

A Basis-preserving Algorithm for Computing the Bézout Matrix of Newton Polynomials

Jing Yang, Wei Yang*

SMS-HCIC-School of Mathematics and Physics,
Center for Applied Mathematics of Guangxi,
Guangxi Minzu University, Nanning 530006, China
yangjing0930@gmail.com; weiyang020499@163.com

Abstract

This paper tackles the problem of constructing Bézout matrices for Newton polynomials in a basis-preserving approach that operates directly with the given Newton basis, thus avoiding the need for transformation from Newton basis to monomial basis. This approach significantly reduces the computational cost and also mitigates numerical instability caused by basis transformation. For this purpose, we investigate the internal structure of Bézout matrices in Newton basis and design a basis-preserving algorithm that generates the Bézout matrix in the specified basis used to formulate the input polynomials. Furthermore, we show an application of the proposed algorithm on constructing confederate resultant matrices for Newton polynomials. Experimental results demonstrate that the proposed methods perform superior to the basis-transformation-based ones.

Keywords: Resultant, Bézout matrix, Newton polynomial, basis-preserving algorithm, companion matrix.

1 Introduction

Resultant theory is a crucial component of computer algebra and has received extensive research in both theoretical and practical aspects (just list a few [3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16–21, 26, 27]). Most of the studies so far have focused on polynomials in standard basis. However, with the growing popularity of basis-preserving algorithms in various applications [1, 8, 12, 14, 15], there is a need to study resultants and subresultant polynomials for polynomials in non-standard basis (see [2, 6, 23, 28]). This paper aims to address this need by presenting an approach for constructing Bézout matrices of Newton polynomials, which covers a wide class of polynomials in the interpolation problem. Standard polynomials in monomial basis can also be viewed as a specialization of Newton polynomials (if we do not require that the nodes in Newton basis are distinct). In the settings of the paper, the input polynomials are formulated in Newton basis and so are the output Bézout matrix.

This study is motivated by the observation that the basis-preserving Bézout matrix usually has a simpler form, compared with the Bézout matrix formulated in monomial basis. A natural way to construct the Bézout matrix of two Newton polynomials is: (1) to convert the polynomials into expressions in monomial basis, (2) construct their Bézout matrix in monomial basis,

*Corresponding author.

and (3) change the Bézout matrix from monomial basis to Newton basis. It is seen that two basis transformations are involved, which often causes a high computational cost and results in numerical instability as well.

To address these problems caused by basis transformation, we present a basis-preserving algorithm for computing the Bézout matrix for two Newton polynomials. More explicitly, the algorithm takes two univariate polynomials in Newton basis as input, and produces a Bézout matrix for the given polynomials, while ensuring that the resulting matrix is formulated in the given basis used to define the input polynomials. To achieve this goal, we investigate the internal structure hidden in Bézout matrices in Newton basis, based on which a basis-preserving algorithm is designed for constructing such a matrix. Notably, the proposed algorithm does not require any basis transformation, thus avoiding the heavy computational cost and numerical instability caused by such transformations. We also demonstrate an application of the proposed algorithm in the construction of the confederate resultant matrix for Newton polynomials. Experimental results show that the proposed algorithms perform significantly better than the basis-transformation-based ones.

The current work can be viewed as a refinement of the work in [30], where the Bézout matrix in general basis is considered and various notable properties of this matrix are developed. However, from the computational view, it is almost impossible to develop a uniform and efficient algorithm to compute Bézout matrices in an arbitrarily given general basis, since it heavily relies on the structure of the chosen basis. Thus we need to develop specialized algorithms for specific instances of general basis. Newton basis is a typical one with nice properties and wide applications. However, as far as we know, there is no work on the construction of Bézout matrix for Newton polynomials. We hope the finding in this paper can help people have a better understanding on the structure of Bézout matrix in Newton basis and promote its application on formulating various resultant matrices and subresultant polynomials.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we first review the concepts of Bézout matrix in a given basis, which is followed by a formal statement of the addressed problem in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to present the main result of the paper (see Theorem 7 and the algorithm `BezNewton_preserving`). The correctness of the main theorem and the algorithm as well as the complexity of the proposed algorithm are verified in Section 5. In Section 6, we present a detailed comparison on the proposed algorithm and the basis-transformation algorithm both in computational complexity and practical performance. In Section 7, we show an application of the proposed algorithm in the construction of confederate resultant matrices for Newton polynomials. The paper is concluded in Section 8 with some further remarks.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly review the concept of the Bézout matrix for two univariate polynomials, which is formulated for an arbitrarily given basis (where a non-standard basis is allowed). Throughout the paper, we assume \mathbb{F} to be the fractional field of an integral domain.

The Bézout matrix of two given polynomials is formulated through their Cayley quotient. Consider $F, G \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ with degrees n and m , respectively, where $n \geq m$. The Cayley quotient of F and G is defined as

$$\Delta(x, y) := \frac{\Lambda(x, y)}{x - y} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\Lambda(x, y) = \begin{vmatrix} F(x) & F(y) \\ G(x) & G(y) \end{vmatrix} \quad (2)$$

It is noted that $\Lambda(x, y) = 0$ when $x = y$. Thus the polynomial $\Lambda(x, y)$ has a factor $x - y$, which implies that $\Delta(x, y)$ is essentially a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}[x]$. One may also note the fact that

$$\deg(\Delta, x) = \deg(\Delta, y) = n - 1$$

Let $\mathbb{F}_{n-1}[x]$ be the vector space consisting of all the polynomials with degree no greater than n and $\Phi_{n-1}(x) = (\phi_{n-1}(x), \dots, \phi_0(x))^T$ be a basis of $\mathbb{F}_{n-1}[x]$. Then we can rewrite $\Delta(x, y)$ into an expression formulated in terms of $\phi_{ij}(x, y)$'s where $\phi_{ij}(x, y) = \phi_i(x)\phi_j(y)$, that is

$$\Delta(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} \phi_{n-i}(x) \phi_{n-j}(y)$$

With the help of expressions for $\Delta(x, y)$, we construct the Bézout resultant matrix of F and G in the basis Φ_{n-1} .

