

On the BCSS Proof of the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra

J. Maurice Rojas¹

June 21, 2024

Abstract

Section 10.4 of the 1998 Springer-Verlag book *Complexity and Real Computation*, by Blum, Cucker, Shub, and Smale, contains a particularly elegant proof of the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra: The central idea of the proof naturally leads to a homotopy continuation algorithm for finding the roots of univariate polynomials, and extends naturally to a proof of Bézout's Theorem (on the number of roots of systems of n equations in n unknowns). We present a more detailed version of the BCSS Proof which is hopefully useful for students and researchers not familiar with algebraic geometry. So while there are no new results in this paper, the exposition is arguably more elementary. Any errors here are solely the responsibility of the current author.

1 Preliminaries

The main theorem we prove is the following:

The Fundamental Theorem of Algebra. *A (univariate) polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ of degree $d \geq 1$ has exactly d roots in \mathbb{C} , counting multiplicities.*

The Fundamental Theorem of Algebra (FTA) is arguably more a statement from complex analysis than from algebra. The first statement of the FTA dates back to work of Girard in 1629 and the first correct approach to its proof dates back to work of D'Alembert in 1746. Perhaps the first proof which would be considered rigorous by today's standards is due to Motzkin and Ostrowski, from 1933. See [RS02, Sec. 1.8, Pg. 61] for valuable historical notes on the FTA.

While one can certainly prove the FTA in one line via Liouville's Theorem from complex analysis, the proof we present below (from [BCSS98, Sec. 10.4]) will have two important advantages: (1) It leads naturally to a homotopy continuation algorithm for finding the roots of univariate polynomials, and (2) the proof extends naturally to a proof Bézout's Theorem, on the number of roots of n polynomials in n variables.

It will be useful to recall two equivalent definitions of multiplicity before we eventually introduce a third, equivalent definition:

Proposition 1.1 *Suppose $f \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ is a univariate polynomial of degree $d \geq 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following two conditions on a root $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ of f are equivalent, and are referred to as f having a root of multiplicity m :*

- (a) $f(x) = (x - \zeta)^m g(x)$ identically, for some $g \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ not divisible by $x - \zeta$.
- (b) $f(\zeta) = f'(\zeta) = \dots = f^{(m-1)}(\zeta) = 0 \neq f^{(m)}(\zeta)$.

We also call roots of multiplicity 1 non-degenerate, and roots of multiplicity ≥ 2 degenerate. ■

¹Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University TAMU 3368, College Station, Texas 77843-3368, USA. e-mail: rojas@math.tamu.edu , Web Page: www.math.tamu.edu/~rojas . Partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1460766 and CCF-1409020, and a von Neumann visiting professorship.

The proof of Proposition 1.1 is straightforward (at least over the complex numbers) via Taylor series. It is worth noting that Definition (a) extends naturally to any field, while Definition (b) extends naturally to any analytic function on \mathbb{C} .

Let us now fix some notation: If $f(x) = a_0 + \cdots + a_d x^d$ and $g(x) = b_0 + \cdots + b_e x^e$ are polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[x]$ then we define *the Sylvester matrix of (f, g) (of format (d, e))* to be:

$$\text{Syl}_{d,e}(f, g) := \begin{array}{cccccccc} \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc} a_0 & \cdots & a_{d-1} & a_d & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & a_0 & \cdots & a_{d-1} & a_d \\ b_0 & \cdots & b_e & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & b_0 & \cdots & b_e \end{array} \right] & \left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} e \text{ many shifting rows} \\ \\ \\ \\ d \text{ many shifting rows} \end{array} \end{array}$$

We also define the *resultant (of format (d, e)) of (f, g)* to be the determinant of $\text{Syl}_{d,e}(f, g)$. Note that the resultant (of format $(d, d-1)$) of (f, f') factors as $a_d \Delta_d(a_0, \dots, a_d)$ for some polynomial $\Delta_d \in \mathbb{Z}[a_0, \dots, a_d]$, thanks to the last column of the underlying Sylvester matrix. We call Δ_d the *degree d (univariate) discriminant polynomial* and study it more later. That Δ_d is in fact not identically zero is a consequence of the following formula.

