

# Optimality of Curtiss Bound on Poincaré Multiplier for Positive Univariate Polynomials

Hoon Hong <sup>\*</sup> and Brittany Riggs <sup>†</sup>

January 2, 2024

## Abstract

Let  $f$  be a monic univariate polynomial with non-zero constant term. We say that  $f$  is *positive* if  $f(x)$  is positive over all  $x \geq 0$ . If all the coefficients of  $f$  are non-negative, then  $f$  is trivially positive. In 1883, Poincaré proved that  $f$  is positive if and only if there exists a monic polynomial  $g$  such that all the coefficients of  $gf$  are non-negative. Such polynomial  $g$  is called a *Poincaré multiplier* for the positive polynomial  $f$ . Of course one hopes to find a multiplier with smallest degree. This naturally raised a challenge: find an upper bound on the smallest degree of multipliers. In 1918, Curtiss provided such a bound. Curtiss also showed that the bound is optimal (smallest) when degree of  $f$  is 1 or 2. It is easy to show that the bound is not optimal when degree of  $f$  is higher. The Curtiss bound is a simple expression that depends only on the angle (argument) of non-real roots of  $f$ . In this paper, we show that the Curtiss bound is optimal among all the bounds that depends only on the angles.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $f$  be a monic univariate polynomial with non-zero constant term. We say that  $f$  is *positive* if  $f(x)$  is positive over all  $x \geq 0$ .<sup>1</sup> If all the coefficients of  $f$  are non-negative, then obviously  $f$  is positive, but the converse is not true. Consider the following small (toy) examples:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= x^4 + x^3 + 10x^2 + 2x + 10 \\ f_2 &= x^4 - x^3 - 10x^2 - 2x + 10 \\ f_3 &= x^4 - x^3 + 10x^2 - 2x + 10 \end{aligned}$$

Note that all the coefficients of  $f_1$  are non-negative. Thus it is trivial to see that  $f_1$  is positive. However  $f_2$  and  $f_3$  have negative coefficients, and thus it is not obvious whether they are positive or not. It turns out that  $f_2$  is not positive and  $f_3$  is positive.

In 1883, Poincaré [15] proposed and proved a modification of the converse: if  $f$  is positive, then there exists a monic polynomial  $g$  such that all the coefficients of  $gf$  are non-negative. Such polynomial  $g$  is called a *Poincaré multiplier* for the positive polynomial  $f$ . For the above examples, we have

- Since  $f_2$  is not positive, there is no Poincaré multiplier for  $f_2$ .

---

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh NC 27695 USA, hong@ncsu.edu

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author. Department of Mathematics, Elon University, Elon NC 27244 USA, briggs@elon.edu

<sup>1</sup>It is equivalent to the condition that  $f$  has no positive real root. In fact, most of the discussion in the paper has a counterpart in a real root counting problem, namely checking whether  $f$  has exactly  $k$  positive real roots for a given  $k$ . There have been many works on the topic and on its extensions, just to list a few: [7, 4, 9, 10, 21, 22, 5, 8].

- Since  $f_3$  is positive, there is a Poincaré multiplier for  $f_3$ . For instance, let  $g = x + 1$ . Then

$$gf_3 = (x + 1)(x^4 - x^3 + 10x^2 - 2x + 10) = x^5 + 9x^4 + 8x^3 + 8x^2 + 10x + 10$$

Note that all the coefficients of  $gf_3$  are non-negative.

In 1928, Pólya provided a shape for the Poincaré multiplier [16], namely  $(x + 1)^k$ .<sup>2</sup> In fact, in the above example, we used a multiplier of the Pólya shape with  $k = 1$ . However, there are other multipliers for  $f_3$  that do not have the Pólya shape. For instance, let  $g = x^2 + x + 1$ . Note that it does not have the Pólya shape, but it is a Poincaré multiplier since all the coefficients of  $gf_3$  are again non-negative:

$$gf_3 = (x^2 + x + 1)(x^4 - x^3 + 10x^2 - 2x + 10) = x^6 + 10x^4 + 7x^3 + 18x^2 + 8x + 10.$$

In fact, there are infinitely many multipliers of diverse shapes. Hence a challenge naturally arises: *Find an upper bound on the smallest degree of multipliers.*

In 1918, Curtiss found an upper bound [6]. However, it seems to have been forgotten until the paper was digitized. Separately, in 2001 Powers and Reznick gave another bound based on the Pólya shape in the multivariate homogeneous case [17]. Avendaño (page 2885 of [2]) specialized this bound to the univariate case.

It is easy to show that the Powers-Reznick bound is not optimal. Curtiss showed that his bound is optimal when degree of  $f$  is 1 or 2. It is, however, easy to show that the bound is not optimal when degree of  $f$  is higher. For example, the Curtiss bound for  $f_3$  is 2, which is bigger than the optimal degree which is 1. Hence another challenge naturally arises: *Find the optimal (smallest) bound.*

This can be done, in principle, by the following process: for each degree  $d$ , starting with 0, we check whether there exists a Poincaré multiplier of degree  $d$ . If not, we continue with next degree. If yes, we report  $d$  to be the optimal bound. The process is guaranteed to terminate due to Poincaré's theorem. Checking the existence of a Poincaré multiplier of a given degree  $d$  can be carried out by any algorithm (such as simplex phase I) for deciding the existence of a solution for a system of linear inequalities in the coefficients of the multiplier polynomial.

However, it has two major difficulties. (1) It requires that we run the software on each  $d$  from scratch. (2) Each run on degree  $d$  quickly becomes very time-consuming as  $d$  grows, making this approach practically infeasible, especially when the optimal bound is very large.

Fortunately, there is a related challenge which might be feasible to tackle. For this, we note the Curtiss bound (Theorem 1) depends only on the angles (arguments) of the non-real roots of  $f$ . Thus, we formulate the following alternative challenge: *Find an optimal bound among the family of bounds that depend only on the angles of the non-real roots.*

Note that Curtiss already showed that his bound is optimal among the family of those bounds for degrees 1 and 2. One wonders whether the Curtiss bound is optimal among this family of bounds for higher degrees. The main contribution of this paper is to prove that it is so (Theorem 2).

## 2 Main Result

Let  $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  be monic such that  $\forall_{x \geq 0} f(x) > 0$ , that is,  $f$  does not have any non-negative real root. We first define a notation for the optimal degree of the Poincaré multiplier as it will be used throughout this work.

**Definition 1 (Optimal Bound)** *The optimal degree of the Poincaré multiplier for  $f$ , written as  $\text{opt}(f)$ , is defined by*

$$\text{opt}(f) = \min_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \setminus 0 \\ \text{coeff}(gf) \geq 0}} \deg(g).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Pólya used the multivariate version of the shape while trying to find a certificate for a variant of Hilbert's 17th problem [11]. For similar efforts on different variants of Hilbert's 17th problem, see [1, 12, 19, 20, 18, 14].

**Example 2** Consider the polynomial

$$f = \left( \prod_{i=1}^4 (x^2 - 2(1) \cos(\theta_i) x + 1^2) \right) (x + 1)$$

where  $\theta = \left\{ \frac{7\pi}{24}, \frac{10\pi}{24}, \frac{11\pi}{24}, \frac{14\pi}{24} \right\}$ . First, note that  $\text{opt}(f) \neq 0$ , as  $f$  has mixed sign coefficients. If we let the Poincaré multiplier be  $g = x + 1$ , we see we have  $\text{opt}(f) = 1$ , since  $\text{coeff}(gf) \geq 0$ .

**Theorem 1 (Curtiss Bound 1918 [6])** Let  $r_1 e^{\pm i\theta_1}, \dots, r_\sigma e^{\pm i\theta_\sigma}$  be the roots of  $f$  where multiple roots are repeated. Let

$$b(f) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq \sigma \\ \theta_i \neq \pi}} \left( \left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\theta_i} \right\rceil - 2 \right).$$

Then  $\text{opt}(f) \leq b(f)$  and the equality holds if  $\deg f \leq 2$ .

**Example 3** Consider the same polynomial from Example 2,

$$f = \left( \prod_{i=1}^4 (x^2 - 2(1) \cos(\theta_i) x + 1^2) \right) (x + 1)$$

where  $\theta = \left\{ \frac{7\pi}{24}, \frac{10\pi}{24}, \frac{11\pi}{24}, \frac{14\pi}{24} \right\}$ . The Curtiss bound for this polynomial is

$$\begin{aligned} b(f) &= \left( \left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\frac{7\pi}{24}} \right\rceil - 2 \right) + \left( \left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\frac{10\pi}{24}} \right\rceil - 2 \right) + \left( \left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\frac{11\pi}{24}} \right\rceil - 2 \right) + \left( \left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\frac{14\pi}{24}} \right\rceil - 2 \right) \\ &= 2 + 1 + 1 + 0 \\ &= 4. \end{aligned}$$

Here we can see by comparing to Example 2 that the Curtiss bound is not always optimal.