Definition 1 (Bézout matrix [2]). *Let $\Phi_{n-1}(x) = (\phi_{n-1}(x), \dots, \phi_0(x))^T$ be a basis of $\mathbb{F}_{n-1}[x]$. The Bézout resultant matrix of F and G with respect to x in the basis Φ_{n-1} is defined as an $n \times n$ matrix $B_\Phi(F, G)$ such that*

$$\Delta(x, y) = \Phi_{n-1}(x)^T B_\Phi(F, G) \Phi_{n-1}(y)$$

Remark 2. *We make the following remarks:*

- (1) *When F and G are clear from the context, we can abbreviate $B_\Phi(F, G)$ as B_Φ .*
- (2) *Let $\Psi(x) = (\psi_{n-1}(x), \dots, \psi_0(x))^T$ be another basis of $\mathbb{F}_{n-1}[x]$. Then there exists a transition matrix U such that $\Phi = U\Psi$. Note that Δ is independent of the chosen basis. Thus it can be further derived that $B_\Psi = U^T B_\Phi U$. In other words, the Bézout matrix of two polynomials in different bases are congruent.*
- (3) *When $\Phi(x) = (x^{n-1}, \dots, x^0)$, the Bézout matrix of F and G is exactly the well known Bézout matrix with respect to x .*
- (4) *It is known that the classical Bézout matrix, i.e., the Bézout matrix in monomial basis, is symmetric, and it can be further deduced from (1) and (2) that the Bézout matrix in any basis is symmetric.*
- (5) *In the rest of the paper, we always assume that F and G are polynomials in terms of x . For the sake of simplicity, we will not specify that their Bézout matrix is with respect to the variable x .*

The main goal of this paper is to present a basis-preserving method for constructing the Bézout matrix of two Newton polynomials where the resulting matrix is required to be formulated in the given basis. To give a formal statement of the problem addressed in the paper, we need to recall the concepts of Newton basis and Newton polynomials, which are the basic concepts in many textbooks on numerical analysis (e.g., [25]).

Definition 3. *Given $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s) \in \mathbb{F}^s$, let $N_\lambda(x) = (N_s(x), \dots, N_1(x), N_0(x))^T$, where*

$$N_i(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = 0; \\ (x - \lambda_i)N_{i-1}(x) & \text{for } i > 0. \end{cases}$$

We call $N_\lambda(x)$ the Newton basis of $\mathbb{F}_s[x]$ with respect to λ and a linear combination of $N_i(x)$'s is called a Newton polynomial.

It is obvious that any polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_s[x]$ can be written into an equivalent Newton polynomial. Hence, for $F, G \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ with degrees n and m respectively, where $n \geq m$, we assume that F and G are given in their Newton form where the Newton basis is $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x) = (N_n(x), \dots, N_1(x), N_0(x))^T$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^n$. More explicitly, we assume

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i N_i(x), \quad G(x) = \sum_{i=0}^m b_i N_i(x). \quad (3)$$

It should be pointed out that the Newton basis used to formulate the Bézout matrix of F and G is a subset of \mathbf{N}_λ obtaining by truncating the first polynomial, rather than the basis itself. In the remaining part of the paper, we denote the truncated \mathbf{N}_λ with $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$ for simplicity.

Next we clarify why we are interested in the Bézout matrix of F and G in the Newton basis $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$ through an illustrative example below.

Example 4. Given the Newton basis with respect to $\lambda = (-1, 0, 2)$, that is,

$$\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x) = (N_3(x), N_2(x), N_1(x), N_0(x))^T$$

where

$$N_0(x) = 1, \quad N_1(x) = x + 1, \quad N_2(x) = x(x + 1), \quad N_3(x) = x(x + 1)(x - 2),$$

let F and G be polynomials in \mathbf{N}_λ . More explicitly,

$$F = a_3 N_3(x) + a_2 N_2(x) + a_1 N_1(x) + a_0 N_0(x), \quad (4)$$

$$G = b_2 N_2(x) + b_1 N_1(x) + b_0 N_0(x). \quad (5)$$

First, we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(x, y) = & a_3 b_2 N_2(x) N_2(y) + a_3 b_1 N_1(x) N_2(y) + a_3 b_0 N_0(x) N_2(y) + a_3 b_1 N_2(x) N_1(y) \\ & + (a_3 b_0 - 2a_3 b_1 + a_2 b_1 - a_1 b_2) N_1(x) N_1(y) + (-3a_3 b_0 + a_2 b_0 - a_0 b_2) N_0(x) N_1(y) \\ & + a_3 b_0 N_2(x) N_0(y) + (-3a_3 b_0 + a_2 b_0 - a_0 b_2) N_1(x) N_0(y) \\ & + (-a_2 b_0 + a_0 b_2 + 3a_3 b_0 + a_1 b_0 - a_0 b_1) N_0(x) N_0(y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the Bézout matrix of F and G in $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$ is

$$\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} a_3 b_2 & a_3 b_1 & a_3 b_0 \\ a_3 b_1 & a_3 b_0 - 2a_3 b_1 + a_2 b_1 - a_1 b_2 & -3a_3 b_0 + a_2 b_0 - a_0 b_2 \\ a_3 b_0 & -3a_3 b_0 + a_2 b_0 - a_0 b_2 & -a_2 b_0 + a_0 b_2 + 3a_3 b_0 + a_1 b_0 - a_0 b_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

We may further expand $\Delta(x, y)$ into an expression in the monomial basis and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(x, y) = & a_3 b_2 x^2 y^2 + (a_3 b_2 + a_3 b_1) x y^2 + (a_3 b_1 + a_3 b_0) y^2 \\ & + (a_3 b_2 + a_3 b_1) x^2 y + (a_3 b_2 + a_3 b_0 + a_2 b_1 - a_1 b_2) x y + Q_1 y \\ & + (a_3 b_1 + a_3 b_0) x^2 + Q_1 x + Q_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 = & -a_3 b_1 - a_3 b_0 + a_2 b_1 - a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_0 - a_0 b_2, \\ Q_2 = & -2a_3 b_1 - 2a_3 b_0 + a_2 b_1 - a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_0 - a_0 b_2 + a_1 b_0 - a_0 b_1. \end{aligned}$$

Then the Bézout matrix of F and G in monomial basis is

$$\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} = \begin{pmatrix} a_3 b_2 & a_3 b_2 + a_3 b_1 & a_3 b_1 + a_3 b_0 \\ a_3 b_2 + a_3 b_1 & a_3 b_2 + a_3 b_0 + a_2 b_1 - a_1 b_2 & Q_1 \\ a_3 b_1 + a_3 b_0 & Q_1 & Q_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

By comparing (6) and (7) in Example 4, we have the following observations:

- The Bézout matrix of Newton polynomials in monomial basis is more complicated than that in the given Newton basis. It can be verified through the two following matrices which consist of the numbers of terms in the entries of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \# \text{ terms in the entries of } \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 3 & 5 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \# \text{ terms in the entries of } \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 4 & 6 \\ 2 & 6 & 8 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

- In fact, the basis-preserving formulation of Bézout matrix can preserve the structure in the Bézout matrix better. For example, the $(2, 2)$ -entry in $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}$ can be obtained by subtracting the $(1, 2)$ -entry multiplied by 2 from the $(1, 3)$ -entry and adding $a_2b_1 - a_1b_2$. Such patterns are buried when the Bézout matrix is formulated in monomial basis.