Proposition 1.2 *For all $d \geq 1$ we have $\text{Res}_{d,d-1}(x^d - 1, dx^{d-1}) = (-1)^{d-1} d^d$.*

Proof: One need only observe that $\text{Syl}_{d,d-1}(x^d - 1, dx^{d-1})$ is upper-triangular, with diagonal entries $-1, \dots, -1$ ($d-1$ times) and d, \dots, d (d times). ■

Let us define

$$\Sigma_d := \{ (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_d) \in \mathbb{C}^{d+1} \mid \gamma_d \Delta_d(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_d) = 0 \} \subset \mathbb{C}^{d+1}.$$

The set Σ_d is a slight variant of the classical discriminant variety $\nabla_{\{0, \dots, d\}} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^d$, which consists of degree d bivariate homogeneous polynomials having a degenerate root. In particular, it will be convenient to identify the polynomial $\gamma_0 + \cdots + \gamma_d x^d \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ with the point $(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_d) \in \mathbb{C}^{d+1}$. In the Appendix, we will prove the following useful algebraic result:

Lemma 1.3 *Following the notation above, assume $d, e \geq 1$ and $\text{Res}_{d,e}(f, g) \neq 0$. Then the 2×1 system of equations $f(x) = g(x) = 0$ has no complex solutions. In particular, if $\Delta_d(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_d) \neq 0$, then any complex root of $\gamma_0 + \cdots + \gamma_d x^d$ has multiplicity 1.*

It will also be useful to recall the following basic fact, easily provable via polynomial division.

Proposition 1.4 *If $f \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ has degree $d \geq 1$ then f has at most d distinct complex roots.* ■

Proposition 1.4 (or rather, the obvious extension where \mathbb{C} is replaced by an arbitrary field F) is sometimes called the *Weak Fundamental Theorem of Algebra*.

We will also need some results on building paths avoiding complex hypersurfaces and bounding roots of polynomials:

Proposition 1.5 *If $g \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_N] \setminus \{0\}$ has complex zero set Z then $\mathbb{C}^N \setminus Z$ is analytically path-connected: For any $p, q \in \mathbb{C}^N \setminus Z$ there is an analytic $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N \setminus Z$ with $\phi(0) = p$ and $\phi(1) = q$.*

Proof: We proceed by induction. Our proof will frequently use the obvious identification between \mathbb{R}^2 and \mathbb{C} via real and imaginary parts.

By an invertible affine transformation $T : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, the $N = 1$ case can clearly be reduced to the special case $(p, q) = (0, 1)$. So then let \mathbb{R}_+ denote the positive ray and consider the family of parabolae $\{H_c\}_{c \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ defined by $H_c := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y = cx(1 - x)\}$. Note that each H_c intersects $\{0, 1\}$, and can clearly be parametrized via $\phi(t) := (t, ct(1 - t))$. The map ϕ is clearly analytic and satisfies $\phi(0) = (0, 0)$ and $\phi(1) = (1, 0)$ (and the last two points in \mathbb{R}^2 can clearly also be viewed as the points 0 and 1 in \mathbb{C}).

Clearly, there are only finite many values of c with $H_c \cap Z \neq \emptyset$: If $Z = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_\ell, y_\ell)\}$ then we simply need to pick a c satisfying $cx_i(1 - x_i) \neq y_i$ for all i . Picking $c = \frac{1}{2} \min_i \frac{y_i}{x_i(1 - x_i)}$ clearly suffices. We thus obtain an H_c connecting 0 and 1, and the resulting parametrized path $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is clearly analytic, as is also the composition $T^{-1}(\phi(\cdot))$. So we are done.

