to count the subsequent ℓ -tests if it outputs 0.

Each test decreases the length $\bar{b} = b_+ - b_-$ of its input range $[b_-, b_+]$ for the exponent to $0.5(1 + \alpha)\bar{b}$. Hence i applications change it into $\frac{(1+\alpha)^i}{2^i}\bar{b}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. These values linearly converge to 0 as i increases to the infinity, and the theorem follows.

Remark 5. In the case where we know that $\#(D(0, \rho)) \geq \ell$ for a fixed ρ in $[\epsilon, 1]$, we only need to refine the initial range $[\rho, 1]$ for the root radius $r_{d-\ell+1}$.

Clearly, \mathbb{I} applications of ℓ -test increase the number of evaluation points for the ratio $\frac{p'(x)}{p(x)}$ by at most a factor of \mathbb{I} , and if the ℓ -test is randomized, then the error probability also grows by at most a factor of \mathbb{I} . Let us specify these estimates for Alg. 18 in both deterministic and randomized cases.

Corollary 6. *Let precisely m zeros of a black box polynomial $p(x)$ of a degree d lie in the unit disc, that is, let $\#(D(0, 1)) = m$, and let $i(D(0, 1)) \geq \theta$, where $\theta - 1$ exceeds a positive constant. Suppose that for two positive tolerance values $\epsilon = 1/2^b$ and ϕ and an integer j , $1 \leq j \leq m$, Alg. 18 approximates the j -th smallest root radius $|x_j|$ within the relative error 2^ϕ or determines that $|x_j| \leq \epsilon$ and let $\mathbb{I} = O(\log(\frac{b}{\phi}))$ be estimated in Thm. 19.*

(i) *Alg. 18 performs at deterministic NR cost $\mathbb{I}\mathcal{A}$ for \mathcal{A} of Observation 10, such that $\mathbb{I}\mathcal{A} = O(m^2 \log(d) \log(\frac{b}{\phi}))$ if it uses Alg. 8 at its pivot steps.*

(ii) *If Alg. 18 uses Alg. 14 for a fixed $v > 1$ at its pivot steps, then it performs at randomized NR cost at most $\lceil 10m\gamma \log_2(4d+2) \rceil v\mathbb{I} = O(m\gamma \log(d) \log(\frac{b}{\phi}))$ for any fixed pair of an integer $v \geq 1$ and a real $\gamma > 1$, in which case the output error occurs with a probability at most $(4/\gamma)^{v/2}\mathbb{I}$.*

(iii) *In both cases the NR cost bounds dominate the cost of the remaining ops involved, even for Mandelbrot's and sparse input polynomials.*

8. Conclusions. [22, Sec. 3] accelerates subdivision root-finding based on a simple and natural but apparently novel concept of ϵ -compression of an isolated disc without losing any root of its root set. The radius of its output disc must be either within a fixed tolerance ϵ to the root approximation errors or minimal possible up to a fixed tolerance factor $\sigma > 1$. The following theorem motivates using this concept.

Theorem 20. [22, Sec. 3]. *Given $\epsilon \geq 0$ and an isolated square on the complex plane containing at most m zeros of a black box polynomial p , one can compute isolated discs of radii at most ϵ whose union covers all these zeros by performing $O(m)$ e/i tests and at most $2m - 1$ compression steps applied to isolated discs.*

Cauchy sum algorithms enable fast e/i tests, but [22, Sec. 3] reduces compression steps to Cauchy sum algorithms as well. Together with Thm. 20 this implies the following corollary.

Corollary 7. *For positive b , R , and ϵ and a complex c such that $R/\epsilon = 1/2^b$, let an isolated square $S = S(c, R)$ on the complex plane contain at most m zeros of a black box polynomial $p(x)$. Then an algorithm supporting Thm. 20 can be performed at overall deterministic and randomized NR cost in $O(m^3 \log(d)) \log(b)$ and $O(m^2 v \gamma \log(d)) \log(b)$, respectively, provided that output errors are allowed with a probability at most $1/\gamma^v$, for any integer $v \geq 1$ and real $\gamma \geq 1$.*

We present our intricate proofs of all these results in a separate paper.

