

Variable projection methods for approximate (greatest) common divisor computations

Konstantin Usevich^{a,b,*}, Ivan Markovsky^c

^a*Univ. Grenoble Alpes, GIPSA-Lab, F-38000 Grenoble, France*

^b*CNRS, GIPSA-Lab, F-38000 Grenoble, France*

^c*Department ELEC, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Pleinlaan 2, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium*

Abstract

We consider the problem of finding for a given N -tuple of polynomials (real or complex) the closest N -tuple that has a common divisor of degree at least d . Extended weighted Euclidean seminorm of the coefficients is used as a measure of closeness. Two equivalent representations of the problem are considered: (i) direct parameterization over the common divisors and quotients (image representation), and (ii) Sylvester low-rank approximation (kernel representation). We use the duality between least-squares and least-norm problems to show that (i) and (ii) are closely related to mosaic Hankel low-rank approximation. This allows us to apply to the approximate common divisor problem recent results on complexity and accuracy of computations for mosaic Hankel low-rank approximation. We develop optimization methods based on the variable projection principle both for image and kernel representation. These methods have linear complexity in the degrees of the polynomials for small and large d . We provide a software implementation of the developed methods, which is based on a software package for structured low-rank approximation.

Keywords: approximate GCD; structured low-rank approximation; variable projection; mosaic Hankel matrices; least squares problem; weighted 2-norm

1. Introduction

The problem of computing a greatest common divisor (GCD) of polynomials with real or complex coefficients appears in many applications: signal processing and system identification [1, 2], computer-aided geometric design [3], blind image deblurring [4], control of linear systems [5, 6] and approximate factorization of polynomials [7]. But, as noted in [8], “computation of polynomial GCDs is an excellent example of numerically ill-posed problems”. Indeed, for any set of polynomials with non-trivial

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: `konstantin.usevich@gipsa-lab.grenoble-inp.fr` (Konstantin Usevich), `ivan.markovsky@vub.ac.be` (Ivan Markovsky)

GCD, a generic perturbation of the coefficients makes them coprime. In the aforementioned applications, perturbations appear naturally due to limited precision of the numerical representation of the coefficients, or due to measurement errors. These reasons make it inevitable to use the notion of approximate greatest common divisor (AGCD).

There is a vast literature on the topic of AGCD (see the list of references), starting with different definitions of AGCD and finishing with different computational methods. Nevertheless, two main optimization-based formulations of AGCD are predominant. In what follows, we give these formulations for the case of two polynomials.

The first commonly accepted problem formulation is the problem of finding the so-called ε -GCD (see [9, Def. 2.2], [10, Def 1.1], [8, Eqn. (1)-(2)]).

Problem 1.1 (ε -GCD). *Given polynomials $p(z), q(z)$, and a threshold ε , find polynomials $\hat{p}^*(z), \hat{q}^*(z)$ with a GCD $\hat{h}^*(z) = \gcd(\hat{p}^*(z), \hat{q}^*(z))$ that are solutions to*

$$\max_{\hat{p}(z), \hat{q}(z)} \deg \gcd(\hat{p}(z), \hat{q}(z)) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \text{dist}((p, q), (\hat{p}, \hat{q})) \leq \varepsilon, \quad (\text{AGCD})$$

where $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is some distance measure for the pairs of polynomials.

The polynomial $\hat{h}^*(z)$ is conventionally called an ε -GCD. The distance in the definition of the ε -GCD is typically of the form

$$\text{dist}((p, q), (\hat{p}, \hat{q})) = \|(p - \hat{p}, q - \hat{q})\|,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is some norm. Various norms are used in the literature: the ℓ_2 -norm ([11, 1, 12, 13]), the ℓ_∞ -norm [14] and mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_∞ -norm in [9, Def. 2.2] and [10, Def 1.1] (i.e., $\|(p, q)\| = \max(\|p\|_2, \|q\|_2)$).

The second core problem formulation [13, Prob. 1.1] is a dual problem to (AGCD).

Problem 1.2. *Given $p(z), q(z)$ and a number d , find $\hat{p}(z), \hat{q}(z)$ that are solutions to*

$$\min_{\hat{p}(z), \hat{q}(z)} \text{dist}((p, q), (\hat{p}, \hat{q})) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \deg \gcd(\hat{p}(z), \hat{q}(z)) \geq d. \quad (\text{ACD})$$

Problem 1.2 appears in many contexts. First, it is often used in a combination with Problem 1.1: since Problem 1.1 typically has infinite number of optimal solutions (\hat{p}^*, \hat{q}^*) , the closest pair of polynomials to the given ones is of interest. Thus Problem 1.2 is often referred to as *refinement* in the AGCD literature [10, §3.2], [15].

Second, as noted in [9], being able to solve Problem 1.2, gives a solution to Problem 1.1. Indeed, if the minimum value of (ACD) for $d = d^*$ is less than or equal to a given ε and the minimum value of (ACD) for $d = d^* + 1$ is strictly greater than ε , then d^* is the solution of (AGCD). (For more details, see the discussion after [9, Def. 2.3].) This fact is illustrated in Fig. 1, where the feasible set for (AGCD) and (ACD) is shown (i.e., the values of d and $\text{dist}((p, q), (\hat{p}, \hat{q}))$, for which exists a pair (\hat{p}, \hat{q}) that satisfies $\deg \gcd(\hat{p}, \hat{q}) \geq d$). The solutions of (ACD) correspond to the lowest points in each vertical line. The optimal solutions of (AGCD) correspond to red segment in Fig. 1 (the points on the rightmost vertical line that intersect the threshold horizontal line). Thus, Problem 1.1 can be solved by solving Problem 1.2 for all possible d (or by using, for example, bisection over d).




Figure 1: Dark blue: feasible set for (AGCD) and (ACD); light blue: optimal points for (ACD); red: optimal points for (AGCD) for a given error ε and degree d .

Finally, Problem 1.2 appears when we know an *a priori* bound on the degree of the GCD is given, which is a reasonable assumption in some applications [1], [16]. Another common example is the problem of finding the nearest non-coprime polynomials [11, 6], which corresponds to $d = 1$. In this paper, we focus on Problem 1.2.

1.1. Previous works

Two main approaches to Problem 1.2 can be identified in the literature, namely the direct parameterization approach (referred to as *image representation* in this paper) and the structured low-rank approximation (SLRA) approach (also referred to as *kernel representation* in this paper). Most of the algorithms were proposed for minimizing the weighted Euclidean distance.

The image representation approach is based on the direct representation of the polynomials as a product of a common factor and quotient polynomials, i.e., the cost function $f(\hat{h}, \hat{u}, \hat{v}) := \text{dist}((p, q), (\hat{h}\hat{u}, \hat{h}\hat{v}))$ is minimized over all candidate common divisors \hat{h} (of degree d) and candidate quotient polynomials \hat{u}, \hat{v} (of degree $n - d$). The image representation approach is used as early as [12]. However, the size of the search space makes minimization of f expensive for general-purpose optimization routines. One of the main ways to reduce the complexity is elimination of variables, which is also named variable projection in the context of nonlinear least squares problems [17].

In short, the variable projection principle is: for a fixed \hat{h} , the minimization of f with respect to the other parameters is a linear least squares problem; thus other parameters can be eliminated, and a function with smaller number of parameters $f(\hat{h})$ can be minimized. In the special case of $d = 1$, as shown in [18], the minimum of $f(\hat{h})$ can be computed by minimizing a univariate polynomial (for real p and q) or bivariate real polynomial (for complex p and q). For the latter case a certified algorithm was presented in [11]. If $d > 1$, but d is small, as shown in [12, 8], $f(\hat{h})$ can be computed efficiently (in linear time in the degree of the polynomials, if d is small). Later (but independently) in [16], it was shown that the first derivative of $f(\hat{h})$ can be evaluated with the same complexity. Independently, in [19, 1], elimination of \hat{h} (instead of \hat{u} and \hat{v}) was proposed. Finally, the variable projection was also implicitly used in [20, 21] for symbolic computation of nearest singular polynomial and semi-definite programming relaxations of the AGCD problem [22, 23]. There are other

developments and extensions for the image representation. For example, in [10, §3.2] it was shown that the Gauss-Newton step can be performed in quadratic time in the degrees of the polynomials.

Another popular approach to Problem 1.2 is the SLRA approach (kernel representation approach), which consists in reformulating Problem 1.2 as a problem of approximating a given structured matrix by a structured matrix of low rank (an SLRA problem [24]). This reformulation is possible since the constraint on the GCD degree can be rewritten as a rank constraint on a structured matrix. For two polynomials, this is a Sylvester or a Sylvester subresultant matrix [15]; for several polynomials there are various generalizations of the Sylvester structure [25, 26] (see Section 4 for more details).

Concerning algorithms for SLRA, the following methods were used in the context of the AGCD problem: *structured total least norm (STLN)* and its improvements [13, 27, 28, 29], *Riemannian SVD* [30], *gradient projection* [31], *alternating least squares with penalization* [32], *variable projection* [33], *Newton-like alternating projection algorithms* [34]. In [35], a step toward global optimization was made by the authors who proposed to compute the number of complex critical points for the optimization problem, using symbolic computations.

1.2. Contribution and structure of this paper

In this paper, we consider generalization of Problem 1.2 to many polynomials. The main contributions of this paper are connections between image/kernel representation approaches to Problem 1.2 and structured low-rank approximation of mosaic-Hankel matrices. First, we show that the generalized Sylvester subresultant low-rank matrix approximation can be reduced to mosaic Hankel SLRA. Second, we show that the cost function in variable projection methods for AGCD in image representation has the same structure as the cost function in the variable projection method for mosaic Hankel SLRA [36]. These connections allow us to use, with small modification, the efficient algorithms developed in [36]. The algorithms have proven computational complexity and can handle real and complex polynomials. As a side result, we show that minimizing the relative distance between tuples of polynomials is equivalent to minimizing a distance based on angles between polynomials.

This structure of the paper is as follows. Sections 2–5 contain known results or their minor improvements. Sections 6–7 contain the main results and experiments. Section 2 contains the necessary background and a formal statement of an analogue of Problem 1.2 for many polynomials; we also introduce the spaces of homogeneous polynomials (polynomials with possible infinite roots) and operations with them, which are key ingredients of this paper. In Section 3 we review the image representation approach and the variable projection principle. In Section 4, we review the structured low-rank approximation (kernel representation) approaches adapted to our problem statement. In Section 5, we recall the mosaic Hankel structure and the results on variable projection methods of the corresponding SLRA problem. In Section 6, we present the main results of the paper. In Section 7, we provide numerical experiments that include comparison with the state-of-the-art methods. The methods developed in this paper are implemented in MATLAB and are based on the SLRA package [37] described in [33]. The source code of the methods and experiments is publicly available at <http://github.com/slra/slra>.