To prove the general case we will let $N \geq 2$ and reduce to the case $N = 1$ by restricting to a cleverly embedded copy of \mathbb{C} in \mathbb{C}^N : Define $L : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ by $L(t) = (1 - t)p + tq$, let $h(t) := g(L(t))$, and let W denote the zero set of h in \mathbb{C} . Note that $L(0) = p$ and $L(1) = q$ and, by assumption, $h(0)h(1) = g(p)g(q) \neq 0$. So, since L is an analytic function, it suffices to find an analytic path in $\mathbb{C} \setminus W$ connecting 0 and 1. By the $N = 1$ case we have already proved, we are done. ■

Lemma 1.6 *If $f(x) = \gamma_0 + \dots + \gamma_d x^d \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ is a univariate polynomial of degree $d \geq 1$ then all the complex roots of f lie in the open disk of radius $2 \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}} \left| \frac{\gamma_i}{\gamma_d} \right|^{\frac{1}{d-i}}$ centered at 0.*

Proof: The proof boils down to a judicious use of the Triangle Inequality. First note that if $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ is a root of f then $|\gamma_d \zeta^d| = |\gamma_0 + \dots + \gamma_{d-1} \zeta^{d-1}|$ and thus

$$|\gamma_d| |\zeta|^d \leq |\gamma_0| + |\gamma_1| |\zeta| + \dots + |\gamma_{d-1}| |\zeta|^{d-1} \quad (1)$$

So let us now consider the special case where $\gamma_d = 1$ and $\max_{i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}} |\gamma_i| = 1$. In this case, Inequality (1) implies that $|\zeta|^d \leq 1 + |\zeta| + \dots + |\zeta|^{d-1}$. So by geometric series we obtain $|\zeta|^d \leq \frac{|\zeta|^d - 1}{|\zeta| - 1}$. In the event that $|\zeta| \geq 2$ we would then obtain $|\zeta|^d \leq |\zeta|^d - 1$, which is clearly impossible. So we see that $|\zeta| < 2$ and our lemma is true.

To obtain the general case, let $C := \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}} \left| \frac{\gamma_i}{\gamma_d} \right|^{\frac{1}{d-i}}$ and consider the polynomial

$$g(x) := \frac{f(Cx)}{\gamma_d C^d}.$$

(Note that $\gamma_d \neq 0$ since f is assumed to have degree d .) Clearly, our lemma is proved if we can prove that all the complex roots of g have norm less than 2. Toward this end, observe that the coefficient of x^i in g (for $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$) is $\frac{\gamma_i C^i}{\gamma_d C^d} = \left(\frac{(\gamma_i / \gamma_d)^{1/(d-i)}}{C} \right)^{d-i}$. Since $|\gamma_i / \gamma_d|^{1/(d-i)} \leq C$ by the definition of C , every coefficient of g has norm at most 1. Furthermore, the coefficient of x^d in g is 1. So by our early special case, we are done. ■

Lemma 1.6 is in fact a very special case of more general estimates on complex roots of univariate polynomials. Such bounds date back to work of Cauchy around 1829, if not earlier. More recent work relates the norms of complex roots to Archimedean tropical varieties (e.g., [AKNR18, Thm. 1.7]) and extends such estimates to polynomials in multiple variables.

Finally, we'll need the following two analytic results.

The Extreme Value Theorem. (See, e.g., [Mun00].) *If $S \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is closed and bounded and $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, then there exist $a_1, a_2 \in S$ with $f(a_1) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x)$ and $f(a_2) = \sup_{x \in S} f(x)$. In particular, f is bounded. ■*

The Implicit Function Theorem. (See, e.g., [Hub15].) *If $G : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is an analytic function with $G(t_0, x_0) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial G}{\partial x}|_{(t_0, x_0)} \neq 0$ for some $(t_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, then there is an open disk $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ containing t_0 , and an analytic function $\mathcal{X} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (called a branch of the implicit function defined by $G(t, x) = 0$) with $\mathcal{X}(t_0) = x_0$ and $G(t, \mathcal{X}(t)) = 0$ for all $t \in U$. ■*

The Extreme Value Theorem is covered in most any basic course in real analysis. We also note that [BCSS98, Sec. 8.2] presents an elegant proof of the *Inverse Function Theorem* (via clever infinite series manipulations) that can be used to derive explicit estimates for the size of the disk in the Implicit Function Theorem.