**Theorem 2 (Main Result: Angle-Based Optimality of Curtiss's Bound)** We have

$$\forall_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_\sigma \in (0, \pi]} \quad \exists_{r_1, \dots, r_\sigma > 0} \quad \text{opt}(f) = b(f).$$

**Example 4** Consider the following polynomial with the same angles as that from Example 3 but different radii,


$$f = \left( \prod_{i=1}^4 (x^2 - 2(10^{i-1}) \cos(\theta_i) x + (10^{i-1})^2) \right) (x + 10^4)$$

where  $\theta = \left\{ \frac{7\pi}{24}, \frac{10\pi}{24}, \frac{11\pi}{24}, \frac{14\pi}{24} \right\}$ . The Curtiss bound for this polynomial is still  $b(f) = 4$ . However, in this case we have  $\text{opt}(f) = b(f) = 4$ .

## 3 Proof of Angle-Based Optimality (Theorem 2)

### 3.1 Overview

As the proof is rather lengthy, we will include an overview of the structure of the proof. First, we provide a diagram of the various components of the proof. As shown in the diagram, the main claim is split into two sub-claims, which are then proven via several smaller claims. Below, we explain the diagram from a big picture standpoint. In the sections referenced in the diagram, we provide the proofs for each claim.



Our goal is to prove the angle-based optimality of Curtiss's bound on the degree of the Poincaré multiplier for a positive polynomial.

Symbolically, we have

$$\forall_{\theta \in \Theta} \exists_{r \in R} \text{opt}(f) = b(f).$$

After extensive exploration, we identified a natural split in strategies between collections of angles  $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$  and those with additional angles  $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta \leq \pi$ . We now have

$$\forall_{\theta \in \Theta_1 \cup \Theta_2} \exists_{r \in R} \text{opt}(f) = b(f).$$

We first focus on the claim for  $\theta \in \Theta_1$ , polynomials with complex root arguments  $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ . That is, for any collection of angles in this subset, there exists a corresponding collection of radii such that Curtiss's bound is the minimum possible degree for the Poincaré multiplier to achieve a product with all non-negative coefficients. One way to show this is to prove that there exist radii such that any multiplier of smaller degree will produce a product with a negative coefficient. We can then rewrite the claim as

$$\forall_{\theta \in \Theta_1} \exists_{r \in R} \forall_{g \in G} \exists_{k \in K} \text{coeff}(gf, k) < 0.$$

Note, with this rewrite we consider a problem with three quantifier alternations. As this is a very complex problem, we seek to reduce the search space for the negative coefficient. It is straightforward to prove that, rather than consider the entire set of multipliers of smaller degree, it is sufficient to focus on the set of multipliers with degree one less than Curtiss's bound to show that any such multiplier will produce a product with a negative coefficient. We now have

$$\forall_{\theta \in \Theta_1} \exists_{r \in R} \forall_{g \in G'} \exists_{k \in K} \text{coeff}(gf, k) < 0$$

for a subset  $G'$  of the original multiplier search space  $G$  that is determined by the Curtiss bound (hence, by  $\theta$ ). After detailed analysis of examples, we surprisingly discovered that we can also narrow down the potential locations of the negative coefficient. In fact, although the collection of product coefficients grows in size with Curtiss's bound, we can identify a negative coefficient from a subset of just 3 possibilities. Hence

$$\forall_{\theta \in \Theta_1} \exists_{r \in R} \forall_{g \in G'} \exists_{k \in K'} \text{coeff}(gf, k) < 0$$

for a subset  $K'$  of the original coefficient search space  $K$  that is determined by the number of angles in  $\theta$  and the Curtiss bound (hence, by  $\theta$ ). Finally, with more difficulty, we determined how to reduce the search space

for the desired radii. By identifying a witness, in terms of  $\cos(\theta)$ , for all but one of the radii, we reduced the radii search space to just a one-dimensional space for the final radius. We have

$$\forall_{\theta \in \Theta_1} \exists_{r \in R'} \forall_{g \in G'} \exists_{k \in K'} \text{coeff}(gf, k) < 0$$

for a subset  $R'$  of the original radii search space  $R$ . Proving this final version of the claim was still a significant challenge. We examined the geometry of the product coefficients as a function of this final unknown radius in order to verify the claim. Expressing the coefficients of the original polynomial  $f$  in terms of the elementary symmetric polynomials in the roots of  $f$  proved essential to our progress, enabling us to make claims about the sign of the coefficients that were otherwise quite challenging.

Having proved the claim in the case where all angles fall in  $\Theta_1$ , we move on to the case where we have mixed angles from  $\Theta_1$  or  $\Theta_2$ . The crux of this claim is that any polynomial in which Curtiss's bound is optimal can be multiplied by a quadratic with angle  $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \pi$  and a radius that preserves the optimality of Curtiss's bound or a linear factor with an appropriate radius that preserves the optimality of Curtiss's bound. Thus, for any collection of additional angles in quadrant 2, we can inductively prove the existence of the necessary radii to ensure the optimality of Curtiss's bound.

$$\forall_{\theta \in \Theta_2} \exists_{r \in R} \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r} f) = \text{opt}(f) = b(f)$$

Note that, in this case, the additional factors in the polynomial do not increase the Curtiss bound. For this sub-claim we utilize a different strategy, relying on linear algebra to rewrite the optimality claim as a separation between two sets.

### 3.2 Proof of Angle-Based Optimality (Theorem 2)

Since we must treat angles separately according to their measure, we split the collection of angles  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_\sigma$  into three sets as detailed below. Let

$$\begin{aligned} f &= f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p} \\ f_{\theta, r_\theta} &= \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq \ell \\ 0 < \theta_i < \frac{\pi}{2}}} (x^2 - 2r_{\theta_i} \cos \theta_i x + r_{\theta_i}^2) \quad \text{where } r_{\theta_i} > 0 \text{ and } 0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2} \\ f_{\phi, r_\phi} &= \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ \frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi_i < \pi}} (x^2 - 2r_{\phi_i} \cos \phi_i x + r_{\phi_i}^2) \quad \text{where } r_{\phi_i} > 0 \text{ and } \frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi_1 \leq \dots \leq \phi_k < \pi \\ f_{\pi, p} &= \prod_{1 \leq i \leq t} (x + p_i) \quad \text{where } p_i > 0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $k + \ell + t = \sigma$  and  $2(k + \ell) + t = n = \deg(f)$ .

*Proof:* [Proof of Theorem 2] We need to show

$$\forall_{\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi_1 \leq \dots \leq \phi_k < \pi} \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{p_1, \dots, p_t > 0} \exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt}(f) = b(f).$$

Let  $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi_1 \leq \dots \leq \phi_k < \pi$  and  $0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}$  be arbitrary but fixed. We need to show

$$\exists_{p_1, \dots, p_t > 0} \exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt}(f) = b(f).$$

We need to find a witness for  $p, r_\phi, r_\theta$  such that  $\text{opt}(f) = b(f)$ . We propose a witness candidate as follows. From the All Angles in Quadrant 1 Lemma (Lemma 4), for the fixed  $\theta$ , we have

$$\exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) = b(f_{\theta, r_\theta}). \quad (1)$$

From the Some Angles in Quadrant 2 Lemma (Lemma 11), for the fixed  $\phi$  and  $\theta$ , we have

$$\exists_{p_1, \dots, p_t > 0} \exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) = \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta}). \quad (2)$$

We propose  $p, r_\phi, r_\theta$  appearing in the above two facts as a witness candidate.

We verify that the proposed candidate is indeed a witness, that is,  $\text{opt}(f) = b(f)$ . Note

$$\begin{aligned} \text{opt}(f) &= \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) \\ &= \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) \text{ by (2)} \\ &= b(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) \text{ by (1)} \\ &= b(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) + b(f_{\phi, r_\phi}) + b(f_{\pi, p}) \text{ since } b(f_{\phi, r_\phi}) = b(f_{\pi, p}) = 0 \\ &= b(f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) \\ &= b(f). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the theorem is proved.  $\square$

### 3.3 Common Notations

The following notation and lemma will be used in both the subsequent subsections. Let

$$\begin{aligned} f &= a_n x^n + \dots + a_0 x^0 \\ g &= b_s x^s + \dots + b_0 x^0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $a_n = 1$  and  $b_s = 1$ . We first rewrite them using vectors. Let

$$a = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & \dots & a_n \end{bmatrix} \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} b_0 & \dots & b_s \end{bmatrix}$$

and let

$$x_k = \begin{bmatrix} x^0 \\ \vdots \\ x^k \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we can write  $f$  and  $g$  compactly as

$$f = ax_n \quad \text{and} \quad g = bx_s.$$

Let

$$A_s = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & \dots & \dots & a_n & & \\ & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ & & a_0 & \dots & \dots & a_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(s+1) \times (s+n+1)}.$$

**Lemma 3 (Coefficients)**  $\text{coeffs}(gf) = bA_s$

*Proof:* Note


$$\begin{aligned} gf &= (bx_s)(ax_n) \\ &= b(x_s ax_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= b \begin{bmatrix} x^0 \\ \vdots \\ x^s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & \cdots & a_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x^0 \\ \vdots \\ x^n \end{bmatrix} \\
&= b \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_n \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & a_0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x^0 \\ \vdots \\ x^{s+n} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= bA_s x_{s+n}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\text{coeffs}(gf) = bA_s$ .  $\square$

### 3.4 Concerning Angles in Quadrant 1, $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$

First, we present the overarching argument for the claim that, given a collection of angles in quadrant 1 (excluding the axes), there exist radii such that the Curtiss bound is optimal. There are a number of claims required for this proof.