2. Main notation and the approximate common divisor problem

2.1. Polynomials with possible roots at infinity

Let $\mathbb{F}[z]$ denote the set of univariate polynomials over the field \mathbb{F} (where \mathbb{F} is \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R}). Let $\mathcal{P}_n \subset \mathbb{F}[z]$ be the set of polynomials of degree at most $n \geq 0$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}_n := \{p_0 + p_1z + \cdots + p_nz^n \mid p_j \in \mathbb{F}\} \subset \mathbb{F}[z]. \quad (1)$$

Then the space \mathcal{P}_n is isomorphic to \mathbb{F}^{n+1} through the correspondence

$$p(z) = p_0 + p_1z + \cdots + p_nz^n \in \mathcal{P}_n \leftrightarrow p = [p_0 \ \cdots \ p_n]^\top \in \mathbb{F}^{n+1}. \quad (2)$$

With some possible abuse of notation, we will use shorthand notation $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

Remark 2.1. *The leading coefficient p_n may be equal to 0. In this case, we will say that the polynomial $p(z)$ has the root ∞ . By multiplicity of the root ∞ we denote the maximal number of consecutive zero leading coefficients. Thus every polynomial in $\mathcal{P}_n \setminus \{0\}$ has exactly n roots in $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ (the Riemannian sphere).*

Example 2.1. *The following polynomial has two simple roots (1 and 2) and a double root ∞ :*

$$0 \cdot z^4 + 0 \cdot z^3 + z^2 - 3z + 2 \in \mathcal{P}_4$$

Remark 2.2. *In this paper, we call the elements of \mathcal{P}_n homogeneous polynomials, since \mathcal{P}_n can be viewed as the space of bivariate homogeneous polynomials.*

2.2. Multiplication and division of homogeneous polynomials

The multiplication of polynomials is defined as $(p^{(1)} \cdot p^{(2)})(z) = p^{(1)}(z)p^{(2)}(z)$ (acting as $\mathcal{P}_{n_1} \times \mathcal{P}_{n_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n_1+n_2}$). It has the following matrix representation:

$$p^{(1)} \cdot p^{(2)} = \mathbf{M}_{n_2}(p^{(1)})p^{(2)} = \mathbf{M}_{n_1}(p^{(2)})p^{(1)},$$

where $p^{(1)} \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1+1}, p^{(2)} \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2+1}$, and $\mathbf{M}_m(h)$ is the multiplication matrix by $h \in \mathcal{P}_d$:

$$\mathbf{M}_m(h) := \begin{bmatrix} h_0 & & & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & & & \\ h_d & & & h_0 & \\ & \ddots & & \vdots & \\ & & & & h_d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}^{(m+d+1) \times (m+1)},$$

which is a rectangular Toeplitz matrix, where the blank triangular parts stand for zeros.

For $0 \leq d \leq n$, we say that a polynomial $h \in \mathcal{P}_d \setminus \{0\}$ divides a polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ (or h is a divisor of p), if there exists a polynomial $q \in \mathcal{P}_{n-d}$ such that $p = q \cdot h$. In particular, this definition includes the following special cases.

- All $h \in \mathcal{P}_d \setminus \{0\}$, $0 \leq d \leq n$, are the divisors of the zero polynomial $0 \in \mathcal{P}_n$.
- A nonzero polynomial of zero degree $h \in \mathcal{P}_0 \setminus \{0\}$ is a divisor of any polynomial.

The notion of divisor in the spaces \mathcal{P}_n differs from the notion of divisors for ordinary polynomials, due to possible presence of the ∞ roots.

Example 2.2. Consider two polynomials

$$p(z) = z^4 - 3z^3 + 2z^2 \in \mathcal{P}_4 \text{ and } h(z) = 0 \cdot z^2 + z - 1 \in \mathcal{P}_2.$$

Although $(z - 1)$ divides of p , the polynomial h does not, because it has the root ∞ .

2.3. N -tuples of polynomials and common divisors

Let $\mathbf{n} = [n_1 \cdots n_N]^\top \in \mathbb{N}^N$ be a vector of fixed degrees, $n_{\min} := \min n_k$, $n := \sum_{k=1}^N n_k$, and denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}} := \mathcal{P}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{P}_{n_N}$ the set of N -tuples of polynomials with these degrees. We also adopt the notation $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)})$, $p^{(k)} \in \mathcal{P}_{n_k}$, for the elements of the N -tuples. With some possible ambiguity of notation (as in (2)), we use the same letter for the N -tuple $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$, and for the stacked vector

$$\mathbf{p} = \text{col}(p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1 + \cdots + n_N + N}.$$

Next, we introduce the operation of multiplication of an N -tuple $\mathbf{g} = (g^{(1)}, \dots, g^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}-d} = \mathcal{P}_{n_1-d} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{P}_{n_N-d}$ by a polynomial $h \in \mathcal{P}_d$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{g} \cdot h := (g^{(1)} \cdot h, \dots, g^{(N)} \cdot h).$$

Definition 2.3. The polynomials $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$ have a common divisor $h \in \mathcal{P}_d \setminus \{0\}$, if h divides all the polynomials $p^{(k)}$. The polynomial h is called a greatest common divisor (GCD) if there are no common divisors in $\mathcal{P}_{d'}$ for any $d' > d$.

Since $1 \in \mathcal{P}_0$ is a divisor of any polynomial, a GCD always exists (but it is not unique). We denote by $\deg \text{gcd } \mathbf{p}$ the degree of GCDs, and denote by $\text{gcd } \mathbf{p}$ the set of all GCD (which is a subset of $\mathcal{P}_{\deg \text{gcd } \mathbf{p}}$). In particular, if all $\mathbf{p} = 0$, then

$$\text{gcd } \mathbf{p} = \mathcal{P}_{n_{\min}} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Otherwise, $\text{gcd } \mathbf{p}$ is a punctured one-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{P}_{\deg \text{gcd } \mathbf{p}}$

$$\text{gcd } \mathbf{p} = \{\alpha h : \alpha \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \{0\}, \quad h \text{ is a GCD of } p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}\}.$$

2.4. The approximate common divisor problem statement

Define the set of N -tuples that have a GCD of degree at least $d \geq 0$ as follows

$$\mathcal{G}_d := \left\{ \hat{\mathbf{p}} = (\hat{p}^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{p}^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}} \mid \deg \text{gcd}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) \geq d \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Finally, assume that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$ is equipped with a distance $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$, which is continuous in the Euclidean topology. We formulate the generalization of Problem 1.2 as follows.

Problem 2.1 (Approximate GCD with bounded degree). Given $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$ and $d : 0 \leq d \leq n_{\min}$, find the distance

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \mathcal{G}_d) := \min_{\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{G}_d} \text{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \hat{\mathbf{p}}). \quad (4)$$

Note that Problem 2.1 well-posed, since the set \mathcal{G}_d is closed in the Euclidean topology, by Lemma Appendix A.1 (see Appendix A).

Remark 2.4. The set \mathcal{G}_d is closed, in particular, thanks to the fact that we use homogeneous polynomials and to the special definition of the GCD in Section 2.3.

2.5. Weighted norm, missing and fixed values

In this paper, we use the following distance:

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) := \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_{\mathbf{w}}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^N \|p^{(k)} - q^{(k)}\|_{w^{(k)}}^2, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{w} = (w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(N)})$ is a tuple of weight vectors $w^{(k)} \in [0, +\infty]^{n_k+1}$, and

$$\|p\|_{\mathbf{w}}^2 := \sum_{j=0}^n w_j p_j \bar{p}_j, \quad (6)$$

is the weighted extended semi-norm on $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$ (see also [33]). If $w_j \in (0, \infty)$, then $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{w}}^2$ is a standard weighted ℓ_2 -norm. The 0 and ∞ weights have a special meaning:

- We formally assume $0 \cdot \infty = 0$ in (6) and require the distance to be finite in (4). Hence, a weight $w_j^{(k)} = \infty$ is equivalent to an equality constraint $p_j^{(k)} = \hat{p}_j^{(k)}$. For example, monicity constraints can be imposed using ∞ weights.
- If a weight $w_j^{(k)} = 0$ is present, the solution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ does not depend on $p_j^{(k)}$. Hence, we may assume that the coefficient is undefined (the case of missing data [38]).

3. Image representation and variable projection

3.1. Image representation

In this approach, the set \mathcal{G}_d is replaced by the set (of candidate factorizations)

$$\mathcal{F}_d := \left\{ (g^{(1)}h, \dots, g^{(N)}h) \mid (g^{(1)}, \dots, g^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}-d}, h \in \mathcal{P}_d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where h is a candidate common divisor, and $g^{(k)}$ are candidate quotient polynomials.

We refer to (7) as *image representation*, since \mathcal{F}_d is the image of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}-d} \times (\mathcal{P}_d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}, \\ (\hat{\mathbf{g}}, \hat{h}) &\mapsto \hat{\mathbf{g}} \cdot \hat{h}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. For complex polynomials, the sets \mathcal{G}_d and \mathcal{F}_d coincide. But for real polynomials we have $\mathcal{F}_d \subseteq \mathcal{G}_d$, and the equality is not always satisfied. The precise relation between \mathcal{G}_d and \mathcal{F}_d is given in Lemma [Appendix A.1](#) in [Appendix A](#).

Then an analogue of Problem 2.1 is formulated as follows.

Problem 3.1. Given \mathbf{p} , find \hat{h} and $\hat{\mathbf{g}} = (g^{(1)}, \dots, g^{(N)})$ that are solutions to

$$\underset{\hat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}-d}, \hat{h} \in \mathcal{P}_d}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|\hat{\mathbf{g}} \cdot \hat{h} - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbf{w}}^2. \quad (8)$$

Remark 3.2. We include the zero polynomial \hat{h} in the search space of (8) (compared to the definition in (7)), since the zero tuple $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$ belongs to \mathcal{F}_d by definition.

Remark 3.3. By Remark 3.1, Problems 2.1 and 3.1 are not equivalent.

3.2. Variable projection methods

Denote the cost function in (8) as

$$f(\widehat{h}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}) = \|\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \cdot \widehat{h} - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbf{w}}^2. \quad (9)$$

The cost function (9) is a nonlinear least squares problem, for which the variable projection principle [17] (based on elimination of variables) can be applied.

The variable projection principle [17] is based on the fact that for one fixed variable (either \widehat{h} or $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}$), minimization of (9) is a linear least squares problem and has a closed form solution. This principle is further explained on each of the examples.

Example 3.1 (Variable projection with respect to a common divisor). *In this case, the problem (3.1) is rewritten as the following double minimization problem*

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\widehat{h} \in \mathcal{P}_d \setminus \{0\}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f_1(\widehat{h}), \quad \text{where} & (10) \\ & f_1(\widehat{h}) := \min_{\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-d}} f(\widehat{h}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}). \end{aligned}$$

We note that computing $f_1(\widehat{h})$ can be rewritten as a linear least squares problem,

$$f_1(\widehat{h}) = \min_{\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-d}} \sum_{k=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_{n_k-d}(\widehat{h})\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{(k)} - p^{(k)}\|_{w^{(k)}}^2,$$

which has a closed form solution (see [Appendix C](#)). Thus in (10) $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}$ is eliminated.

Example 3.2 (Variable projection with respect to quotient polynomials). *In this case, the problem (3.1) is rewritten as the following double minimization problem*

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-d} \setminus \{0\}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f_2(\widehat{\mathbf{g}}), \quad \text{where} & (11) \\ & f_2(\widehat{\mathbf{g}}) := \min_{\widehat{h} \in \mathcal{P}_d} f(\widehat{h}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}). \end{aligned}$$

As in [Example 3.1](#), the function f_2 has the form

$$f_2(\widehat{\mathbf{g}}) = \min_{\widehat{h} \in \mathcal{P}_d} \sum_{k=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_d(\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{(k)})\widehat{h} - p^{(k)}\|_{w^{(k)}}^2, \quad (12)$$

thus the variable \widehat{h} is eliminated from the problem (11).