2 The Proof of the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra

We first observe that the case $d=1$ is trivial: $\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 x$ has only the root $-\gamma_0/\gamma_1$, which has multiplicity 1 since $f'(x)$ is identically γ_1 , and $\gamma_1 \neq 0$ since we assumed the degree of f is $d=1$. So we may assume $d \geq 2$ henceforth.

We then separate our proof into two cases: (1) $f \notin \Sigma_d$ and (2) $f \in \Sigma_d$. The first case is harder so we take care of it first.

2.1 The Case $f \notin \Sigma_d$

First observe that $x^d - 1 \notin \Sigma_d$ thanks to Proposition 1.2. Since Σ_d is the complex zero set of a polynomial, Proposition 1.5 tells us that there is an analytic function

$$\phi = (\phi_0, \dots, \phi_d) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d+1} \setminus \Sigma_d$$

with $\phi(0) = x^d - 1$ and $\phi(1) = f$. (Since we identify polynomials and points, we could have also said $\phi(0) = (-1, 0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and $\phi(1) = (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_d)$.) Let $G : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the analytic function defined by $G(t, x) := \phi_0(t) + \dots + \phi_d(t)x^d$, i.e., G simply evaluates the polynomial $\phi(t)$ on our path at the complex number x .

Our main trick then will be to use our path of polynomials to build d paths of roots. On one end ($t=0$), the root paths start at the d^{th} roots of unity. We will ultimately prove that, on the other end ($t=1$), our root paths yield d distinct complex roots for f . Since $f \notin \Sigma_d$ implies that each root of f has multiplicity 1, and Proposition 1.4 tells us that f can have no more than d complex roots, proving that f has d complex roots will complete our proof.

Letting $D \subseteq [0, 1]$ denote the set of $t \in [0, 1]$ such that $Z_t := \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \mid G(t, \zeta) = 0\}$ has cardinality d , it clearly suffices to prove $D = [0, 1]$. Toward this end, we'll first establish the

following facts:

(P_0) D is non-empty. (P_1) D is open. (P_2) D is closed.

To prove (P_0), first note that $x^d - 1$ has exactly d roots: They are $e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/d}, \dots, e^{2\pi(d-1)\sqrt{-1}/d}$, thanks to Euler's 1748 formula for the exponential function. The Implicit Function Theorem applied to each of these roots then implies that there are a positive ε , and analytic functions $\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_d : [0, \varepsilon] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, with $\{\mathcal{X}_1(0), \dots, \mathcal{X}_d(0)\} = \{e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/d}, \dots, e^{2\pi(d-1)\sqrt{-1}/d}\}$ and $G(t, \mathcal{X}_i(t)) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, \varepsilon)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Furthermore, since the \mathcal{X}_i are continuous and $|\mathcal{X}_i(0) - \mathcal{X}_j(0)| > 0$ for all $i \neq j$, we can assume further that $|\mathcal{X}_i(t) - \mathcal{X}_j(t)| > 0$ for all $i \neq j$ and $t \in [0, \varepsilon')$, for some positive $\varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon$. Since Z_t has cardinality $\leq d$ for all t (thanks to Proposition 1.4), we thus obtain that $D \supseteq [0, \varepsilon')$. So (P_0) is proved, and we refer to analytic functions \mathcal{X}_i satisfying $G(t, \mathcal{X}_i(t))$ for t in some open interval as *root branches*. (So the root paths we are trying to build are connected subsets of the graphs of the root branches.)

