

An Algorithm for Discriminating the Complete Multiplicities of a Parametric Univariate Polynomial

Simin Qin^a, Bican Xia^b, and Jing Yang^{*a}

^aHCIC–School of Mathematical Sciences, Center for Applied Mathematics of Guangxi, Guangxi Minzu University, Nanning 530006, China

^bSchool of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100091, China

Abstract

In this paper, we tackle the parametric complete multiplicity problem for a univariate polynomial. Our approach to the parametric complete multiplicity problem has a significant difference from the classical method, which relies on repeated gcd computation. Instead, we introduce a novel technique that uses incremental gcds of the given polynomial and its high-order derivatives. This approach, formulated as non-nested subresultants, sidesteps the exponential expansion of polynomial degrees in the generated condition. We also uncover the hidden structure between the incremental gcds and pseudo-remainders. Our analysis reveals that the conditions produced by our new algorithm are simpler than those generated by the classical approach in most cases. Experiments show that our algorithm is faster than the one based on repeated gcd computation for problems with relatively big size.

1 Introduction

Solving univariate polynomials for roots is a very fundamental problem in computer algebra with numerous applications. Depending on whether the coefficients contain indeterminates, we categorize the problem into two sub-problems.

- For polynomials with constant coefficients, “solving” means finding/isolating the roots.
- For polynomials with parametric coefficients, “solving” means classifying the *complete root structures* the given polynomial may have and providing a set of conditions under which each structure occurs. By complete root structure, we mean the numbers of real and imaginary roots and their multiplicities. Thus complete root structure is also called *complete multiplicity structure*.

In this paper, we tackle the second problem. More explicitly, we consider a polynomial of the form $P = a_n x^n + \dots + a_0$, where $a_n \neq 0$ and a_i 's are parameters which take values over the real field \mathbb{R} , and explore the problem of determining a set of conditions on a_i 's (which provides a partition of the parameter set) so that P exhibits a specific complete multiplicity structure under each condition. For instance, we consider a quartic polynomial $P = a_4 x^4 + a_3 x^3 + a_2 x^2 + a_1 x + a_0$,

*Corresponding author: yangjing0930@gmail.com.

where $a_4 \neq 0$ and a_i 's are real parameters. All the potential complete multiplicity structures of P are:

$$\begin{aligned} & ((1, 1, 1, 1); ()), \quad ((1, 1); (1, 1)), \quad ((2, 1, 1); ()), \quad ((2); (1, 1)), \\ & ((2, 2); ()), \quad ((); (2, 2)), \quad ((3, 1); ()), \quad ((4); ()), \end{aligned}$$

where $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_R; \boldsymbol{\mu}_I)$ with $\#\boldsymbol{\mu}_R + \#\boldsymbol{\mu}_I = n$ is interpreted as follows:

- the real roots of P have the multiplicity structure $\boldsymbol{\mu}_R$, and
- the imaginary roots of P have the multiplicity structure $\boldsymbol{\mu}_I$.

For instance, if P has a complete multiplicity structure $((2); (1, 1))$, then P has a double real root and a pair of simple imaginary roots. With this setting, we aim to find a set of conditions C_0, C_1, \dots on a_i 's so that

$$\text{the complete multiplicity structure of } P = \begin{cases} ((1, 1, 1, 1); ()) & \text{iff } C_0 \text{ holds} \\ ((1, 1); (1, 1)) & \text{iff } C_1 \text{ holds} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ ((4); ()) & \text{iff } C_7 \text{ holds} \end{cases}$$

In general, the problem is stated as follows:

Problem: For every $\boldsymbol{\mu}_c = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_R; \boldsymbol{\mu}_I)$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_R = (\mu_{R,1}, \dots, \mu_{R,m_1})$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_I = (\mu_{I,1}, \dots, \mu_{I,m_2})$ are such that

- $\mu_{R,1} \geq \dots \geq \mu_{R,m_1} > 0$,
- $\mu_{I,1} = \mu_{I,2} \geq \dots \geq \mu_{I,m_2-1} = \mu_{I,m_2} > 0$, and
- $\sum_{i=1}^{m_1} \mu_{R,i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m_2} \mu_{I,i} = n$,

find a necessary and sufficient condition on the coefficients of a polynomial P over \mathbb{R} of degree n such that the complete multiplicity structure of P is $\boldsymbol{\mu}_c$.

This problem is significant as it has numerous applications in various fields, such as mathematics, science, and engineering. Due to its importance, the problem and several related problems have already been extensively studied (e.g., see [3, 6, 10–12, 15]). In [15], Yang, Hou and Zeng gave an algorithm to generate a condition for discriminating different complete multiplicity structures of a univariate polynomial (referred to as YHZ's condition hereinafter) by making use of repeated gcd computation for parametric polynomials [1, 2, 13]. A similar idea was adopted by Gonzalez-Vega et al. [3] for solving the real root classification and quantifier elimination problems by using Sturm-Habicht sequences. Roughly speaking, this method computes multiple factors at different levels, which can be realized by repeated gcd computation, i.e., computing the gcd of P and its first derivative, the gcd of the previous gcd and its derivative, and so on. For the gcd at each level, we determine the condition that it has a certain number of distinct real roots/pairs of imaginary roots. By conjoining all the conditions at different levels, one can get a condition that P has a given complete multiplicity structure. It should be pointed out that in YHZ's method, the polynomials in the conditions are computed from repeated gcds whose coefficients are nested determinants. Thus, the "size" of these polynomials increases dramatically when the degree of P grows, causing a huge computational burden.

A coarser version of the problem, which is stated as the parametric multiplicity problem, has been well studied (mainly via repeated gcd computation) in classical subresultant theory (e.g., [16]). In the parametric multiplicity structure, we do not differentiate real and imaginary

roots, and thus, the multiplicity structure considered is called a complex multiplicity structure. Recently, Hong and Yang revisited the problem in [5, 8], resulting in two non-nested conditions for determining the multiplicity structure. It is shown that the generated conditions by [5, 8] are smaller than that produced via repeated gcd computation. Note that the complete multiplicity can be viewed as the refinement of complex multiplicity. We aim to find conditions with “small” size for the complete multiplicity problem, measured in terms of the number of polynomials appearing in the conditions and their maximum degree.

The main contribution of this paper is to provide such a condition, which has a *smaller* size than that in the previous methods. The key idea for generating the new condition is to replace the repeated gcds with the gcds of P and its high-order derivatives of different orders for describing the multiple factors at different levels. For this purpose, we introduce the concept of incremental gcd and prove that it can be written as some specific subresultant of P and its derivatives (see Theorem 16). Then, we devise an algorithm for computing the condition for every possible complete multiplicity structure P may have. It is shown that the output condition has a smaller number of polynomials, and the maximal degree of polynomials in the condition is also significantly smaller than those in YHZ’s method. Furthermore, we also explore the relationship among these incremental gcds and identify an interesting structure (see Proposition 20) which is similar to the generalized Habicht’s theorem in [7].

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we first present the problem to be addressed in a formal way. In Section 3, we review the concept of subresultant for multiple polynomials and its equivalent form in roots. In Section 4, we present the main result of the paper (Theorem 16), which is followed by a detailed proof in Section 5. In Section 6, we design an algorithm for solving the proposed problem with the newly developed tool. In Section 7, we compare the performance of the algorithm and the size of polynomials output by the algorithm and those given by previous works. To keep the presentation of the main result in a tight manner, we postpone the proofs for two secondary results (which we hope could be useful for tackling other related problems) to Appendices A and B.

2 Problem Statement

Notation 1.

- $P = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$, where $a_n \neq 0$;
- $\text{mult}(P) = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ is the multiplicity vector of P , where $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_m \geq 1$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that the polynomial considered in this paper has degree greater than 1.

Definition 2 (Complete multiplicity). *Given $P \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, assume P has m_1 distinct real roots of P with multiplicities $\mu_{R,1}, \dots, \mu_{R,m_1}$, and m_2 distinct imaginary roots of P with multiplicities $\mu_{I,1}, \dots, \mu_{I,m_2}$, respectively, where $\mu_{R,1} \geq \dots \geq \mu_{R,m_1} \geq 1$ and $\mu_{I,1} = \mu_{I,2} \geq \dots \geq \mu_{I,m_2-1} = \mu_{I,m_2} \geq 1$. Then the complete multiplicity of P , written as $\text{cmult}(P)$, is defined by*

$$\text{cmult}(P) = ((\mu_{R,1}, \dots, \mu_{R,m_1}); (\mu_{I,1}, \dots, \mu_{I,m_2})).$$

Example 3. *Let $P = x^5 - 4x^4 + 6x^3 - 6x^2 + 5x - 2$. Then $\text{mult}(P) = (2, 1, 1, 1)$, since it can be verified that $P = (x - 1)^2(x - 2)(x^2 + 1)$. It is easy to see that*

$$\text{cmult}(P) = ((2, 1); (1, 1)).$$

Notation 4.

- $\mathcal{M}(n) := \{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) : \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_m = n, \mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_m \geq 1\}$;
- $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(n) := \left\{ ((\mu_{R,1}, \dots, \mu_{R,m_1}); (\mu_{I,1}, \dots, \mu_{I,m_2})) : \bigwedge \left(\begin{array}{l} \mu_{R,1} \geq \dots \geq \mu_{R,m_1} \geq 1 \\ \mu_{I,1} = \mu_{I,2} \geq \dots \geq \mu_{I,m_2-1} = \mu_{I,m_2} \geq 1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} \mu_{R,i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m_2} \mu_{I,i} = n \end{array} \right) \right\}$.

Obviously, every $\mu_{\mathbf{c}} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(n)$ can be viewed as a 2-partition of some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(n)$ with the first part representing the multiplicities of real roots and the second part representing those of imaginary roots. For example, $\text{cmult}(P) = ((2, 1); (1, 1)) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(5)$ is a 2-partition of $\text{mult}(P) = (2, 1, 1, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(5)$, where $(2, 1)$ indicates that P has two real roots with one of them to be of multiplicity 2 and $(1, 1)$ indicates that P has a pair of simple imaginary roots.

Now we are ready to give a formal statement of the problem addressed in the current paper.

Problem 5 (Parametric complete multiplicity problem).

In: $P = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \mathbb{Z}[a_0, \dots, a_n][x]$ where $n \geq 2$ and a_i 's take values over \mathbb{R} with a_n assumed to be nonzero.

Out: for each $\mu_{\mathbf{c}} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(n)$, find a necessary and sufficient condition $C_{\mu_{\mathbf{c}}}$ on a_i 's such that $\text{cmult}(P) = \mu_{\mathbf{c}}$.

3 Preliminaries

A useful tool for formulating the multiple factors of a polynomial is subresultant for multiple polynomials, which is proposed by Hong and Yang in [6, 7] with several variants developed in [14] and is usually defined in the form of determinant polynomial.

Definition 6 (Determinant polynomial). *Let M be a $p \times q$ matrix where $p \leq q$. Then the determinant polynomial of M , written as $\text{dp } M$, is defined as*

$$\text{dp } M = \sum_{i=0}^{q-p} M^{(i)} x^i$$

where $M^{(i)} = |M_1, \dots, M_{p-1}, M_{q-i}|$ and M_k stands for the k -th column of M .