Remark 3.4 (On algorithms). *After eliminated of variables, for the reduced cost function ($f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) we can apply conventional smooth optimization methods, such as:*

- gradient-based methods, which require evaluation of the cost function $f(x)$ and its gradient $\nabla f(x)$ (including quasi-Newton methods, for example, BFGS [39]);

- if the cost function can be represented as a sum of squares, i.e.,

$$f(x) = \|g(x)\|_2^2,$$

where $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, the Gauss-Newton/Levenberg-Marquardt methods can be applied, which require evaluation of the vector function $g(x)$ and its Jacobian $J_g(x)$ at each iteration. In the context of nonlinear least squares problems, the Levenberg-Marquardt method has shown to be particularly effective, especially when combined with the variable projection [17, 40].

The choice of the type of the variable projection depends on a particular problem and its dimensions. For example, the variable projection with respect to \hat{h} (Example 3.1) is reasonable when the degree of the common divisor is small, see [18, 11, 12, 8, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23]. For real polynomials and uniform weights, in [16] it was shown that $f_1(\hat{h})$ and its gradient can be evaluated in $O(dn)$ flops.

Variable projection with respect to \hat{g} is less common (used in framework of Common Factor Estimation [19, 1]). But, in fact, the inner minimization problem (12) is well-known in the AGCD literature: it is exactly the so-called least squares division (see, for example, [15]).

4. Structured low-rank approximation approaches

In this section, we recall the structured low-rank approximation problem, and review the most popular parameterizations of the problem (4), adapted to our case.

4.1. SLRA problem

The structured low-rank approximation problem is formulated as follows [38]. An *affine matrix structure* is an affine map from the *structure parameter space* \mathbb{F}^{n_p} to the space of matrices $\mathbb{F}^{K \times L}$ (where \mathbb{F} is \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C}), defined by

$$\mathcal{S}(p) = S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} p_i S_i, \quad S_i \in \mathbb{F}^{K \times L}. \quad (13)$$

Problem 4.1 (Structured low-rank approximation). *Given an affine structure \mathcal{S} , data vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$, and natural number $r < \min(K, L)$*

$$\underset{\hat{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|p - \hat{p}\|_w \quad \text{subject to} \quad \text{rank } \mathcal{S}(\hat{p}) \leq r, \quad (\text{SLRA})$$

where $\|\cdot\|_w$ is the weighted extended seminorm, see Section 2.5.

Thus if they are able to represent the set \mathcal{G}_d through the set of low-rank matrices, then Problem 1.2 can be reformulated as Problem 4.1. The classic theorem of Sylvester provides this correspondence for two polynomials.

Theorem 4.1 (Sylvester). *Two homogeneous polynomials $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $q \in \mathcal{P}_m$ have a non-trivial common divisor if and only if the matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{n_1-1}(p^{(2)}) & \mathbf{M}_{n_2-1}(p^{(1)}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (14)$$

is rank deficient. The rank defect of the matrix is equal to the degree of the GCD.

There exists a generalization of Theorem 4.1, for so-called subresultant matrices.

4.2. Generalized Sylvester subresultant matrix

For several polynomials (a tuple $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$), the following matrix is typically considered (called generalized Sylvester subresultant matrix) [9, 25].

$$\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{n_1-d}(p^{(2)}) & -\mathbf{M}_{n_2-d}(p^{(1)}) & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ \mathbf{M}_{n_1-d}(p^{(N)}) & 0 & 0 & -\mathbf{M}_{n_N-d}(p^{(1)}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{M}_k(p)$ is defined in Section 2.2. The matrix $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$ has K rows and L columns:

$$K = (N-1)(n_1-d+1) + \sum_{k=2}^N n_k, \quad L = \sum_{k=1}^N (n_k-d+1), \quad K \geq L. \quad (16)$$

The matrix (15) is called the *generalized Sylvester subresultant matrix*.

Example 4.1. For $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, p^{(3)})$, the matrix $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$ has the form

$$\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{n_1-d}(p^{(2)}) & -\mathbf{M}_{n_2-d}(p^{(1)}) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_{n_1-d}(p^{(3)}) & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{M}_{n_3-d}(p^{(1)}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

It can be shown that the following lemma holds true.

Lemma 4.2. For $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$, $p^{(1)} \neq \mathbf{0}$, we have that

$$\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{G}_d \iff \text{rank } \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}) \leq L-1,$$

or, equivalently $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$ has rank deficiency at least 1.

Proof. The proof is given in [Appendix B](#). □

Remark 4.3. The following equality of sets holds true:

$$\{\mathbf{p} : \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}) \text{ is rank deficient, } p^{(1)} \neq \mathbf{0}\} = \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{G}_p : p^{(1)} \neq \mathbf{0}\}.$$

But, the set of N -tuples \mathbf{p} with rank-deficient subresultant matrix

$$\{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}} : \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}) \text{ is rank deficient}\}, \quad (17)$$

does not coincide with \mathcal{G}_d , in view of our definition of GCD. Indeed, if $p^{(1)} = \mathbf{0}$ then the matrix $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$ becomes automatically rank-deficient.

4.3. Full Sylvester subresultant matrix

By Remark 4.3, if the solution of SLRA f has $\widehat{p}^{(1)} = \mathbf{0}$, then it does not give a desired solution to Problem 2.1. In order to handle properly this non-generic case, we can use an alternative structure, which can be constructed recursively from subresultants.

For an N -tuple $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$, define

$$\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p}) := \begin{cases} \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}) \\ \mathbf{0} \quad \mathcal{S}_d((p^{(2)}, \dots, p^{(N)})) \end{array} \right], & \text{if } N > 2, \\ \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}), & \text{if } N = 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$ is defined in (15), and the number of columns of the zero block is $n_1 - d + 1$. Thus $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$ has $K^{(full)}$ rows and L columns, where L is as in (16) and

$$K^{(full)} = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=k+1}^N (n_k + n_l - d + 1).$$

Example 4.2 (Example 4.1, continued). For $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, p^{(3)})$, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{n_1-d}(p^{(2)}) & -\mathbf{M}_{n_2-d}(p^{(1)}) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_{n_1-d}(p^{(3)}) & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{M}_{n_3-d}(p^{(1)}) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{M}_{n_2-d}(p^{(3)}) & -\mathbf{M}_{n_3-d}(p^{(2)}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Remark 4.4. Compared with the matrix $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$ (which has $N - 1$ block rows), the matrix $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$ has $\binom{N}{2}$ block rows, i.e., all possible pairs of the polynomials are present. The structure of $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$ is similar to the structure of Young flattening of tensors [41, §3.8], and probably has a similar algebraic description.

Next, we show that SLRA of $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$ is equivalent to Problem 2.1.

Proposition 4.5. For $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$, we have that

$$\deg \gcd \mathbf{p} \geq d \iff \mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p}) \text{ is rank-deficient.} \quad (18)$$

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix B. \square

Apart from the precise correspondence between the approximation problems (proved in Proposition 4.5), the structure $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$ can be used to construct initial approximation in the optimization methods (see Section 4.5). As shown in the following lemma, the quotient polynomials can be obtained from the kernel of $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$.

Lemma 4.6. If $\deg \gcd(\mathbf{p}) = d$ and $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, for $\mathbf{u} = (u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}-d} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, then $p^{(k)} = u^{(k)}h$, where $h \in \gcd(\mathbf{p})$.

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix B. \square

4.4. Extended Sylvester matrix

Yet another elegant extension of the Sylvester matrix was proposed in [26]. The *extended Sylvester matrix*, [26, (2.2b)] for a parameter $L' \geq \max_k n_k$, defined as

$$S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p}) = [\mathbf{M}_{L'-n_1-1}(p^{(1)}) \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{M}_{L'-n_N-1}(p^{(1)})]^\top. \quad (19)$$

The number of rows $K' = \sum_{k=1}^N (L' - n_k)$ does not exceed the number of columns L' .

For the structure (19), the following theorem holds true.

Theorem 4.7 ([26, Thm. 1]). For $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}}$ and $L' \geq \max_k n_k$,

$$\text{rank } S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p}) = L' - \deg \gcd \hat{\mathbf{p}}.$$

The proof of Theorem 4.7 (which can be found in [26, Thm. 1]) is based on the following fact on the right kernel of $S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p})$ (an analogue of Lemma 4.6).

Remark 4.8. *Suppose (for simplicity) that the polynomial $h = \gcd \mathbf{p}$ has d simple roots (excluding ∞). From (19), it follows that for the roots λ of h , the vector*

$$[1 \quad \lambda \quad \dots \quad \lambda^{L'-1}]^\top, \quad (20)$$

is in the right kernel of $S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p})$. It can be shown that the vectors in the right kernel are linear combinations of the vectors of the form (20), thus the rank defect of $S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p})$ is d .

Hence, the Problem 2.1 is equivalent to structured low-rank approximation of the matrix $S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p})$, and can be solved as an SLRA problem.

Remark 4.9. *Note that the methods [26, 42] (matrix pencil methodologies) do not solve the structured low-rank approximation problem. Instead, they are based on unstructured relaxations of the problem (using singular value decomposition).*

4.5. Initial approximations for the direct parameterization methods

The formulation (SLRA) also provides a heuristic to obtain an initial guess for \hat{h} and/or $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ for the optimization methods in image or kernel representation (from Section 3). The common heuristic consists in replacing the SLRA problem by unstructured low-rank approximation of a structured matrix $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{p})$. The unstructured low-rank approximation can be computed, for example, using the SVD.

The first option is to use Lemma 4.6, and use an approximate solution of $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{u} \approx 0$. Such a solution obtained by unstructured low-rank approximation will be denoted $\mathbf{u}_{LRA} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-d}$. We may assume that \mathbf{u}_{LRA} give an approximation of quotient polynomials (due to the fact that the condition $\deg \gcd(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) = d$ represents generic points in \mathcal{G}_n). Then an initial approximation of \hat{h} , can be found by finding the minimizer of (12). Let us summarize this option in the following algorithm.

Algorithm 4.1. *Input: N -tuple $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $d \geq 0$. Output: initial approximation $\hat{h}_0(z)$.*

- Compute \mathbf{u}_{LRA} — last right singular vector of $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$ (or $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$);
- Set $\hat{h}_0 = \arg \min_{\hat{h} \in \mathcal{P}_d} \sum_{k=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_d(\hat{u}^{(k)})\hat{h} - p^{(k)}\|_w^2$.

Remark 4.10. *In Algorithm 4.1, it may be preferable to use $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$, because it contains each polynomial $p^{(k)}$ the same number of times.*

Another option is to use the approximate kernel of the structure (19), described in Remark 4.8, and compute the initial approximation \hat{h}_0 using the matrix pencil approach (modified matrix pencil method of [42]). In this case, the algorithm is as follows.

Algorithm 4.2. *Input: N -tuple $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $\hat{d} \geq 0$. Output: initial approximation $\hat{h}_0(z)$.*

- Construct the extended Sylvester matrix $S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p})$ defined in (19).

- Compute the SVD $S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p}) = U\Sigma V^*$, and define by $P \in \mathbb{R}^{L' \times d}$ the matrix composed of the last d columns of V .
- Define $\hat{Z} = \arg \min_{Z \in \mathbb{F}^{d \times d}} \|P_{1:L'-1,:} Z - P_{2:L',:}\|_F$.
- Set $\hat{h}_0(z) = \det(Z - zI)$ (computed using the eigenvalue decomposition of Z).

5. Mosaic Hankel low-rank approximation

In this section, we recall the definition of mosaic-Hankel matrices and results on mosaic Hankel SLRA [36]. Note that compared with [36], we use transposed matrices.