The proof of Statement (P_1) follows the proof of Statement (P_0) almost identically: If Z_t has cardinality d for some $t \in [0, 1]$, then the Implicit Function Theorem applied to each of the $\zeta \in Z_t$ yields d root branches defined in an open neighborhood $U \ni t$. By continuity again, we obtain that there is a non-empty open set $U' \subseteq U$, with $U' \ni t$ as well, such that the root paths do not intersect at any $t \in U'$. So then $U' \subseteq D$ and (P_1) is proved.

To prove Statement (P_2) we first need to observe that $|\phi_0|, \dots, |\phi_d|$ are continuous functions on the compact set $[0, 1]$. So by the Extreme Value Theorem, there is a positive M with $|\phi_0(t)|, \dots, |\phi_{d-1}(t)| \leq M$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, ϕ_d is nonzero on all of $[0, 1]$ (by the definition of Σ_d) and thus $|\phi_d|$ is a positive on $[0, 1]$. So by the Extreme Value Theorem once again, $|\phi_d|$ has a positive minimum m on $[0, 1]$, and thus $\left| \frac{\phi_i(t)}{\phi_d(t)} \right| \leq M/m$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. By Lemma 1.6 we thus obtain that

$$\mathcal{I} := \{(t, \zeta) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{C} \mid G(t, \zeta) = 0\}$$

is a bounded set. \mathcal{I} is also closed since it is the intersection of a closed (and bounded) rectangle with the zero set of a continuous function.

Suppose now that $t' \in [0, 1] \setminus D$ is a limit point of D . Then there are sequences

$$\zeta_1^{(1)}, \zeta_2^{(1)}, \dots \in \mathbb{C},$$

\vdots

$$\zeta_1^{(d)}, \zeta_2^{(d)}, \dots \in \mathbb{C},$$

and $t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots \in D$, such that $\{\zeta_i^{(1)}, \dots, \zeta_i^{(d)}\}$ has cardinality d for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $G(t_i, \zeta_i^{(j)}) = 0$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \{1, \dots, d\}$, and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} t_i = t'$.

We claim that the sequences of roots $(\zeta_i^{(1)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \dots, (\zeta_i^{(d)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ always remain at a positive distance from each other. More precisely, we claim that there is a δ with $|\zeta_i^{(j)} - \zeta_i^{(j')}| \geq \delta > 0$ for all $j \neq j'$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For if not, then there is a pair (j, j') with $j \neq j'$ and a subsequence i_1, i_2, \dots with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\zeta_{i_n}^{(j)} - \zeta_{i_n}^{(j')}| = 0$, i.e., both $\zeta_{i_n}^{(j)}$ and $\zeta_{i_n}^{(j')}$ tend to a common limit ζ .

Since G and $\frac{\partial G}{\partial x}$ are continuous, we would then obtain $G(t', \zeta) = 0$ and

$$\left. \frac{dG}{dx} \right|_{(t', \zeta)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(t_{i_n}, \zeta_{i_n}^{(j)}) - G(t_{i_n}, \zeta_{i_n}^{(j')})}{\zeta_{i_n}^{(j)} - \zeta_{i_n}^{(j')}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{0 - 0}{\zeta_{i_n}^{(j)} - \zeta_{i_n}^{(j')}} = 0.$$

But then, this contradicts the fact that $\phi([0, 1])$ avoids Σ_d . So the sequences $(\zeta_i^{(1)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \dots, (\zeta_i^{(d)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are indeed separated by some positive δ .

By this separation, and from the fact that \mathcal{I} is closed and bounded, we then obtain that each sequence $(\zeta_i^{(j)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a limit point $\zeta^{(j)}$, and these limit points are all separated by a distance at least δ from each other. In particular, again using the continuity of G , we obtain $G(t', \zeta^{(j)}) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. So $Z_{t'}$ has cardinality $\geq d$ and thus, by Proposition 1.4 again, $t' \in D$. So we at last have Statement (P_2) .