Notation 7.

- $F = (F_0, F_1, \dots, F_t) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[a][x]$, where
 - $t \geq 1$,
 - $d_i = \deg F_i$, and
 - $F_i = \sum_{j=0}^{d_i} a_{ij} x^j$;
- $\mathcal{P}(d_0, t) = \{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}^t : \delta_1 + \dots + \delta_t \leq d_0\}$.
- For $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t) \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, t)$, $|\delta| := \delta_1 + \dots + \delta_t$.

Definition 8 (Generalized Sylvester matrix). Given \mathbf{F} as in Notation 7 and $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, t)$, the $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ -th Sylvester matrix of \mathbf{F} , written as $\mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F})$, is defined as

$$\mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_0 \\ \mathbf{B}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}_t \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\mathbf{B}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \cdots & \cdots & a_{i1} & a_{i0} \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & \cdots & \cdots & a_{i1} & a_{i0} \end{bmatrix}_{\delta_i \times (\delta_0 + d_0)}$$

$$\delta_0 = \begin{cases} \max_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq t \\ \delta_i \neq 0}} (d_i + \delta_i) - d_0, & \text{if } \max_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq t \\ \delta_i \neq 0}} (d_i + \delta_i) \geq d_0, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Remark 9. One may check that the number of rows in $\mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F})$ is $\delta_0 + |\boldsymbol{\delta}|$ and that of columns is $\delta_0 + d_0$. Since $|\boldsymbol{\delta}| \leq d_0$, we immediately see that $\mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F})$ is either a wide or square matrix. Thus it is meaningful to compute its determinant polynomial.

Definition 10. The $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ -th subresultant $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ of \mathbf{F} with respect x is defined as

$$R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F}) := \text{dp } \mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F}).$$

The principal leading coefficient of $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F})$, i.e., the coefficient of the term $x^{d_0 - |\boldsymbol{\delta}|}$, is called the $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ -th principal subresultant coefficient and is denoted by $\overline{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}}(\mathbf{F})$.

Remark 11.

- When the meaning of \mathbf{F} is clear from the context, $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F})$ and $\overline{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}}(\mathbf{F})$ can be abbreviated as $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ and $\overline{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}}$, respectively.
- If the length of $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is 1, that is, $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1)$, we also write $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ as R_{δ_1} for simplicity.

In [6], Hong and Yang provided an equivalent expression in the roots of F_0 for $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F})$. To present the formula, we introduce the following notations.

Notation 12.

- $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d_0})$ where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d_0}$ are the complex roots of F_0 ;
- $\mathbf{X}_{\varepsilon} = (x^{\varepsilon}, \dots, x^0)^T$;
- $\mathbf{X}_{\varepsilon}(\alpha_i) = (\alpha_i^{\varepsilon}, \dots, \alpha_i^0)^T$;
- $\mathbf{X}_{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = [\mathbf{X}_{\varepsilon}(\alpha_1) \ \cdots \ \mathbf{X}_{\varepsilon}(\alpha_{d_0})]$;
- $V(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = |\mathbf{X}_{d_0-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})|$.

Theorem 13. Given P and $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, t)$ as in Notation 7, we have

$$R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F}) = (-1)^{\varepsilon} \cdot a_{0d_0}^{\delta_0} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{M}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{M}_t \\ \mathbf{X}_{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) & \mathbf{X}_{\varepsilon} \end{vmatrix} / V(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$$

where

- δ_0 is as in (1), $\varepsilon = d_0 - |\boldsymbol{\delta}|$,
- $M_i = \begin{bmatrix} (x^{\delta_i-1}F_i)(\alpha_1) & \cdots & (x^{\delta_i-1}F_i)(\alpha_{d_0}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ (x^0F_i)(\alpha_1) & \cdots & (x^0F_i)(\alpha_{d_0}) \end{bmatrix}$, and
- X_ε , $\mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and $V(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ are as in Notation 12.

4 Main Results

Definition 14 (Conjugate). Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in \mathcal{M}(n)$. Then the conjugate of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is defined by $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_n)$ where

$$\bar{\mu}_i = \#\{j \in [1, \dots, m] : \mu_j \geq i\}.$$

Definition 15 (Incremental gcd). Given \mathbf{F} as in Notation 7, let

$$G_i = \gcd(F_0, F_1, \dots, F_i).$$

Then we call $\mathbf{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_n)$ the incremental gcd of \mathbf{F} , written as $\text{icgcd } \mathbf{F}$.

Theorem 16 (Main theorem). Given $P \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree n with $\text{mult}(P) = \boldsymbol{\mu}$, assume $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_n)$. Let $\mathbf{F} = (P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(n)})$ where $P^{(k)}$ is the k -th derivative of P with respect to x for $0 \leq k \leq n$. Then we have

$$\text{icgcd } \mathbf{F} = (G_1, \dots, G_n)$$

where

$$G_i = R_{(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i)}(P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(i)})$$

Remark 17. It is observed that when $\delta_i = 0$, F_i is not involved in $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F})$. Thus for simplicity, we make the convention that

$$R_{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_i)}(\mathbf{F}) := R_{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_i)}(F_0, \dots, F_i)$$

In other words, we view $\delta_{i+1} = \dots = \delta_n = 0$. Under this convention, G_i in Theorem 16 can be written as

$$G_i = R_{(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i)}(\mathbf{F})$$

where $\mathbf{F} = (P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(n)})$. Moreover, from now on, we will assume $\mathbf{F} = (P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(n)})$ in the rest of the paper unless specified in the context.

Example 18. Consider $P = (x-1)^3(x+1)^2(x^2+1) = x^7 - x^6 - x^5 + x^4 - x^3 + x^2 + x - 1$. Let $\mathbf{F} = (P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, P^{(2)}, P^{(3)}, P^{(4)}, P^{(5)}, P^{(6)}, P^{(7)})$. It is easy to see that

$$\text{icgcd } \mathbf{F} = ((x-1)^2(x+1), x-1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) \quad (2)$$

In what follows, we calculate $\text{icgcd } \mathbf{F}$ by Theorem 16.

Since $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (3, 2, 1, 1)$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (\bar{\mu}_1, \bar{\mu}_2, \bar{\mu}_3, \bar{\mu}_4, \bar{\mu}_5, \bar{\mu}_6, \bar{\mu}_7) = (4, 2, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
G_1 &= R_{(4)}(\mathbf{F}) \\
&= \text{dp}(x^2P^{(0)}, x^1P^{(0)}, x^0P^{(0)}, x^3P^{(1)}, x^2P^{(1)}, x^1P^{(1)}, x^0P^{(1)}) \\
&= \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & & & \\ & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & & \\ & & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & \\ 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & & & \\ & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & & \\ & & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & \\ & & & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -1536(x-1)^2(x+1) \\
G_2 &= R_{(4,2)}(\mathbf{F}) \\
&= \text{dp}(x^2P^{(0)}, x^1P^{(0)}, x^0P^{(0)}, x^3P^{(1)}, x^2P^{(1)}, x^1P^{(1)}, x^0P^{(1)}, x^1P^{(2)}, x^0P^{(2)}) \\
&= \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & & & \\ & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & & \\ & & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & \\ 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & & & \\ & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & & \\ & & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & \\ & & & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & \\ & & & & 42 & -30 & -20 & 12 & -6 & 2 & \\ & & & & & 42 & -30 & -20 & 12 & -6 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -1179648(x-1) \\
G_3 &= R_{(4,2,1)}(\mathbf{F}) \\
&= \text{dp}(x^2P^{(0)}, x^1P^{(0)}, x^0P^{(0)}, x^3P^{(1)}, x^2P^{(1)}, x^1P^{(1)}, x^0P^{(1)}, x^1P^{(2)}, x^0P^{(2)}, x^0P^{(3)}) \\
&= \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & & & \\ & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & & \\ & & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & \\ 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & & & \\ & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & & \\ & & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & & \\ & & & 7 & -6 & -5 & 4 & -3 & 2 & 1 & \\ & & & & 42 & -30 & -20 & 12 & -6 & 2 & \\ & & & & & 42 & -30 & -20 & 12 & -6 & 2 \\ & & & & & & 210 & -120 & -60 & 24 & -6 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -56623104 \\
G_4 &= R_{(4,2,1,0)}(\mathbf{F}) = R_{(4,2,1)}(\mathbf{F}) \\
G_5 &= R_{(4,2,1,0,0)}(\mathbf{F}) = R_{(4,2,1)}(\mathbf{F}) \\
G_6 &= R_{(4,2,1,0,0,0)}(\mathbf{F}) = R_{(4,2,1)}(\mathbf{F}) \\
G_7 &= R_{(4,2,1,0,0,0,0)}(\mathbf{F}) = R_{(4,2,1)}(\mathbf{F})
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{icgcd } \mathbf{F} = (G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4, G_5, G_6, G_7)$$

which only differs from (2) by constant factors.

Remark 19.

- It is noted that when $\bar{\mu}_i \neq 0$ and $\bar{\mu}_{i+1} = \dots = \bar{\mu}_n = 0$,

$$G_i = R_{(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i)}(\mathbf{F})$$

is a nonzero constant. Obviously, in this case,

$$G_{i+1} = \dots = G_n = G_i$$

- Since $k!$ is a common factor of the coefficients for $P^{(k)}$, we can use $P^{(k)}/k!$ instead of $P^{(k)}$ to simplify the computation in practice. So the gcds in Example 18 can be simplified into the followings:

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= -1536(x-1)^2(x+1), & G_2 &= -589824(x-1), \\ G_3 &= G_4 = G_5 = G_6 = G_7 = -9437184 \end{aligned}$$

One may wonder whether there are inherent relationships among $R_{\delta}(\mathbf{F})$'s. Indeed, we succeed to find such a relationship for polynomials with formal coefficients, which reveals the hidden structures in the potential G_i 's and converts the computation of subresultants into that of pseudo-remainders. We hope this relationship could be useful for exploring more hidden structures among the potential G_i 's and can be applied to enhance the efficiency of computing $R_{\delta}(\mathbf{F})$'s. The proof of the proposition can be found in Appendix A.

Proposition 20. Let $P = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \mathbb{Z}[a_0, \dots, a_n][x]$ and $\mathbf{F} = (P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(n)})$. Let $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t) \in \mathcal{P}(n, t)$ be such that

- $\delta_1 \geq \dots \geq \delta_t \geq 1$, and
- $\delta_j > \delta_{j+1}$ holds for some $1 \leq j < t$.

Then

$$\overline{R_{\delta - e_j - e_t}(\mathbf{F})} \cdot R_{\delta}(\mathbf{F}) = \text{prem}(R_{\delta - e_j}(\mathbf{F}), R_{\delta - e_t}(\mathbf{F}))$$

where e_k is the k -th unit vector of length t .