5.1. Mosaic Hankel matrices

Let $\mathcal{H}_{k,l}(c) \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times l}$ denote a Hankel matrix, generated from $c \in \mathbb{F}^{k+l-1}$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{H}_{k,l}(c) = \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & c_2 & \cdots & c_l \\ c_2 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_k & \cdots & \cdots & c_{k+l-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For two vectors $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^M$, $\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{N}^T$, vectors $c^{(i,j)} \in \mathbb{F}^{k_i+l_j-1}$, and the combined vector

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c} &= \text{col}(c^{(1,1)}, \dots, c^{(1,T)}, \dots, c^{(M,1)}, \dots, c^{(M,T)}) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_p}, \\ n_p &:= \sum_{i,j=1}^{M,T} (k_i + l_j - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

we define the *mosaic Hankel matrix* [36]:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}(\mathbf{c}) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{k_1,l_1}(c^{(1,1)}) & \cdots & \mathcal{H}_{k_1,l_T}(c^{(1,T)}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{H}_{k_M,l_1}(c^{(M,1)}) & \cdots & \mathcal{H}_{k_M,l_T}(c^{(M,T)}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}^{K \times L}. \quad (22)$$

5.2. Structured low-rank approximation and variable projection

We consider the problem (SLRA) for the real-valued structure (22) (i.e., $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$). We assume that $w \in (0; +\infty]^{n_p}$, $K \geq L$, and denote by $t := L - r$ the rank defect.

Then, following the variable projection approach, as described in [36], the problem (SLRA) can be rewritten as a bi-level optimization problem:

$$\underset{P \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times t}, \text{rank } P=t}{\text{minimize}} \quad f_*^{(LN)}(P), \quad \text{where} \quad (23)$$

$$f_*^{(LN)}(P) := \left(\min_{\hat{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}} \|c - \hat{c}\|_w^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}(\hat{c})P = 0 \right). \quad (24)$$

The problem (24) is a linear least norm problem, and has a closed form solution. Define $\widehat{c}^*(P)$ the optimal solution of (24), and

$$g_*^{(LN)}(P) := \text{diag}(\sqrt{w})(c - \widehat{c}_*(P)), \quad (25)$$

such that $f_*^{(LN)}(P) = \|g_*^{(LN)}(P)\|_2^2$. Then the following result holds true.

Theorem 5.1 ([36, Thm. 1-3]). *The complexity (in flops) of the evaluation of $f_*^{(LN)}(P)$, $\nabla f_*^{(LN)}(P)$, $g_*^{(LN)}(P)$ and the Jacobian of $g_*^{(LN)}(P)$ with respect to P is $O(t^3 L^2 K)$.*

Remark 5.2. *The complexity bound are lower for certain cases (evaluation of $f_*^{(LN)}(P)$, $\nabla f_*^{(LN)}(P)$ in the case of uniform weights), but we stick to the bound in Theorem 5.1, since it gives complexity for the Gauss-Newton/Levenberg-Marquardt step.*

Remark 5.3. *In (24), the elements of $g_*^{(LN)}(P)$ corresponding to the infinite weights are equal to 0, due to equality constraints for elements \widehat{c}_* and c (see also Section 2.5).*

6. Main results

In this section, we provide the main results of the paper on the connections between the ACD problem and mosaic-Hankel low-rank approximation.

6.1. Generalized Sylvester LRA as mosaic Hankel LRA

First, we consider the matrix $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$ and show how it can be represented in the form $\mathcal{H}_{k,1}(\mathbf{p})\Phi$, where Φ is full row rank matrix, and $\mathcal{H}_{k,1}(\mathbf{p})$ is a mosaic Hankel matrix. Thus SLRA for this structure can be solved with the methods of [33].

Denote K, L as in (16), $\ell_k := n_k - d$, $\ell_0 := K - n_1 - 1$, and

$$q^{(1)} := \text{col}(\mathbf{0}_{\ell_0}, p^{(1)}, \mathbf{0}_{\ell_0}), \quad q^{(2)} := \text{col}(\mathbf{0}_{\ell_1}, p^{(2)}, \mathbf{0}_{\ell_1}, p^{(3)}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{\ell_1}, p^{(N)}, \mathbf{0}_{\ell_1}),$$

where $\mathbf{0}_n$ denotes the vector of zeros of length n .

Proposition 6.1. *The generalized Sylvester subresultant matrix (15) can be represented as the following mosaic Hankel matrix:*

$$\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{H}_{K,1}(\text{col}(q^{(1)}, q^{(2)}))\Phi, \quad (26)$$

where $\mathbf{1} := [\ell_0 + 1 \quad \ell_1 + 1]^\top$ and

$$\Phi := \text{blkdiag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} -I_{\ell_N+1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_1 \times (\ell_N+1)} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} -I_{\ell_3+1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_1 \times (\ell_3+1)} \end{bmatrix}, -I_{\ell_2+1}, I_{\ell_1+1} \right) J_L.$$

Proof. For $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and ℓ we have

$$\mathbf{M}_m(p) = \mathcal{H}_{\ell+n+1, \ell+1}(\text{col}(\mathbf{0}_\ell, p, \mathbf{0}_\ell)) J_{\ell+1}.$$

If we denote $H^{(i,j)} := \mathcal{H}_{\ell_i+n_j+1, \ell_i+1}(\text{col}(\mathbf{0}_{\ell_i}, p^{(j)}, \mathbf{0}_{\ell_i}))$, then we have that

$$\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & 0 & -H^{(2,1)} & H^{(1,2)} \\ \mathbf{0} & \ddots & 0 & \vdots \\ -H^{(N,1)} & \mathbf{0} & 0 & H^{(1,N)} \end{bmatrix} J = \mathcal{H}_{K,1}(\text{col}(q^{(1)}, q^{(2)})) \Phi,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 6.2. *The problem (SLRA) for the matrix (15) can be solved as a weighted mosaic low-rank approximation of the matrix in (26), if we fix the zero elements. This can be accomplished by taking the following weight vector:*

$$w = \text{col}(\infty \mathbf{1}_{\ell_0}, w^{(1)}, \infty \mathbf{1}_{\ell_0}, \infty \mathbf{1}_{\ell_1}, w^{(2)}, \infty \mathbf{1}_{\ell_1}, w^{(3)}, \dots, \infty \mathbf{1}_{\ell_1}, w^{(N)}, \infty \mathbf{1}_{\ell_1}),$$

where $\mathbf{1}_n$ denotes the vector of ones of length n . We note that the case of infinite weights can be handled by the methods of [33].

Corollary 6.3. *The complexity of the Gauss-Newton/Levenberg-Marquardt step for the structure (26) (using the methods of [33]) is $O(K(K-d+1)^2)$.*

Remark 6.4. *As in Proposition 6.1, the structure (19) can be represented as a mosaic Hankel structure. We do not consider this representation here, because SLRA of $S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p})$ presents a difficulty for optimization methods based on kernel representation of the rank constraint [33], due to the nonlinear structure of the right kernel of a rank deficient $S'_{L'}(\hat{\mathbf{p}})$ (as shown in Remark 4.8). Recently [32], new methods were proposed for structured low-rank approximation of $S'_{L'}(\mathbf{p})$, but the method [32] has cubic computational complexity and is not efficient for large problems.*

6.2. Mosaic Hankel matrices and least-squares problems with multiplication matrices

In this section, we establish relations between the variable projection for the problem (8) and variable projection for mosaic-Hankel low-rank approximation.

Given $P \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times t}$, an integer vector $\mathbf{k} = [k_1 \ \dots \ k_T]^\top \in \mathbb{N}^T$ (we also denote $L = \sum_{j=1}^T l_j$), and for $k \geq 1$, we define the matrix-polynomial multiplication matrix:

$$\mathcal{A}_{k, \mathbf{l}}(P) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{k-1}(P^{(1,1)}) & \dots & \mathbf{M}_{k-1}(P^{(1,t)}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathbf{M}_{k-1}(P^{(T,1)}) & \dots & \mathbf{M}_{k-1}(P^{(T,t)}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

where $P^{(i,j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times 1}$ are the following sub-matrices of the matrix P :

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P^{(1,1)} & \dots & P^{(1,t)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ P^{(T,1)} & \dots & P^{(T,t)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

For two integer vectors \mathbf{l} and $\mathbf{k} = [k_1 \ \dots \ k_M]^\top$, we define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}}(P) := \text{blkdiag}(\mathcal{A}_{k_1, \mathbf{l}}(P), \dots, \mathcal{A}_{k_M, \mathbf{l}}(P)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times (Kt)}.$$

where n_p is defined in (21), and $K = \sum_{j=1}^M k_j$. Next, consider a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$, and a weight vector $v \in [0; +\infty)^{n_p}$. Then the following proposition takes place.

Proposition 6.5. *For $w := v^{-1}$ and $c := \text{diag}(v)b$, the solutions of the the minimization problem (24) and the problem*

$$f_*^{(LS)}(P) := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^K} \|\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}}(P)x - b\|_v^2, \quad (29)$$

are related through the following correspondence:

$$f_*^{(LS)}(P) = \|b\|_v^2 - f_*^{(LN)}(P). \quad (30)$$

Moreover, for the function

$$g_*^{(LS)}(P) := \text{diag} \sqrt{v}(b - \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}}(P)x_*), \quad (31)$$

where x_* is the minimizer of (29), it holds that

$$g_*^{(LS)}(P) = \text{diag} \sqrt{v}b - g_*^{(LN)}(P), \quad (32)$$

where $g_*^{(LN)}$ is defined in (25). Also, $f_*^{(LS)}(P) = \|g_*^{(LS)}(P)\|_2^2$.

Proof. From [36, Sec.3]), we have that the following equality takes place:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}}^\top(P)c = 0 \iff \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}}(c)P = 0. \quad (33)$$

The rest follows from the correspondence between linear least squares and linear least norm problems presented in Appendix C. \square

Proposition allows us to apply the results from [36] for the complexity of the Levenberg-Marquardt/Gauss-Newton step in Remark 3.4. (In this case, the function $g_*^{(LS)}$ from (C.2) can be taken as the function g in Remark 3.4.)

Corollary 6.6. *The complexity (in flops) of the evaluation of $f_*^{(LS)}(P)$, $\nabla f_*^{(LS)}(P)$, $g_*^{(LS)}(P)$ and the Jacobian of $g_*^{(LS)}(P)$ with respect to P is $O(t^3 L^2 K)$.*

6.3. Variable projection for real-valued polynomials

In this subsection, we consider the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ and the methods presented in Section 3.2. We denote by $n = \sum_k n_k$ the sum of all degrees of the polynomials.

First, we consider variable projection with respect to common divisors (Example 3.1). In this case, the cost function can be expressed as the cost function (29)

$$f_1(\hat{h}) = f_*^{(LS)}(P),$$

if we put $P = \hat{h}$, $x = \mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{l} = [d + 1]$, $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{n} - d$ and $v = \mathbf{w}$. Indeed, in this case,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}}(P) = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{M}_{n_1-d}(\hat{h}), \dots, \mathbf{M}_{n_N-d}(\hat{h})).$$

Corollary 6.7. *The function f_1 , its gradient, the vector $g_*^{(LS)}(P)$ from (31), and its Jacobian can be evaluated in $O(d^2n)$ flops.*

Thus the variable projection with respect to \hat{h} is especially beneficial if $d \ll n_k$.