To conclude, note that we must have $D = [0, 1]$ since $[0, 1]$ is connected, and D being non-empty, open, and closed implies that D must be a connected component of $[0, 1]$. ■

2.2 The Case $f \in \Sigma_d$

First note that we may assume $\gamma_d \neq 0$, for otherwise we could simply decrease d and reduce to a lower degree case.

Now let $L(t, x) := (1-t)(\gamma_d x^d - \gamma_d) + t f(x)$ and observe that the coefficient of x^d in $L(t, x)$ is exactly $\gamma_d \neq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{C}$. So the roots of $L(0, x)$ are the roots of unity, $L(1, x) = f(x)$, and $L(t, x)$ has degree d in x for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, since $x^d - 1 \notin \Sigma_d$ (as already observed in our last case), $\Delta_d(L(t, x))$ is a polynomial of *positive* degree $\leq 2d - 1$ in t . So, by restricting $L(t, \cdot)$ to $[\varepsilon, 1]$ for some suitable $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and rescaling t , we can build an analytic path $\psi = (\psi_0, \dots, \psi_d) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d+1}$ with $\psi(0) = g$ for some $g \in \mathbb{C}^{d+1} \setminus \Sigma_d$ and *only* intersecting Σ_d at $\psi(1) = f$. We will use ψ to build root paths that prove that f has at least one root in \mathbb{C} and then conclude by long division.

More precisely, similar to our last case, let

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, x) &:= \psi_0(t) + \dots + \psi_d(t)\zeta^d \\ W_t &:= \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \mid H(t, \zeta) = 0\} \\ \mathcal{J} &:= \{(t, \zeta) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{C} \mid H(t, \zeta) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the framework of the $f \notin \Sigma_d$ case (which we've already proved), it is clear that H is analytic, $\mathcal{J} \setminus (\{1\} \times \mathbb{C})$ is a disjoint union of d real analytic curves, and \mathcal{J} is closed and bounded. In particular, these curves induce (possibly overlapping) limit points $(1, \rho_1), \dots, (1, \rho_d)$. Furthermore, since H is continuous, f must vanish at each ρ_i . So f has at least one root $\rho \in \mathbb{C}$ and, letting μ (≥ 1) denote the multiplicity of ρ , it suffices to prove that $\frac{f(x)}{(x-\rho)^\mu}$ has exactly $d - \mu$ roots in \mathbb{C} counting multiplicities. So by induction, we are done. ■

3 Consequences for Intersection Multiplicity and Resultants

We first point out that the preceding proof yields a *geometric* definition of intersection multiplicity: For a degenerate root $\rho \in \mathbb{C}$ of f , following the notation of the last section, we can define the intersection multiplicity of a root ρ to be the number of paths of \mathcal{J} ending at $(1, \rho)$, i.e., the number of ρ_i equal to ρ . With just a little more work (see, e.g., [BCSS98, Ch. 10]), we can show that this definition makes sense, i.e., our definition is independent of how we build a path of polynomials in $\mathbb{C}^{d+1} \setminus \Sigma_d$ tending to f . It turns out that this definition of intersection multiplicity generalizes easily to higher-dimensions, e.g., Bézout's Theorem (see [BCSS98, Sec. 10.5] for the details).

A useful consequence of the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra is the following inverse of the implication from Lemma 1.3:

Lemma 3.1 *Following the notation of Lemma 1.3, assume instead that $\text{Res}_{d,e}(f, g) = 0$ and $a_d b_e \neq 0$. Then there is a $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $f(\zeta) = g(\zeta) = 0$.*

We prove Lemma 3.1 in the Appendix.

