

A Simple Near-Optimal Subdivision Algorithm for Complex Root Isolation based on the Pellet Test and Newton Iteration

R. Becker* M. Sagraloff* V. Sharma† C. Yap‡

January 20, 2016

Abstract

We describe a subdivision algorithm for isolating the complex roots of a polynomial $F \in \mathbb{C}[x]$. Our model assumes that each coefficient of F has an oracle to return an approximation to any absolute error bound. Given any box \mathcal{B} in the complex plane containing only simple roots of F , our algorithm returns disjoint isolating disks for the roots in \mathcal{B} .

Our complexity analysis bounds the absolute error to which the coefficients of F have to be provided, the total number of iterations, and the overall bit complexity. This analysis shows that the complexity of our algorithm is controlled by the geometry of the roots in a near neighborhood of the input box \mathcal{B} , namely, the number of roots and their pairwise distances. The number of subdivision steps is near-optimal. For the *benchmark problem*, namely, to isolate all the roots of an integer polynomial of degree n with coefficients of bitsize less than τ , our algorithm needs $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2\tau)$ bit operations, which is comparable to the record bound of Pan (2002). It is the first time that such a bound has been achieved using subdivision methods, and independent of divide-and-conquer techniques such as Schönhage's splitting circle technique.

Our algorithm uses the quadtree construction of Weyl (1924) with two key ingredients: using Pellet's Theorem (1881) combined with Graeffe iteration, we derive a soft test to count the number of roots in a disk. Using Newton iteration combined with bisection, in a form inspired by the quadratic interval method from Abbot (2006), we achieve quadratic convergence towards root clusters. Relative to the divide-conquer algorithms, our algorithm is simple with the potential of being practical. This paper is self-contained: we provide pseudo-code for all subroutines used by our algorithm.

1 Introduction

The computation of the roots of a univariate polynomial is one of the best studied problems in the areas of computer algebra and numerical analysis,

*MPI for Informatics, Campus E1 4, 66123 Saarbrücken, Germany. emails: ruben@mpi-inf.mpg.de and msagralo@mpi-inf.mpg.de

†Institute of Mathematical Sciences Chennai, India 600113. vikram@imsc.res.in

‡Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, New York, USA. email: yap@cs.nyu.edu

nevertheless there are still a number of novel algorithms presented each year; see [19, 20, 21, 22, 28] for an extensive overview. One reason for this development is undoubtedly the great importance of the problem, which results from the fact that solutions for many problems from mathematics, engineering, computer science, or the natural sciences make critical use of univariate root solving. Another reason for the steady research is that, despite the huge existing literature, there is still a large discrepancy between methods that are considered to be efficient in practice and those that achieve good theoretical bounds. For instance, for computing all complex roots of a polynomial, practitioners typically use Aberth's, Weierstrass-Durand-Kerner's and QR algorithms. These iterative methods are relatively simple as, in each step, we only need to evaluate the given polynomial (and its derivative) at certain points. They have been integrated in popular packages such as MPSOLVE [5] or `eigensolve` [14], regardless of the fact that their excellent empirical behavior has not been entirely verified in theory. In contrast, there exist algorithms [13, 27, 23] that achieve near-optimal bounds with respect to asymptotic complexity, however, implementations of these methods do not exist. The main reason for this situation is that these algorithms are quite involved and that they use a series of asymptotically fast subroutines (see [27, p. 702]). In most cases, this rules out a self-contained presentation, which makes it difficult to access such methods, not only for practitioners but also for researchers working in the same area. In addition, for an efficient implementation, it would be necessary to incorporate a sophisticated precision management and many implementation tricks. Even then, there might still be a considerable overhead due to the extensive use of asymptotically fast subroutines, which does not show up in the asymptotic complexity bounds but is critical for input sizes that can be handled on modern computers.

In this paper, we aim to resolve the above described discrepancy by introducing a simple subdivision algorithm for complex root isolation, which we denote by `CISOLATE`. We derive bounds on its theoretical worst-case complexity matching the best bounds currently known for this problem; see Section 1.1 for more details. For our method, we mainly combine known techniques such as the classical quad-tree construction by Weyl [47], Pellet's Theorem, Graeffe iteration [4], and Newton iteration. Hence, our contribution should primarily be considered as an algorithmic one, which, as we hope, will finally bring together theory and practice in the area of complex root finding. In this context, it is remarkable that, for the complexity results, we do not require any asymptotically fast subroutines except the classical fast algorithms for polynomial multiplication and Taylor shift computation. Our presentation is self contained and we provide pseudo-code for all subroutines. Compared to existing asymptotically fast algorithms, our method is relatively simple and has the potential of being practical.