Remark 6.8. *Note that for uniform weights (when $w^{(k)} = \text{const}$ in (5)), the complexity is $O(dn)$ (which corresponds to the results of [12, 16]).*

Remark 6.9. *The cost function f_1 is invariant to multiplication by a scalar; i.e. $f_1(\alpha\hat{h}) = f_1(\hat{h})$ for any $\alpha \neq 0$, since the columns of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k},1}(\hat{h})$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k},1}(\alpha\hat{h})$ span the same subspace. Therefore, (10) is a minimization on the projective space (which is a special case of minimization the Grassmann manifold [40]).*

Moreover, due to correspondence (30), the minimization problem (10) has a similar structure to (23). This fact is exploited in the software package [33].

Now let us consider variable projection with respect to \mathbf{g} (Example 3.2). In this case, the cost function can be expressed as

$$f_2(\hat{\mathbf{g}}) = f_*^{(LS)}(P),$$

where $P = \hat{\mathbf{g}}$, $\mathbf{k} = [d + 1]$ and $\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{n} - d$ and $v = \mathbf{w}$.

Corollary 6.10. *The function f_2 , its gradient, the vector $g_*^{(LS)}(P)$ from (31), and its Jacobian can be evaluated in $O((n - Nd)^2n)$.*

The variable projection with respect to \mathbf{g} is beneficial if $(n_k - d) \ll n$ (i.e., where the degrees of the quotients are fixed and small). In this case, the complexity is linear in the degrees of the polynomials.

Remark 6.11. *For $N > 2$, the complexity in Corollary 6.10 is smaller than in the case of the kernel representation approach (using generalized Sylvester subresultant matrices), where the complexity never approaches the linear rate, see the Corollary 6.3.*

Remark 6.12. *The cost function, as in Remark 6.9 is invariant with respect to scaling, i.e., $f_2(\alpha\hat{\mathbf{g}}) = f_2(\hat{\mathbf{g}})$ for $\alpha \neq 0$, since the columns of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k},1}(\hat{\mathbf{g}})$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k},1}(\alpha\hat{\mathbf{g}})$ span the same subspace. Therefore, problem (11) has similar structure to problem (23), which can be solved by the software package [33].*

6.4. Variable projection for complex-valued polynomials

Now assume that the polynomials in (8) are complex. (In this section, we only consider variable projection w.r.t. \hat{h} .) Then the polynomials can be represented as

$$p^{(k)} = p^{(\mathcal{R},k)} + i \cdot p^{(\mathcal{I},k)}, \quad \hat{h} = \hat{h}^{\mathcal{R}} + i \cdot \hat{h}^{\mathcal{I}}, \quad g^{(k)} = g^{(\mathcal{R},k)} + i \cdot g^{(\mathcal{I},k)},$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$. If we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}^{(\mathbb{R})} &= \text{col} \left(p^{(\mathcal{R},1)}, p^{(\mathcal{I},1)}, \dots, p^{(\mathcal{R},N)}, p^{(\mathcal{I},N)} \right), \\ \mathbf{g}^{(\mathbb{R})} &= \text{col} \left(g^{(\mathcal{R},1)}, g^{(\mathcal{I},1)}, \dots, g^{(\mathcal{R},N)}, g^{(\mathcal{I},N)} \right), \\ \mathbf{w}^{(\mathbb{R})} &= \text{col} \left(w^{(1)}, w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(N)}, w^{(N)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$P(\hat{h}) := \begin{bmatrix} \hat{h}^{\mathcal{R}} & -\hat{h}^{\mathcal{I}} \\ \hat{h}^{\mathcal{I}} & \hat{h}^{\mathcal{R}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times 2}.$$

Then we have that the problem (8) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\hat{h}, \hat{\mathbf{g}}} \|\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{k},1}(P(\hat{h}))\mathbf{P}^{(\mathbb{R})} - \mathbf{g}^{(\mathbb{R})}\|_{\mathbf{w}^{(\mathbb{R})}}^2, \quad (34)$$

for $\mathbf{l} = [d+1 \quad d+1]^\top$, $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{n} - d$, $v = \mathbf{w}$. Then (34) can be rewritten as

$$\text{minimize}_{\hat{h} \in \mathcal{P}_d \setminus \{0\}} f_3(P(\hat{h})), \quad \text{where} \quad (35)$$

$$f_3(P(\hat{h})) := \text{minimum of (34) for fixed } P(\hat{h}) = f_*^{(LS)}(P(\hat{h})). \quad (36)$$

It can be seen that $f_3(P(\hat{h})) = f_3(P(\alpha\hat{h}))$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore, f_3 can be minimized on the complex projective plane. Another option is to use parameterization

$$\text{vec}\left((P(\hat{h}))^\top\right) = \begin{bmatrix} A & -B \\ B & A \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{h}^{\mathcal{R}} \\ \hat{h}^{\mathcal{I}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad A := I_{d+1} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B := I_{d+1} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which is supported in the package [33], and we use it in numerical experiments.

6.5. Accuracy of the computations

As shown in [36], the key step in evaluation of (30), (32) and their derivatives is the solution of a system of equations $\Gamma u = v$, where Γ is defined in [36]. From Proposition 6.5, we have that

$$\Gamma(P) = \text{blkdiag}\left(\Gamma^{(k_1)}(P), \dots, \Gamma^{(k_M)}(P)\right),$$

where $\Gamma^{(k)}(P) := \mathcal{A}_{k,1}^\top(P) \text{diag } v \mathcal{A}_{k,1}(P)$. In the software [37], the system $\Gamma u = v$ is solved block by block, using Cholesky factorization. The accuracy of solving the subsystems $\Gamma^{(k)}(P)u = v$ mainly depends on the condition number of $\Gamma^{(k)}$ [43].

Remark 6.13. *Although in this paper we use Cholesky factorisation, the QR factorisation (for example, using the updating strategy of [15]) may be used to avoid squaring the condition number.*

In what follows, for simplicity, we consider the case of 2-norm ($v \equiv 1$). (In fact, the case of blockwise weighted 2-norm is similar [36].) In this case, the matrix $\Gamma^{(k)}(P)$ is block-Toeplitz, and behaviour of its eigenvalues depends on its *symbol* [44]

$$F(z) = P^*(z)P(z), \quad (37)$$

where $P(z)$ is the matrix polynomial

$$P(z) := \begin{bmatrix} P^{(1,1)}(z) & \dots & P^{(1,t)}(z) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ P^{(K,1)}(z) & \dots & P^{(K,t)}(z) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $P^{(i,j)}(z)$ are the generating functions of the vectors $P^{(i,j)}$ in (28). Since $F(z)$ is Hermitian for all z , and is continuous on the unit circle \mathbb{T} , we can define

$$a_F := \min_{\mathbb{T}} \lambda_{\min}(F(z)) \geq 0, \quad b_F := \max_{\mathbb{T}} \lambda_{\max}(F(z)) < \infty.$$

Where $\lambda_{\min}(B)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(B)$ are the minimal and maximal eigenvalues of a matrix B . The results of [44] imply that $\lambda_{\min}(\Gamma^{(k)}) \searrow a_F$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\Gamma^{(k)}) \nearrow b_F$, i.e. the eigenvalues are in the interval $[a_F; b_F]$ and converge to the endpoints as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the condition number $\kappa_2(\Gamma^{(k)}) := \lambda_{\max}(\Gamma^{(k)})/\lambda_{\min}(\Gamma^{(k)})$ behaves as

$$\kappa_2(\Gamma^{(k)}) \nearrow \frac{b_F}{a_F}. \quad (38)$$

If $F(z)$ is positive definite on \mathbb{T} , then $\kappa_2(\Gamma^{(k)}) \leq b_F/a_F < \infty$. Otherwise, $\kappa_2(\Gamma^{(k)}) \rightarrow \infty$ (results on the rate of convergence are known). See [36, §6.2] for more details.

Example 6.1. In the real-valued case (see Section 6.3), for variable projection with respect to \hat{h} (see Example 3.1), easy calculations show that (37) becomes

$$F(z) = |\hat{h}(z)|^2, \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{T},$$

and

$$a_F = \min_{z \in \mathbb{T}} |\hat{h}(z)|^2, \quad b_F = \max_{z \in \mathbb{T}} |\hat{h}(z)|^2. \quad (39)$$

From (38), we conclude that the computations are well-conditioned if the tentative common divisor \hat{h} (during optimisation) does not have roots on the unit circle. If it has roots on the unit circle, the computations may become ill-conditioned.

The results in Example 6.1 are in agreement with the similar analysis of conditioning of $\Gamma^{(k)}$, performed in [12]. Easy calculations show that (38) with (39) are valid also for complex polynomials (see Section 6.4)).

Example 6.2. In the real-valued case (see Section 6.3), for variable projection with respect to \hat{g} (see Example 3.2), (37) becomes

$$F(z) = \sum_{j=1}^N |\hat{g}^{(j)}(z)|^2, \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{T},$$

and

$$a_F = \min_{z \in \mathbb{T}} F(z), \quad b_F = \max_{z \in \mathbb{T}} F(z).$$

Thus the computations in this case may become ill conditioned if all the tentative quotient polynomials $\hat{g}^{(j)}(z)$ have common roots on the unit circle, which is less likely.

6.6. Angles between polynomials as an approximation criterion

Finally, the variable projection principle helps us to understand the importance of the relative distance, which was used by many authors, see for example the discussion in [10, §4]. Define two distances between tuples of polynomials

$$\text{dist}_{\sin}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) := \sum_{k=1}^N \sin^2(\angle(p^{(k)}, q^{(k)})). \quad (40)$$

and

$$\text{dist}_{nrm}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) := \frac{\|p^{(k)} - q^{(k)}\|_2^2}{\|p^{(k)}\|_2^2}. \quad (41)$$

The distance (40) does not depend on the scaling of coefficients of $p^{(k)}$ and $q^{(k)}$ and depends only on the roots of the polynomials. But, the distance dist_{sin} may be difficult to minimize as is. However, the normalized distance (41) is just a special case of the weighted 2-norm, but depends on scaling of the polynomials.

In what follows, we prove that the solutions of the problem (8) coincide for the two distances. The proof is quite simple, but we could not find it in the AGCD literature.

Proposition 6.14. *For any tuple of polynomials \mathbf{p} and for any d we have that*

$$\min_{\substack{\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-d}, \\ \widehat{h} \in \mathcal{P}_d}} \text{dist}_{nrm}(\mathbf{p}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}} \cdot \widehat{h}) = \min_{\substack{\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-d}, \\ \widehat{h} \in \mathcal{P}_d}} \text{dist}_{sin}(\mathbf{p}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}} \cdot \widehat{h}).$$

Proof. Consider minimization of (40). By applying the variable projection principle, the problem becomes

$$f_4(\widehat{h}) := \min_{\widehat{\mathbf{g}}} \sum_{k=1}^N \sin^2(\angle(p^{(k)}, \widehat{h} \cdot \widehat{g}^{(k)})) = \sum_{k=1}^N \min_{\widehat{g}^{(k)}} \sin^2(\angle(p^{(k)}, \mathbf{M}_{n_k-d}(\widehat{h})\widehat{g}^{(k)})).$$

It is well known [45, §17.26], that the least-squares solution minimizes the angle between the approximating vector and the given vector. Let $\widehat{g}_*^{(k)}$ be the solution of a least squares problem with matrix $A_k = \mathbf{M}_{n_k-d}(\widehat{h})$ and right-hand side $p^{(k)}$. Then $(p^{(k)} - A_k \widehat{g}_*^{(k)}) \perp A_k \widehat{g}_*^{(k)}$ and we have that

$$f_4(\widehat{h}) := \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\|A_k \widehat{g}_*^{(k)} - p^{(k)}\|_2^2}{\|p^{(k)}\|_2^2} = \min_{\widehat{\mathbf{g}}} \text{dist}_{nrm}(\mathbf{p}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}} \cdot \widehat{h}),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 6.15. *Minimizing the relative distance (41) is equivalent to minimizing the ℓ_2 -norm after a preliminary scaling of the input polynomials.*

7. Numerical examples

In this section, we provide numerical experiments that include comparison with the state-of-the-art methods. The methods developed in this paper are implemented in MATLAB and are based on the SLRA package [37] described in [33]. The source code of the methods and experiments is publicly available at <http://github.com/slra/slra>.