4 A Root Approximation Algorithm from our Proof

Given any $f \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, consider the function $H(t, x) := (1-t)(x^d - 1) + tf(x)$. Let N be a large integer to be specified later, and consider the following iteration: Define $z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(d)}$ to be the d^{th} roots of unity, and then set

$$z_{n+1}^{(j)} := z_n^{(j)} - \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \Big|_{\left(\frac{n+1}{N}, z_n^{(j)}\right)} \right)^{-1} H\left(\frac{n+1}{N}, z_n^{(j)}\right)$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. This is the most basic *homotopy continuation method* for approximating the roots of f : Under certain reasonably enforceable conditions, $z_N^{(1)}, \dots, z_N^{(d)}$ are high-precision approximations to all the roots of f .

The key trick behind this method is that the sequences

$$\left(H\left(\frac{n}{N}, x\right), z_n^{(1)} \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \dots, \left(H\left(\frac{n}{N}, x\right), z_n^{(d)} \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

respectively yield discrete approximations to pieces of the *incidence variety*

$$\mathcal{J} := \{(c_0, \dots, c_d, \zeta) \in \mathbb{C}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{C} \mid c_0 + \dots + c_d \zeta^d = 0\}.$$

In particular, the incidence variety consists of all pairs consisting of a polynomial and its roots, and we are trying to recover a point on \mathcal{J} from its projection onto the first factor: the coefficient space \mathbb{C}^{d+1} . The preceding iteration takes d (easily obtainable) points on \mathcal{J} and then applies Newton's method (to deformations of f) to follow the d curves leading to the (hard to find) pairs $(f, \zeta_1), \dots, (f, \zeta_d)$ where $\{\zeta^{(1)}, \dots, \zeta^{(d)}\}$ is the multi-set of roots of f (appearing with appropriate multiplicity).

If by luck we have that the line segment $\mathcal{L} := \{(1-t)(x^d - 1) + tf(x)\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ does *not* intersect Σ_d , and N is sufficiently large, then one can in fact guarantee that the underlying

Newton iterations are all well-defined and that the points $z_N^{(1)}, \dots, z_N^{(d)}$ are approximate roots of f in the sense of Smale. One should of course not rely on luck. However, the assumption that \mathcal{L} does not intersect Σ_d actually holds with probability 1 for many natural probability measures on the space of coefficients \mathbb{C}^{d+1} . And, in the event that \mathcal{L} intersects Σ_d , there are well-known strategies to modify the underlying path and iteration.

As for the size of the parameter N , there is a rigorous notion of *approximate root* (due to Smale [Sma81]) that gives a practical sufficient condition for an approximation $z_N^{(j)}$ to be efficiently refinable (to arbitrarily small distance from a true root) via Newton's method applied directly to $(f, z_N^{(j)})$. Four seminal references on analyzing how large N should be are [SS94, BCSS98, BP09, Lai17].

This approach to numerical solving has a transparent generalization to systems of multivariate polynomial equations (see, e.g., [SW05]), and has already been implemented and proven quite valuable. An excellent example is the package `Bertini`, which is freely downloadable after a simple google search. Homotopy methods thus possess a certain conceptual beauty, and making them faster and fully reliable leads to many active research problems in (numerical) algebraic geometry.

Appendix: Proving the Equivalence of Vanishing Discriminants and the Presence of Degenerate Roots

Collecting powers of x , it is easy to prove the following proposition, which we'll use below:

Proposition 4.1 *For any $d, e \geq 1$, and complex constants $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$, and u_i , we have that the matrix product identity*

$$[\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{e-1}, \beta_0, \dots, \beta_{d-1}] \text{Syl}_{d,e}(f, g) = [u_0, \dots, u_{d+e-1}]$$

holds if and only if the polynomial identity

$$(\alpha_0 + \dots + \alpha_{e-1}x^{e-1})f + (\beta_0 + \dots + \beta_{d-1}x^{d-1})g(x) = u_0 + \dots + u_{d+e-1}x^{d+e-1}$$

holds. ■

The Proof of Lemma 1.3

If $d = e = 1$ then the resultant not vanishing is equivalent to the vectors $[a_0, a_1]$ and $[b_0, b_1]$ being linearly independent. So it is clear that $f = g = 0$ can have no complex solutions. So let us assume, swapping f and g if necessary, that $d \geq 2$.