3 Problem Statement

Now we are ready to give a formal statement of the problem we address in this paper.

Problem 5. *The formulation problem of Bézout matrix in Newton basis is stated as:*

In : $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^n$, which determines a Newton basis $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x) = (N_n(x), \dots, N_0(x))^T$ of $\mathbb{F}_n[x]$;
 $F, G \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ with degrees n and m respectively, where $n \geq m$, and written in the form:

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i N_i(x), \quad G(x) = \sum_{i=0}^m b_i N_i(x).$$

Out: $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}$, the Bézout matrix of F and G in the basis $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda = (N_{n-1}, \dots, N_0)^T$.

One straightforward way to solve Problem 5 is: (1) converting the input polynomials into expressions in monomial basis, (2) constructing the Bézout matrix in monomial basis, and (3) changing back to the given basis. However, this naive approach involves two basis transformations which take expensive costs. It can be shown that the computational complexity of the above method is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. Readers may refer to Subsection 6.2 for its detailed complexity analysis. On the other hand, Chionh et al. proposed a recursive way for constructing the Bézout resultant in monomial basis with a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$. One may naturally wonder whether it is possible to formulate the Bézout matrix of Newton polynomials in the given Newton basis with the complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

Another disadvantage of the above straightforward approach is the back-and-forth basis transformation often cause numerical instability, especially when the values of λ_i 's are big. It motivates us to investigate a basis-preserving algorithm for formulating the Bézout matrix in Newton basis, which does not involve any basis transformation and thus can avoid the numerical instability issue.

4 Main Results

We introduce the following short-hand notation for a concise presentation of the main theorem.

Notation 6. $[i, j] = \begin{vmatrix} a_i & a_j \\ b_i & b_j \end{vmatrix}.$

Theorem 7. *Given $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^n$ which determines a Newton basis $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x)$ of $\mathbb{F}_n[x]$ and $F, G \in \mathbb{F}_n[x]$ be as in (3), let $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda} = (c_{i,j})_{n \times n}$ be the Bézout matrix of F and G in the Newton basis $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$. Then the entries in $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}$ has the following relationship:*

$$c_{i,j} = c_{i-1,j+1} + (\lambda_{n-j+1} - \lambda_{n-i+2})c_{i-1,j} + [n-i+1, n-j],$$

where

- $c_{p,q} := 0$, if $p = 0$ or $q = n+1$;
- $b_p := 0$, if $p > m$;
- $\lambda_p := 0$, if $p > n$.

Example 8 (Continued from Example 4). Recall that $\lambda = (-1, 0, 2)$. By Theorem 7, we have

- when $(i, j) = (1, 2)$,

$$c_{1,2} = c_{0,3} + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_4)c_{0,2} + [3, 1] = a_3b_1 - a_1b_3 = a_3b_1,$$

since $c_{0,3} = c_{0,2} = b_3 = 0$;

- when $(i, j) = (2, 2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2,2} &= c_{1,3} + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)c_{1,2} + [2, 1] \\ &= a_3b_0 + (0 - 2)a_3b_1 + a_2b_1 - a_1b_2 \\ &= a_3b_0 - 2a_3b_1 + a_2b_1 - a_1b_2. \end{aligned}$$

Both agree with the expressions of $c_{1,2}$ and $c_{2,2}$ in Example 4.

Now we present the following algorithm for constructing the Bézout matrix of two Newton polynomials with basis unchanged.

Algorithm. $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda} \leftarrow \text{BezNewton_preserving}(F, G)$

In : $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^n$, which determines a Newton basis $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x)$ of $\mathbb{F}_n[x]$;
 $F, G \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ in Newton basis $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x)$ with degrees n and m respectively, where $n \geq m$, i.e.,

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i N_i(x), \quad G(x) = \sum_{i=0}^m b_i N_i(x).$$

Out: the Bézout matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}$ of F and G in $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$.

Step 1. Initialization.

$$(c_{i,j})_{n \times (n+1)} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} [n, n-1] & \cdots & [n, 0] & 0 \\ & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ & & [1, 0] & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Step 2. Recursion.

For $i = 2 \dots, n$

For $j = i, \dots, n$

$$c_{i,j} \leftarrow c_{i,j} + c_{i-1,j+1} + (\lambda_{n-j+1} - \lambda_{n-i+2})c_{i-1,j}$$

Step 3. Symmetrization.

For $i = 1 \dots, n$

For $j = i + 1, \dots, n$

$$c_{j,i} \leftarrow c_{i,j}$$

Step 4. Truncation.

$$\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_{\lambda}} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} c_{1,1} & \cdots & c_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n,1} & \cdots & c_{n,n} \end{pmatrix}_{n \times n}$$

Step 5. Return $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_{\lambda}}$.

Example 9 (Continued from Example 4). *Let F and G be as in (4) and (5). Now we show how to construct the Bézout matrix of F and G in $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_{\lambda}$ by using the algorithm `BezNewton_preserving`(F, G). Following the steps described in the algorithm, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \xrightarrow{\text{Initialization}} \begin{pmatrix} [3, 2] & [3, 1] & [3, 0] & 0 \\ & [2, 1] & [2, 0] & 0 \\ & & [1, 0] & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{Recursion: } i=2} \begin{pmatrix} [3, 2] & [3, 1] & [3, 0] & 0 \\ & [2, 1] + [3, 0] + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)[3, 1] & [2, 0] + 0 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0] & 0 \\ & & [1, 0] & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{Recursion: } i=3} \begin{pmatrix} [3, 2] & [3, 1] & [3, 0] & 0 \\ & [2, 1] + [3, 0] + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)[3, 1] & [2, 0] + 0 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0] & 0 \\ & & [1, 0] + 0 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)([2, 0] + 0 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0]) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{Symmetrization}} \begin{pmatrix} [3, 2] & [3, 1] & [3, 0] & 0 \\ [3, 1] & [2, 1] + [3, 0] + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)[3, 1] & [2, 0] + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0] & 0 \\ [3, 0] & [2, 0] + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0] & [1, 0] + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)[2, 0] + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0] & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{Truncation}} \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_{\lambda}} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} [3, 2] & [3, 1] & [3, 0] \\ [3, 1] & [2, 1] + [3, 0] + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)[3, 1] & [2, 0] + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0] \\ [3, 0] & [2, 0] + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0] & [1, 0] + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)[2, 0] + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)[3, 0] \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The output of the algorithm is $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_{\lambda}}$.