In the experiments, the method used for minimization of $f_*^{(LN)}(P) = \|g_*^{(LN)}(P)\|_2^2$ or $f_*^{(LS)}(P) = \|g_*^{(LS)}(P)\|_2^2$ is the Levenberg-Marquardt method. In the SLRA package [37], two implementations of the Levenberg-Marquardt method are currently used: a standard implementation in GNU Scientific Library [46] and own implementation that uses data-driven local coordinates approach [40], based on the variant described in [47, p.366]. In this paper, the former variant is mainly used in real-valued case, and the latter in complex-valued case.

Table 1: Optimal approximations of the methods

d	LRA	VP _h	VP _g	VP _S	UVGCD	FASTGCD
1	$2.39 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.83 \cdot 10^{-16}$	$1.66 \cdot 10^{-15}$	$1.74 \cdot 10^{-16}$	$3.45 \cdot 10^{-16}$	$9.06 \cdot 10^{-16}$
2	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.25 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$7.81 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$8.35 \cdot 10^{-17}$	$2.25 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$8.3 \cdot 10^{-14}$
3	$1.07 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.53 \cdot 10^{-12}$	$1.53 \cdot 10^{-12}$	$1.89 \cdot 10^{-16}$	$1.53 \cdot 10^{-12}$	$3.08 \cdot 10^{-12}$
4	$1.76 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$8.4 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$8.4 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$1.55 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$8.4 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$1.79 \cdot 10^{-10}$
5	$4.58 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$4.49 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$4.49 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$1.72 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$4.49 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$7.69 \cdot 10^{-9}$
6	$3.25 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.83 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$1.83 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$2.7 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.83 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$3.39 \cdot 10^{-7}$
7	$4.89 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$7.09 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$7.09 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$3.93 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$7.09 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$1.16 \cdot 10^{-5}$
8	$2.85 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.73 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.73 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.73 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.55 \cdot 10^{-4}$
9	$2.18 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$4 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.44 \cdot 10^{-3}$
10	$6.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.14

Table 2: Number of iterations of the methods

d	VP _h	VP _g	VP _S	FASTGCD
1	4	5	3	4
2	4	4	2	7
3	4	4	2	13
4	4	4	9	5
5	5	4	6	12
6	6	4	16	6
7	6	4	100	4
8	31	3	5	7
9	4	3	4	19
10	1	1	1	2

Table 3: Condition number of the Γ matrices

d	VP _h	VP _g	VP _S
1	2.17	1.19	$7.89 \cdot 10^{33}$
2	1.22	4.62	$7.44 \cdot 10^{28}$
3	2.37	6.1	$1.43 \cdot 10^{24}$
4	1.61	10.13	$2.15 \cdot 10^{19}$
5	2.97	13.97	$1.67 \cdot 10^{15}$
6	2.36	14.02	$8.34 \cdot 10^{10}$
7	3.82	17.06	$7.07 \cdot 10^7$
8	2.99	12.33	49,153.71
9	1.41	9.37	857.7
10	1	1	1

7.1. Example of ill-conditioned polynomials

First, we consider a classic example from [15, Test 2] (which can be also found in [10, Example 4.2] and [31, Test 5]). The following two polynomials are considered:

$$u(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{10} (x - x_j), \quad v(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{10} (x - x_j + 10^{-j}), \quad x_j = (-1)^j (j/2).$$

Compared with the mentioned reference, we normalize the polynomials as

$$p^{(1)} = u(x)/\|u\|_2, \quad p^{(2)} = v(x)/\|v\|_2,$$

and compare methods according to Euclidean distance $\|(p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}) - (\hat{p}_*^{(1)}, \hat{p}_*^{(2)})\|_2$.

All the methods are started from the same initial approximation computed in Algorithm 4.1. ‘‘LRA’’ stands for using initial approximation in Section 4.5 without optimization (refinement). ‘‘VP_h’’ denotes the variable projection method w.r.t. \hat{h} in the image representation (Example 3.1). ‘‘VP_g’’ denotes the variable projection method w.r.t. \hat{g} (Example 3.2). ‘‘VP_S’’ stands for the variable projection method in the kernel representation (Section 6.1). ‘‘FASTGCD’’ denotes the combination of the Gauss-Newton method and line search, used in [10] (function `c_f_newton_iter`).

The results in Table 1 show the Euclidean distances, and in Table 2, we show number iterations of the methods (unfortunately, the number of iterations for “UVGCD” is not available). In Table 3, we present the condition numbers for the Γ matrix in the variable projection methods.

The results of the experiments show “UVGCD” gives the overall best approximation, and we use its results as a reference. We see that the methods “VP_h” and “VP_g” match the results of “UVGCD” in few iterations, except the cases $d = 8$ for “VP_h” and $d = 1, 2$ for “VP_g”. However, each of these “bad” cases corresponds to the cases where the methods large search space and high computational complexity, and should not normally be used. It is natural to use “VP_h” for $d < \frac{n_k}{2}$ and “VP_h” for $d \geq \frac{n_k}{2}$, (for example, “VP_g” in the case $d = 8$). The Γ matrices (see Section 6.5) are well-conditioned in all cases for these methods.

The method “FASTGCD” does not match the results of “UVGCD”, probably due to the settings of the stopping criteria. Also, the method produces polynomials with complex coefficients as a result.

The method based on the kernel representation (Section 6.1) fails to produce good results for $d < 8$. For $d = 1, \dots, 4$ it seems to give a good result, but the Γ matrix used in computations is ill-conditioned, and the regularization of Γ in the package [37] is automatically applied in this example. (This means that the computed approximating polynomials are not guaranteed to have a common divisor.) Therefore, the variable projection in kernel representation should be used only for small d .

7.2. Complex polynomials and speed of the computations

In this section, we compare speed of methods “VP_h”, “VP_g”, and “FASTGCD”.

7.2.1. Small GCD degree scenario

We consider the example of complex polynomials from [10, § 4.6]:

$$\begin{aligned} q^{(1,k)}(z) &:= h(z)g^{(1,k)}(z), & q^{(2,k)} &:= h(z)g^{(2,k)}(z), \\ h &:= z^4 + 10z^2 + z - 1, \\ g^{(1,k)}(z) &:= (z^{k\ell_1} - 1)(z^{k\ell_2} - 2)(z^{k\ell_3} - 3), \\ g^{(2,k)}(z) &:= (z^{k\ell_1} + i)(z^{k\ell_2} + 5)(z^{k\ell_3} + 2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\ell_1 = 25$, $\ell_2 = 15$, $\ell_3 = 10$. We compute normalized polynomials ($\tilde{q}^{(1,k)}$ and $\tilde{q}^{(2,k)}$), and also add a small noise to the polynomials:

$$p^{(1,k)} := q^{(1,k)} + \varepsilon_{1,k}, \quad p^{(2,k)} := q^{(2,k)} + \varepsilon_{2,k},$$

where each $\varepsilon_{j,k}$ is a realization of the Gaussian zero-mean i.i.d. random vector with standard deviation 10^{-4} . We average the results over 20 realizations of noise.

We consider the test polynomials for $k = \{1, \dots, 8\}$, thus the degrees of the polynomials range between 50 and 400. We compare two methods: “VP_h” and “FASTGCD”. All the methods are started from the same initial approximation.

As shown in Tables 4 and 5, the method “VP_h” achieves better approximation error with similar number of iterations. For measuring speed, we limit the number of iterations to 1 in “VP_h” and call directly function `c_iterfast` (one iteration of “FASTGCD”). In Fig. 2, the time is plotted versus n .

k	n	LRA	VP _h	FASTGCD
1	55	8.59 · 10 ⁻³	1.64 · 10 ⁻⁴	1.52 · 10 ⁻³
2	105	9.82 · 10 ⁻³	1.8 · 10 ⁻⁴	1.51 · 10 ⁻³
3	155	7.73 · 10 ⁻³	1.59 · 10 ⁻⁴	3.15 · 10 ⁻³
4	205	8.51 · 10 ⁻³	1.54 · 10 ⁻⁴	1.91 · 10 ⁻³
5	255	8.67 · 10 ⁻³	1.61 · 10 ⁻⁴	2.1 · 10 ⁻³
6	305	7.55 · 10 ⁻³	1.57 · 10 ⁻⁴	2.21 · 10 ⁻³
7	355	1.17 · 10 ⁻²	1.68 · 10 ⁻⁴	3.44 · 10 ⁻³
8	405	1.01 · 10 ⁻²	1.58 · 10 ⁻⁴	3.67 · 10 ⁻³

k	n	VP _h	FASTGCD
1	55	2.1	3.3
2	105	2.1	3.6
3	155	2.1	3.35
4	205	2.05	3.35
5	255	2.05	3.3
6	305	2	2.95
7	355	2.25	2.95
8	405	2.05	3.6




Figure 2: Comparison of the time per iteration, small d

7.2.2. Large GCD degree scenario

We repeat the same experiments, but for the case of growing GCD degree. We consider polynomials from [10, Ex. 4.3]:

$$q^{(1)}(z) := \left(\sum_{j=0}^3 z^j \right) u_d(z), \quad q^{(2)}(z) := \left(\sum_{j=0}^3 (-z)^j \right) u_d(z),$$

and u_d is a polynomial of degree d , whose coefficients are random integers in $[-5; 5]$. We compute normalized polynomials $\tilde{q}^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{q}^{(2)}$, and add a small noise:

$$p^{(1)} := q^{(1)} + \varepsilon_1, \quad p^{(2)} := q^{(2)} + \varepsilon_2,$$

where each ε_j is a realization of the Gaussian zero-mean i.i.d. random vector with standard deviation 10^{-4} . We average the results over 20 realizations of the noise vector.

d	LRA	VP _g	VP _g (5)	FASTGCD
50	0.22	8.33 · 10 ⁻²	8.68 · 10 ⁻²	0.75
100	0.17	1.81 · 10 ⁻²	3.19 · 10 ⁻²	0.65
200	0.11	2.06 · 10 ⁻²	2.18 · 10 ⁻²	0.74
500	7.34 · 10 ⁻²	3.77 · 10 ⁻²	3.78 · 10 ⁻²	0.28
1,000	8.38 · 10 ⁻²	2.47 · 10 ⁻²	2.91 · 10 ⁻²	0.81

d	VP _g	FASTGCD
50	12.35	4.5
100	9.1	5.85
200	9.8	5.85
500	8.05	5.7
1,000	11	4.3

In Tables 6 and 7, we provide the approximation errors and numbers of iterations. For “FASTGCD” the average number of iterations is close to 5. We also provide

in Table 6 the results for “VP_g” with number of iterations limited to 5 (denoted by “VP_g(5)”). In this case, again “VP_g” achieves better approximation error for same number of iterations as “FASTGCD”.