Example 21. Consider $P = a_3 x^3 + a_2 x^2 + a_1 x + a_0$ and $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2) = (2, 1)$. Suppose we have

$$R_{(1,1)}(\mathbf{F}) = 6 a_3 (3 a_3 x + a_2), \quad R_{(2,0)}(\mathbf{F}) = a_3 ((6 a_1 a_3 - 2 a_2^2)x + (9 a_0 a_3 - a_1 a_2)), \quad \overline{R_{(1,0)}(\mathbf{F})} = 3 a_3.$$

By Proposition 20, we can calculate $R_{(2,1)}(\mathbf{F})$ via

$$\begin{aligned} R_{(2,1)}(\mathbf{F}) &= \text{prem}(R_{(1,1)}(\mathbf{F}), R_{(2,0)}(\mathbf{F})) / \overline{R_{(1,0)}(\mathbf{F})} \\ &= -6 a_3^2 (27 a_0 a_3^2 - 9 a_1 a_2 a_3 + 2 a_2^3) / (3 a_3) \\ &= -2 a_3 (27 a_0 a_3^2 - 9 a_1 a_2 a_3 + 2 a_2^3) \end{aligned}$$

5 Proof of Theorem 16

This section is devoted to proving the paper's main result (Theorem 16). To achieve this goal, we first rewrite $R_{\delta}(\mathbf{F})$ from an expression in coefficients to that in multiple roots through divided difference. Then we simplify the resulting expression in roots with the multiplicity information (i.e., the evaluation of the k -th derivative of P at its multiple root r_i is zero for $0 \leq k \leq \mu_i - 1$ and is nonzero when $k = \mu_i$ where μ_i is the multiplicity of r_i). It turns out that the simplified expression corresponds to a certain gcd in igcd \mathbf{F} .

5.1 Converting $R_\delta(\mathbf{F})$ into an expression in multiple roots

Lemma 22 (Subresultant in multiple roots). *Let P be of degree n with m distinct roots r_1, \dots, r_m whose multiplicities are μ_1, \dots, μ_m , respectively. Let $\mathbf{F} = (P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(n)})$ and $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n) \in \mathcal{P}(n, n)$. Then we have*

$$R_\delta(\mathbf{F}) = c_{\delta, \mu} \cdot \frac{\begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_1-1)}(r_1) & \cdots & \cdots & \mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_m) & \cdots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_m-1)}(r_m) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_1-1)}(r_1) & \cdots & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_m) & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_m-1)}(r_m) \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} (r_v - r_u)^{\mu_u \mu_v}}$$

where

- $c_{\delta, \mu} = (-1)^{\binom{n}{2} + \varepsilon} \frac{a_n^{\delta_0}}{\prod_{u=1}^m \prod_{v=0}^{\mu_u-1} v!}$,
- $\varepsilon = n - |\delta|$,
- δ_0 is as in (1),
- $\mathbf{X}_\varepsilon = (x^\varepsilon, \dots, x^0)^T$,
- $\mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(k)} = ((x^\varepsilon)^{(k)}, \dots, (x^0)^{(k)})^T$, and
- $\mathbf{H}^{(k)} = \left((x^{\delta_1-1} P^{(1)})^{(k)}, \dots, (x^0 P^{(1)})^{(k)}, \dots, (x^{\delta_n-1} P^{(n)})^{(k)}, \dots, (x^0 P^{(n)})^{(k)} \right)^T$.

Proof. Let $P = a_n(x - \alpha_1) \cdots (x - \alpha_n)$. When $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are treated as numbers, without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are grouped into m sets as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \{\alpha_1 \dots \dots \dots \alpha_{\mu_1}\}, \\ I_2 &:= \{\alpha_{\mu_1+1} \dots \dots \dots \alpha_{\mu_1+\mu_2}\}, \\ &\vdots \\ I_m &:= \{\alpha_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_{m-1}+1} \dots \alpha_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_{m-1}+\mu_m}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where elements in I_i are all equal to r_i .

Now we treat $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ as indeterminates. Let

$$\mathbf{H} = \left(x^{\delta_1-1} P^{(1)}, \dots, x^0 P^{(1)}, \dots, x^{\delta_n-1} P^{(n)}, \dots, x^0 P^{(n)} \right)^T$$

and $\mathbf{X}_\varepsilon = (x^\varepsilon, \dots, x^0)^T$. By Theorem 13,

$$R_\delta(\mathbf{F}) = (-1)^\varepsilon \cdot a_n^{\delta_0} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{H}(\alpha_n) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\alpha_n) \end{vmatrix} / V(\alpha)$$

where δ_0 is as in (1), $\varepsilon = n - |\delta|$, and \mathbf{X}_ε and $V(\alpha)$ are as in Notation 12. It follows that

$$R_\delta = \frac{(-1)^\varepsilon \cdot a_n^{\delta_0} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{H}(\alpha_n) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\alpha_n) \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{V(\alpha)} = \frac{(-1)^\varepsilon \cdot a_n^{\delta_0} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{H}(\alpha_n) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\alpha_n) \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{(-1)^{\binom{n}{2}} \prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq n} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u)}$$

Next, we carry out the exact division so that the differences between the collapsed α_i 's do not appear in the denominator. For this purpose, we let $Q[x_1, \dots, x_u]$ denote the $(u-1)$ -th divided difference of $Q \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ at x_1, x_2, \dots, x_u which is defined recursively as follows:

$$Q[x_1, \dots, x_u] = \begin{cases} Q(x_1), & \text{if } u = 1; \\ \frac{Q[x_1, \dots, x_{u-2}, x_u] - Q[x_1, \dots, x_{u-2}, x_{u-1}]}{x_u - x_{u-1}}, & \text{if } u > 1. \end{cases}$$

Now we eliminate the factors of the form $\alpha_v - \alpha_u$ where $\alpha_u, \alpha_v \in I_1$ by using successive divided differences. For the sake of simplicity, let $c' = (-1)^{\varepsilon+} \binom{n}{2} \cdot a_n^{\delta_0}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\delta &= \frac{c' \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{H}(\alpha_n) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon(\alpha_n) \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq n} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u)} \\ &= \frac{c' \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1] & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1, \alpha_2] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_{\mu_1-1}, \alpha_{\mu_1}] & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_{\mu_1+1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_n] \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1] & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1, \alpha_2] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_{\mu_1-1}, \alpha_{\mu_1}] & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_{\mu_1+1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_n] \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{\substack{\alpha_u, \alpha_v \in I_1 \\ v-u > 1}} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u) \prod_{\substack{\alpha_u, \alpha_v \notin I_1 \\ v-u > 0}} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u) \prod_{\substack{\alpha_u \in I_1 \\ \alpha_v \notin I_1}} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u)} \\ &= \frac{c' \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1] & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1, \alpha_2] & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_{\mu_1-2}, \alpha_{\mu_1-1}, \alpha_{\mu_1}] & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_{\mu_1+1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_n] \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1] & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1, \alpha_2] & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_{\mu_1-2}, \alpha_{\mu_1-1}, \alpha_{\mu_1}] & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_{\mu_1+1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_n] \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{\substack{\alpha_u, \alpha_v \in I_1 \\ v-u > 2}} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u) \prod_{\substack{\alpha_u, \alpha_v \notin I_1 \\ v-u > 0}} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u) \prod_{\substack{\alpha_u \in I_1 \\ \alpha_v \notin I_1}} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u)} \\ &\vdots \\ &= \frac{c' \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1] & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1, \alpha_2] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\mu_1}] & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_{\mu_1+1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_n] \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1] & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1, \alpha_2] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\mu_1}] & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_{\mu_1+1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_n] \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{\substack{\alpha_u, \alpha_v \notin I_1 \\ v-u > 0}} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u) \prod_{\substack{\alpha_u \in I_1 \\ \alpha_v \notin I_1}} (\alpha_v - \alpha_u)} \end{aligned}$$

Repeating the same procedure for α'_v 's in each I_u , for $u = 2, \dots, m$, successively, we have

$$R_\delta = \frac{c' \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\mu_1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_{m-1}+1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[\alpha_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_{m-1}+1}, \dots, \alpha_n] \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\mu_1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_{m-1}+1}] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\alpha_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_{m-1}+1}, \dots, \alpha_n] \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} \prod_{\substack{\alpha_p \in I_u \\ \alpha_q \in I_v}} (\alpha_q - \alpha_p)}$$

Now we substitute

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= \alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_{\mu_1}, \\ &\vdots \\ r_m &= \alpha_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_{m-1}+1} = \cdots = \alpha_n \end{aligned}$$

into R_δ and obtain

$$R_\delta = \frac{c' \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}[r_1] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[r_1, \dots, r_1] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[r_m] & \cdots & \mathbf{H}[r_m, \dots, r_m] \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[r_1] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[r_1, \dots, r_1] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[r_m] & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[r_m, \dots, r_m] \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} (r_v - r_u)^{\mu_u \mu_v}} \quad (3)$$

For any given polynomial $Q \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, we have

$$Q[\underbrace{r_u, \dots, r_u}_k \text{ } r'_u \text{ } s] = \frac{Q^{(k-1)}(r_u)}{(k-1)!}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}[\underbrace{r_u, \dots, r_u}_k \text{ } r_u \text{'s}] &= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left((x^{\delta_1-1} P^{(1)})^{(k-1)}(r_u), \dots, (x^0 P^{(1)})^{(k-1)}(r_u), \right. \\ &\quad \dots, \\ &\quad \left. (x^{\delta_n-1} P^{(n)})^{(k-1)}(r_u), \dots, (x^0 P^{(n)})^{(k-1)}(r_u) \right)^T \\ &= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \mathbf{H}^{(k-1)}(r_u) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon[\underbrace{r_u, \dots, r_u}_k \text{ } r_u \text{'s}] &= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left((x^\varepsilon)^{(k-1)}(r_u), \dots, (x^0)^{(k-1)}(r_u) \right)^T \\ &= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(k-1)}(r_u) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The substitution of (4) and (5) into (3) yields

$$R_\delta = \frac{c_{\delta, \mu} \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_1-1)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_m) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_m-1)}(r_m) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_1-1)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_m) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_m-1)}(r_m) \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} (r_v - r_u)^{\mu_u \mu_v}}$$

where

$$c_{\delta, \mu} = \frac{c'}{\prod_{u=1}^m \prod_{v=0}^{\mu_u-1} v!} = (-1)^{\binom{n}{2} + \varepsilon} \frac{a_n^{\delta_0}}{\prod_{u=1}^m \prod_{v=0}^{\mu_u-1} v!}$$

The proof is completed. \square

5.2 Property of confluent Vandermonde matrices

It is seen in Lemma 22 that the numer of the expression $R_\delta(\mathbf{F})$ in multiple roots is a generalization of the confluent Vandermonde matrix, which inspires us to consider this particular type of matrices.

Let p and q be positive integers. The $p \times q$ Vandermonde block in terms of x is defined as

$$\mathbf{U}(x; p, q) = (c_{ij})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq p \\ 1 \leq j \leq q}}$$

where $c_{ij} = \binom{i-1}{j-1} x^{i-j}$ with the convention $\binom{i-1}{j-1} := 0$ for $i < j$.

Definition 23 (Confluent Vandermonde matrix). *Given $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_\ell)$, the $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ -confluent Vandermonde matrix in terms of \mathbf{x} is defined as the $k \times k$ matrix*

$$\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\tau}) := [\mathbf{U}(x_1; k, \tau_1) \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{U}(x_\ell; k, \tau_\ell)]$$

where $k = \tau_1 + \dots + \tau_\ell$ and $\mathbf{U}(x_i; k, \tau_i)$ is the $k \times \tau_i$ Vandermonde block in terms of x_i .