We will utilize the following notations throughout this subsection. For  $\ell \geq 2$ , let

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i &= r_i e^{i\theta_i} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq \ell \\
\alpha_{\ell+i} &= r_i e^{-i\theta_i} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq \ell \\
t_i &= \cos(\theta_i) \\
f_{\theta, r_\theta} &= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x^2 - 2r_i t_i x + r_i^2) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x - \alpha_i)(x - \alpha_{\ell+i}) = \sum_{i=0}^{2\ell} a_i x^i \\
s &= b(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) \\
g &= x^{s-1} + b_{s-2} x^{s-2} + \cdots + b_1 x + b_0 \\
c_k &= \text{coeff}(g f_{\theta, r_\theta}, x^k).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $a_i = (-1)^{2\ell-i} e_{2\ell-i}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})$  where  $e_k(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})$  is the elementary symmetric polynomial of degree  $k$  in the roots  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}$ . When  $\ell = 0$ , we define  $e_0 = 1$ . Second,  $t_i > 0$  since  $0 < \theta_i < \frac{\pi}{2}$ .

#### Lemma 4 (All Angles in Quadrant 1)

$$\forall_{\ell \geq 0} \quad \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \quad \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \quad \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) = b(f_{\theta, r_\theta})$$

*Proof:* We need to prove the following claim for every  $\ell \geq 0$ .

$$\forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \quad \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \quad \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) = s$$

where  $s = b(f_{\theta, r_\theta})$ . By the One Less Degree Lemma (Lemma 5), it suffices to show

$$0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \exists r_{\theta_1, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell}} > 0 \quad \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \quad \exists_{0 \leq k \leq 2\ell+s-1} c_k < 0.$$

We will show it in three cases depending on the values of  $\ell$ .

Case:  $\ell = 0$ .

Here,  $f = 1$ . The claim is trivially true since  $\text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) = b(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) = 0$ .

Case:  $\ell = 1$ .

Immediate from the Curtiss Bound (Theorem 1).

Case:  $\ell \geq 2$ .

Note

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \exists r_{\theta_1, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell}} > 0 \quad \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) = b(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) \\ \iff & 0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \exists r_{\theta_1, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell}} > 0 \quad \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) < s}} \quad \exists_k c_k < 0 \\ \iff & 0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \exists r_{\theta_1, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell}} > 0 \quad \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \quad \exists_k c_k < 0 \quad \text{by Lemma 5} \\ \iff & 0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \exists r_{\theta_1, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell}} > 0 \quad \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \quad \exists_{k \in \{s-2, 2\ell+s-5, 2\ell+s-2\}} c_k < 0 \quad \text{by Lemma 6.} \end{aligned}$$

We prove this final claim to be true in the Existence of Radii Lemma, Lemma 10.

□

Now we prove Lemmas 5 and 6, cited above, and also several other lemmas required for the main claim, the Existence of Radii Lemma (Lemma 10).

First, we prove the small but essential claim that if there is no Poincaré multiplier,  $g$ , of a certain degree, then there is also no Poincaré multiplier with smaller degree.

$$\textbf{Lemma 5 (One Less Degree)} \quad \nexists_{g, \deg(g)=s} \quad \forall_k c_k \geq 0 \quad \implies \quad \nexists_{g, \deg(g) < s} \quad \forall_k c_k \geq 0$$

*Proof:* We will prove via the contrapositive:

$$\exists_{g, \deg(g) < s} \quad \forall_k c_k \geq 0 \quad \implies \quad \exists_{g, \deg(g)=s} \quad \forall_k c_k \geq 0.$$

Assume  $\exists_{g, \deg(g) < s} \quad \forall_k c_k \geq 0$ . Then there exists a  $g$  with  $\deg(g) = t < s$  such that  $g f_{\theta, r_\theta}$  has all non-negative coefficients. Let  $u = s - t$ .

Consider the multiplier  $x^u g$ . Note that  $(x^u g) f_{\theta, r_\theta} = x^u (g f_{\theta, r_\theta})$  must have all non-negative coefficients and  $\deg(x^u g) = u + t = s$ . Then there exists a multiplier,  $x^u g$  with degree equal to  $s$  such that the product has all non-negative coefficients.

Hence we have

$$\exists_{g, \deg(g) < s} \quad \forall_k c_k \geq 0 \quad \implies \quad \exists_{g, \deg(g)=s} \quad \forall_k c_k \geq 0.$$



□

Our ultimate goal for this section is to prove that there exist radii such that there is no multiplier with degree less than  $b(f_{\theta, r_\theta})$ . The One Less Degree Lemma (Lemma 5) states that it suffices to show there is no multiplier with degree  $b(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) - 1$ . Next, we show that if we consider a multiplier of degree one less, it suffices to examine a specific subset of the coefficients in the product rather than all coefficients to prove the claim. Note that the surprisingly small subset of coefficients was selected by examining the geometry of the coefficients and determining a minimally sufficient set. This is the proof that a subset will suffice. The proof that this particular subset satisfies the claim is given in Lemma 10.

**Lemma 6 (3 Coefficients)**

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \exists_{k \in \{s-2, 2\ell+s-5, 2\ell+s-2\}} c_k < 0 \\ \implies & \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \exists_k c_k < 0 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof:* Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} s &= b(f_{\theta, r_\theta}) \\ g &= x^{s-1} + b_{s-2}x^{s-2} + \dots + b_1x + b_0 \\ t_i &= \cos(\theta_i). \end{aligned}$$

Note that if  $\deg(f) = 2\ell$  and  $\deg(g) = s - 1$ , then  $\deg(gf) = 2\ell + s - 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \exists_k c_k < 0 \\ \iff & \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \exists_{0 \leq k \leq 2\ell+s-1} c_k < 0 \\ \iff & \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \exists_{k \in \{s-2, 2\ell+s-5, 2\ell+s-2\}} c_k < 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next two lemmas are helpful in the proof of Lemma 10 and are listed separately here to streamline the proof of Lemma 10.

**Lemma 7 (Coefficient Expressions)** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} c_{s-2} &= a_0b_{s-2} + a_1b_{s-3} + \sum_{i=2}^{s-2} a_i b_{(s-2)-i} \\ c_{2\ell+s-5} &= a_{2\ell-4} + a_{2\ell-3}b_{s-2} + a_{2\ell-2}b_{s-3} + a_{2\ell-1}b_{s-4} + b_{s-5} \\ c_{2\ell+s-2} &= a_{2\ell-1} + b_{s-2} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &\geq 2 \\ f_{\theta, r_\theta} &= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x^2 - 2r_i t_i x + r_i^2) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x - \alpha_i)(x - \alpha_{\ell+i}) = \sum_{i=0}^{2\ell} a_i x^i \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
s &= b(f_{\theta, r_{\theta}}) \\
g &= x^{s-1} + b_{s-2}x^{s-2} + \cdots + b_1x + b_0 \\
c_k &= \text{coeff}(g f_{\theta, r_{\theta}}, x^k).
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof:* Recall from the Coefficients Lemma (Lemma 3) for  $0 \leq i \leq 2\ell$  and  $0 \leq j \leq s-1$ ,

$$\text{coeffs}(gf) = \begin{bmatrix} b_0 & \cdots & b_{s-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_{2\ell} & & \\ & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ & & a_0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_{2\ell} \end{bmatrix}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{coeff}(gf, x^k) &= \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^k a_i b_{k-i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\text{coeff}(gf, x^k) = \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j = \sum_{i=0}^k a_i b_{k-i} \text{ for } 0 \leq k \leq 2\ell + s - 1.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{s-2} &= \sum_{i=0}^{s-2} a_i b_{(s-2)-i} \\
&= a_0 b_{s-2} + a_1 b_{s-3} + \sum_{i=2}^{s-2} a_i b_{(s-2)-i} \\
c_{2\ell+s-5} &= \sum_{i+j=2\ell+s-5} a_i b_j \\
&= a_{2\ell-4} b_{s-1} + a_{2\ell-3} b_{s-2} + a_{2\ell-2} b_{s-3} + a_{2\ell-1} b_{s-4} + a_{2\ell} b_{s-5} \\
&= a_{2\ell-4} + a_{2\ell-3} b_{s-2} + a_{2\ell-2} b_{s-3} + a_{2\ell-1} b_{s-4} + b_{s-5} \quad \text{since } a_{2\ell} = b_{s-1} = 1 \\
c_{2\ell+s-2} &= \sum_{i+j=2\ell+s-2} a_i b_j \\
&= a_{2\ell-1} b_{s-1} + a_{2\ell} b_{s-2} \\
&= a_{2\ell-1} + b_{s-2} \quad \text{since } a_{2\ell} = b_{s-1} = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma verifies a property of elementary symmetric polynomials in the roots  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}$  that is required for the proof of the Existence of Radii Lemma (Lemma 10).