In theory, the currently best algorithm for complex root finding goes back to Schönhage's splitting circle method [41], which has been considerably refined by Pan [27] and others [16, 26]. In [27], Pan gives an algorithm for approximate polynomial factorization with near-optimal arithmetic and bit complexity.¹ From

¹Pan considers a similar model of computation, where it is assumed that the coefficients of the input polynomial are complex numbers that can be accessed to an arbitrary precision. Then, for a polynomial F with roots z_1, \dots, z_n contained in the unit disk and an integer $L \geq n \log n$, Pan's algorithm computes approximations \tilde{z}_i of z_i with $\|F - \text{lcf}(F) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \tilde{z}_i)\|_1 < 2^{-L} \cdot \|F\|_1$ using only $\tilde{O}(n \log L)$ arithmetic operations with a precision of $O(L)$. For a lower bound on

an approximate factorization, one can derive isolating disks for all complex roots. A corresponding algorithm for complex root isolation, which uses Pan's method as a subroutine, has been presented and analyzed in [23]. Its cost can be expressed in terms of (accessible) parameters that directly depend on the input such as the degree of F and the size of its coefficients, but also in terms of (hidden) geometric parameters such as the pairwise distances between the roots. A special case, namely the so-called (*complex benchmark problem*) of isolating all complex roots of a polynomial F with integer coefficients of bit size at most τ , has attracted a lot of interest in the literature. Using Pan's method [13, 23], the latter problem can be solved with $\tilde{O}(n^2\tau)$ operations, which constitutes the current record bound for this problem.² So far, there exists no other method for complex root isolation that achieves a comparable bound. For the *real benchmark problem*, that is the isolation of the *real* roots of a polynomial of degree n with integer coefficients of bit size at most τ , recent work [38] describes a practical subdivision algorithm based on the Descartes method and Newton Iteration with bit complexity $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2\tau)$. A first implementation of this method [17] is competitive with the fastest existing implementations [34] for real root isolation, and it shows superior performance for hard instances, where roots appear in clusters. Our contribution is in the same line with [38], that is, both methods combine a subdivision approach, a simple predicate to test for roots, and Newton iteration to speed up convergence. The main difference is that we treat the more general problem of isolating all complex roots, whereas the algorithm from [38] can only be used to compute the real roots, due to the use of Descartes' Rule of Signs to test for roots.

We further remark that, in comparison to global approaches such as Pan's method from [27], which always compute all complex roots, our algorithm can also be used for a local search for only the roots contained in some given box. In this case, the number of iterations as well as the cost of the algorithm adapt to geometric parameters that only depend on the roots located in some neighborhood of the given box.

the bit complexity of the approximate polynomial factorization, Pan considers a polynomial whose coefficients must be approximated with a precision of $\Omega(L)$ as, otherwise, the above inequality is not fulfilled. This shows that already the cost for reading sufficiently good approximations of the input polynomial is comparable to the cost for running the entire algorithm. Hence, near-optimality of his algorithm follows. In the considered computational model, Pan's algorithm also performs near-optimal with respect to the Boolean complexity of the problem of approximating all roots. However, we remark that this *does not* imply near-optimality of his method for the benchmark problem of isolating the complex roots of an integer polynomial. Namely, Pan's argument for the lower bound is based on a lower bound on the precision to which the coefficients have to be approximated. In the case of integer polynomials, the coefficients are given exactly, hence the cost for reading an arbitrary good approximation of the polynomial never exceeds the cost for reading the integer coefficients.

²So far, the bound $\tilde{O}(n^2\tau)$ can only be achieved by running Pan's factorization algorithm with an L of size $\Omega(n(\tau + \log n))$, which means that we need $\tilde{\Theta}(n^2\tau)$ bit operations for any polynomial; see [13, Theorem 3.1] for details. The adaptive algorithm from [23] needs $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2\tau)$ bit operations, however its cost crucially depends on the hardness of the input polynomial (e.g., the separations of its roots), hence the actual cost is typically much lower.