Example 24. Consider $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (3, 1, 2)$ and $k = |\boldsymbol{\tau}| = 6$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\tau}) &= \mathbf{V}((x_1, x_2, x_3); (3, 1, 2)) \\ &= [\mathbf{U}(x_1; 6, 3) \quad \mathbf{U}(x_2; 6, 1) \quad \mathbf{U}(x_3; 6, 2)] \end{aligned}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ x_1 & 1 & 0 & x_2 & x_3 & 1 \\ x_1^2 & 2x_1 & 1 & x_2^2 & x_3^2 & 2x_3 \\ x_1^3 & 3x_1^2 & 3x_1 & x_2^3 & x_3^3 & 3x_3^2 \\ x_1^4 & 4x_1^3 & 6x_1^2 & x_2^4 & x_3^4 & 4x_3^3 \\ x_1^5 & 5x_1^4 & 10x_1^3 & x_2^5 & x_3^5 & 5x_3^4 \end{bmatrix}$$

Lemma 25 ([9]). *With the above settings, we have*

$$V(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\tau}) := |\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\tau})| = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq \ell} (x_j - x_i)^{\tau_i \tau_j}.$$

Remark 26. *In particular, when $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_\ell = 1$, $V(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (x_j - x_i)$, which is the Vandermonde determinant and thus can be abbreviated as $V(\mathbf{x})$.*

5.3 Proof of Theorem 16

Proof of Theorem 16. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$, i.e., $P = a_n (x - r_1)^{\mu_1} \dots (x - r_m)^{\mu_m}$. It is easy to see that

$$G_i = \gcd(P^{(0)}, \dots, P^{(i)}) = \prod_{\mu_j > i} (x - r_j)^{\mu_j - i}.$$

On the other hand, let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_n)$ where $\bar{\mu}_j = \#\{j : \mu_j \geq i\}$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i = (\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i)$. We only need to show that $R_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i}(P^{(0)}, \dots, P^{(i)}) = c \prod_{\mu_j > i} (x - r_j)^{\mu_j - i}$ for some constant c . For the sake of simplicity, we will omit $(P^{(0)}, \dots, P^{(i)})$ in the proof when $R_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i}$ is mentioned.

By Lemma 22,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i} &= R_{(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i, 0, \dots, 0)}(\mathbf{F}) \\ &= \frac{c_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i} \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_1-1)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_m) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_m-1)}(r_m) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_1-1)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_m) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_m-1)}(r_m) \end{vmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} (r_v - r_u)^{\mu_u \mu_v}} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

for some constant $c_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}^{(k)} &= \left((x^{\bar{\mu}_1-1} P^{(1)})^{(k)} \quad \dots \quad (x^0 P^{(1)})^{(k)} \mid \dots \mid (x^{\bar{\mu}_i-1} P^{(i)})^{(k)} \quad \dots \quad (x^0 P^{(i)})^{(k)} \right)^T, \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon &= (x^\varepsilon, \dots, x^0)^T, \quad \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(k)} = \left((x^\varepsilon)^{(k)}, \dots, (x^0)^{(k)} \right)^T, \quad \text{and } \varepsilon = n - |\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i|. \end{aligned}$$

After reordering the columns, we obtain

$$R_{(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i)} = \pm \frac{c_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i} \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{M}^{(1)} & \dots & \mathbf{M}^{(i)} & \mathbf{M}^{(i+1)} \end{vmatrix}}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} (r_v - r_u)^{\mu_u \mu_v}} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}^{(j)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_1-j)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j-j})}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_1-j)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j-j})}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \end{bmatrix}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, i$, and

$$\mathbf{M}^{(i+1)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_1-(i+1))}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}) & \dots & \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}-(i+1)}}(r_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}) \\ \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_1-(i+1))}(r_1) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}) & \dots & \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}-(i+1)}}(r_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}) \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon$$

The column reordering is inspired by the following observation.

Since P and its first $\mu_v - 1$ derivatives are equal to zero at $x = r_v$, by the Leibniz rule, we immediately know that for $u = 1, \dots, i$ and v satisfying $\mu_v \geq u$,

$$(x^\xi P^{(u)})^{(\ell)}(r_v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \ell + u < \mu_v; \\ r_v^\xi P^{(\mu_v)}(r_v) & \text{if } \ell + u = \mu_v; \\ * & \text{if } \ell + u > \mu_v. \end{cases}$$

Thus for $k = 0, \dots, \mu_v - 1$,

$$\mathbf{H}^{(k)}(r_v) = \left(\mathbf{0}_{1 \times \bar{\mu}_1} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{0}_{1 \times \bar{\mu}_{\mu_v - k - 1}} \mid r_v^{\bar{\mu}_{\mu_v - k - 1}} P^{(\mu_v)}(r_v) \quad \cdots \quad r_v^0 P^{(\mu_v)}(r_v) \mid * \quad \cdots \quad * \right)^T, \quad (8)$$

Moreover, we can also derive that

$$\mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(k)}(r_v) = \left(\frac{\varepsilon!}{(\varepsilon - k)!} \cdot r_v^{\varepsilon - k}, \dots, k! \cdot r_v^0, 0, \dots, 0 \right)^T = k! \left(\binom{\varepsilon}{k} \cdot r_v^{\varepsilon - k}, \dots, \binom{k}{k} r_v^0, 0, \dots, 0 \right)^T \quad (9)$$

Next we further simplify $\mathbf{M}^{(j)}$'s by making use of (8) and (9) and obtain the followings.

(a) When $j \leq i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_1 - j)}(r_1) &= \left(\mathbf{0}_{1 \times \bar{\mu}_1} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{0}_{1 \times \bar{\mu}_{j-1}} \mid r_1^{\bar{\mu}_j - 1} P^{(\mu_1)}(r_1) \quad \cdots \quad r_1^0 P^{(\mu_1)}(r_1) \mid * \quad \cdots \quad * \right)^T \\ &\quad \vdots \\ \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j} - j)}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) &= \left(\mathbf{0}_{1 \times \bar{\mu}_1} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{0}_{1 \times \bar{\mu}_{j-1}} \mid r_{\bar{\mu}_j}^{\bar{\mu}_j - 1} P^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j})}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \quad \cdots \quad r_{\bar{\mu}_j}^0 P^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j})}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \mid * \quad \cdots \quad * \right)^T \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{M}^{(j)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{\bar{\mu}_1 \times \bar{\mu}_j} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{\bar{\mu}_{j-1} \times \bar{\mu}_j} \\ \mathbf{M}_j \\ *_{\bar{\mu}_{j+1} \times \bar{\mu}_j} \\ \vdots \\ *_{\bar{\mu}_i \times \bar{\mu}_j} \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}_j = \begin{bmatrix} r_1^{\bar{\mu}_j - 1} P^{(\mu_1)}(r_1) & \cdots & r_{\bar{\mu}_j}^{\bar{\mu}_j - 1} P^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j})}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ r_1^0 P^{(\mu_1)}(r_1) & \cdots & r_{\bar{\mu}_j}^0 P^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j})}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

(b) The simplification of $\mathbf{M}^{(i+1)}$ relies on the following observations:

- $\mathbf{H}^{(0)}(r_\ell) = \cdots = \mathbf{H}^{(\mu_\ell - (i+1))}(r_\ell) = \mathbf{0}_{\sum_{j=1}^i \bar{\mu}_j \times 1} = \mathbf{0}_{|\bar{\mu}_i| \times 1}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_{i+1}$, and
- $[\mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(0)}(r_\ell) \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon^{(\mu_\ell - (i+1))}(r_\ell)] = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{U}(r_\ell; \varepsilon + 1, \mu_\ell - i) \mathbf{D}_{\mu_\ell - i}$

where

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix} & & 1 \\ & \ddots & \\ 1 & & \end{bmatrix}_{(\varepsilon+1) \times (\varepsilon+1)} \quad \mathbf{D}_{\mu_\ell - i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0! & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & (\mu_\ell - (i+1))! \end{bmatrix}_{(\mu_\ell - i) \times (\mu_\ell - i)}$$

Hence

$$\mathbf{M}^{(i+1)} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{0}_{|\bar{\mu}_i| \times (\mu_1 - i)} & \cdots \\ \mathbf{J}\mathbf{U}(r_1; \varepsilon + 1, \mu_1 - i) \mathbf{D}_{\mu_1 - i} & \cdots \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{|\bar{\mu}_i| \times (\mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} - i)} & \cdots \\ \mathbf{J}\mathbf{U}(r_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}; \varepsilon + 1, \mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} - i) \mathbf{D}_{\mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} - i} & \cdots \end{array} \right] \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon$$

Let

$$\mathbf{N} = [\mathbf{J}\mathbf{U}(r_1; \varepsilon + 1, \mu_1 - i) \mathbf{D}_{\mu_1 - i} \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{J}\mathbf{U}(r_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}; \varepsilon + 1, \mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} - i) \mathbf{D}_1 \quad \mathbf{X}_\varepsilon]$$

Using (a) and (b), we simplify (7) and get

$$R_{(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i)} = \pm \frac{\begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{M}_1 & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \\ c_{\bar{\mu}_i} \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{M}_1 & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{M}_i & & \end{vmatrix} & & \\ \vdots & \cdots & \mathbf{M}_i \\ \vdots & \cdots & \mathbf{N} \end{vmatrix}}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} (r_v - r_u)^{\mu_u \mu_v}} = \pm \frac{c_{\bar{\mu}_i} \prod_{j=1}^i |\mathbf{M}_j| \cdot |\mathbf{N}|}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} (r_v - r_u)^{\mu_u \mu_v}}$$

where \mathbf{M}_j is as in (10) for $j = 1, \dots, i$.