**Lemma 8 (Symmetric Polynomials)** *If  $0 < \theta_i < \frac{\pi}{2}$ , then  $e_k(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) > 0$  for  $k = 0, \dots, 2\ell$ .*

*Proof:* We will induct on  $\ell$ , the number of quadratic factors of  $f$  with non-real roots.

Base Case:  $\ell = 0$ .

Note that  $e_0 = 1 > 0$ .

Hypothesis:  $\ell \geq 1$ .

Assume  $e_k(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) > 0$  for  $\ell \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq k \leq 2\ell$ .

Induction Step: Prove  $e_k(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2(\ell+1)}) > 0$  for  $0 \leq k \leq 2(\ell+1)$ .

Let  $f_\ell = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x^2 - 2r_i t_i x + r_i^2)$  and  $a_{\ell,k} = \text{coeff}(f_\ell, x^k)$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\ell+1} &= (x^2 - 2r_{\ell+1} t_{\ell+1} x + r_{\ell+1}^2) f_\ell \\ a_{\ell+1,k} &= a_{\ell,k-2} - 2r_{\ell+1} t_{\ell+1} a_{\ell,k-1} + r_{\ell+1}^2 a_{\ell,k}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\ell+1,k} &= (-1)^{2(\ell+1)-k} e_{2(\ell+1)-k}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2(\ell+1)}) \\ &= (-1)^{2\ell-(k-2)} e_{2\ell-(k-2)}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ &\quad - 2r_{\ell+1} t_{\ell+1} (-1)^{2\ell-(k-1)} e_{2\ell-(k-1)}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ &\quad + r_{\ell+1}^2 (-1)^{2\ell-k} e_{2\ell-k}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by dividing the above by  $(-1)^{2(\ell+1)-k}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{2(\ell+1)-k}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2(\ell+1)}) &= e_{2\ell-(k-2)}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ &\quad - 2r_{\ell+1} t_{\ell+1} (-1)^{-1} e_{2\ell-(k-1)}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ &\quad + r_{\ell+1}^2 (-1)^{-2} e_{2\ell-k}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ &= e_{2\ell-(k-2)}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ &\quad + 2r_{\ell+1} t_{\ell+1} e_{2\ell-(k-1)}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ &\quad + r_{\ell+1}^2 e_{2\ell-k}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

by the inductive hypothesis and the fact that  $r_{\ell+1}, t_{\ell+1} > 0$ .

□

The next lemma provides witnesses for a claim that is utilized in the proof of the Existence of Radii Lemma (Lemma 10). It is stated separately to preserve the intuitive flow of the proof of the Existence of Radii Lemma.

**Lemma 9 (Partial Witness)**  $\forall_{\ell \geq 3} \forall_{1 > t_1 \geq \dots \geq t_\ell > 0} \exists_{r_1, \dots, r_\ell > 0} C(r) < 1$  where

$$C(r) = \frac{e_0(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) e_{2\ell-2}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})}{e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) e_{2\ell-3}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})}.$$

*Proof:* Note

$$\begin{aligned} e_0(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) &= 1 \\ e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) &= \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{\ell-1} + \alpha_{\ell+1} + \dots + \alpha_{2\ell-1} \\ &= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_{\ell+1}) + \dots + (\alpha_{\ell-1} + \alpha_{2\ell-1}) \\ &= 2r_1 t_1 + \dots + 2r_{\ell-1} t_{\ell-1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{2\ell-3}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) &= \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, \ell-1, \ell+1, \dots, 2\ell-1\}} \left( \prod_{j \neq i} \alpha_j \right) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-1} \left( \prod_{j \neq i} \alpha_j + \prod_{j \neq \ell+i} \alpha_j \right) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-1} \left( (\alpha_{\ell+i} + \alpha_i) \prod_{j \neq i, \ell+i} \alpha_j \right) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-1} \left( (2r_i t_i) \prod_{j \neq i} r_j^2 \right) \\
e_{2\ell-2}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) &= \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_{\ell-1} \alpha_{\ell+1} \cdots \alpha_{2\ell-1} \\
&= \alpha_1 \alpha_{\ell+1} \cdots \alpha_{\ell-1} \alpha_{2\ell-1} \\
&= r_1^2 \cdots r_{\ell-1}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
C(r) &= \frac{e_0(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) e_{2\ell-2}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})}{e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) e_{2\ell-3}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})} \\
&= \frac{r_1^2 \cdots r_{\ell-1}^2}{(2r_1 t_1 + \cdots + 2r_{\ell-1} t_{\ell-1}) \left( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-1} \left( (2r_i t_i) \prod_{j \neq i} r_j^2 \right) \right)} \\
&= \frac{r_1 \cdots r_{\ell-1}}{(2r_1 t_1 + \cdots + 2r_{\ell-1} t_{\ell-1}) \left( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-1} \left( (2t_i) \prod_{j \neq i} r_j \right) \right)} \\
&= \frac{1}{(2r_1 t_1 + \cdots + 2r_{\ell-1} t_{\ell-1}) \left( \frac{2t_1}{r_1} + \cdots + \frac{2t_{\ell-1}}{r_{\ell-1}} \right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the following witness candidates for the existentially quantified variables  $r_1, \dots, r_{\ell-1}$ :

$$r_1 = 2t_1, \quad r_i = \frac{1}{2t_i} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq \ell-1.$$

Obviously,  $r_1, \dots, r_{\ell-1} > 0$ . Note

$$\begin{aligned}
C(r) &= \frac{1}{(2r_1 t_1 + 2r_2 t_2 + \cdots + 2r_{\ell-1} t_{\ell-1}) \left( \frac{2t_1}{r_1} + \frac{2t_2}{r_2} + \cdots + \frac{2t_{\ell-1}}{r_{\ell-1}} \right)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\left( 2(2t_1)t_1 + 2\left(\frac{1}{2t_2}\right)t_2 + \cdots + 2\left(\frac{1}{2t_{\ell-1}}\right)t_{\ell-1} \right) \left( \frac{2t_1}{2t_1} + \frac{2t_2}{\frac{1}{2t_2}} + \cdots + \frac{2t_{\ell-1}}{\frac{1}{2t_{\ell-1}}} \right)} \\
&= \frac{1}{(4t_1^2 + 1 + \cdots + 1)(1 + 4t_2^2 + \cdots + 4t_{\ell-1}^2)} \\
&< 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the candidates are witnesses.  $\square$

Note that the candidates provided above were discovered via guess-and-check in an attempt to manipulate the expression  $C(r)$  into a fraction of the form  $\frac{1}{1 + \text{positive terms}}$  where the stated property would be clear.

Finally, we provide the Existence of Radii Lemma, the core argument supporting the All Angles in Quadrant 1 Lemma (Lemma 4). One of the biggest obstacles was in determining which coefficients to examine to prove the claim. You will notice that different coefficients are required based on the number of angles in this quadrant and where they lie. For example, the coefficients needed to prove the claim when there are two angles  $\frac{\pi}{3} \leq \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 < \frac{\pi}{2}$  are different from the coefficients needed when  $0 < \theta_1 < \frac{\pi}{3}$  and  $\frac{\pi}{3} \leq \theta_2 < \frac{\pi}{2}$ .

**Lemma 10 (Existence of Radii)**  $\forall_{\ell \geq 2} \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \exists_{k \in \{s-2, 2\ell+s-5, 2\ell+s-2\}} c_k < 0$

*Proof:* Note

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall_{\ell \geq 2} \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \forall_{\substack{g \in \mathbb{R}[x] \\ \deg(g) = s-1}} \exists_{k \in \{s-2, 2\ell+s-5, 2\ell+s-2\}} c_k < 0 \\ \iff & \forall_{\ell \geq 2} \forall_{1 > t_1 \geq \dots \geq t_\ell > 0} \exists_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \forall_{\{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2}\} \in \mathbb{R}} \exists_{k \in \{s-2, 2\ell+s-5, 2\ell+s-2\}} c_k < 0 \end{aligned}$$

since the leading coefficient of  $g$  is assumed to be 1.

Let  $\ell \geq 2$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_\ell$  be such that  $1 > t_1 \geq \dots \geq t_\ell > 0$ . Let  $r_1 > 0$ .