Figure 3: Comparison of the time per iteration, large d

It can be seen from Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, the time growth resembles $O(n)$ for the variable projection method, which confirms the results of Section 6.2. The time growth for the iterations of “FASTGCD” resembles $O(n^2)$, which is consistent with complexity results of [10]. Note that in Fig. 2 the time needed for one iteration of the local optimization is of the same order as the total time reported in [10] (including initial approximation), and therefore cannot be neglected.

7.3. Example with several polynomials

We consider the example of three polynomials [48, Example 21.].

$$\begin{aligned}
 p^{(1)}(s) &= -16.316s^{11} + 182.73s^{10} - 185.83s^9 + 106.68s^8 - 266.22s^7 + 125.80s^6 \\
 &\quad - 195.53s^5 + 243.81s^4 + 23.013s^3 + 64.186s^2 - 24.300s - 43.810, \\
 p^{(2)}(s) &= 4.6618s^{11} - 52.209s^{10} + 53.094s^9 - 30.481s^8 + 76.064s^7 - 35.944s^6 \\
 &\quad + 55.866s^5 - 69.659s^4 - 6.5751s^3 - 18.339s^2 + 6.9428s + 12.517, \\
 p^{(3)}(s) &= -4.1155s^{11} + 47.507s^{10} - 59.034s^9 + 2.2157s^8 - 45.276s^7 + 83.932s^6 \\
 &\quad - 34.013s^5 + 15.007s^4 + 4.3083s^3 - 9.0031s^2 + 14.297s - 14.783.
 \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in the common divisor of degree 2.

Since the degree of the common divisor is small, we will use the image representation¹ and variable projection with respect to the common divisor (see Example 3.1), and solve the optimization problem (10) (minimize the function $f_1(\hat{h})$ over $\mathcal{P}_d \setminus \{0\}$). Since $f_1(\hat{h})$ is invariant of scaling of the parameter, this is a problem of optimization on a projective space. We fix a coordinate chart in this space and optimize only over the polynomials $\hat{h}(z) = \hat{b}z^2 + \hat{a}z - 1$. In Fig. 4, we plot the cost function

¹Optimization with variable projection in the Sylvester low-rank approximation is not applicable here, see the discussion in Section 7.4.




Figure 4: The logarithm of the cost function: $\ln f^{(1)}([-1 \hat{a} \hat{b}]^\top)$.

$f^{(1)}([-1 \hat{a} \hat{b}]^\top)$ evaluated on a 100×100 grid in the box $[-2; 2] \times [-2; 2]$. In Fig. 4, we see that $f^{(1)}$ possesses many local minima and a large Lipschitz constant.

We consider several initial approximations. The polynomials \hat{h}_{kl0} , where, $1 \leq k < l \leq 3$, are the initial approximations obtained from Sylvester sub-resultant matrices of two polynomials $p^{(k)}$ and $p^{(l)}$ by Algorithm 4.1. The polynomial \hat{h}_{1230} denotes the result of Algorithm 4.1 for the structure $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$, and \hat{h}_{123f} denotes the result of the Algorithm 4.1 for the structure $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$. \hat{h}_{123m} denotes the result of Algorithm 4.2 (for $K = 32$). Finally, \hat{h}_{ref} denotes the result provided in [48, Example 21.]:

$$c(z^2 - 11.28371806974011z + 11.64469379842480),$$

where the constant c is chosen to conform to the normalization. All the polynomials are normalized to be of the form $\hat{h}(z) = \hat{b}z^2 + \hat{a}z - 1$.

From all initial approximations, we run the optimization algorithm for (10) (with the maximum number of iterations 300). The initial approximations (\hat{a}_0, \hat{b}_0) , the initial value of the cost function (f_0), the distance to the reference polynomial (ρ_{ref}), the point of the local minimum $(\hat{a}_{opt}, \hat{b}_{opt})$, the cost function value at the minimum (f_{opt}) and the number of iterations needed (iter.) are shown in Table 8.

In Table 8, we see that \hat{h}_{130} and \hat{h}_{123m} give the best answer. The polynomial \hat{h}_{123m} is the closest to the reference polynomial [48, Example 21.], and gives the same result as optimization started from the reference polynomial. We also see from Table 8, that the initial approximation \hat{h}_{123f} obtained from improved the Sylvester subresultant $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$ (suggested in [1]) is slightly better (and closer to the reference polynomial) than \hat{h}_{1230} (obtained from the subresultant $\mathcal{S}_d(\mathbf{p})$). Both give a good solution, but not the optimal one (they fall into a neighboring local minimum).

We also see that the methods converged to different local minima, shown in Fig. 4. Note that Fig. 4 does not reflect the values of the cost function at local minima, for

Table 8: Optimal approximations of the methods

value	\widehat{h}_{130}	\widehat{h}_{230}	\widehat{h}_{120}	\widehat{h}_{1230}	\widehat{h}_{123f}	\widehat{h}_{123m}	\widehat{h}_{ref}
\widehat{a}_0	0.93	-0.8	1.52	0.93	0.94	0.97	0.97
\widehat{b}_0	$-7.15 \cdot 10^{-2}$	-1.87	-0.25	$1.69 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.14 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$-8.65 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$-8.59 \cdot 10^{-2}$
f_0	9.47	69.97	177.34	541.83	486.17	$1.31 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$4.69 \cdot 10^{-4}$
ρ_{ref}	$3.83 \cdot 10^{-2}$	2.51	0.58	0.11	0.1	$5.97 \cdot 10^{-4}$	0
\widehat{a}_{opt}	0.97	-0.74	1.52	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.97
\widehat{b}_{opt}	$-8.6 \cdot 10^{-2}$	-1.74	-0.14	$-8.77 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$-8.77 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$-8.6 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$-8.6 \cdot 10^{-2}$
f_{opt}	$3.64 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$1.49 \cdot 10^{-6}$	11.25	$8.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$8.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3.64 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$3.64 \cdot 10^{-7}$
iter.	5	4	4	7	7	2	2

example, the global minimum (for \widehat{h}_{130} and \widehat{h}_{123m}) is not visible in Fig. 4. This is explained by the fact that Fig. 4 is evaluated on a grid and some minima may not be captured by the grid. This also shows intrinsic complexity of the optimization problem.

7.4. Applicability of the kernel representation for $N > 2$: singularity of Γ matrix

In this subsection we show that on a particular example of $N = 3$ polynomials, in the Sylvester low-rank approximation approach the corresponding Γ matrix from [36] is essentially singular. Consider three polynomials $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, p^{(3)} \in \mathcal{P}_2$, and $d = 1$. Then the corresponding generalized Sylvester subresultant matrix is

$$\mathcal{S}_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_1(p^{(2)}) & -\mathbf{M}_1(p^{(1)}) & \\ \mathbf{M}_1(p^{(3)}) & & -\mathbf{M}_1(p^{(1)}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Proposition 6.1 and the results of [36], we have that the corresponding Γ matrix has the form $\Gamma(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) = G(\mathbf{u})G^\top(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})$, where

$$G(\mathbf{u}) = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{M}_2(\widehat{u}^{(2)}) & \mathbf{M}_2(\widehat{u}^{(1)}) & \\ -\mathbf{M}_2(\widehat{u}^{(3)}) & & \mathbf{M}_2(\widehat{u}^{(1)}) \end{bmatrix},$$

and $\widehat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{P}_{[111]}$ such that $\mathcal{S}_1^{(1)}\widehat{\mathbf{u}} = 0$. It can be easily checked that the polynomial matrix $\Gamma(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})$ has (symbolic) determinant 0. This is also confirmed by running the optimization method with the help of SLRA package.

8. Conclusions

We have developed methods based on the variable projection principle, for optimization in the direct parameterization and Sylvester low-rank approximation. The advantages of the developed methods are that they have proven complexity results, and have available implementation that allows to use different optimization methods and different stopping criteria.

The methods for optimization in the direct parameterization have linear complexity in the degrees of the polynomials if the degree of the common divisor d is small or if d is large. The methods provide accurate results matching the accuracy of other existing methods. We also showed that the methods based on direct parameterization perform

better than the methods based on the kernel representation. The latter have higher computational complexity and have issues of intrinsic singularity of the Γ matrix for $N > 2$ and ill-conditioning of Γ when the degree d is small.

Acknowledgement

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC Grant agreement no. 258581 “Structured low-rank approximation: Theory, algorithms, and applications” and Grant Agreement No. 320594 DECODA project. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for valuable suggestions, which led to significant improvements in the presentation of the paper.

Appendix A. Basic properties of the ACD problem

Lemma Appendix A.1. *For the sets \mathcal{G}_d defined in Sections 2.4 and 2.4*

$$\mathcal{G}_d = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F}_d, & \text{if } \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C} \text{ or } (\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R} \text{ and } d \text{ is even}), \\ \mathcal{F}_d \cup \mathcal{F}_{d+1}, & \text{if } \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R} \text{ and } d \text{ is odd}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Evidently, $\mathcal{F}_d \subset \mathcal{G}_d$, $\mathcal{F}_{d+1} \subset \mathcal{G}_d$ and $0 \in \mathcal{F}_d$. Let $\mathbf{p} = (p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}) \in \mathcal{G}_d \setminus \{0\}$ and $h \in \gcd(\mathbf{p})$, where $\deg h = d' > d$. Then, h can be factorized as

$$h(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{d'} (z - \alpha_k),$$

where $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. If $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ then the $p^{(k)}$ have a common divisor of degree d and $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_d$. If $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, then every α_k has its conjugate counterpart. Hence, \mathbf{p} have common divisors of degrees $2l$ for any $l : 0 \leq 2l \leq d'$. Therefore, $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_d$ if d is even and $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_{d+1}$ if d is odd. \square

Lemma Appendix A.2. *For any $0 \leq d \leq n_{min}$, sets $\mathcal{F}_d, \mathcal{G}_d$ are closed subsets of \mathcal{P}_n .*

Proof. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_d \subset \mathcal{P}_d$ the polynomials with 2-norm equal to 1. Then \mathcal{F}_d is the image of the infinitely smooth map $\mathcal{P}_{n-d} \times \mathcal{S}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_n$ defined as $(\hat{\mathbf{g}}, \hat{h}) \mapsto \hat{\mathbf{g}} \cdot \hat{h}$. Since the domain of the definition is closed and the map is continuous, \mathcal{F}_d is closed. Finally by Lemma Appendix A.1, \mathcal{G}_d can be expressed as a union of at most two sets \mathcal{F}_{d_1} and \mathcal{F}_{d_2} , and therefore it is also closed. \square

Appendix B. Properties of the extended Sylvester sub resultants

The following lemma is well-known in the computer algebra community [9, 25]. We present it in a modified version, which takes care of possible zero polynomials.

Note that any matrix $\mathcal{S}_d^{(k)}(\mathbf{p})$ can be extracted from the matrix $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$ by selecting corresponding block rows (and, possibly, negation). Therefore, if $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}-d}$ is a right annihilating vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{n}-d}$ of $\mathcal{S}_d^{(full)}(\mathbf{p})$, it is also annihilating vector of $\mathcal{S}_d^{(k)}(\mathbf{p})$. Let us select k such that $u^{(k)} \neq 0$. Then we have that

$$\mathcal{S}_d(p^{(k)}, p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(k-1)}, p^{(k+1)}, \dots, p^{(N)}) \text{col}(u^{(k)}, u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(k-1)}, u^{(k+1)}, \dots, u^{(N)}) = 0,$$

and by Lemma [Appendix B.1](#), the polynomials have $\deg \text{gcd} \geq d$. \square

Appendix C. Least-squares and least-norm problems

In this paper, we use the duality between least-squares and least-norm problems. Next, we give an overview of these problems.