It is easy to derive that

$$|\mathbf{M}_j| = \begin{vmatrix} r_1^{\bar{\mu}_j - 1} P^{(\mu_1)}(r_1) & \cdots & r_{\bar{\mu}_j}^{\bar{\mu}_j - 1} P^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j})}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ r_1^0 P^{(\mu_1)}(r_1) & \cdots & r_{\bar{\mu}_j}^0 P^{(\mu_{\bar{\mu}_j})}(r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \end{vmatrix} = \left(\prod_{1 \leq \ell \leq \bar{\mu}_j} P^{(\mu_\ell)}(r_\ell) \right) \cdot V(r_1, \dots, r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \neq 0$$

Furthermore, noting that

$$\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{J} [\mathbf{U}(r_1; \varepsilon + 1, \mu_1 - i) \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{U}(r_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}; \varepsilon + 1, \mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} - i) \quad \mathbf{J}\mathbf{X}_\varepsilon] \\ \cdot \text{diag} [\mathbf{D}_{\mu_1 - i} \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{D}_{\mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} - i} \quad \mathbf{I}_1]$$

and $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{X}_\varepsilon = [x^0 \quad \cdots \quad x^\varepsilon]^T$ where \mathbf{I}_1 is the identity matrix of size 1, we have

$$|\mathbf{N}| = \pm \left(\prod_{j=1}^{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} |\mathbf{D}_{\mu_j - i}| \right) V((r_1, \dots, r_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}, x); (\mu_1 - i, \dots, \mu_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} - i, 1)) \\ = \pm \left(\prod_{j=1}^{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} |\mathbf{D}_{\mu_j - i}| \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq \bar{\mu}_{i+1}} (r_v - r_u)^{(\mu_u - i)(\mu_v - i)} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{1 \leq u \leq \bar{\mu}_{i+1}} (x - r_u)^{\mu_u - i} \right).$$

Therefore,

$$R_{(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i)} = c \prod_{1 \leq u \leq \bar{\mu}_{i+1}} (x - r_u)^{\mu_u - i} = c \prod_{\mu_u > i} (x - r_u)^{\mu_u - i} = G_i$$

where

$$c = \pm \frac{c_{\bar{\mu}_i} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} |\mathbf{D}_{\mu_j - i}| \right) \prod_{j=1}^i \left(V(r_1, \dots, r_{\bar{\mu}_j}) \prod_{1 \leq \ell \leq \bar{\mu}_j} P^{(\mu_\ell)}(r_\ell) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq \bar{\mu}_{i+1}} (r_v - r_u)^{(\mu_u - i)(\mu_v - i)} \right)}{\prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq m} (r_v - r_u)^{\mu_u \mu_v}}$$

which is obviously non-zero due to the assumption r_1, \dots, r_m are distinct. \square

- If $[\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1}, \dots, \sigma_{i+j}]$ is a section of the given list, where $\sigma_i \neq 0$, $\sigma_{i+1} = \dots = \sigma_{i+j-1} = 0$, $\sigma_{i+j} \neq 0$, then we replace the section

$$[\sigma_{i+1}, \sigma_{i+2}, \dots, \sigma_{i+j-1}]$$

by

$$[-\sigma_i, -\sigma_i, \sigma_i, \sigma_i, -\sigma_i, -\sigma_i, \sigma_i, \sigma_i, \dots];$$

i.e. let

$$\sigma'_{i+k} = (-1)^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \cdot \sigma_i$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, j - 1$.

- Otherwise, let $\sigma'_i = \sigma_i$.

Theorem 31. *Given a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, let σ be the sign list of the discriminant sequence of P and ν be the number of the sign changes of the revised sign list of σ . Then we have*

- *the number of the pairs of distinct conjugate imaginary roots of P is ν ;*
- *the number of the distinct real roots of P equals $\eta - 2\nu$ where η is the number of non-vanishing members in the revised sign list of σ .*

6.3 Algorithm

Combining Theorems 16, 28 and 31, we can derive a new necessary and sufficient condition for a polynomial $P = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$ having a designated complete multiplicity $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_R; \boldsymbol{\mu}_I)$. This new condition is based on an observation that if r_k is a root of P with multiplicity μ_k , then it is a root of G_i with multiplicity $\max(\mu_k - i, 0)$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ be the complex multiplicity of P corresponding to $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_R; \boldsymbol{\mu}_I)$. By Theorem 31, with the premise $\text{mult}(P) = \boldsymbol{\mu}$, G_i has ν pairs of distinct imaginary roots if and only if

$$\nu = \text{Var} (D_1(G_i, G'_i), \dots, D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(G_i, G'_i))$$

where $G_0 := P$ and $\text{Var}(L)$ is the short-hand for the number of sign changes for the revised list of the sign list of L . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cmult}(P) = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_R; \boldsymbol{\mu}_I) &\iff \left(\bigwedge_{\substack{\gamma > \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \\ \gamma \in \mathcal{M}(n)}} R_\gamma(\mathbf{F}) = 0 \right) \wedge R_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}(\mathbf{F}) \neq 0 \\ &\wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=0}^{\mu_1-1} \text{Var} (D_1(G_i, G'_i), \dots, D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(G_i, G'_i)) = \bar{\mu}_{I, i+1}/2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{\mu}_{I, i}$ is the i -th element of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I$.

Now we propose the following algorithm as a solution to Problem 5.

Algorithm 1 ParametricCompleteMultiplicity(P)

In: $P = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \mathbb{R}[a_0, \dots, a_n][x]$

Out: $\mathcal{C} = \{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_c, C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_c}) : \boldsymbol{\mu}_c \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(n)\}$ such that $\text{cmult}(P) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_c \iff C_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_c}$.

```
1:  $\mathbf{F} \leftarrow (P^{(0)}, \dots, P^{(n)})$   
    $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \emptyset$   
2:  $\mathcal{M}(n) \leftarrow \{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t) : \delta_1 + \dots + \delta_t = n, \delta_1 \geq \dots \geq \delta_t \geq 1\}$   
    $\mathcal{N}(n) \leftarrow \{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t) : \delta_1 + \dots + \delta_t < n, \delta_1 \geq \dots \geq \delta_t \geq 1\}$   
3: for  $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{M}(n) \cup \mathcal{N}(n)$  do  
4:    $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \leftarrow R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{F})$   
5: end for  
6: for  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)$  do  
7:    $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (\bar{\mu}_1, \bar{\mu}_2, \dots) \leftarrow$  the conjugate of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$   
8:   for  $i = 0, \dots, \mu_1 - 1$  do  
9:      $G_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} P & \text{if } i = 0 \\ R_{(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_i)} & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases}$   
10:    for  $j = 1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_{i+1}$  do  
11:       $D_j \leftarrow$  the  $j$ -th polynomial in the discriminant sequence of  $G_i$   
12:    end for  
13:  end for  
14:  for each 2-partition of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , say  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_c = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_R; \boldsymbol{\mu}_I)$ , do  
15:     $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I = (\bar{\mu}_{I,1}, \dots) \leftarrow$  the conjugate of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_I$ ;  
16:     $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_c) \leftarrow \left( \bigwedge_{\gamma \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \gamma \succ \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \quad R_{\gamma}(\mathbf{F}) = 0 \right) \wedge (R_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}(\mathbf{F}) \neq 0)$   
       $\wedge \left( \bigwedge_{i=0}^{\mu_1-1} \text{Var}(D_1, \dots, D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}) = \bar{\mu}_{I,i+1}/2 \right)$   
17:     $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \cup \{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_c, \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_c))\}$   
18:  end for  
19: end for  
20: return  $\mathcal{C}$ .
```

Remark 32. In [15], Yang et al. proposed a method for discriminating the complete multiplicities of a parametric univariate polynomial by counting the numbers of distinct real/imaginary roots of the repeated gcds (called multiple factors there) of the given polynomials. In the ParametricCompleteMultiplicity algorithm, we use the incremental gcds of $\mathbf{F} = (P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(n)})$ instead of repeated gcds. Their equivalence seems to be quite straightforward. However, we could not find a reference for its proof and thereby we provide a detailed one in Appendix B for readers' reference (see Lemma 39).

7 Comparison

In this section, we compare the “sizes” of the conditions generated by the Algorithm ParametricCompleteMultiplicity and those by [15] (abbreviated as YHZ's method).

7.1 Review on YHZ's condition

We start by reproducing the result given by YHZ's method for readers' convenience.

Assume P is of degree n with the complete multiplicity $\boldsymbol{\mu}_c = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_R; \boldsymbol{\mu}_I)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ be the complex multiplicity of P . For the sake of simplicity, we introduce the following shorthand notations.

Notation 33.

- $\tilde{G}_i = \begin{cases} P & \text{if } i = 0; \\ R_{\bar{\mu}_i}(\tilde{G}_{i-1}, \tilde{G}'_{i-1}) & \text{if } i > 0; \end{cases}$
- $s_i = \sum_{k=i+1}^{\mu_1} \bar{\mu}_k$, i.e., s_i is the degree of \tilde{G}_i in x ;
- Let $\overline{R_k(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i)}$ represent the principal coefficient of $R_k(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i)$, that is, the coefficient of the term x^{s_i-k} in $R_k(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i)$.

It is easy to see that \tilde{G}_i is the multiple factor of P at the i -th level. By Theorem 31, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cmult}(P) = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_R; \boldsymbol{\mu}_I) \\ \iff & \left(\bigwedge_{i=0}^{\mu_1-2} \bigwedge_{j=\bar{\mu}_{i+1}+1}^{s_i} D_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i) = 0 \right) \wedge D_{s_{\mu_1-1}}(\tilde{G}_{\mu_1-1}, \tilde{G}'_{\mu_1-1}) \neq 0 \\ & \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=0}^{\mu_1-1} \text{Var} \left(D_1(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i), \dots, D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i) \right) = \bar{\mu}_{I,i+1}/2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Theoretical analysis on YHZ's method in the rest of this section is based on the following natural assumption which is also assumed in [4].

Assumption 34. We will assume that $\forall \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)$, $\overline{R_{s_i}(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i)}$ in the above YHZ's condition is not identically 0 as a polynomial in terms of the coefficients of P .

7.2 Comparison

We compare the “sizes” of the polynomial conditions generated by the ParametricCompleteMultiplicity algorithm and those given by YHZ's method from the following two aspects:

- the numbers of polynomials for partitioning the parameter set, and
- the degrees of polynomials appearing in the conditions.

Furthermore, we compare the computational efficiency of the two methods via practical examples.

7.2.1 Comparison on the number of polynomials

For simplicity, we introduce the following notations:

- $T_{\text{YHZ}}(n)$: the number of polynomials appearing in YHZ's condition;
- $T_{\text{QXY}}(n)$: the number of polynomials appearing in the new condition (produced by Algorithm 1).

As usual, we assume P to be a univariate polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$ with formal coefficients.

We start by deducing a recursive formula for computing $T_{\text{YHZ}}(n)$. In YHZ's method, the main idea is to restore the complete multiplicity of P by counting the number of distinct real/imaginary roots of $\tilde{G}_0, \dots, \tilde{G}_{n-1}$. Thus one only needs to discriminate the cases when \tilde{G}_i has different numbers of distinct real roots/pairs of imaginary roots. For this purpose, only the polynomials in the discriminant sequence of \tilde{G}_i 's are needed.