It should be mentioned that in order to show what is exactly going on in the execution of the algorithm, we keep λ in the parametric form. In fact, we can evaluate $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_{\lambda}}$ at $\lambda = (-1, 0, 2)$, which gives us the same expression as in (6).

Proposition 10.

- (1) The algorithm `BezNewton_preserving`(F, G) terminates at a finite number of steps, and the algorithm output is correct.
- (2) The complexity of the algorithm `BezNewton_preserving` is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of Theorem 7

Proof. By the multi-linearity of determinants, we simplify the expression of $\Lambda(x, y)$ in (2) and derive the following:

$$\Lambda(x, y) = \det \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=0}^n a_i N_i(x) & \sum_{i=0}^n a_i N_i(y) \\ \sum_{i=0}^m b_i N_i(x) & \sum_{i=0}^m b_i N_i(y) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq n \\ 0 \leq j \leq n}} \det \begin{bmatrix} a_i & a_j \\ b_i & b_j \end{bmatrix} N_i(x) N_j(y) \quad (8)$$

(where $b_i = 0$ if $i > m$.)

On the other hand, $\Lambda(x, y)$ can be obtained from the multiplication of $\Delta(x, y)$ and $x - y$. More specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(x, y) &= \Delta(x, y)(x - y) \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda(x)^T \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda} \tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda(y)(x - y) \\ &= (N_{n-1}(x) \quad \cdots \quad N_1(x) \quad N_0(x)) \begin{pmatrix} c_{1,1} & \cdots & c_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n,1} & \cdots & c_{n,n} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} N_{n-1}(y) \\ \vdots \\ N_1(y) \\ N_0(y) \end{pmatrix} (x - y) \\ &= (x - y) \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Next we rewrite (9) into an expression in terms of $N_i(x)N_j(y)$'s where $0 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &x \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} (x - \lambda_{n-i+1} + \lambda_{n-i+1}) N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} (c_{i,j} (x - \lambda_{n-i+1}) N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) + c_{i,j} \lambda_{n-i+1} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y)) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i+1}(x) N_{n-j}(y) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} \lambda_{n-i+1} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

With similar deduction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &y \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j+1}(y) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} \lambda_{n-j+1} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The subtraction of (11) from (10) yields

$$\Lambda(x, y) = x \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) - y \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i+1}(x) N_{n-j}(y) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} \lambda_{n-i+1} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \\
&\quad - \left(\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j+1}(y) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} \lambda_{n-j+1} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \right) \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i+1,j} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) + \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} \lambda_{n-i+1} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \\
&\quad - \left(\sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j+1} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) + \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} c_{i,j} \lambda_{n-j+1} N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \right) \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} (c_{i+1,j} - c_{i,j+1} + (\lambda_{n-i+1} - \lambda_{n-j+1}) c_{i,j}) N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y) \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

(where $c_{i,j} = 0$, if $i \leq 0$ or $j \leq 0$.)

Comparing the coefficients of (8) and (12) in the term $N_{n-i}(x) N_{n-j}(y)$, we obtain

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_{n-i} & a_{n-j} \\ b_{n-i} & b_{n-j} \end{vmatrix} = c_{i+1,j} - c_{i,j+1} + (\lambda_{n-i+1} - \lambda_{n-j+1}) c_{i,j}$$

which is equivalent to the following:

$$c_{i+1,j} = c_{i,j+1} - (\lambda_{n-i+1} - \lambda_{n-j+1}) c_{i,j} + \begin{vmatrix} a_{n-i} & a_{n-j} \\ b_{n-i} & b_{n-j} \end{vmatrix}$$

Reset $i + 1$ to be i and we achieve that

$$c_{i,j} = c_{i-1,j+1} + (\lambda_{n-j+1} - \lambda_{n-i+2}) c_{i-1,j} + [n - i + 1, n - j]$$

□

5.2 Proof of Proposition 10

In this subsection, we show the the algorithm `BezNewton_preserving`(F, G) terminates within finite steps and outputs the correct Bézout matrix. Furthermore, a detailed analysis on its computational complexity is provided.

Proof. (1) *Termination.* The termination of the algorithm is guaranteed by the finiteness of n .

(2) *Correctness.* The proof is given in an inductive way. We start with the resulting matrix of the Initialization step, denoted by M_1 . Its (j, k) -th entry $c_{j,k}^{(1)}$ is assigned to be $[n - j + 1, n - k]$ except for those in the last column, which indicates that the $(1, k)$ -th entry in the first row is $[n, n - k]$. When $j = 1$, by Theorem 7, we have the $(1, k)$ -th entry $c_{1,k}$ of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$ where $1 \leq k \leq n$ is:

$$c_{1,k} = c_{0,k+1} + (\lambda_{n-k+1} - \lambda_{n+1}) c_{0,k} + [n, n - k] = [n, n - k]$$

where the simplification is due to the settings $c_{0,k} = c_{0,k+1} = 0$. Thus the first row of M_1 is the same as that of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$.

Next we show that after the $n - 1$ recursions, the (j, k) -th entry $c_{j,k}^{(n)}$ of the resulting matrix, denoted by M_n , is the same as that of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$, where $j \leq n$ and $k \geq j$. The proof is given in an inductive way.