By applying the non-costly heuristic e/i test of [5,7], cited in Remark 2, we can decrease the above NR cost bounds to $O(m \log(b) \log^2(d))$, albeit the resulting root-finder has only empirical support so far. Even for $m = d$ these black box estimates match the optimal ones of [16]; this explains why even for approximation of all d roots [7] competes with MPSolve – the root-finder of user’s choice, operating with the coefficients of p .

APPENDIX

More on error detection and correction. The following simple observations bound the cost and the error probability of the recursive process of Remark 3.

Theorem 21. *Let the above recipe for error detection and correction be applied to the output of a basic randomized root-finder performing at the cost α (under a fixed model) and correct with a probability $1/\beta$ for $\beta > 1$ and let the basic algorithm be reapplied, each time with error detection at cost δ . Then in v recursive applications of the algorithm, its output is certified to be correct at the cost less than $(\alpha + \delta)v$ with a probability at least $1 - 1/\beta^v$.*

Having $d - w$ tame roots $x_{w+1}, x_{w+1}, \dots, x_d$ approximated, we can deflate the factor $q(x) = \prod_{j=1}^w (x - x_j)$, e.g., by applying evaluation-interpolation techniques [30], but this can blow up the coefficient length and destroy numerical stability unless w is a sufficiently small integer.

Working with a black box polynomial, however, we have an option of implicit deflation of *the wild factor* of p of any degree w , whose root set is made up of the w wild roots x_1, \dots, x_w : we can apply the same or another root-finder to the quotient polynomial $q(x) = p(x) / \prod_{j=w+1}^d (x - x_j)$, without computing the coefficients of this quotient. We can compute the ratio $\frac{q'(x)}{q(x)}$ by applying the following expression:
$$\frac{q'(x)}{q(x)} = \frac{p'(x)}{p(x)} - \sum_{j=1}^{d-w} \frac{1}{x - x_j}.$$

References

1. Ahlfors, L.: Complex Analysis. McGraw-Hill series in Mathematics, McGraw-Hill (2000), ISBN 0-07-000657-1

2. Alman, Josh; Williams, Virginia Vassilevska: A Refined Laser Method and Faster Matrix Multiplication. In Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA), pages 522–539. SIAM Publications (2021). arXiv:2010.05846.
3. Cramér, H.: *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*. Princeton Mathematical Series, 8, pp. xvi+575 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1946), also Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, 1999. ISBN 0-691-00547-8
4. Henrici, P.: *Applied and Computational Complex Analysis*. Vol. 1: Power Series, Integration, Conformal Mapping, Location of Zeros. Wiley, NY (1974)
5. Imbach, R., Pan, V.Y.: New progress in univariate polynomial root-finding. In: Procs. of ACM-SIGSAM ISSAC 2020, pages 249 – 256, July 20-23, 2020, Kalamata, Greece, ACM Press (2020). ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-7100-1/20/07
6. Imbach, R., Pan, V.Y.: New practical advances in polynomial root clustering. LNCS 11989, In Book: *Mathematical Aspects of Computer and Information Sciences (MACIS 2019)*, D. Salmanig et al (Eds.), Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020, Chapter No: 11, pages 1–16, Chapter DOI:10.1007/978 – 3 – 030 – 43120 – 4_11
7. Imbach, R., Pan, V.Y.: Accelerated subdivision for clustering roots of polynomials given by evaluation oracles. In: *Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing (CASC’22)*, Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2022, F. Boulier et al. (Eds.): CASC 2022, LNCS 13366, pp. 143–164, 2022
8. Imbach, R., Pan, V.Y., Yap, C.: Implementation of a near-optimal complex root clustering algorithm. In: *Proc. Int. Congress Math Software (ICMS 2018)*, Davenport, J.H., Kaers, M., Labahn, G., Urban, G. (eds.), LNCS **10931**, 235–244, Springer, Cham 235–244 (2018) doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-96418-8_28
9. Karstadt, Elayeh; Schwartz, Oded: Matrix multiplication, a little faster. *Journal of the ACM* **67**(1), 1–31 (2020) doi:10.1145/3364504, MR 4061328, S2CID 211041916
10. Knuth, D.E.: *The Art of Computer Programming*, volume 2, Addison-Wesley, 1981 (second edition), 1997 (third edition).
11. Luan, Q., Pan, V.Y., Kim, W., Zaderman, V.: Faster numerical univariate polynomial root-finding by means of subdivision iterations. In: *Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing*, Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020, F. Boulier et al. (Eds.): CASC 2020, LNCS 12291, pp. 431–446. Springer (2020)
12. Louis, A., Vempala, S. S.: Accelerated Newton iteration: roots of black box polynomials and matrix eigenvalues. 2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), Volume: 1, Pages: 732-740 (2016) DOI Bookmark: 10.1109/FOCS.2016.83; also arXiv:1511.03186, January 2016
13. McNamee, J.M.: *Numerical Methods for Roots of Polynomials, Part I*, XIX+354 pages. Elsevier (2007) ISBN: 044452729X; ISBN13: 9780444527295
14. McNamee, J.M., Pan, V.Y.: *Numerical Methods for Roots of Polynomials, Part II*, XXI+728 pages. Elsevier (2013) ISBN: 9780444527301
15. Merzbach, U.C., Boyer, C.B.: *A History of Mathematics*. Wiley, New York (2011), fifth edition, doi: 10.1177/027046769201200316
16. Pan, V.Y.: Optimal (up to polylog factors) sequential and parallel algorithms for approximating complex polynomial zeros. In: *Proc. 27th Ann. ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing (STOC’95)*, 741–750. ACM Press, New York (1995) doi: 10.1145/225058.225292
17. Pan, V.Y.: Solving a polynomial equation: Some history and recent progress. *SIAM Review* **39**(2), 187–220 (1997) doi: 10.1137/S0036144595288554