1.1 Overview of the Algorithm and Main Results

We consider a polynomial

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \mathbb{C}[x], \quad \text{with } n \geq 2 \text{ and } \frac{1}{4} < |a_n| \leq 1. \quad (1)$$

Notice that, after multiplication with a suitable power of two, we can always ensure that the above requirement on the leading coefficient is fulfilled, without changing the roots of the given polynomial. It is assumed that the coefficients of F are given by means of a coefficient oracle. That is, for an arbitrary L , the oracle provides a dyadic approximation \tilde{a}_i of each coefficient a_i that coincides with a_i to L bits after the binary point. We call an approximation \tilde{F} obtained in this way an (*absolute*) L -bit approximation of F and assume that the cost for asking the oracle for an L -bit approximation of F is the cost of reading such an approximation;³ see Section 2 for more details. Let us denote by z_1 to z_n the roots of F , where each root occurs as often as determined by its multiplicity. Now, given a closed, axis-aligned, and squared box \mathcal{B} in the complex plane, our goal is to compute isolating disks for all roots of F contained in \mathcal{B} . Since we can only ask for approximations of the coefficients, we need to further require that \mathcal{B} contains only simple roots of F as, otherwise, a multiple root of multiplicity k cannot be distinguished from a cluster of k nearby roots, and thus the problem becomes ill-posed. If the latter requirement is fulfilled, then our algorithm CISOLATE computes isolating disks for all roots contained in \mathcal{B} .⁴ However, it may also return isolating disks for some of the roots contained in $2\mathcal{B}$, the box centered at \mathcal{B} and of twice the size as \mathcal{B} . Our approach is based on Weyl's quad tree construction, that is, we recursively subdivide \mathcal{B} into smaller sub-boxes and discard boxes for which we can show that they do not contain a root of F . The remaining boxes are clustered into maximal connected components, which are tested for being isolating for a single root.

As exclusion and inclusion predicate, we propose a novel test based on Pellet's theorem and Graeffe iteration. We briefly outline our approach and refer to Section 3 for more details. Let $\Delta := \Delta(m, r) \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the disk centered at m with radius r , and define $\lambda \cdot \Delta(m, r) := \Delta(m, \lambda \cdot r)$ for arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$. According to Pellet's theorem, the number of roots contained in Δ equals k if the absolute value of the k -th coefficient of $F_\Delta(x) := F(m + rx)$ dominates the sum of the absolute values of all other coefficients. For $k = 0$ and $k = 1$, it has been known [39, 49] that Pellet's theorem applies if the smaller disk $n^{-c_1} \cdot \Delta$ contains k roots and the larger disk $n^{c_2} \cdot \Delta(m, r)$ contains no further root, where c_1 and c_2 are suitable positive constants. We improve upon this result by giving constants c_1 and c_2 such that the latter result stays true for all k . As a consequence, using only $O(\log \log n)$ Graeffe iteration for iteratively squaring the roots of F_Δ , we can replace the factors n^{c_1} and n^{c_2} by the constants $\rho_1 := \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \approx 0.94$

³Notice that we only require approximations of the coefficients, hence our method also applies to polynomials with algebraic, or even transcendental coefficients. In any case, the given bounds for the cost of isolating the roots of such a polynomial do not encounter the cost for computing sufficiently good L -bit approximations of the coefficients. Depending on the type of the coefficients, this cost might be considerably larger than the cost for just reading such approximations.

⁴If the requirement is not fulfilled, our algorithm does not terminate. However, using an additional stopping criteria, it can be used to compute arbitrarily good approximations of all (multiple) roots; see the remark at the end of Section 4.2 for more details.

and $\rho_2 := \frac{4}{3}$. More precisely, we derive a test, denoted T_k^G , which allows us to exactly count the number of roots contained in a disk Δ , provided that the disks $\rho_2 \cdot \Delta$ and $\rho_1 \cdot \Delta$ contain the same number of roots.⁵ Since, in general, the latter test requires exact arithmetic and since we can only ask for approximations of the coefficients of F , there might be cases, where we either cannot decide the outcome of our test or where an unnecessarily high precision is needed. Based on the idea of so-called soft-predicates [51], we formulate a variant of the T_k^G -test, which we denote by \tilde{T}_k^G , that uses only approximate arithmetic and runs with a precision demand that is directly related to the maximal absolute value that F takes on the disk Δ .