- Initial step. When $i = 1$, the first row of M_1 is the same as that of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$, which is already shown above.
- Inductive step. Assume after the $(i-1)$ -th recursion, the (j, k) -th entry $c_{j,k}^{(i)}$ of M_i is the same as the (j, k) -th entry $c_{j,k}$ of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$ for $j \leq i$ and $k \geq j$. Now we execute the i -th recursion. Note that in the i -th recursion, only the $(i+1)$ -th row is updated. Hence the (j, k) -th entry $c_{j,k}^{(i+1)}$ of M_{i+1} for $k = j+1, \dots, n$ is

$$c_{j,k}^{(i+1)} = \begin{cases} c_{j,k}^{(i)} + c_{j-1,k+1}^{(i)} + (\lambda_{n-k+1} - \lambda_{n-j+2})c_{j-1,k}^{(i)} & j = i+1 \\ c_{j,k}^{(1)} & j > i+1 \end{cases}$$

Let $j = i+1$. Since $c_{i+1,k}^{(i)} = c_{i+1,k}^{(1)} = [n-i, n-k]$, $c_{i,k+1}^{(i)} = c_{i,k+1}$, $c_{i,k}^{(i)} = c_{i,k}$,

$$c_{i+1,k}^{(i+1)} = c_{i,k+1} + (\lambda_{n-k+1} - \lambda_{n-i+1})c_{i,k} + [n-i, n-k]$$

By Theorem 7,

$$c_{i+1,k} = c_{i,k+1} + (\lambda_{n-k+1} - \lambda_{n-i+1})c_{i,k} + [n-i, n-k]$$

Hence $c_{i+1,k}^{(i+1)} = c_{i+1,k}$. Note that the first i -th rows of M_i do not change in the i -th recursion. Therefore, the (j, k) -th entry $c_{j,k}^{(i+1)}$ of M_{i+1} is the same as the (j, k) -th entry $c_{j,k}$ of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$ for $j \leq i+1$ and $k \geq j$.

After $n-1$ recursions, we obtain the upper triangular part of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$. By the symmetry of Bézout matrix, we can immediately have the lower triangular part of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$.

- (3) *Complexity.* The computation cost of the algorithm **BezNewton_preserving** occurs in the steps of Initialization and Recursion. In the Initialization step, we need to compute $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ determinants of order 2. Each determinant requires two multiplications and one addition. Hence the total cost in this step is $n(n+1)$ multiplications and $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ additions. In the Recursion step, we need to compute $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ entries of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}$ and each entry costs one multiplication and three additions. Hence the total cost in this step is $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ multiplications and $\frac{3n(n-1)}{2}$ additions.

In summary, the overall cost for one execution of the algorithm **BezNewton_preserving** is $\frac{3n^2+n}{2}$ multiplications and $2n^2 - n$ additions. □

6 Comparison

In this section, we compare the algorithm **BezNewton_preserving** for computing the Bézout matrix in Newton basis proposed in this paper with a basis-transformation-based algorithm, called **BezNewton_trans**. The two approaches are illustrated in Figure 1. The comparison will be carried out from two aspects: computational complexity and practical performance.

6.1 A description of the algorithm **BezNewton_trans**

For the comparison purpose, we give a brief description of the algorithm **BezNewton_trans** below.




Figure 1: Two approaches for computing the Bézout matrix in Newton basis

In : $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^n$, which determines a Newton basis $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x)$ of $\mathbb{F}_n[x]$;
 $F, G \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ in Newton basis $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x)$ with degrees n and m respectively, where $n \geq m$, i.e.,

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i N_i(x), \quad G(x) = \sum_{i=0}^m b_i N_i(x).$$

Out: the Bézout matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}$ of F and G in $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$.

Step 1. Convert F and G into their equivalent expressions F' and G' in monomial basis \mathbf{P} ;

Step 2. Call an algorithm from [9, Section 3.3] for computing the Bézout matrix of F' and G' in $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$, resulting a matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}$;

Step 3. Convert the matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}$ into the Bézout matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}$ in $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$.

It should be pointed out that the algorithm from [9, Section 3.3] is, to the best of our knowledge, the most efficient one for computing Bézout matrices in monomial basis.

6.2 Complexity

By Proposition 10-(3), the algorithm `BezNewton_preserving` requires $\frac{n(3n+1)}{2}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$) multiplications and $2n^2 - n$ (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$) additions.

Now we analyze the complexity of the algorithm `BezNewton_trans` in each step.

- (1) In Step 1, the conversion of the input Newton polynomials into polynomials in monomial basis requires two multiplications of an $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ (or $(m+1) \times (m+1)$) upper-triangular transition matrix and a coefficient vector of length $n+1$ (or $m+1$), whose computational complexity is $((n+1)(n+2) + (m+1)(m+2))/2$ multiplications and $(n(n+1) + m(m+1))/2$ additions.
- (2) In Step 2, the computational complexity for computing the Bézout matrix of the two standard polynomials with degrees n and m respectively is $n^2 + n$ multiplications and n^2 additions [9, Table 1].
- (3) The conversion of the Bézout matrix in monomial basis to that in Newton basis involves two multiplications of an $n \times n$ triangular matrix and an $n \times n$ full matrix, which requires $n^2(n+1)$ multiplications and $n^2(n-1)$ additions.

In summary, the total cost of the algorithm `BezNewton_trans` is

- # of multiplications: $\frac{(2n^3 + 5n^2 + 5n) + (m^2 + 3m + 4)}{2}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ since $m \leq n$), and

- # of additions: $\frac{(2n^3 + n^2 + n) + (m^2 + m)}{2}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ since $m \leq n$).

The discussion above can be summarized into Table 1 below.

Table 1: The computational complexity of BezNewton_preserving and BezNewton_trans

	BezNewton_preserving	BezNewton_trans
# of mul.	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3)$
# of add.	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3)$

6.3 Performance

To compare the practical performance of the algorithms BezNewton_preserving and algorithm BezNewton_trans, we carry out a series of experiments. These experiments are performed in Maple 2022 on a PC equipped with a CPU of Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-9300H (2.40GHz) and a RAM of 16.0GB. The examples used in the experiment are classified into two groups: one with constant coefficients and the other with parametric coefficients. For polynomials in the first group, the coefficients are randomly generated and so are λ 's. For polynomials in the second group, we set λ 's to be random numeric vectors and the coefficients are formal ones (i.e., a_i 's and b_j 's). Both the program and the test examples can be accessed via the link <https://github.com/JYangMATH/NewtonBez.git>. The computational results are shown in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively, where $t_{\text{preserving}}$ and t_{trans} are the time cost charged by the algorithms BezNewton_preserving and BezNewton_trans, respectively.

Table 2: Comparison on the time cost (in seconds) of BezNewton_preserving and BezNewton_trans for polynomials with constant coefficients.