18. Pan, V.Y.: Approximation of complex polynomial zeros: modified quadtree (Weyl's) construction and improved Newton's iteration. *J. Complexity* **16**(1), 213–264 (2000) doi: 10.1006/jcom.1999.
19. Pan, V.Y.: Univariate polynomials: nearly optimal algorithms for factorization and rootfinding. *J. Symb. Comput.* **33**(5), 701–733 (2002) doi: 10.1006/jsco.2002.0531. Proc. version in Proc. Intern. Symp. on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC'01), 253–267, ACM Press, New York (2001)
20. Pan, V.Y.: Old and new nearly optimal polynomial root-finders. In: Proceedings of the 21st International Workshop on Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing (CASC'2019), (M. England, W. Koepf, T.M. Sadikov, W.M. Seiler, and E. V. Vorozhtsov, editors), LNCS **11661**, 393–411, Springer Nature Switzerland (2019) doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-26831-2
21. Pan, V.Y.: Acceleration of subdivision root-finding for sparse polynomials. In: Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing, Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020, F. Boulrier et al. (Eds.): CASC 2020, LNCS 12291, pp. 1 – 17 (2020)
22. Pan, V.Y.: New progress in polynomial root-finding. arXiv 1805.12042, submitted on May 30, 2018, last revised on August 31, 2022.
23. Pan, V.Y., Chen, A., The Complexity of the Matrix Eigenproblem, Proc. 31st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'99), 507–516, ACM Press, New York (1999)
24. Reinke, B.: Diverging orbits for the Ehrlich-Aberth and the Weierstrass root finders. arXiv 2011.01660 (November 20, 2020)
25. Renegar, J.: On the worst-case arithmetic complexity of approximating zeros of polynomials. *J. Complex.* **3**(2), 90–113 (1987) doi: 10.1016/0885-064X(87)90022-7
26. Schönhage, A.: The fundamental theorem of algebra in terms of computational complexity. Math. Dept., University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany (1982)
27. Storjohann, A.: The shifted number system for fast linear algebra on integer matrices, *Journal of Complexity* **21**(4), 609–650 (2005)
28. Stewart, G. W.: *Matrix Algorithms, Vol. II: Eigensystems*, SIAM (1998).
29. Strassen, V.: Some Results in Algebraic Complexity Theory, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vancouver, 1974 (Ralph D. James, editor), Volume 1, Canadian Mathematical Society, pages 497–501 (1974)
30. Toom, A. L., The complexity of a scheme of functional elements realizing the multiplication of integers. *Soviet Mathematics Doklady* **3**, 714–716 (1963)
31. Weyl, H.: Randbemerkungen zu Hauptproblemen der Mathematik. II. Fundamentalsatz der Algebra und Grundlagen der Mathematik. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **20**, 131–151 (1924)