Then $\text{Res}_{d,e}(f, g) \neq 0$ implies that $\det \text{Syl}_{d,e}(f, g) \neq 0$, and thus the linear system

$$[r_0, \dots, r_{e-1}, s_0, \dots, s_{d-1}] \text{Syl}_{d,e}(f, g) = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$$

has a unique solution.

By Proposition 4.1 we then have that

$$(r_0 + \dots + r_{e-1}x^{e-1})f(x) + (s_0 + \dots + s_{d-1}x^{d-1})g(x) = 1$$

identically. This implies, in particular, that f and g can have no complex roots in common: Evaluating our last polynomial linear combination at such a root would imply that $0 = 1$ — a contradiction. So we obtain the main assertion.

The consequence for Δ_d follows immediately upon setting $g = f'$ and observing that any root $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ of f with $f'(\zeta) \neq 0$ is a root of multiplicity 1, thanks to Proposition 1.1. ■

The Proof of Lemma 3.1

Under the stated hypotheses, $\det \operatorname{Res}_{d,e}(f, g) = 0$. So Proposition 4.1 implies that there must be polynomials $r, s \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, at least one of which is not identically 0, with degrees respectively bounded from above by $e - 1$ and $d - 1$, satisfying $rf + sg = 0$ identically. In particular, the factorizations of rf and $-sg$ must be identical. Note also that if s is identically 0 then f must be identically 0, and we trivially have that f vanishes at all the roots of g . (And g has at least 1 complex root, thanks to the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra.) So we may assume that *both* r and s are not identically 0.

By the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra, f has exactly d degree 1 factors (counting multiplicity) since $a_d \neq 0$. Since s has no more than $d - 1$ linear factors, f and g must have a degree 1 factor in common. So we are done. ■

References

- [AKNR18] Martín Avendaño; Roman Kogan; Mounir Nisse; and J. Maurice Rojas, “*Metric Estimates and Membership Complexity for Archimedean Amoebae and Tropical Hypersurfaces*,” presented at MEGA 2013. Published in *Journal of Complexity*, Vol. 46, June 2018, pp. 45–65.
- [BP09] Carlos Beltrán and Luis Miguel Pardo, “*Smale’s 17th problem: average polynomial time to compute affine and projective solutions*,” *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 22 (2009), no. 2, pp. 363–385.
- [BCSS98] Lenore Blum; Felipe Cucker; Mike Shub; and Steve Smale, *Complexity and Real Computation*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [Fuj16] M. Fujiwara, “*Über die obere Schranke des absoluten Betrags der Wurzeln einer algebraischen Gleichung*,” *Tôhoku Mathematical Journal*, **10**, pp. 167–171, 1916.
- [Hub15] John Hubbard and Barbara Burke Hubbard, *Vector Calculus, Linear Algebra, and Differential Forms: A Unified Approach*, Matrix Editions, 2015.
- [Lai17] Pierre Lairez, “*A deterministic algorithm to compute approximate roots of polynomial systems in polynomial average time*,” *Found. Comput. Math.* 17 (2017), no. 5, pp. 1265–1292.
- [Mun00] James R. Munkres, *Topology*, 2nd edition, Pearson, 2000.
- [RS02] Q. I. Rahman and G. Schmeisser, *Analytic Theory of Polynomials*, London Mathematical Society Monographs 26, Oxford Science Publications, 2002.
- [SS94] Mike Shub and Steve Smale, “*Complexity of Bezout’s theorem V – Polynomial time*,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 133, no. 1, pp. 141–164, 1994.
- [SW05] Andrew J. Sommese and Charles W. Wampler, “*The Numerical Solution to Systems of Polynomials Arising in Engineering and Science*,” World Scientific, Singapore, 2005.

[Sma81] Steve Smale, “*The fundamental theorem of algebra and complexity theory*,” Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) Volume 4, Number 1 (1981), pp. 1–36.