Degree	Matrix size	$t_{\text{preserving}}$	t_{trans}	$\frac{t_{\text{trans}}}{t_{\text{preserving}}}$
(102, 98)	102×102	0.015	2.390	159.33
(135, 127)	135×135	0.031	6.078	196.06
(168, 163)	168×168	0.046	11.796	256.43
(201, 199)	201×201	0.078	24.015	307.88
(234, 228)	234×234	0.109	130.875	1200.69
(267, 265)	267×267	0.156	333.500	2137.82
(300, 290)	300×300	0.171	557.125	3258.04
(333, 326)	333×333	0.203	989.062	4872.23
(366, 359)	366×366	0.265	1464.156	5525.12
(399, 391)	399×399	0.296	2283.281	7713.79
(432, 432)	432×432	0.406	3511.890	8649.98
(500, 500)	500×500	0.515	5355.609	10748.76

From Tables 2 and 3, we make the following observations.

- (1) For both cases, we have $t_{\text{recursive}} \ll t_{\text{trans}}$, indicating that the algorithm BezNewton_preserving behaves significantly better than the algorithm BezNewton_trans. Even for numeric polynomials of degree 500, the recursive approach only costs less than one second while the basis-transformation-based approach costs almost three hours.

Table 3: Comparison on the time cost (in seconds) of BezNewton_preserving and BezNewton_trans for polynomials with parametric coefficients

Degree	Matrix size	$t_{\text{preserving}}$	t_{trans}	$\frac{t_{\text{trans}}}{t_{\text{preserving}}}$
(35, 35)	35×35	0.031	1.656	53.42
(40, 40)	40×40	0.062	2.687	43.34
(45, 45)	45×45	0.078	6.390	81.92
(50, 50)	50×50	0.140	16.515	117.96
(55, 55)	55×55	0.156	21.046	134.91
(60, 60)	60×60	0.296	38.531	130.17
(65, 65)	65×65	0.421	60.000	142.52
(70, 70)	70×70	0.609	90.343	148.37
(75, 75)	75×75	0.718	140.796	196.09
(80, 80)	80×80	0.968	264.593	273.34
(85, 85)	85×85	1.218	326.984	268.46
(90, 90)	90×90	1.578	614.593	389.48

- (2) The ratio $t_{\text{trans}}/t_{\text{preserving}}$ increases as the degree of the input polynomial increases, which shows that the algorithm BezNewton_preserving has better scalability than BezNewton_trans. This agrees with the magnitude of their computational complexity.

We attribute the dominant performance of the proposed algorithm to the avoidance of basis transformation, which are computationally intensive. Another benefit brought by the avoidance of basis transformation is that an inflation on the size of coefficients, which makes the computation unstable, will not occur.

7 Application

In this section, we show an application of the proposed algorithm in computing the confederate resultant matrix of Newton polynomials, which can be used to formulate subresultant polynomials in Newton basis [28].

7.1 Problem formulation

Bézout matrix in monomial basis can be used to construct companion resultant matrices in monomial basis, by making use of the relationship between them [4]. In [30], Yang revealed that the relationship between the two matrices formulated in monomial basis can be extended to that in general basis with a specialization to be Newton basis. Thus we can use the Bézout matrix in Newton polynomials to construct the confederate resultant matrix of Newton polynomials.

We begin by a review on the concept of the well known companion matrix.

Definition 11 ([22]). Let $F = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \in \mathbb{F}[x]$. The companion matrix of F with respect to x is defined as an $n \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{C}(F)$ such that

$$x \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(x) \equiv_F \mathbf{C}(F) \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(x) \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(x) = (x^{n-1}, \dots, x^0)$. More explicitly,

$$\mathbf{C}(F) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{a_{n-1}}{a_n} & -\frac{a_{n-2}}{a_n} & \dots & -\frac{a_1}{a_n} & -\frac{a_0}{a_n} \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ & 1 & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & 0 & \\ & & & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The matrix $G(\mathbf{C}(F))$ is called the companion resultant matrix of F and G with respect to x .

The companion resultant matrix can be used to formulate generalized subresultant polynomials of several univariate polynomials, called Barnett-type subresultant polynomials (see [17]). The following Barnett formula provides a practical way to compute the companion resultant matrix.

Proposition 12 (Barnett formula [5]). *Given F and $G \in \mathbb{F}[x]$, we have*

$$G(\mathbf{C}(F)) = \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}(F, 1)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}(F, G)$$

In [24], Maroulas and Barnett generalized the concept of companion matrix to confederate matrix in general basis. The main idea is to maintain the relationship defined by (13), which captures the most essential property of companion matrices. Later Yang showed that the Barnett formula can be extended to the case of confederate matrix and Bézout matrix in general basis. Since Newton basis is a specialization of general basis and is what we are concerned with in the current paper, we recall the concept of confederate matrix in Newton basis below.

Definition 13 ([1, 24]). *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^n$ and $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x)$ be the Newton basis associated with λ . Let $F = a_n N_n(x) + \dots + a_1 N_1(x) + a_0 N_0(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$ be obtained by truncating the first polynomial in \mathbf{N}_λ . Then the confederate matrix of F with respect to x in $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda(x)$ is defined as an $n \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F)$ such that*

$$x \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda(x) \equiv_F \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F) \tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda(x)$$

More explicitly,

$$\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a_n \lambda_n - a_{n-1}}{a_n} & \frac{-a_{n-2}}{a_n} & \dots & \frac{-a_0}{a_n} \\ 1 & \lambda_{n-1} & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 1 & \lambda_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

The matrix $G(\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F))$ is called the confederate resultant matrix of F and G with respect to x in $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$.

One may easily derive the relationship between $G(\mathbf{C}(F))$ and $G(\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F))$.

Proposition 14. *With the above settings, we have $G(\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F)) = U^{-1} \cdot G(\mathbf{C}(F)) \cdot U$ where U is the transition matrix from $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ to $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$.*

Zhang extended the Barnett formula to the case of confederate matrices and Bézout matrix in [30], which is stated below.

Proposition 15 ([30]). *With the above settings, we have*

$$G(\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F)) = \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F, 1)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F, G)$$

Similar to the companion resultant matrix, the confederate resultant matrix can also be used to formulate generalized subresultant polynomials of several univariate polynomials in Newton polynomials (see [28]). Hence we need a practical way to compute the confederate resultant matrix in Newton basis.

Now we are ready to make a formal presentation of the problem to be studied in this section.

Problem 16. *The problem of computing confederate resultant matrix of two polynomials in Newton basis can be stated as follows.*

*In : $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^n$, which determines a Newton basis $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x)$ of $\mathbb{F}_n[x]$;
 $F, G \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ in Newton basis $\mathbf{N}_\lambda(x)$ with degrees n and m respectively, where $n \geq m$, i.e.,*

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i N_i(x), \quad G(x) = \sum_{i=0}^m b_i N_i(x).$$

Out: the confederate resultant matrix $G(\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F))$ of F, G in the Newton basis $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$.