**Claim 1:** When  $s = 2$ ,  $\exists_{r_\ell^{(1)} > 0} \forall_{r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(1)}} \forall_{b_0} c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0$ .

Note that  $s = 2$  only when  $\ell = 2$  and  $\frac{\pi}{3} \leq \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 < \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Note

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2\ell+s-5} &= a_0 + a_1 b_0 \\ c_{2\ell+s-2} &= a_3 + b_0. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 & \iff b_0 > -\frac{a_0}{a_1} \iff b_0 > \frac{e_4(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4)}{e_3(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4)} \iff b_0 > \frac{r_1 r_2}{2r_2 t_1 + 2r_1 t_2} \\ c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0 & \iff b_0 < -a_3 \iff b_0 < e_1(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) \iff b_0 < 2r_1 t_1 + 2r_2 t_2. \end{aligned}$$

Note  $\exists_{r_2 > 0} \forall_{b_0} c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0$ . Note

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall_{b_0} c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0 \\ \iff & \frac{r_1 r_2}{2r_2 t_1 + 2r_1 t_2} < 2r_1 t_1 + 2r_2 t_2 \\ \iff & \frac{r_1 r_2}{(2r_2 t_1 + 2r_1 t_2)(2r_1 t_1 + 2r_2 t_2)} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note

$$\forall_{b_0} \lim_{r_2 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r_1 r_2}{(2r_2 t_1 + 2r_1 t_2)(2r_1 t_1 + 2r_2 t_2)} = 0$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_{r_2}(r_1 r_2) &= 1 \\ \deg_{r_2}((2r_2 t_1 + 2r_1 t_2)(2r_1 t_1 + 2r_2 t_2)) &= 2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\exists_{r_2^{(1)} > 0} \forall_{r_2 \geq r_2^{(1)}} \forall_{b_0} c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0$ . The claim has been proved.

Example for Claim 1: *The following two graphs demonstrate Claim 1 for the degree 4 polynomial*

$$f = \left( x^2 - 2(1) \cos\left(\frac{10\pi}{24}\right) x + (1)^2 \right) \left( x^2 - 2r_2 \cos\left(\frac{11\pi}{24}\right) x + r_2^2 \right)$$

where  $\frac{\pi}{3} < \frac{10\pi}{24} < \frac{11\pi}{24} < \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Note that  $r_1 = 1$  and  $g = x + b_0$ , as  $s = 2$ .



When both radii are equal to 1, there are potential values of  $b_0$  that do not produce a negative coefficient. When  $r_2$  is increased to 10, at least one coefficient is negative for any  $b_0$ .

For the remainder of the proof, let  $s \geq 3$ . Let  $r_1, \dots, r_{\ell-1} > 0$  be such that  $C(r) < 1$  is true, where

$$C(r) = \frac{e_0(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) e_{2\ell-2}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})}{e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) e_{2\ell-3}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})}.$$

The existence of such radii is justified based on the value of  $\ell$ .

1. In the case where  $\ell = 2$  and  $s \geq 3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} C(r) &= \frac{e_0(\alpha_1, \alpha_3) e_2(\alpha_1, \alpha_3)}{e_1(\alpha_1, \alpha_3) e_1(\alpha_1, \alpha_3)} \\ &= \frac{1 \cdot \alpha_1 \alpha_3}{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3)} \\ &= \frac{r_1^2}{4r_1^2 t_1^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{4t_1^2} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $s \geq 3$ , we must have  $0 < \theta_1 < \frac{\pi}{3}$  and  $t_1 > \frac{1}{2}$ . Hence,  $C(r) < 1$ .

2. In the case where  $\ell \geq 3$ , we know such radii exist from Lemma 9.

Using the coefficient expressions from Lemma 7, note

$$\begin{aligned} c_{s-2} = 0 &\iff b_{s-3} = -\frac{a_0}{a_1} b_{s-2} - \sum_{i=2}^{s-2} \frac{a_i}{a_1} b_{(s-2)-i} \\ c_{2\ell+s-5} = 0 &\iff b_{s-3} = -\frac{a_{2\ell-3}}{a_{2\ell-2}} b_{s-2} - \frac{a_{2\ell-1} b_{s-4} + b_{s-5} + a_{2\ell-4}}{a_{2\ell-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $b_0, \dots, b_{s-4}$  be arbitrary but fixed.

Let  $L_k$  be the line given by  $c_k = 0$  in  $(b_{s-2}, b_{s-3})$  space. Let  $\mu_k$  be the slope of  $L_k$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{s-2} &= -\frac{a_0}{a_1} \\ \mu_{2\ell+s-5} &= -\frac{a_{2\ell-3}}{a_{2\ell-2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since  $a_i = (-1)^{2\ell-i} e_{2\ell-i}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}a_0 &= e_{2\ell}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ a_1 &= -e_{2\ell-1}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ a_{2\ell-3} &= -e_3(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ a_{2\ell-2} &= e_2(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{s-2} &= \frac{e_{2\ell}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})}{e_{2\ell-1}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})} \\ \mu_{2\ell+s-5} &= \frac{e_3(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})}{e_2(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})}.\end{aligned}$$

Claim 2:  $\exists_{r_\ell^{(2)} > 0} \forall_{r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(2)}} \mu_{2\ell+s-5} > \mu_{s-2}$ .

Note as  $r_\ell \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}e_{2\ell}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) &\rightarrow \alpha_\ell \alpha_{2\ell} e_{2\ell-2}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) \\ e_{2\ell-1}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) &\rightarrow \alpha_\ell \alpha_{2\ell} e_{2\ell-3}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) \\ e_3(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) &\rightarrow \alpha_\ell \alpha_{2\ell} e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}) \\ e_2(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) &\rightarrow \alpha_\ell \alpha_{2\ell} e_0(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{s-2} &\rightarrow \frac{e_{2\ell-2}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})}{e_{2\ell-3}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})} \\ \mu_{2\ell+s-5} &\rightarrow \frac{e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})}{e_0(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})}.\end{aligned}$$

Then for sufficiently large  $r_\ell$ ,


$$\begin{aligned}\Leftrightarrow & \frac{\mu_{2\ell+s-5}}{e_0(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})} > \frac{\mu_{s-2}}{e_{2\ell-3}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell-1}, \alpha_{\ell+1}, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell-1})} \\ \Leftrightarrow & 1 > C(r)\end{aligned}$$

which is true for the  $r_1, \dots, r_{\ell-1}$  we have previously chosen based on the claim from Lemma 9. Recall that the elementary symmetric polynomials in these roots are always positive by Lemma 8. The claim has been proved.

Continuing with the proof of the lemma, let  $r_\ell^{(2)}$  be such that  $\forall_{r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(2)}} \mu_{2\ell+s-5} > \mu_{s-2}$ . Such  $r_\ell^{(2)}$  exists due

to the previous claim. Let  $r_\ell$  be arbitrary but fixed such that  $r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(2)}$ . Then over the space  $(b_{s-2}, b_{s-3})$ , there exists a unique intersection point of  $L_{s-2}$  and  $L_{2\ell+s-5}$ . Let  $(p, q)$  be the intersection point.

Example of  $(p, q)$ : In this example,  $f = \left(x^2 - 2(1) \cos\left(\frac{7\pi}{24}\right)x + (1)^2\right) \left(x^2 - 2r_2 \cos\left(\frac{10\pi}{24}\right)x + r_2^2\right)$ , so  $s = 3$ ,  $g = x^2 + b_1x + b_0$ , and  $(p, q)$  is the intersection point of  $L_1$  with  $L_2$ .



We will continue using this example to illustrate the remainder of the proof.

Continuing with the proof of the lemma, as shown below, we have  $p = \frac{a_{2\ell-2}d_0 - a_1d_1}{a_0a_{2\ell-2} - a_1a_{2\ell-3}}$  and

$q = \frac{a_0d_1 - a_{2\ell-3}d_0}{a_0a_{2\ell-2} - a_1a_{2\ell-3}}$  where  $d_0 = -\sum_{i=2}^{s-2} a_i b_{(s-2)-i}$  and  $d_1 = -a_{2\ell-1}b_{s-4} - b_{s-5} - a_{2\ell-4}$ . Note