In the subdivision process, we inscribe each box in a corresponding disk and run the \tilde{T}_0^G -test on this disk. Boxes, for which the test succeeds, do not contain a root and can thus be discarded. The remaining boxes are clustered into maximal connected components, which we also inscribe in corresponding disks. If the \tilde{T}_1^G -test succeeds for such a disk, we discard the cluster and store the disk as an isolating disk. Otherwise, we keep on subdividing each box into four equally sized sub-boxes and proceed. This approach on its own already yields a reasonably efficient algorithm, however, only linear convergence against the roots can be achieved. As a consequence, there might exist long paths in the subdivision tree with no branching (there are at most n branching nodes). For instance, when considering the benchmark problem, there exist polynomials (e.g., Mignotte polynomials) for which the length of such a sequence is lower bounded by $\Omega(n\tau)$. We show how to traverse such sequences in a much faster manner (reducing their length to $O(\log(n\tau))$ in the worst-case) via a regula falsi method, which combines Newton iteration and box quartering. Our approach is inspired by the so-called quadratic interval refinement (QIR for short) method proposed by Abbott [1]. He combines the secant method and interval bisection in order to further refine an interval that is already known to be isolating for a root. In [35, 36, 38], the QIR approach has been considerably refined by replacing the secant method by Newton iteration (for multiple roots). Compared to Abbott's original variant, this yields a method with quadratic convergence against clusters of roots during the isolation process. Our approach is similar to the one from [38], however, we use the \tilde{T}_k^G -test instead of Descartes' Rule of Signs, which only applies to intervals on the real axes. Furthermore, the approach from [38] uses fast approximate multipoint evaluation [18, 16] in order to determine subdivision points whose distance to the roots of F is not too small. This is needed to avoid an unnecessarily large precision when using Descartes' Rule of Signs. For our algorithm `CISOLATE`, there is no need for (fast) approximate multipoint evaluation. We now state our first main theoretical result, which shows that our algorithm performs near-optimal with respect to the number of produced boxes:

Theorem. *Let F be polynomial as in (1) and suppose that F is square-free. For isolating all complex roots of F , the algorithm `CISOLATE` produces a number of boxes bounded by*

$$\tilde{O}\left(n \cdot \log(n) \cdot \log\left(n \cdot \Gamma_F \cdot \overline{\log}(\sigma_F^{-1})\right)\right),$$

where we define $\overline{\log}(x) := \max(1, \log \max(1, |x|))$ for arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Gamma_F :=$

⁵The subscript k indicates a test to check whether Δ contains exactly k roots. The superscript G indicates that we apply Graeffe iteration.

$\overline{\log}(\max_{i=1}^n |z_i|)$ the logarithmic root bound of F , and $\sigma_F := \min_{(i,j):i \neq j} |z_i - z_j|$ the separation of F .

For the benchmark problem, the above bound simplifies to $O(n \log(n) \log(n\tau))$. When running our algorithm on an arbitrary axis-aligned box \mathcal{B} , we obtain refined bounds showing that our algorithm is also adaptive with respect to the number of roots contained in some neighborhood of \mathcal{B} as well as with respect to their geometric location. Namely, suppose that the enlarged box $2\mathcal{B}$ contains only simple roots of F , then we may replace n , Γ_F , and σ_F in the above bound by the number of roots contained in the enlarged box $2\mathcal{B}$, the logarithm of the width of \mathcal{B} , and the minimal separation of the roots of F contained in $2\mathcal{B}$, respectively; see also Theorem 6.

Finally, we give bounds on the precision to which the coefficients of F have to be provided as well as bounds on the bit complexity of our approach:

Theorem. *Let F be a polynomial as in (1) and suppose that F is square-free. For isolating all complex roots of F , the algorithm `CSOLATE` uses a number of bit operations bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{O}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n n \cdot (\tau_F + n \cdot \overline{\log}(z_i) + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(z_i)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(z_i)^{-1}))\right) = \\ & \tilde{O}(n(n^2 + n \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) + \overline{\log}(\text{Disc}(F)^{-1}))), \end{aligned}$$

where we define $\tau_F := \lceil \overline{\log} \|F\|_\infty \rceil$, $\sigma_F(z_i) := \min_{j \neq i} |z_i - z_j|$ the separation of z_i , $\text{Mea}(F) := \prod_{i=1}^n \max(1, |z_i|)$ the Mahler Measure, and $\text{Disc}(F)$ the discriminant of F . As input, the algorithm requires an L -bit approximation of F with

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \tilde{O}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\tau_F + n \cdot \overline{\log}(z_i) + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(z_i)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(z_i)^{-1}))\right) \\ &= \tilde{O}(n^2 + n \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) + \overline{\log}(\text{Disc}(F)^{-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Again, we also give refined complexity bounds for the problem of isolating all roots of F contained in some box \mathcal{B} , which show that the cost and the precision demand of our algorithm adapt to the hardness of the roots contained in a close neighborhood of the box. For the benchmark problem, the above bound simplifies to $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2\tau)$. It is remarkable that our bounds on the bit complexity for isolating all complex roots as achieved by `CSOLATE` exactly match the corresponding bounds for the complex root isolation algorithm from [23], which uses Pan's method for approximate polynomial factorization.