7.2 Three approaches for computing confederate resultant matrices

In this subsection, we propose three methods for computing confederate resultant matrices in Newton basis.

(1) Approach A: matrix polynomial evaluation + Horner algorithm

Approach A computes confederate resultant matrices in a straightforward way. More explicitly, we evaluate the value of $G(x)$ when $x = \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F)$, which is a matrix polynomial evaluation. Hence we can use the well known Horner algorithm for polynomial evaluating to improve the computational efficiency.

(2) Approach B: basis transformation + Barnett formula

Step B1. Convert F and G into their equivalent expressions F' and G' in monomial basis \mathbf{P} ;

Step B2. Call an algorithm from [9, Section 3.3] to compute the Bézout matrix of F' and G' , and that of F' and 1, in $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$, resulting two matrices $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}(F', G')$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}(F', 1)$;

Step B3. Compute $G(\mathbf{C}(F))$ by multiplying the inverse of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}(F', 1)$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}(F', G')$.

Step B4. Convert the companion resultant matrix $G(\mathbf{C}(F))$ to the confederate resultant matrix $G(\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F))$ of F, G in $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$ by Proposition 14.

(3) Approach C: generalized Barnett formula

Step C1. Call the algorithm `BezNewton_preserving` for computing the Bézout matrices of F and G , and that of F and 1, in the Newton basis $\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda$, resulting two matrices $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F, G)$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F, 1)$;

Step C2. Compute $G(\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F))$ by multiplying the inverse of $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F, 1)$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\mathbf{N}}_\lambda}(F, G)$.

In the following subsection, we will show that Approach C which employs the algorithm `BezNewton_preserving` proposed in the current paper has the best performance.

7.3 Comparison

In this section, we compare the three approaches presented in Subsection 7.2. The comparison is carried out from two aspects, i.e., computational complexity and practical performance.

7.3.1 Complexity

We first give a detailed complexity analysis for each of the three approaches presented above.

In Approach A, the main cost is the evaluation of a matrix polynomial. The computation of $G(C_{\tilde{N}_\lambda}(F))$ with the Horner algorithm requires m matrix multiplications and m matrix additions where the involved matrices are of size $n \times n$. Since each matrix multiplication needs $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ additions. Hence the total cost of Approach A is $\mathcal{O}(mn^3)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(mn^3)$ additions.

Approach B has four steps and we analyze the complexity for each step.

- (1) In Step B1, the conversion of the input Newton polynomials into polynomials in monomial basis requires two multiplications of an $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ (or $(m+1) \times (m+1)$) upper-triangular transition matrix and a coefficient vector of length $n+1$ (or $m+1$). Since $m \leq n$, the total cost in Step B1 is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ additions.
- (2) Step B2 only involves the computation of two Bézout matrices in monomial basis. By [9, Table 1], each of them charges $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ additions.
- (3) In Step B3, we need to compute the inverse of an $n \times n$ matrix and the multiplication of two $n \times n$ matrices and each of them requires $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ additions.
- (4) Step B4 requires two multiplications of $n \times n$ matrices, which needs $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ additions.

Altogether, the cost of Approach B is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ additions.

In Approach C, Step C1 involves the computation of two Bézout matrices in Newton basis. From Table 1, each of them charges $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ additions. Step C2 requires one matrix inversion and one matrix multiplication where the matrices involved are all of order $n \times n$. Each of them require $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ additions. Thus, the total cost of Approach C is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ multiplications and $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ additions.

We summarize the above discussion in Table 4.

Table 4: The computational complexity of Approaches A, B and C

	Approach A	Approach B	Approach C
# of mul.	$\mathcal{O}(mn^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3)$
# of add.	$\mathcal{O}(mn^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3)$

7.3.2 Performance

In order to evaluate the practical performance of the three approaches, we conduct a series of experiments on numeric and parametric polynomials. The specification for the input polynomials is the same as experiments in Subsection 6.3. These experiments are performed in Maple 2022 on a PC equipped with a CPU of Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-9300H(2.40GHz) and a RAM of 16.0GB. Both the program and the test examples can be accessed via the link

<https://github.com/JYangMATH/NewtonBez.git>. The experimental results are reported in Tables 5 (for numeric polynomials) and 6 (for parametric polynomials) where t_A , t_B , t_C are the time costs of Approaches A, B, and C, respectively.

Table 5: The time cost (in sec.) of Approaches A, B, and C for numeric polynomials

Degree	Matrix size	t_A	t_B	t_C	$\frac{t_A}{t_C}$	$\frac{t_B}{t_C}$
(50, 50)	50×50	0.750	0.468	0.156	4.81	3.00
(70, 70)	70×70	2.187	1.312	0.375	5.83	3.50
(90, 90)	90×90	8.234	3.203	0.921	8.94	3.48
(110, 110)	110×110	22.593	7.031	2.390	9.45	2.94
(130, 130)	130×130	52.890	11.078	3.250	16.27	3.41
(150, 150)	150×150	107.203	20.687	6.593	16.26	3.14
(170, 170)	170×170	166.587	19.796	5.125	32.50	3.86
(190, 190)	190×190	303.796	56.218	15.843	19.18	3.55
(210, 210)	210×210	680.140	83.500	23.078	29.47	3.62
(230, 230)	230×230	720.156	186.406	31.843	22.62	5.85
(250, 250)	250×250	993.953	335.500	49.718	19.99	6.75
(270, 270)	270×270	5721.625	436.125	51.765	110.53	8.43

Table 6: The time cost (in sec.) of Approaches A, B, and C for parametric polynomials

Degree	Matrix size	t_A	t_B	t_C	$\frac{t_A}{t_C}$	$\frac{t_B}{t_C}$
(16, 16)	16×16	7.000	0.046	0.031	225.80	1.48
(17, 17)	17×17	16.609	0.093	0.062	267.89	1.50
(18, 18)	18×18	40.812	0.109	0.093	438.84	1.17
(19, 19)	19×19	112.031	0.187	0.140	800.22	1.36
(20, 20)	20×20	251.734	0.281	0.187	1346.17	1.50
(21, 21)	21×21	587.687	0.250	0.218	3142.71	1.15
(22, 22)	22×22	1487.531	0.437	0.390	3739.82	1.12
(25, 25)	23×23	> 6000	1.468	1.062	> 5649.72	1.38
(30, 30)	24×24	> 6000	6.250	3.375	> 5649.72	1.85
(35, 35)	25×25	> 6000	34.390	17.640	> 5649.72	1.95
(40, 40)	26×26	> 6000	155.921	83.453	> 5649.72	1.89
(45, 45)	27×27	> 6000	692.234	349.500	> 5649.72	1.98

From Tables 5 and 6 , we make the following observations:

- (1) $t_C < t_B < t_A$, indicating that Approach C behaves better than the other two and Approach A is the worst.
- (2) The ratio t_B/t_C exhibits a slow increase as the degree increases, which means Approach C has a better scalability than Approach B though their complexity is at the same level. We suspect the underlying reason is the magnitude of the entries in the matrices representing the involved basis transformations are increasing as the degree of the input polynomials becomes higher.
- (3) The ratio t_A/t_C increases as the degree of the input polynomial increases, which shows that

Approach C has a much better scalability than Approach A. This is expected from the computational analysis.