Problem Appendix C.1 (Weighted least-squares problem). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $m \geq n$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $v \in [0, \infty)^m$, such that $\text{rank} \text{diag}(\sqrt{v})A = n$*

$$\underset{x \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{minimize}} \|Ax - b\|_v^2. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The problem [\(C.1\)](#) is the orthogonal projection of b on the image of A in the semi-norm $\|\cdot\|_v$. The solution can be found by rewriting the cost function in [\(C.1\)](#) as $\|g^{(LS)}\|_2^2$, where $g^{(LS)} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{v})(b - Ax)$. Then the solution of [\(C.1\)](#) is

$$\begin{aligned} x_* &= (A^\top \text{diag}(v)A)^{-1} A^\top \text{diag}(v)b, \\ g_*^{(LS)} &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{v})b - \text{diag}(\sqrt{v})A(A^\top \text{diag}(v)A)^{-1} A^\top \text{diag}(v)b, \\ f_*^{(LS)} &= \|g_*^{(LS)}\|_2^2 = \|b\|_v^2 - b^\top \text{diag}(v)A(A^\top \text{diag}(v)A)^{-1} A^\top \text{diag}(v)b. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

The least-squares problem [\(C.1\)](#) is closely connected to the following dual problem:

Problem Appendix C.2 (Weighted least-norm problem). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $m \geq n$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $w \in (0, \infty]^m$, such that $\text{rank} \text{diag}(\sqrt{w^{-1}})A = n$*

$$\underset{z \in \mathbb{R}^m}{\text{minimize}} \|c - z\|_w^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad A^\top z = 0. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

The problem [\(C.3\)](#) is to find the orthogonal projection of the vector c on the kernel of the matrix A in the norm $\|\cdot\|_w$. Changing variables as $c - z = \text{diag}(\sqrt{w^{-1}})g^{(LN)}$ The cost function can be rewritten as $\|g^{(LN)}\|_2^2$, and the constraint $A^\top z = 0$ as

$$A^\top \text{diag}(\sqrt{w^{-1}})g^{(LN)} = A^\top c.$$

Therefore, the solution of [\(C.3\)](#) is the following

$$\begin{aligned} z_* &= c - \text{diag}(w^{-1})A(A^\top \text{diag}(w^{-1})A)^{-1} A^\top c, \\ g_*^{(LN)} &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{w^{-1}})A(A^\top \text{diag}(w^{-1})A)^{-1} A^\top c, \\ f_*^{(LN)} &= \|g_*^{(LN)}\|_2^2 = c^\top A(A^\top \text{diag}(w^{-1})A)^{-1} A^\top c. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

One can see that the expressions for the solutions of [\(C.1\)](#) and [\(C.3\)](#) have a similar form. In particular, if we have $c = \text{diag}(w^{-1})b$ and $v = w^{-1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} f_*^{(LS)} &= \|b\|_v^2 - f_*^{(LN)}, \\ g_*^{(LS)} &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{v})b - g_*^{(LN)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

References

References

- [1] M. Agrawal, P. Stoica, and P. Åhgren. Common factor estimation and two applications in signal processing. *Signal Processing*, 84(2):421–429, 2004.
- [2] N. D. Gaubitch, J. Benesty, and P. A. Naylor. Adaptive common root estimation and the common zeros problem in blind channel identification. In *13th European Signal Processing Conference, September 4-8, 2005*, Antalya, Turkey, 2005.
- [3] I. Z. Emiriz, T. Kalinka, C. Konaxis, and T. Luu Ba. Sparse implicitization by interpolation: Characterizing non-exactness and an application to computing discriminants. *Computer-Aided Design*, 45(2):252–261, 2013.
- [4] Z. Li, Z. Yang, and L. Zhi. Blind image deconvolution via fast approximate GCD. In *Proceedings of the 2010 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ISSAC '10*, pages 155–162, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [5] S. R. Khare, H. K. Pillai, and M. N. Belur. Real radius of controllability for systems described by polynomial matrices: SIMO case. In *Proceedings of the 19th Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems (MTNS'10)*, pages 517–522, 2010.
- [6] N. Guglielmi and I. Markovsky. Computing the distance to uncontrollability: the SISO case. Technical report, Vrije Univ. Brussel, 2014.
- [7] Z. Zeng. ApaTools: A software toolbox for approximate polynomial algebra. In Michael Stillman, Jan Verschelde, and Nobuki Takayama, editors, *Software for Algebraic Geometry*, volume 148 of *The IMA Vol. in Math. and its Appl.*, pages 149–167. Springer, 2008.
- [8] V. Y. Pan. Computation of approximate polynomial GCDs and an extension. *Information and Computation*, 167(2):71–85, 2001.
- [9] D. Rupprecht. An algorithm for computing certified approximate GCD of n univariate polynomials. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 139(1–3):255–284, 1999.
- [10] D. A. Bini and P. Boito. A fast algorithm for approximate polynomial gcd based on structured matrix computations. In *Numerical Methods for Structured Matrices and Applications*, pages 155–173. Birkhäuser, 2010.
- [11] G. Chèze, A. Galligo, B. Mourrain, and J.-C. Yakoubsohn. A subdivision method for computing nearest gcd with certification. *Theoretical Comp. Sc.*, 412(35):4493–4503, 2011.
- [12] R. M. Corless, P. M. Gianni, B. M. Trager, and S. M. Watt. The singular value decomposition for polynomial systems. In *Proceedings of the 1995 international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation, ISSAC '95*, pages 195–207, New York, 1995. ACM.
- [13] E. Kaltofen, Z. Yang, and L. Zhi. Structured low rank approximation of a sylvester matrix. In Dongming Wang and Lihong Zhi, editors, *Symbolic-Numeric Computation*, Trends in Mathematics, pages 69–83. Birkhauser Basel, 2007.
- [14] M. Hitz. *Efficient algorithms for computing the nearest polynomial with constrained roots*. PhD thesis, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y., 1998.

- [15] Z. Zeng. The numerical greatest common divisor of univariate polynomials. In *Contemporary Mathematics*, volume 556, pages 187–217. AMS, 2011.
- [16] I. Markovsky and S. Van Huffel. An algorithm for approximate common divisor computation. In *Proc. 17th Symp. on Math. Theory of Networks and Systems (MTNS'06)*, pages 274–279, 2006.
- [17] G. Golub and V. Pereyra. The differentiation of pseudo-inverses and nonlinear least squares problems whose variables separate. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 10(2):pp. 413–432, 1973.
- [18] N.K. Karmarkar and Y.N. Lakshman. On approximate gcds of univariate polynomials. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 26(6):653–666, 1998.
- [19] P. Stoica and T. Söderström. Common factor detection and estimation. *Automatica*, 33(5):985–989, 1997.
- [20] L. Zhi, M. Noda, H. Kai, and W. Wu. Hybrid method for computing the nearest singular polynomials. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 21:149–162, 2004.
- [21] Z. Li and L. Zhi. Computing the nearest singular univariate polynomials with given root multiplicities. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 479:150–162, 2013.
- [22] Bin Li, Jiawang Nie, and Lihong Zhi. Approximate gcds of polynomials and sparse sos relaxations. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 409(2):200–210, December 2008.
- [23] E. Kaltofen, B. Li, Z. Yang, and L. Zhi. Exact certification of global optimality of approximate factorizations via rationalizing sums-of-squares with floating point scalars. In *Proceedings of ISSAC'08*, pages 155–164. ACM, 2008.
- [24] I. Markovsky. Structured low-rank approximation and its applications. *Automatica*, 44(4):891–909, 2008.
- [25] E. Kaltofen, Z. Yang, and L. Zhi. Approximate greatest common divisors of several polynomials with linearly constrained coefficients and singular polynomials. In *Proceedings of ISSAC'06*, pages 169–176. ACM, 2006.
- [26] N. Karcianas, S. Fatouros, M. Mitrouli, and G.H. Halikias. Approximate greatest common divisor of many polynomials, generalised resultants, and strength of approximation. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 51(12):1817–1830, 2006.
- [27] B. Li, Z. Yang, and L. Zhi. Fast low rank approximation of a sylvester matrix by structured total least norm. *J. Japan Soc. Symbolic and Algebraic Comp.*, 11:165–174, 2005.
- [28] J. R. Winkler and J. D. Allan. Structured total least norm and approximate gcds of inexact polynomials. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 215(1):1–13, 2008.
- [29] J. R. Winkler and M. Hasan. An improved non-linear method for the computation of a structured low rank approximation of the Sylvester resultant matrix. *J. Comp. Appl. Math.*, 237(1):253–268, 2013.
- [30] B. Botting, M. Giesbrecht, and J. May. Using riemannian svd for problems in approximate algebra. In D. Wang and L. Zhi, editors, *Proc. Internat. Workshop on Symbolic-Numeric Comput.*, pages 209–219, Xian, China, July 2005.

- [31] A. Terui. GPGCD: An iterative method for calculating approximate GCD of univariate polynomials. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 479:127–149, 2013.
- [32] M. Ishteva, K. Usevich, and I. Markovsky. Factorization approach to structured low-rank approximation with applications. *SIAM J. Matr. Anal. Appl.*, 35(3):1180–1204, 2014.
- [33] I. Markovsky and K. Usevich. Software for weighted structured low-rank approximation. *J. Comp. and Appl. Math.*, 256:278–292, 2014.
- [34] É. Schost and P.-J. Spaenlehauer. A quadratically convergent algorithm for structured low-rank approximation. Technical report, 2013. arXiv:1311.2376.
- [35] G. Ottaviani, P.-J. Spaenlehauer, and B. Sturmfels. Exact solutions in structured low-rank approximation. Technical report, 2013. arXiv:1311.2376.
- [36] K. Usevich and I. Markovsky. Variable projection methods for affinely structured low-rank approximation in weighted 2-norms. *J. Comp. and Appl. Math.*, 272:430–448, 2014.
- [37] SLRA. <http://github.com/slra/slra/>, 2015.
- [38] I. Markovsky and K. Usevich. Structured low-rank approximation with missing data. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 34(2):814–830, 2013.
- [39] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright. *Numerical Optimization, 2nd edition*. World Scientific, 2006.
- [40] K. Usevich and I. Markovsky. Optimization on a Grassmann manifold with application to system identification. *Automatica*, 50(6):1656–1662, 2014.
- [41] J. M. Landsberg. *Tensors: Geometry and applications*, volume 128. AMS, 2012.
- [42] N. Karcaniyas, M. Mitrouli, and D. Triantafyllou. Matrix pencil methodologies for computing the greatest common divisor of polynomials: hybrid algorithms and their performance. *International Journal of Control*, 79(11):1447–1461, 2006.
- [43] G. Golub and C. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins University Press, third edition, 1996.
- [44] M. Miranda and P. Tilli. Asymptotic spectra of Hermitian block Toeplitz matrices and preconditioning results. *SIAM J. Matr. Anal. Appl.*, 21(3):867–881, 2000.
- [45] M. Kendall and A. Stuart. *The advanced theory of statistics*, volume 2: Inference and Relationship. Charles Griffin, London, 4th edition, 1977.
- [46] GSL. <http://www.gnu.org/software/gsl/>, 2015. — GNU Scientific Library.
- [47] R. Pintelon and J. Schoukens. *System Identification: A Frequency Domain Approach*. Wiley, 2nd edition, 2012.
- [48] D. Christou, N. Karcaniyas, and M. Mitrouli. The eres method for computing the approximate gcd of several polynomials. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 60(12):94–114, 2010.