In the first step, we compute all the potential gcds of \tilde{G}_0 and \tilde{G}'_0 , i.e., $R_n(\tilde{G}_0, \tilde{G}'_0), \dots, R_1(\tilde{G}_0, \tilde{G}'_0)$. We also need $D_1(\tilde{G}_0, \tilde{G}'_0), \dots, D_n(\tilde{G}_0, \tilde{G}'_0)$ to discriminate the numbers of real roots/pairs of imaginary roots \tilde{G}_0 may have. In this step, we need n polynomials in the parameters. Note that each $R_i(\tilde{G}_0, \tilde{G}'_0)$ is a potential gcd of \tilde{G}_0 and \tilde{G}'_0 with degree $n - i$ where $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$. When $i = n - 1$, $\deg R_i(\tilde{G}_0, \tilde{G}'_0) = 1$. We immediately know that $R_i(\tilde{G}_0, \tilde{G}'_0)$ has only one (real) root and there are no other cases to be discriminated. So we do not need extra polynomials. On the other hand, to discriminate all the complete multiplicities of \tilde{G}_i , we need $T_{\text{YHZ}}(n - i)$ polynomials. As a result, when $n \geq 2$, we have

$$T_{\text{YHZ}}(n) = n + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} T_{\text{YHZ}}(n - i) = n + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} T_{\text{YHZ}}(i)$$

One can easily derive from the relation that when $n \geq 3$,

$$T_{\text{YHZ}}(n) - T_{\text{YHZ}}(n - 1) = 1 + T_{\text{YHZ}}(n - 1)$$

Therefore,

$$T_{\text{YHZ}}(n) = \frac{3}{4} \cdot 2^n - 1$$

Now we consider the number of polynomials required by the new method to discriminate all the complete multiplicities of P , which is denoted by $T_{\text{QXY}}(n)$. To discriminant all the complex multiplicities of P , we need $R_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$'s where $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)$ and the total number of $R_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$'s is $\#\mathcal{M}(n)$. To discriminate all the complete multiplicities of P , we need to consider all the possibilities of G_i , which form a set $\{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} : \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{N}(n)\}$ by Theorem 16 with

$$\mathcal{N}(n) = \{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t) : \delta_1 + \dots + \delta_t < n, \delta_1 \geq \dots \geq \delta_t \geq 1\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{N}(n) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{M}(i)$, we have

$$\{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} : \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{N}(n)\} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} : \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{M}(i)\}.$$

In each subset of the right-hand side, $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$'s have the same degree $n - i$. When $i = n - 1$, $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$'s are of degree 1 and we will not add any polynomial to the condition. When $0 \leq i \leq n - 2$, to discriminate all the possible numbers of distinct real/imaginary roots for each $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$, we need $D_1(R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}), R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \dots, D_{n-i}(R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, R'_{\boldsymbol{\delta}})$ and thus altogether $\#\mathcal{M}(i) \cdot (n - i)$ polynomials are required to discriminate the numbers of distinct real/imaginary roots for all $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$'s of degree $n - i$. In summary, in the condition generated by the proposed method, the number of polynomials is


$$T_{\text{QXY}}(n) = \#\mathcal{M}(n) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \#\mathcal{M}(i) \cdot (n - i)$$

In Table 1, we list the two numbers, i.e., T_{YHZ} and T_{QXY} , for $n = 3, \dots, 18$. In Figure 1, we show the trend of the two numbers as n increases. It is observed that


Table 1: Comparison on the numbers of polynomials in the conditions generated by YHZ's method and the proposed method, respectively.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
T_{YHZ}	5	11	23	47	95	191	383	767
T_{QXY}	8	16	28	49	79	127	195	296
$\frac{T_{\text{YHZ}}}{T_{\text{QXY}}}$	0.625	0.688	0.821	0.959	1.203	1.504	1.964	2.591
n	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
T_{YHZ}	1535	3071	6143	12287	24575	49151	98303	196607
T_{QXY}	437	639	914	1297	1812	2510	3436	4670
$\frac{T_{\text{YHZ}}}{T_{\text{QXY}}}$	3.513	4.806	6.721	9.473	13.562	19.582	28.610	42.100

- As expected, T_{YHZ} increases exponentially with n while T_{QXY} is not. In fact, it is seen from Figure 1a that T_{QXY} increases significantly slower than T_{YHZ} as n increases.
- From Fig. 1b, we can further see that the ratio of T_{YHZ} to T_{QXY} is always greater than 1 for $n \geq 7$, which indicates that $T_{\text{QXY}} < T_{\text{YHZ}}$ when $n \geq 7$.
- Moreover, Fig. 1b exhibits an exponential increase on the ratio $T_{\text{YHZ}}/T_{\text{QXY}}$ along with n . Thus, T_{YHZ} becomes dramatically smaller than T_{YHZ} when n grows.



(a) The plots of numbers of polynomials in the conditions generated by the two methods



(b) The ratio of the two numbers of polynomials in the conditions generated by the two methods

Figure 1: Comparison on the numbers of polynomials in the conditions generated by YHZ's method and the proposed method.

7.2.2 Comparison on the degree of polynomials

In this subsection, we compare the degrees of polynomials appearing in the conditions. We choose the maximal degree as an indicator for this assessment. For simplicity, we introduce the following notations:

- d_{YHZ} : the maximal degree of polynomials appearing in YHZ's condition;
- d_{QXY} : the maximal degree of polynomials appearing in the new condition (produced by Algorithm 1).

Under Assumption 34, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 35. $d_{\text{YHZ}} \geq 3^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$.

Proof. Note that when $1 \leq j \leq \deg \tilde{G}_i - 1$,

$$D_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i) = \pm \text{lcoef}(\tilde{G}_i) \cdot \overline{R_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i)}$$

Thus $\deg_a D_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i) \geq \deg_a \overline{R_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i)}$. Thereby,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{YHZ}} &= \max_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \max \left(\bigcup_{i=0}^{\mu_1-2} \bigcup_{j=\bar{\mu}_{i+1}+1}^{s_i} \left\{ \deg_a D_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i) \right\} \cup \left\{ \deg D_{s_{\mu_1-1}}(\tilde{G}_{\mu_1-1}, \tilde{G}'_{\mu_1-1}) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{\mu_1-1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} \left\{ \deg_a D_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i) \right\} \right) \\ &\geq \max_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \max \left(\bigcup_{i=0}^{\mu_1-2} \bigcup_{j=\bar{\mu}_{i+1}+1}^{s_i} \left\{ \deg_a \overline{R_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i)} \right\} \cup \left\{ \deg \overline{R_{s_{\mu_1-1}}(\tilde{G}_{\mu_1-1}, \tilde{G}'_{\mu_1-1})} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{\mu_1-1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} \left\{ \deg_a D_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i) \right\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of simplicity, we use the following shorthand notation:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mu} &= \max \left(\bigcup_{i=0}^{\mu_1-2} \bigcup_{j=\bar{\mu}_{i+1}+1}^{s_i} \left\{ \deg_a \overline{R_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i)} \right\} \cup \left\{ \deg \overline{R_{s_{\mu_1-1}}(\tilde{G}_{\mu_1-1}, \tilde{G}'_{\mu_1-1})} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{\mu_1-1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} \left\{ \deg_a D_j(\tilde{G}_i, \tilde{G}'_i) \right\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Then $d_{\text{YHZ}} \geq \max_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(n)} d_{\mu}$.

By [4, Lemma 17-3], when $2 \leq m \leq n-2$, $d_{\mu} \geq 2n + 3^{\mu_2} - 4\mu_2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{YHZ}} &\geq \max_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(n)} d_{\mu} \\ &\geq \max_{\substack{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(n) \\ 2 \leq m \leq n-2}} d_{\mu} \\ &\geq 2n + 3^{\mu_2} - 4\mu_2 \\ &= 2n + 3^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} - 4\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \\ &\geq 3^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \end{aligned}$$

□

For the maximal degree of polynomials in the new condition presented in this paper, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 36. When $n \geq 3$, $d_{\text{QXY}} = n(n-1)$.

Proof. Recall (11). We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{QXY}} &= \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \left(\bigcup_{\substack{\gamma \succ \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \\ \gamma \in \mathcal{M}(n)}} \{\deg_a R_\gamma(\mathbf{F})\} \cup \{\deg_a R_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}(\mathbf{F})\} \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{\mu_1-1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}} \{\deg_a D_j(G_i, G'_i)\} \right) \\ &= \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \left(\max_{\substack{\gamma \succ \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \\ \gamma \in \mathcal{M}(n)}} \deg_a R_\gamma(\mathbf{F}), \max_{0 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} \deg_a D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(G_i, G'_i) \right) \end{aligned}$$

It was shown in [8] that

$$\max_{\substack{\gamma \succ \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \\ \gamma \in \mathcal{M}(n)}} \deg_a R_\gamma(\mathbf{F}) = 2n - \mu_m$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{QXY}} &= \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \left(2n - \mu_m, \max_{0 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} \deg_a D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(G_i, G'_i) \right) \\ &= \max \left(2n - 1, \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \max_{0 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} \deg_a D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(G_i, G'_i) \right) \\ &= \max \left(2n - 1, \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \max_{0 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} 2\bar{\mu}_{i+1} \deg_a G_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\deg_a G_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 0; \\ (\bar{\mu}_1 - 1) + (\bar{\mu}_1 + \cdots + \bar{\mu}_i) & \text{if } i > 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \max_{0 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} \deg_a D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(G_i, G'_i) \\ &= 2 \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n)} \max \left(\bar{\mu}_1, \max_{1 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} \bar{\mu}_{i+1} ((\bar{\mu}_1 - 1) + (\bar{\mu}_1 + \cdots + \bar{\mu}_i)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the following three cases.

1. When $m = 1$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (n)$, $\bar{\mu}_1 = \cdots = \bar{\mu}_n = 1$. It follows that

$$\max \left(\bar{\mu}_1, \max_{1 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} \bar{\mu}_{i+1} ((\bar{\mu}_1 - 1) + (\bar{\mu}_1 + \cdots + \bar{\mu}_i)) \right) = \max(1, \max_{1 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} i) = n - 1$$

Thus,

$$\max_{0 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} \deg_a D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(G_i, G'_i) = 2(n-1) < 2n - 1$$

2. When $m = n$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (1, \dots, 1)$,

$$\max_{0 \leq i \leq \mu_1-1} \deg_a D_{\bar{\mu}_{i+1}}(G_i, G'_i) = \deg_a D_{\bar{\mu}_1}(G_0, G'_0) = 2n > 2n - 1$$

3. When $2 \leq m \leq n - 1$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\mu} \notin \{(n), (1, \dots, 1)\}$, let $b = \mu_1 - 1$ and $c = \bar{\mu}_{\mu_1}$. Thus $\bar{\mu}_1 + \dots + \bar{\mu}_{\mu_1 - 1} = n - c$. From the Young tableau of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ below,

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \left. \begin{array}{l} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ \bar{\mu}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\mu}_{\mu_1 - 1} \\ \bar{\mu}_{\mu_1} (= c) \end{array} \right\} n - c \quad \begin{array}{c} b + 1 \\ \begin{array}{cccccc} \square & \square & \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \square & \square & \square & \square & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & & \\ \square & \square & & & & \\ \square & & & & & \end{array} \end{array} \quad (13)
 \end{array}$$

we have $b + c \leq n - c$. Now we consider the following function

$$f(c, b) = c(b + n - c)$$

in c and b whose feasible region (see Fig. 2) is bounded by

$$\begin{cases} 1 \leq c \leq n - 1, & \text{a natural condition} \\ 1 < b + 1 < n, & \text{since } 1 < \mu_1 < n \\ b + 1 \leq n - c, & \text{see (13)} \end{cases}$$




Figure 2: The feasible region of (c, b)

Then we have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial c} = (b + n) - 2c, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial b} = c.$$

Obviously, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial b} \geq 1$. Moreover, since $c \leq \bar{\mu}_{\mu_1 - 1} \leq n - c$ which can be deduced from (13), we derive the following:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial c} = b + ((n - c) - c) \geq 0$$

which indicates that $f(c, b)$ increases w.r.t. c and b in the feasible region. Hence, the maximal value of f is achieved on the right boundary of the region, which is defined by

$b + 1 = n - c$. Therefore, the maximal value of $f(c, b)$ over the feasible region is

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\max} &= \max_{c \in \{1, \dots, n\}} f(c, n - c - 1) \\ &= \max_{c \in \{1, \dots, n\}} c(2n - 2c - 1) \\ &= \max_{c \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left(-2 \left(c - \frac{2n-1}{4} \right)^2 + \frac{(2n-1)^2}{8} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We consider the following two cases.