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_{s-2} = 0 \quad \wedge \quad c_{2\ell+s-5} = 0 \\
\iff & a_0b_{s-2} + a_1b_{s-3} + \sum_{i=2}^{s-2} a_i b_{(s-2)-i} = 0 \quad \wedge \\
& a_{2\ell-4} + a_{2\ell-3}b_{s-2} + a_{2\ell-2}b_{s-3} + a_{2\ell-1}b_{s-4} + b_{s-5} = 0 \\
\iff & a_0b_{s-2} + a_1b_{s-3} = -\sum_{i=2}^{s-2} a_i b_{(s-2)-i} \quad \wedge \\
& a_{2\ell-3}b_{s-2} + a_{2\ell-2}b_{s-3} = -a_{2\ell-1}b_{s-4} - b_{s-5} - a_{2\ell-4} \\
\iff & a_0b_{s-2} + a_1b_{s-3} = d_0 \quad \text{where } d_0 = -\sum_{i=2}^{s-2} a_i b_{(s-2)-i} \quad \wedge \\
& a_{2\ell-3}b_{s-2} + a_{2\ell-2}b_{s-3} = d_1 \quad \text{where } d_1 = -a_{2\ell-1}b_{s-4} - b_{s-5} - a_{2\ell-4} \\
\iff & \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 \\ a_{2\ell-3} & a_{2\ell-2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b_{s-2} \\ b_{s-3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} d_0 \\ d_1 \end{bmatrix} \\
\iff & b_{s-2} = \frac{\begin{vmatrix} d_0 & a_1 \\ d_1 & a_{2\ell-2} \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_1 \\ a_{2\ell-3} & a_{2\ell-2} \end{vmatrix}} \quad \wedge \quad b_{s-3} = \frac{\begin{vmatrix} a_0 & d_0 \\ a_{2\ell-3} & d_1 \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_1 \\ a_{2\ell-3} & a_{2\ell-2} \end{vmatrix}} \\
\iff & b_{s-2} = \frac{a_{2\ell-2}d_0 - a_1d_1}{a_0a_{2\ell-2} - a_1a_{2\ell-3}} \quad \wedge \quad b_{s-3} = \frac{a_0d_1 - a_{2\ell-3}d_0}{a_0a_{2\ell-2} - a_1a_{2\ell-3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

**Claim 3:**  $\forall_{r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(2)}} \forall_{\substack{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2} \\ b_{s-2} > p}} c_{s-2} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0$ .

Let  $r_\ell^{(2)}$  be such that  $\forall_{r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(2)}} \mu_{2\ell+s-5} > \mu_{s-2}$ . In Claim 2, we showed that such  $r_\ell^{(2)}$  exists. Let  $r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(2)}$  be arbitrary but fixed.

Let  $b_0, \dots, b_{s-4}$  be arbitrary but fixed. We need to show  $\forall_{\substack{b_{s-2}, b_{s-3} \\ b_{s-2} > p}} c_{s-2} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0$ .

Over the space  $(b_{s-2}, b_{s-3})$  where  $b_{s-2} > p$ , we have



1.  $c_{2\ell+s-5} = 0$  line and  $c_{s-2} = 0$  line do not intersect
2.  $c_{2\ell+s-5} = 0$  line is above  $c_{s-2} = 0$  line.


Let  $(b_{s-2}, b_{s-3})$  be an arbitrary but fixed point such that  $b_{s-2} > p$ . Then  $(b_{s-2}, b_{s-3})$  is above  $L_{s-2}$  or below  $L_{2\ell+s-5}$ . Note

$$\begin{aligned} (b_{s-2}, b_{s-3}) \text{ is above } L_{s-2} &\iff b_{s-3} > -\frac{a_0}{a_1}b_{s-2} + \frac{d_0}{a_1} &\iff c_{s-2} < 0 \\ (b_{s-2}, b_{s-3}) \text{ is below } L_{2\ell+s-5} &\iff b_{s-3} < -\frac{a_{2\ell-3}}{a_{2\ell-2}}b_{s-2} + \frac{d_1}{a_{2\ell-2}} &\iff c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 \end{aligned}$$

since  $a_1 = (-1)^{2\ell-1}e_{2\ell-1}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) < 0$  and  $a_{2\ell-2} = (-1)^2e_2(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) > 0$ .

Thus  $c_{s-2} < 0$  or  $c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0$ . The claim has been proved.

Example of Claim 3: Again,  $f = \left(x^2 - 2(1) \cos\left(\frac{7\pi}{24}\right)x + (1)^2\right) \left(x^2 - 2r_2 \cos\left(\frac{10\pi}{24}\right)x + r_2^2\right)$ , so  $s = 3$ ,  $g = x^2 + b_1x + b_0$ , and  $(p, q)$  is the intersection point of  $L_1$  with  $L_2$ .



For any point with  $b_{s-2} = b_1 > p$ , we can see that either  $c_1 < 0$  or  $c_2 < 0$ .

Claim 4:  $\exists_{r_\ell^{(3)} > 0} \forall_{r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(3)}} \forall_{\substack{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2} \\ b_{s-2} \leq p}} c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0$ .

Note

$$\forall_{r_\ell > 0} \forall_{\substack{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2} \\ b_{s-2} \leq p}} \frac{a_{2\ell-2}d_0 - a_1d_1}{e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})(a_0a_{2\ell-2} - a_1a_{2\ell-3})} < 1 \implies c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} &c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0 \\ \iff &b_{s-2} < -a_{2\ell-1} \\ \iff &p < -a_{2\ell-1} \quad \text{since } b_{s-2} \leq p \\ \iff &\frac{a_{2\ell-2}d_0 - a_1d_1}{a_0a_{2\ell-2} - a_1a_{2\ell-3}} < e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) \\ \iff &\frac{a_{2\ell-2}d_0 - a_1d_1}{e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})(a_0a_{2\ell-2} - a_1a_{2\ell-3})} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Once more,  $e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell}) > 0$  from Lemma 8.

Let  $e_k = e_k(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})$ . Note

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{a_{2\ell-2}d_0 - a_1d_1}{e_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2\ell})(a_0a_{2\ell-2} - a_1a_{2\ell-3})} \\ &= \frac{-e_2 \sum_{i=2}^{s-2} (-1)^{2\ell-i} e_{2\ell-i} b_{(s-2)-i} + e_{2\ell-1} (e_1 b_{s-4} - b_{s-5} - e_4)}{e_1 (e_{2\ell} e_2 - e_{2\ell-1} e_3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note


$$\forall_{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2}} \lim_{r_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-e_2 \sum_{i=2}^{s-2} (-1)^{2\ell-i} e_{2\ell-i} b_{(s-2)-i} + e_{2\ell-1} (e_1 b_{s-4} - b_{s-5} - e_4)}{e_1 (e_{2\ell} e_2 - e_{2\ell-1} e_3)} = 0$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_{r_\ell} \left( -e_2 \sum_{i=2}^{s-2} (-1)^{2\ell-i} e_{2\ell-i} b_{(s-2)-i} + e_{2\ell-1} (e_1 b_{s-4} - b_{s-5} - e_4) \right) &\leq 4 \\ \deg_{r_\ell} (e_1 (e_{2\ell} e_2 - e_{2\ell-1} e_3)) &= 5. \end{aligned}$$

The claim has been proved.

Example of Claim 4: Once more,  $f = \left( x^2 - 2(1) \cos\left(\frac{7\pi}{24}\right) x + (1)^2 \right) \left( x^2 - 2r_2 \cos\left(\frac{10\pi}{24}\right) x + r_2^2 \right)$ , so  $s = 3$ ,  $g = x^2 + b_1 x + b_0$ , and  $(p, q)$  is the intersection point of  $L_1$  with  $L_2$ .



Notice that when  $r_2 = 1$ , there is a region of points with  $b_{s-2} = b_1 \leq p$  where  $c_{2\ell+s-2} = c_5$  is not negative. However, when  $r_2 = 10$ ,  $c_5 < 0$  for all points where  $b_1 \leq p$ .

We continue with the proof of the lemma.

From Claim 1, when  $\ell = s = 2$ , for some  $r_\ell^{(1)} > 0$  we have  $\forall_{r_\ell > r_\ell^{(1)}} \forall_{b_0} c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0$ .

From Claim 3, when  $s \geq 3$ , for some  $r_\ell^{(2)} > 0$  we have

$$\forall_{r_\ell > r_\ell^{(2)}} \forall_{\substack{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2} \\ b_{s-2} > p}} c_{s-2} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0.$$

From Claim 4, when  $s \geq 3$ , for some  $r_\ell^{(3)} > 0$  we have  $\forall_{r_\ell \geq r_\ell^{(3)}} \forall_{\substack{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2} \\ b_{s-2} \leq p}} c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0$ .

Then for  $r_\ell^* = \max\{r_\ell^{(1)}, r_\ell^{(2)}, r_\ell^{(3)}\}$ , we have

$$\forall_{r_\ell \geq r_\ell^*} \left[ \left[ \forall_{\substack{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2} \\ b_{s-2} > p}} c_{s-2} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 \right] \wedge \left[ \forall_{\substack{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2} \\ b_{s-2} \leq p}} c_{2\ell+s-5} < 0 \vee c_{2\ell+s-2} < 0 \right] \right].$$


Hence

$$\exists_{r_\ell > 0} \forall_{b_0, \dots, b_{s-2}} \bigvee_{k \in \{s-2, 2\ell+s-5, 2\ell+s-2\}} c_k < 0.$$

The lemma has finally been proved.  $\square$

### 3.5 Concerning Angles in Quadrant 2, $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi \leq \pi$

Finally, we present the proof for the case when some angles fall in quadrant 2, including the axes. We convert the optimality claim into a statement on the separation of two sets in Lemma 12. Then we prove that for any polynomial for which Curtiss' bound is optimal, there is a radius such that we can multiply by a linear or quadratic factor with angle  $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi \leq \pi$  and this radius while maintaining the optimality of the bound. Inductively, we can extend this argument to any collection of angles in quadrant 2.