8 Conclusion and Perspectives

In this paper, we consider the problem of constructing the Bézout matrix for Newton polynomials. It is required that the output matrix is also formulated in the given basis used to define the input polynomials. After investigating the structure hidden in Bézout matrices in Newton basis, we design an efficient algorithm for constructing such a matrix. It should be pointed out that the proposed algorithm does not require basis transformation and thus can avoid the heavy computational cost and numerical instability caused by transformation. We also show an application of the proposed algorithm in the construction of confederate resultant matrix for Newton polynomials. Experimental results show that the proposed methods display a significantly better behavior compared with the basis-transformation-based one.

Another application of Bézout matrix in Newton basis is to formulate subresultant polynomials (e.g., [28, 29]) for Newton polynomials. One merit of the subresultant polynomials formulated with Bézout matrix is that the basis is preserved. However, there is still a lack of works on a deep understanding of the structure of Bézout matrix from which the computation of subresultant polynomials in Newton basis can be accelerated. This could be an interesting topic worthy of further investigation in the future.

Acknowledgements. This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos.: 12326353 and 12261010), the Natural Science Foundation of Guangxi (Grant No.: 2023GXNSFBA026019), and the Natural Science Cultivation Project of GXMZU (Grant No.: 2022MDKJ001).

References

- [1] Amiraslani A, Aruliah D A, and Corless R M. The Rayleigh quotient iteration for generalized companion matrix pencils. *Preprint*, 2006.
- [2] Aruliah D A, Corless R M, Gonzalez-Vega L, and Shakoory A. Geometric applications of the Bezout matrix in the Lagrange basis. In *Proceedings of the 2007 International Workshop on Symbolic-Numeric Computation*, SNC '07, page 55–64, New York, NY, USA, 2007. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [3] Barnett S. Greatest common divisor of several polynomials. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 70, pages 263–268. Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- [4] Barnett S. A note on the Bezoutian matrix. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 22(1):84–86, 1972.
- [5] Barnett S. *Polynomials and Linear Control Systems*. Marcel Dekker, Inc., USA, 1983.
- [6] Bini D A and Gemignani L. Bernstein-Bezoutian matrices. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 315(2-3):319–333, 2004.
- [7] Bostan A, D’Andrea C, Krick T, Szanto A, and Valdetaro M. Subresultants in multiple roots: an extremal case. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 529:185–198, 2017.

- [8] Carnicer J M and Pena J M. Shape preserving representations and optimality of the Bernstein basis. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 1(2):173–196, 1993.
- [9] Chionh E-W, Zhang M, and Goldman R N. Fast Computation of the Bezout and Dixon Resultant Matrices. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 33(1):13–29, 2002.
- [10] Collins G E. Subresultants and reduced polynomial remainder sequences. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 14(1):128–142, 1967.
- [11] Cox D A and D’Andrea C. Subresultants and the Shape Lemma. *Mathematics of Computation*, 92:2355–2379, 2021.
- [12] Delgado J and Peña J M. A shape preserving representation with an evaluation algorithm of linear complexity. *Computer Aided Geometric Design*, 20(1):1–10, 2003.
- [13] Diaz-Toca G M and González-Vega L. Various new expressions for subresultants and their applications. *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing*, 15(3):233–266, 2004.
- [14] Farouki R T and Rajan V T. On the numerical condition of polynomials in Bernstein form. *Computer Aided Geometric Design*, 4(3):191–216, 1987.
- [15] Goodman T N T and Said H B. Shape preserving properties of the generalised Ball basis. *Computer Aided Geometric Design*, 8(2):115–121, 1991.
- [16] Ho C-J. *Topics in Algebraic Computing: Subresultants, GCD, Factoring and Primary Ideal Decomposition*. PhD thesis, USA, 1989.
- [17] Hong H and Yang J. A condition for multiplicity structure of univariate polynomials. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 104:523–538, 2021.
- [18] Hong H and Yang J. Subresultant of several univariate polynomials. *arXiv:2112.15370*, 2021.
- [19] Hong H and Yang J. Computing greatest common divisor of several parametric univariate polynomials via generalized subresultant polynomials. *arXiv:2401.00408*, 2023.
- [20] Lascoux A and Pragacz P. Double Sylvester sums for subresultants and multi-Schur functions. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 35(6):689–710, 2003.
- [21] Li Y B. A new approach for constructing subresultants. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 183(1):471–476, 2006.
- [22] Mac Duffee C C. *The characteristic equation*. In *The Theory of Matrices*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und Ihrer Grenzgebiete, pages 17–29, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1933.
- [23] Marco A and Martínez J-J. Bernstein–Bezoutian matrices and curve implicitization. *Theoretical computer science*, 377(1-3):65–72, 2007.
- [24] Maroulas J and Barnett S. Polynomials with respect to a general basis. i. theory. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 72(1):177–194, 1979.
- [25] Stoer J and Bulirsch R. *Interpolation*, pages 37–144. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2002.

- [26] Sylvester J. On a theory of syzygetic relations of two rational integral functions, comprising an application to the theory of Sturm's functions, and that of the greatest algebraic common measure. *Phil. Trans*, 143:407–548, 1853.
- [27] Terui A. Recursive polynomial remainder sequence and its subresultants. *Journal of Algebra*, 320(2):633–659, 2008.
- [28] Wang W D and Yang J. Generalized companion subresultants of several univariate polynomials in Newton basis. *arXiv:2212.03422*, 2022.
- [29] Yang J and Yang W. Bézout subresultants for univariate polynomials in general basis. *arXiv:2305.03906*, 2023.
- [30] Yang Z H. Polynomial Bezoutian matrix with respect to a general basis. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 331(1):165–179, 2001.