(a) When n is even, i.e., $n = 2k$ for some integer $k \geq 1$,

$$\max_{c \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left(-2 \left(c - \frac{2n-1}{4} \right)^2 + \frac{(2n-1)^2}{8} \right) = \max_{c \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left(-2 \left(c - \frac{4k-1}{4} \right)^2 + \frac{(4k-1)^2}{8} \right).$$

The above maximal value is achieved at $c = k = \frac{n}{2}$, which immediately yields

$$f_{\max} = c(2n - 2c - 1) \Big|_{c=\frac{n}{2}} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}.$$

In this case, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \right)$.

(b) When n is odd, i.e., $n = 2k + 1$ for some integer $k \geq 0$,

$$\max_{c \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left(-2 \left(c - \frac{2n-1}{4} \right)^2 + \frac{(2n-1)^2}{8} \right) = \max_{c \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left(-2 \left(c - \frac{4k+1}{4} \right)^2 + \frac{(4k+1)^2}{8} \right).$$

The above maximal value is achieved at $c = k = \frac{n-1}{2}$, which immediately yields

$$f_{\max} = c(2n - 2c - 1) \Big|_{c=\frac{n-1}{2}} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}.$$

In this case, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \left(\frac{n+1}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2} \right)$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{QXY}} &= \max \left(2n, 2 \max_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(n) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu} \notin \{(n), (1, \dots, 1)\}}} \bar{\mu}_{\mu_1} (\bar{\mu}_1 - 1 + \bar{\mu}_1 + \dots + \bar{\mu}_{\mu_1 - 1}) \right) \\ &= \max (2n, n(n-1)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $2n \leq n(n-1)$ for $n \geq 3$, we conclude that $d_{\text{QXY}} = n(n-1)$. \square

From Propositions 35 and 36, it is immediately seen that the maximal degree of polynomials in the condition given by YHZ's method increases in exponential scale w.r.t. n while that given by QXY's method shows an increase in polynomial scale. Furthermore, with the help of Propositions 35 and 36, one can easily show the following proposition.


Proposition 37. *When $n \geq 8$, $d_{\text{YHZ}} \geq d_{\text{QXY}}$.*

In Table 2, we list the two numbers, i.e., d_{YHZ} and d_{QXY} , for $n = 3, \dots, 8$, while Fig. 3 shows the trend of the two numbers as n increases. From Table 2 and Fig. 3, we make the following observations.


- When $d < 6$, $d_{\text{YHZ}} \leq d_{\text{QXY}}$ and their differences is relatively small (no more than 2, see Table 2). Roughly speaking, $d_{\text{QXY}} \approx d_{\text{YHZ}}$.
- When n surpasses 6, d_{QXY} is significantly smaller than d_{YHZ} (see Fig. 3a). When $n \geq 4$, the ratio $\frac{d_{\text{YHZ}}}{d_{\text{QXY}}}$ grows as n increases (see Fig. 3b). Therefore, the size of the polynomial with the maximal degree in YHZ's method becomes even bigger than that in the proposed method. Hence, it is expected that when n is large enough, the new method will be far more efficient than YHZ's method.

Table 2: Comparison on the maximal degrees of polynomials in the conditions generated by YHZ's method and the proposed method.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8
d_{YHZ}	6	10	18	30	54	90
d_{QXY}	6	12	20	30	42	56
$\frac{d_{\text{YHZ}}}{d_{\text{QXY}}}$	1.000	0.833	0.900	1.000	1.286	1.607



(a) The plots of numbers of polynomials in the conditions generated by the two methods



(b) The ratio of the two numbers of polynomials in the conditions generated by the two methods

Figure 3: Comparison on the maximal degrees of polynomials in the conditions generated by YHZ's method and the proposed method, respectively.

7.2.3 Comparison on performance

In this part, we compare YHZ's method to the proposed method (i.e., QXY's method) in terms of computational efficiency. For this purpose, we carry out several experiments for n ranging

Table 3: Comparison on the time cost of YHZ’s method and the proposed method (in seconds)

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
t_{YHZ}	0.000	0.015	0.031	0.078	4.046	8772.687	?
t_{QXY}	0.015	0.031	0.093	0.171	1.046	434.468	?
$\frac{t_{\text{YHZ}}}{t_{\text{QXY}}}$	0.000	0.484	0.333	0.456	3.868	20.192	–

from 3 to 9. The experiments are performed on a PC equipped with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-7300U processor and an 8GB RAM.

The experimental results are reported in Table 3 where t_{YHZ} and t_{QXY} represent the time cost (in seconds) charged by YHZ’s method and the proposed method, respectively. It is seen that the proposed method outperforms YHZ’s method when solving relatively larger examples (see $n = 7, 8$ in Table 3).

Although both methods fail on the case $n = 9$, the new algorithm can still give some positive results. For example, if we take the polynomial of the following form

$$P = x^9 + a_7x^7 + \cdots + a_0$$

(which can also be viewed as a generic form of polynomials with degree 9) as input, the algorithm `ParametricCompleteMultiplicity` succeeds after 3009.296 seconds (< 1 hour) while YHZ’s method does not terminate after running for 10 hours.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a new algorithm for solving the parametric complete multiplicity problem. Different from using the repeated gcd computation in the classical one [15], the new approach uses incremental gcds instead, which can effectively reduce the size of the polynomials appearing in the condition.

It is noted that in the new approach, we also confront with nested determinants/subresultants, which requires intensive computation. Thus a natural question is: is it possible to use non-nested determinants to solve the parametric complete multiplicity problem? The investigation along this direction is very attractive not only because it can help to improve the efficiency of the algorithms but also provides a closed form for the parametric complete multiplicity problem. Another interesting direction is to explore the hidden structures for subresultant used in the algorithm `ParametricCompleteMultiplicity` which may further enhance the computational efficiency.

Acknowledgements. Bican Xia’s work was supported by the National Key R & D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1005102). Simin Qin and Jing Yang’s work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos.: 12326353 and 12261010) and the National Science Cultivation Project of GXMZU (Grant No.: 2022MDKJ001).

Appendix A.

Appendix A is dedicated to proving Proposition 20. For this purpose, we need the following lemma which is a specialization of [7, Lemma 29].

Lemma 38. Given $P \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ with degree n , let $\mathbf{F} = (P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(t)})$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t) \in \mathcal{P}(n, t)$. Then we have $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \in \langle \mathbf{F} \rangle$. More explicitly,

$$R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \sum_{u=0}^t \sum_{v=0}^{\delta_u-1} c_{u,v} x^v P^{(u)}$$

where δ_0 is determined as in (1), $c_{u,\delta_u-1} = (-1)^\sigma a_n^\tau \overline{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}-\mathbf{e}_u}}$ for $u \geq 1$ and

$$\sigma = 1 + \delta_u + \dots + \delta_t, \quad \text{and} \quad \tau = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d_u + \delta_u > \max_{\substack{\delta_i \neq 0 \\ i \neq 0, u}} (d_i + \delta_i); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof of Proposition 20. Recall $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t)$ satisfies $|\boldsymbol{\delta}| \leq n$, $\delta_t \geq 1$ and $\delta_j > \delta_{j+1}$ for some $1 \leq j < t$. Let $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\delta} - \mathbf{e}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}' = \boldsymbol{\delta} - \mathbf{e}_t$. By Lemma 38,

$$R_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \sum_{u=0}^t \sum_{v=0}^{\gamma_u-1} c_{u,v} x^v P^{(u)}, \quad R_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}'} = \sum_{u=0}^t \sum_{v=0}^{\gamma'_u-1} c'_{u,v} x^v P^{(u)}$$

where γ_0 and γ'_0 are determined as in (1), and

$$\begin{aligned} c_{t,\gamma_t-1} &= (-1)^{1+\gamma_t} \overline{R_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}-\mathbf{e}_t}} \\ &\quad (\tau = 0 \text{ is implied by } \gamma_t < \gamma_1 \text{ and } d_t = n - t < n - 1 = d_1) \\ &= (-1)^{1+\delta_t} \overline{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}-\mathbf{e}_j-\mathbf{e}_t}(\mathbf{F})}, \quad (\text{since } \gamma_t = \delta_t) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c'_{j,\gamma'_j-1} &= (-1)^{1+\gamma'_j+\dots+\gamma'_t} a_n^\tau \overline{R_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}'-\mathbf{e}_j}} \\ &= (-1)^{\delta_j+\dots+\delta_t} a_n^\tau \overline{R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}-\mathbf{e}_t-\mathbf{e}_j}} \\ &\quad (\text{since } \gamma'_j = \delta_j \text{ for } j < t \text{ and } \gamma'_t = \delta_t - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\tau = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ (which is a specialization of τ in Lemma 38).

Since $\gamma_t = \delta_t$ and $\gamma'_j = \delta_j$, the above linear combinations can be further rewritten as

$$c_{t,\delta_t-1} x^{\delta_t-1} P^{(t)} = R_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \sum_{(u,v) \in C_1} c_{u,v} x^v P^{(u)}, \quad (16)$$

$$c'_{j,\delta_j-1} x^{\delta_j-1} P^{(j)} = R_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}'} - \sum_{(u,v) \in C_2} c'_{u,v} x^v P^{(u)}. \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \{(u, v) : 0 \leq u \leq t, 0 \leq v \leq \gamma_u - 1\} \setminus \{(t, \delta_t - 1)\}, \\ C_2 &= \{(u, v) : 0 \leq u \leq t, 0 \leq v \leq \gamma'_u - 1\} \setminus \{(j, \delta_j - 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider $R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$, which is

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} &= \text{dp}(x^{\delta_1-2} P^{(0)}, \dots, x^0 P^{(0)}, x^{\delta_1-1} P^{(1)}, \dots, x^0 P^{(1)}, \\ &\quad \dots, x^{\delta_j-1} P^{(j)}, \dots, x^0 P^{(j)}, \dots, x^{\delta_t-1} P^{(t)}, \dots, x^0 P^{(t)}). \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of simplicity, we introduce the following notations. Let

$$P_{u,v} = x^v P^{(u)}, Q_{u,v} = P_{u,v-1}, \dots, P_{u,0}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\delta} &= \text{dp}(Q_{0,\delta_1-1}, Q_{1,\delta_1}, \dots, Q_{j,\delta_j}, \dots, Q_{t,\delta_t}, \dots, Q_{n,\delta_n}) \\ &= \text{dp}(Q_{0,\delta_1-1}, Q_{1,\delta_1}, \dots, \underbrace{P_{j,\delta_j-1}, Q_{j,\delta_j-1}, \dots}_{Q_{j,\delta_j}}, \dots, \underbrace{P_{t,\delta_t-1}, Q_{t,\delta_t-1}, \dots}_{Q_{t,\delta_t}}, \dots, Q_{n,\delta_n}). \end{aligned}$$