The main challenge of this section was in the One New Quadrant 2 Factor Lemma (Lemma 13). To prove a separation between the two necessary sets, we examined the Euclidean distance between them and proved it must be greater than zero, a surprisingly non-trivial task.

**Lemma 11 (Some Angles in Quadrant 2)** *We have*

$$\forall_{\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi_1 \leq \dots \leq \phi_k < \pi} \forall_{0 < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_\ell < \frac{\pi}{2}} \exists_{p_1, \dots, p_t > 0} \exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) = \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta}).$$

*Proof:* We will first induct on  $k$ , the number of quadratic factors with  $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi_i < \pi$  in  $f_{\phi, r_\phi}$ , to show that  $\text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi}) = \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta})$ .

Base Case: The claim holds for  $k = 0$ .

It is trivially true.

Hypothesis: Assume the claim holds for  $k$  quadratic factors with  $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi_i < \pi$ .

$$\exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi}) = \text{opt}(f_{\theta, r_\theta})$$

Induction Step: Consider  $k + 1$  quadratic factors with  $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi_i < \pi$ .

Assume  $r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0$  are such that the induction hypothesis holds. By the One More Quadrant 2 Factor Lemma (Lemma 13),

$$\exists_{r_{\phi_{k+1}} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt}\left(f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} \left(x^2 - 2r_{\phi_{k+1}} \cos \phi_{k+1} x + r_{\phi_{k+1}}^2\right)\right)$$

$$= \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi}) + \text{opt} \left( x^2 - 2r_{\phi_{k+1}} \cos \phi_{k+1} x + r_{\phi_{k+1}}^2 \right).$$

By the Curtiss Bound, (Theorem 1),  $\text{opt} \left( x^2 - 2r_{\phi_{k+1}} \cos \phi_{k+1} x + r_{\phi_{k+1}}^2 \right) = 0$ , so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{opt} \left( f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} \left( x^2 - 2r_{\phi_{k+1}} \cos \phi_{k+1} x + r_{\phi_{k+1}}^2 \right) \right) &= \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi}) \\ &= \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have  $\exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi}) = \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta})$ .

Now we will induct on  $t$ , the number of linear factors in  $f_{\pi, p}$ , to show that

$$\exists_{p_1, \dots, p_t > 0} \exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) = \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta}).$$

Base Case: The claim holds for  $t = 0$ .

Trivially true.

Hypothesis: Assume the claim holds for  $t$  linear factors.

$$\exists_{p_1, \dots, p_t > 0} \exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) = \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta})$$

Induction Step: Consider  $t + 1$  linear factors.

Assume  $p_1, \dots, p_t, r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0$  are such that the induction hypothesis holds. By the One More Quadrant 2 Factor Lemma (Lemma 13),

$$\exists_{p_{t+1} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p} (x + p_{t+1})) = \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) + \text{opt} (x + p_{t+1}).$$

By the Curtiss Bound (Theorem 1),  $\text{opt} (x + p_{t+1}) = 0$ , so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p} (x + p_{t+1})) &= \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) \\ &= \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have  $\exists_{p_1, \dots, p_t > 0} \exists_{r_{\phi_1}, \dots, r_{\phi_k} > 0} \forall_{r_{\theta_1}, \dots, r_{\theta_\ell} > 0} \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta} f_{\phi, r_\phi} f_{\pi, p}) = \text{opt} (f_{\theta, r_\theta})$ .

□

The above proof relies on the One More Quadrant 2 Factor Lemma (Lemma 13). To prove this lemma, we will build additional notation and convert the optimality claim to a claim about separation of sets. Recall that

$$A_s = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_n \\ & \ddots & & \ddots \\ & & a_0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(s+1) \times (s+n+1)}$$

and, from the Coefficients Lemma (Lemma 3),  $\text{coeffs}(gf) = bA_s$ . We partition  $A_s$  into two sub-matrices as  $A_s = [L_s|R_s]$  where

$$L_s = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & \cdots & a_{n-1} \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & a_0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(s+1) \times n} \quad \text{and} \quad R_s = \begin{bmatrix} a_n & & & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & & \\ a_0 & & & \ddots & \\ & \ddots & & & \ddots \\ & & a_0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(s+1) \times (s+1)}.$$

Let

$$c = bR_s \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (s+1)} \\ T_s = R_s^{-1}L_s \in \mathbb{R}^{(s+1) \times n}.$$

**Lemma 12 (Separation of Sets)** *We have*

$$\exists_{g \neq 0, \deg(g) \leq s} \text{coeffs}(gf) \geq 0 \iff \text{ConvexHull}(T_s) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \neq \emptyset$$

where  $T_s$  is viewed as a set of row vectors.

*Proof:* Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{coeffs}(gf) &= bA_s \quad (\text{from Lemma 3}) \\ &= b(R_s R_s^{-1})A_s \\ &= (bR_s)(R_s^{-1}A_s) \\ &= (bR_s)(R_s^{-1}[L_s|R_s]) \\ &= (bR_s)[R_s^{-1}L_s|R_s^{-1}R_s] \\ &= (bR_s)[R_s^{-1}L_s|I] \\ &= c[T_s|I] \quad \text{where } c = bR_s \quad \text{and } T_s = R_s^{-1}L_s. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists_{g \neq 0, \deg(g) \leq s} \text{coeffs}(gf) \geq 0 \\ \iff &\exists_{c \neq 0} c[T_s|I] \geq 0 \\ \iff &\exists_{c \neq 0} cT_s \geq 0 \quad \text{and } c \geq 0 \\ \iff &\exists_{c \geq 0, c \neq 0} cT_s \geq 0 \\ \iff &\exists_{c \geq 0, c_0 + \cdots + c_s = 1} cT_s \geq 0 \\ \iff &\text{ConvexHull}(T_s) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Notation 5** *Note*

- $h_{\phi,r} = x + r$  when  $\phi = \pi$
- $h_{\phi,r} = x^2 - 2r \cos \phi x + r^2$  when  $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi < \pi$
- $P = \{f \in \mathbb{R}[x] : f(x) > 0 \text{ for } x \geq 0\}$

**Lemma 13 (One New Quadrant 2 Factor)**  $\forall_{f \in P, \deg(f) \geq 1} \forall_{\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \phi \leq \pi} \exists_{r > 0} \text{opt}(f h_{\phi,r}) = \text{opt}(f) + \text{opt}(h_{\phi,r})$

*Proof:* Let  $f \in P$  and  $h = f h_{\phi,r}$ . We need to show  $\exists_{r > 0} \text{opt}(h) = \text{opt}(f)$  since  $\text{opt}(h_{\phi,r}) = 0$ . We will divide the proof into several claims.

Claim 1:  $\exists_{r > 0} \text{opt}(h) = \text{opt}(f) \iff \exists_{r > 0} \text{CH}(T_{h,0}^*, \dots, T_{h,s-1}^*) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n = \emptyset$

where

- $n = \deg(f)$
- $s = \text{opt}(f)$
- $d = \deg(h)$
- The  $T_{h,i}$  are the rows of  $T_{s-1}$  for  $h$ .
- $T_{h,i}^*$  is obtained from  $T_{h,i}$  by deleting the first  $d$  elements.

Note

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{opt}(h) = \text{opt}(f) \\
\iff & \text{opt}(h) \geq s \quad \text{since } \text{opt}(h) \leq \text{opt}(f) + \text{opt}(h_{\phi,r}) = \text{opt}(f) = s \\
\iff & \neg \exists_{g \neq 0, \deg(g) < s} \text{coeffs}(gh) \geq 0 \\
\iff & \neg \left( \text{CH}(T_{h,0}, \dots, T_{h,s-1}) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n+d} \neq \emptyset \right) \quad \text{from Lemma 12} \\
\iff & \text{CH}(T_{h,0}, \dots, T_{h,s-1}) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n+d} = \emptyset \\
\iff & \text{CH}(T_{h,0}^*, \dots, T_{h,s-1}^*) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n = \emptyset.
\end{aligned}$$

Claim 2:  $\exists_{r > 0} \text{opt}(h) = \text{opt}(f) \iff \exists_{r > 0} \varepsilon_h(r) > 0$

where  $\varepsilon_h(r)$  stands for the minimum Euclidean distance between  $\text{CH}(T_{h,0}^*, \dots, T_{h,s-1}^*)$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ , that is,

$$\varepsilon_h(r) := \min_{\substack{x \in \text{CH}(T_{h,0}^*, \dots, T_{h,s-1}^*) \\ y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n}} \|x - y\|.$$

Immediate from the above claim.

Claim 3:  $\varepsilon_h(r)$  is continuous at  $r = 0$ .

Note

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_h(r) &= \min_{\substack{c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^s \\ c_0 + \dots + c_{s-1} = 1 \\ y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n}} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} c_i T_{h,i}^* - y \right\| \\
&= \min_{\substack{c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^s \\ c_0 + \dots + c_{s-1} = 1 \\ y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n}} \left\| \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} c_i T_{h,i,1}^* - y_1, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} c_i T_{h,i,n}^* - y_n \right] \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \min_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{s+n} \\ z_0 + \dots + z_{s-1} = 1}} \left\| \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} z_i T_{h,i,1}^* - z_s, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} z_i T_{h,i,n}^* - z_{s+n-1} \right] \right\| \quad \text{where } z = (c, y) \\
&= \min_{z \in C} p(z, r)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $p(z, r)$  is Euclidean distance and

$$C = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{s+n} : z_1 + \dots + z_s = 1 \right\}.$$

Note, since  $p(z, r)$  is the distance between two closed sets, the minimum distance is realized by a point in each set. Hence,

$$\varepsilon_h(r) = \min_{z \in C} p(z, r) = \inf_{z \in C} p(z, r).$$

Note the following:

1. By Section 3.1.5 of [3],  $p(z, r)$  is a convex function since  $p(z, r)$  is a norm.
2. By Section 3.2.5 of [3],  $\varepsilon_h(r) = \inf_{z \in C} p(z, r)$  is a convex function, since  $C$  is convex and  $p(z, r)$  is bounded below.
3. By Corollary 3.5.3 in [13], since  $\varepsilon_h(r)$  is a convex function defined on a convex set  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\varepsilon_h(r)$  is continuous on the relative interior of  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\text{ri}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}$ .
4. Hence,  $\varepsilon_h(r)$  is continuous at  $r = 0$ .

**Claim 4:**  $\varepsilon_h(0) > 0$ .

The claim follows immediately from the following subclaims. Let  $r = 0$ . Then  $h = x^d \cdot f$ .

**Subclaim 1 :**  $T_{h,i,j}^* = T_{f,i,j}$ . Note that these are the entries of  $T_{h,s-1}^*$  and  $T_{f,s-1}$ . We will prove the claim using the fact that  $T_{s-1} = R_{s-1}^{-1} L_{s-1}$  for any  $f$ .

Note  $R_{f,s-1} = R_{h,s-1}$ . This is clear from the definition of  $R_{s-1}$ . Hence  $R_{f,s-1}^{-1} = R_{h,s-1}^{-1}$ .

Note that  $L_{f,i,j} = L_{h,i,j+d}$ . This is clear from the definition of  $L_{s-1}$ , since  $L_{h,s-1}$  is composed of  $L_{f,s-1}$  with  $d$  columns of zeroes added on the left.

Note that for  $i = 0, \dots, s-1$  and  $j = 0, \dots, n-1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{h,i,j}^* &= T_{h,i,j+d} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} R_{h,i,k}^{-1} L_{h,k,j+d} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} R_{f,i,k}^{-1} L_{f,k,j} \\
&= T_{f,i,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $T_{h,i,j}^* = T_{f,i,j}$ .

**Subclaim 2:**  $\varepsilon_h(0) = \varepsilon_f$  where  $\varepsilon_f$  stands for the minimum Euclidean distance between  $\text{CH}(T_{f,0}, \dots, T_{f,s-1})$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ , that is,

$$\varepsilon_f := \min_{\substack{x \in \text{CH}(T_{f,0}, \dots, T_{f,s-1}) \\ y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n}} \|x - y\|.$$

To see this, note

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_h(0) &= \min_{\substack{c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^s \\ c_0 + \dots + c_{s-1} = 1 \\ y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n}} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} c_i T_{h,i}^* - y \right\| \\ &= \min_{\substack{c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^s \\ c_0 + \dots + c_{s-1} = 1 \\ y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n}} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} c_i T_{f,i} - y \right\| \\ &= \min_{\substack{x \in \text{CH}(T_{f,0}, \dots, T_{f,s-1}) \\ y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n}} \|x - y\| \\ &= \varepsilon_f. \end{aligned}$$

**Subclaim 3:**  $\varepsilon_f > 0$ .

Note since  $\text{opt}(f) = s$ , we have  $\text{CH}(T_{f,0}, \dots, T_{f,s-1}) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n = \emptyset$ . Thus  $\varepsilon_f > 0$ .

From the above four claims, we immediately have

$$\exists_{r>0} \text{opt}(h) = \text{opt}(f).$$

Thus we have proved the lemma.  $\square$

**Example 6** Consider the following function, for which  $b(f) = 4$ :

$$f = \prod_{i=1}^3 (x^2 - 2(10^{i-1}) \cos(\theta_i) x + (10^{i-1})^2) \quad \text{where } \theta = \left\{ \frac{7\pi}{24}, \frac{10\pi}{24}, \frac{11\pi}{24} \right\}.$$

When  $h_{\phi,r} = x^2 - 2(10^0) \cos\left(\frac{14\pi}{24}\right) x + (10^0)^2$ , we have  $\text{opt}(f h_{\phi,r}) = 3$ .

When  $h_{\phi,r} = x^2 - 2(10^3) \cos\left(\frac{14\pi}{24}\right) x + (10^3)^2$ , we have  $\text{opt}(f h_{\phi,r}) = b(f) = 4$ .

**Example 7** Consider the following function, for which  $b(f) = 4$ :

$$f = \prod_{i=1}^4 (x^2 - 2(10^{i-1}) \cos(\theta_i) x + (10^{i-1})^2) \quad \text{where } \theta = \left\{ \frac{7\pi}{24}, \frac{10\pi}{24}, \frac{11\pi}{24}, \frac{14\pi}{24} \right\}.$$

When  $h_{\phi,r} = x + 10^0$ , we have  $\text{opt}(f h_{\phi,r}) = 3$ .

When  $h_{\phi,r} = x + 10^4$ , we have  $\text{opt}(f h_{\phi,r}) = 4$ .

**Acknowledgements.** Hoon Hong's work was supported by National Science Foundation (CCF: 2212461 and 1813340).



## References

- [1] E. Artin. Über die zerlegung definiten funktionen in quadrate. *Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg*, 5:100–115, 12 1927.
- [2] M. Avendaño. Descartes' rule of signs is exact! *Journal of Algebra - J ALGEBRA*, 324:2884–2892, 11 2010.
- [3] S. P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [4] F. Budan. *Nouvelle méthode pour la résolution des équations numériques d'un degré quelconque : d'après laquelle toute le calcul exigé pour cette résolution se réduit à l'emploi des deux premières règles de l'arithmétique*. Courcier, 1807.
- [5] T. Cameron and P. Psarrakos. On descartes' rule of signs for matrix polynomials. *Operators and Matrices*, pages 643–652, 01 2019.
- [6] D. R. Curtiss. Recent extensions of Descartes' rule of signs. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 19(4):251–278, 1918.
- [7] R. Descartes. *The Geometry of Rene Descartes: With a facsimile of the first edition*. Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [8] E. Feliu and M. L. Telek. On generalizing descartes' rule of signs to hypersurfaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 408:108582, 10 2022.
- [9] J. B. J. Fourier. *Oeuvres de Fourier: Publiées par les soins de Gaston Darboux*, volume 2 of *Cambridge Library Collection - Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [10] C. Hermite. Remarques sur le théorème de m. Sturm. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 36:294–297, 1853.
- [11] D. Hilbert. Mathematical problems. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 8(10):437 – 479, 1902.
- [12] J.-L. Krivine. Anneaux préordonnés. *Journal d'analyse mathématique*, 12:p. 307–326, 1964.
- [13] C. Niculescu and L. Persson. *Convex functions and their applications*. Springer Verlag New York, 2006.
- [14] J. Nie and M. Schweighofer. On the complexity of putinar's positivstellensatz. *Journal of Complexity*, 23:135–150, 02 2007.
- [15] H. Poincaré. Sur les équations algébriques. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris*, 93:1418–1414, 1883.
- [16] G. Pólya. Über positive Darstellung von Polynomen Vierteljschr. *Naturforsch. Ges. Zurich*, (73), 1928.
- [17] V. Powers and B. Reznick. A new bound for pólya's theorem with applications to polynomials positive on polyhedra. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 164(1-2):221–229, 10 2001.
- [18] M. Putinar. Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42(3):969–984, 1993.
- [19] K. Schmüdgen. The k-moment problem for compact semi-algebraic sets. *Mathematische Annalen*, 289(2):203–206, 1991.
- [20] M. Schweighofer. On the complexity of schmüdgen's positivstellensatz. *J. Complexity*, 20:529–543, 08 2004.
- [21] P. Sturm. *Mémoire sur la résolution des équations numériques*, volume 6, pages 345–390. Birkhäuser Basel, 01 2009.
- [22] D. Tokarev. A generalisation of descartes' rule of signs. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 91, 12 2011.