Consider $c_{t,\delta_t-1} c'_{j,\delta_j-1} R_{\delta}$. We derive the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & c_{t,\delta_t-1} c'_{j,\delta_j-1} R_{\delta} \\ &= \text{dp}(Q_{0,\delta_1-1}, Q_{1,\delta_1}, \dots, c'_{j,\delta_j-1} P_{j,\delta_j-1}, Q_{j,\delta_j-1}, \dots, c_{t,\delta_t-1} P_{t,\delta_t-1}, Q_{t,\delta_t-1}, \dots, Q_{n,\delta_n}) \\ & \hspace{15em} (\text{pushing } c_{t,\delta_t-1} c'_{j,\delta_j-1} \text{ into dp}) \\ &= \text{dp}(Q_{0,\delta_1-1}, Q_{1,\delta_1}, \dots, R_{\delta-e_t}, Q_{j,\delta_j-1}, \dots, R_{\delta-e_j}, Q_{t,\delta_t-1}, \dots, Q_{n,\delta_n}) \\ & \hspace{15em} (\text{using (16)–(17) and the multi-linearity of determinant polynomial to simplify } R_{\delta}) \\ &= (-1)^{\delta_j+\dots+\delta_{t-1}} \text{dp}(Q_{0,\delta_1-1}, Q_{1,\delta_1}, \dots, Q_{j,\delta_j-1}, \dots, Q_{t,\delta_t-1}, \dots, Q_{n,\delta_n}, R_{\delta-e_j}, R_{\delta-e_t}) \\ & \hspace{15em} (\text{moving } R_{\delta-e_j} \text{ and } R_{\delta-e_t} \text{ to the end}) \\ &= (-1)^{\delta_j+\dots+\delta_{t-1}} a_n^{\tau} \overline{R_{\delta-e_j-e_t}} \text{dp}(R_{\delta-e_j}, R_{\delta-e_t}) \hspace{15em} (\text{using the block structure of dp}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tau = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now we substitute (14) and (15) into the first line of the equation and obtain

$$(-1)^{\delta_j+\dots+\delta_{t-1}+1} a_n^{\tau} \left(\overline{R_{\delta-e_j-e_t}(\mathbf{F})} \right)^2 R_{\delta}(\mathbf{F}) = (-1)^{\delta_j+\dots+\delta_{t-1}} a_n^{\tau} \overline{R_{\delta-e_j-e_t}(\mathbf{F})} \text{dp}(R_{\delta-e_j}, R_{\delta-e_t}) \quad (18)$$

Note that δ is a decreasing vector and so is $\delta - e_t - e_j$, which implies that for some value of a_i 's, $\overline{R_{\delta-e_t-e_j}(\mathbf{F})} \neq 0$. Hence $\overline{R_{\delta-e_t-e_j}(\mathbf{F})}$ is a nonzero polynomial in terms of a_i 's. Therefore, after canceling the common factors from both sides of (18), we have

$$-\overline{R_{\delta-e_t-e_j}(\mathbf{F})} R_{\delta}(\mathbf{F}) = \text{dp}(R_{\gamma}(\mathbf{F}), R_{\gamma'}(\mathbf{F})).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \deg R_{\gamma}(\mathbf{F}) &= n - |\gamma| = n - |\delta| + 1, \\ \deg R_{\gamma'}(\mathbf{F}) &= n - |\gamma'| = n - |\delta| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\deg R_{\gamma}(\mathbf{F}) = \deg R_{\gamma'}(\mathbf{F})$. Therefore, we deduce that

$$\text{dp}(R_{\gamma}(\mathbf{F}), R_{\gamma'}(\mathbf{F})) = -\text{prem}(R_{\gamma}(\mathbf{F}), R_{\gamma'}(\mathbf{F}))$$

which indicates that

$$\overline{R_{\delta-e_j-e_t}(\mathbf{F})} R_{\delta}(\mathbf{F}) = \text{prem}(R_{\delta-e_j}(\mathbf{F}), R_{\delta-e_t}(\mathbf{F})).$$

□

Appendix B.

Given a polynomial P , the repeated gcd of P and P' is defined as $(\tilde{G}_1, \dots, \tilde{G}_n)$ where

$$\tilde{G}_i = \gcd(\tilde{G}_{i-1}, \tilde{G}'_{i-1})$$

with $\tilde{G}_0 := P$. In this paper, we use the incremental gcds of $P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}, \dots$ instead of repeated gcds. In the appendix, we provide a detailed proof on their equivalence.

Lemma 39. *Let $G_0 = P$. Then for $i \geq 0$, we have $G_i \sim \tilde{G}_i$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$P = a_n \prod_{k=1}^m (x - r_k)^{\mu_k}.$$

To prove $G_i \sim \tilde{G}_i$, we only need to show

- $G_i \sim \prod_{\mu_k > i} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - i}$, and
- $\tilde{G}_i \sim \prod_{\mu_k > i} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - i}$,

whose proof will be given in an inductive manner.

Base case. When $i = 0$, we have

$$G_0 = \tilde{G}_0 = P = a_n \prod_{\mu_k > 0} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k}$$

which is obviously true.

Induction step. We assume the claim holds when $i = j$, i.e.

$$G_j = \gcd(G_{j-1}, P^{(j)}) \sim \prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j},$$

$$\tilde{G}_j = \gcd(\tilde{G}_{j-1}, \tilde{G}'_{j-1}) \sim \prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j}.$$

Then for $i = j + 1$,

$$G_{j+1} = \gcd(G_j, P^{(j+1)}), \quad \tilde{G}_{j+1} = \gcd(\tilde{G}_j, \tilde{G}'_j).$$

Next we deduce the expressions for G_{j+1} and \tilde{G}_{j+1} , respectively.

By assumption, $G_j \sim \prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j}$. Obviously, we have

- $\prod_{\mu_k > j+1} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - (j+1)} \mid G_j$, and
- when $\mu_k > j$,

$$(x - r_k)^{\mu_k} \mid P^{(0)}, (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - 1} \mid P^{(1)}, \dots, (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j} \mid P^{(j)}$$

Next we show that $\prod_{\mu_k > j+1} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - (j+1)} \mid P^{(j+1)}$. The key for verifying the claim is the observation that when $\mu_k > j + 1$,

$$P^{(j+1)}(r_k) = \dots = P^{(\mu_k - 1)}(r_k) = 0,$$

but $P^{(\mu_k)}(r_k) \neq 0$, which indicates that $x = r_k$ is the multiple roots of $P^{(j+1)}(x)$ with multiplicity $\mu_k - (j+1)$. Thereby, $(x - r_k)^{\mu_k - (j+1)} \mid P^{(j+1)}(x)$. Moreover, we also have $(x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j} \nmid P^{(j+1)}$. Hence

$$G_{j+1} = \gcd(G_j, P^{(j+1)}) \sim \prod_{\mu_k > j+1} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - (j+1)}$$

Again, by assumption, $\tilde{G}_j \sim \prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}'_j &\sim \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j} \right)' = \sum_{\mu_k > j} \left((\mu_k - j)(x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j - 1} \prod_{\substack{\ell \neq k \\ \mu_\ell > j}} (x - r_\ell)^{\mu_\ell - j} \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{\mu_k > j} (\mu_k - j) \prod_{\substack{\ell \neq k \\ \mu_\ell > j}} (x - r_\ell) \right) \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j - 1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_{j+1} &= \gcd(\tilde{G}_j, \tilde{G}'_j) \\ &\sim \gcd \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j}, \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j} \right)' \right) \\ &= \gcd \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j}, \left(\sum_{\mu_k > j} (\mu_k - j) \prod_{\substack{\ell \neq k \\ \mu_\ell > j}} (x - r_\ell) \right) \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j - 1} \right) \right) \\ &= \gcd \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k), \sum_{\mu_k > j} (\mu_k - j) \prod_{\substack{\ell \neq k \\ \mu_\ell > j}} (x - r_\ell) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j - 1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that

$$\gcd \left(\prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k), \sum_{\mu_k > j} (\mu_k - j) \prod_{\substack{\ell \neq k \\ \mu_\ell > j}} (x - r_\ell) \right) = 1$$

which can be proved with the following verification

$$\left(\sum_{\mu_k > j} (\mu_k - j) \prod_{\substack{l \neq k \\ \mu_l > j}} (x - r_l) \right) \Big|_{x=r_u} = (\mu_u - j) \prod_{\substack{\ell \neq k \\ \mu_\ell > j}} (r_u - r_\ell) \neq 0$$

for $u \in \{\mu_k : \mu_k > j\}$. Hence

$$\tilde{G}_{j+1} \sim \prod_{\mu_k > j} (x - r_k)^{\mu_k - j - 1} \sim G_{j+1}.$$

□

References

- [1] W. S. Brown and J. F. Traub. On Euclid’s algorithm and the theory of subresultants. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 18:505–514, 1971.
- [2] G. E. Collins. Subresultants and reduced polynomial remainder sequences. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 14:128–142, 1967.
- [3] L. González-Vega, T. Recio, H. Lombardi, and M. F. Roy. Sturm-Habicht Sequences, Determinants and Real Roots of Univariate Polynomials. In *Quantifier Elimination and Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition. Texts and Monographs in Symbolic Computation (A Series of the Research Institute for Symbolic Computation, Johannes-Kepler-University, Linz, Austria)*, pages 300–316. Springer, 1998.
- [4] H. Hong and J. Yang. A condition for multiplicity structure of univariate polynomials. *CoRR*, abs/2001.02388, 2020.
- [5] H. Hong and J. Yang. A condition for multiplicity structure of univariate polynomials. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 104:523–538, 2021.
- [6] H. Hong and J. Yang. Subresultant of several univariate polynomials. *CoRR*, abs/2112.15370, 2021.
- [7] H. Hong and J. Yang. Computing greatest common divisor of several parametric univariate polynomials via generalized subresultant polynomials. *CoRR*, abs/2401.00408, 2024.
- [8] H. Hong and J. Yang. Parametric “non-nested” discriminants for multiplicities of univariate polynomials. *Science China Mathematics*, 67(8):1911–1932, 2024.
- [9] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Topics in Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [10] S. Liang and D. J. Jeffrey. An algorithm for computing the complete root classification of a parametric polynomial. In J. Calmet, T. Ida, and D. Wang, editors, *Artificial Intelligence and Symbolic Computation*, pages 116–130, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [11] S. Liang, D. J. Jeffrey, and M. M. Maza. The complete root classification of a parametric polynomial on an interval. In *International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, 2008.
- [12] S. Liang and J. Zhang. A complete discrimination system for polynomials with complex coefficients and its automatic generation. *Science in China Series E: Technological Sciences*, 42:113–128, 1999.
- [13] R. Loos. Generalized polynomial remainder sequences. In B. Buchberger, G. E. Collins, R. Loos, and R. Albrecht, editors, *Computer Algebra: Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 115–137. Springer Vienna, Vienna, 1983.

- [14] W. Wang and J. Yang. Two variants of Bézout subresultants for several univariate polynomials. In F. Boulier, M. England, I. Kotsireas, T. M. Sadykov, and E. V. Vorozhtsov, editors, *Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing*, pages 350–369, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [15] L. Yang, X. Hou, and Z. Zeng. A complete discrimination system for polynomials. *Science in China (Series E): Technological Sciences*, 39:628–646, 1996.
- [16] C. K. Yap. *Fundamental Problems of Algorithmic Algebra*. Oxford University Press, Inc., USA, 1999.