1.2 Related Work

As already mentioned at the beginning, there exists a huge literature on computing the roots of a univariate polynomial. This makes it simply impossible to give a comprehensive overview without going beyond the scope of a research paper, hence we suggest the interested reader to consult some of the excellent surveys [19, 20, 21, 22, 28]. Here, we mainly focus on a comparison of our method with other existing subdivision methods for real and complex root finding.

For real root computation, subdivision algorithms have become extremely popular due to their simplicity, ease of implementation, and practical efficiency. They have found their way into the most popular computer algebra systems, where they constitute the default routine for real root computation. Prominent

examples of subdivision methods are the Descartes method [8, 11, 12, 34, 35, 38, 37, 43], the Bolzano method⁶ [6, 39, 3], the Sturm method [10], and the continued fraction method [2, 42, 45]. From a high-level point of view, all of the above mentioned methods essentially follow the same approach: Starting from a given interval I_0 , they recursively subdivide I_0 to search for the roots contained in I_0 . Intervals that are shown to contain no root are discarded, and intervals that are shown to be isolating for a simple root are returned. The two main differences between these algorithms are the choice of the exclusion predicate and the way how the intervals are subdivided. For the *real benchmark problem* of isolating all real roots of a polynomial of degree n with integers of bit size τ or less, most of the above methods need $\tilde{O}(n\tau)$ subdivision steps and their worst-case bit complexity is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n^4\tau^2)$. The bound on the number of subdivision steps stems from the fact that the product of the separation of all roots is lower bounded by $2^{-\tilde{O}(n\tau)}$ and that only linear convergence against the roots is achieved. By considering special polynomials (e.g., Mignotte polynomials) that have roots with separation $2^{-\Omega(n\tau)}$, one can further show that the bound $\tilde{O}(n\tau)$ is even tight up to logarithmic factors; see [12, 7]. When using exact arithmetic, the cost for each subdivision step is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n^3\tau)$ bit operations, which is due to the fact that n arithmetic operations with a precision of $\tilde{O}(n^2\tau)$ are performed. In [37], it has been shown for the Descartes method that it suffices to work with a precision of size $\tilde{O}(n\tau)$ in order to isolate all real roots, a fact that has already been empirically verified in [34]. This yields a worst-case bit complexity bound of size $\tilde{O}(n^3\tau^2)$ for a modified Descartes method, which uses approximate instead of exact arithmetic. For a corresponding modified variant of the Bolzano method [3], a similar argument yields the same bound. Recent work [35, 38, 43] combines the Descartes method and Newton iteration, which yields algorithms with quadratic convergence in almost all iterations. They use only $O(n \log(n\tau))$ subdivision steps, which is near optimal. The methods from [35, 43] work for integer polynomials only and each computation is carried out with exact arithmetic. An amortized analysis of their cost yields the bound $\tilde{O}(n^3\tau)$ for the bit complexity. [38] introduces an algorithm that improves upon the methods from [35, 43] in two points. First, it can be used to compute the real roots of a polynomial with arbitrary real coefficients. Second, due to the use of approximate arithmetic, its precision demand is considerably smaller. For the real benchmark problem, it achieves the bit complexity bound $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2\tau)$. More precisely, it needs $\tilde{O}(n \log(n\tau))$ iterations, and, in each iteration, $\tilde{O}(n)$ arithmetic operations are carried out with an average precision of size $\tilde{O}(n + \tau)$. This essentially matches the bounds as achieved by our algorithm `CISOLATE` for complex root isolation. `CISOLATE` shares common elements with the method from [38], however we had to develop novel tools to accommodate the fact that our search area is now the entire complex plane and not the real axis. In particular, we replaced Descartes' Rule of Signs, which serves as the test for real roots in [38], by our novel test \tilde{T}_k^G for counting the number of complex roots in a disk.

For computing the complex roots, there also exist a series of subdivision

⁶The Bolzano method is based on Pellet's theorem (with $k = 0$). It is used to test an interval I for roots of the input polynomial F and its derivative F' . I contains no root if Pellet's theorem applies to F . If it applies to F' , the function F is monotone on I , and thus I is either isolating for a root or it contains no root depending on whether there is a sign change of F at the endpoints of I or not.

methods (e.g. [9, 50, 24, 39, 33, 29, 25, 31, 48]), however, only a few algorithms have been analyzed in a way that allows a direct comparison with our method.

Similar to our method, Yakoubsohn [50] combines Weyl’s quad tree approach and a test for roots based on Pellet’s theorem. However, since only an exclusion predicate (based on Pellet’s theorem with $k = 0$) is considered but no additional test to verify that a region is isolating, his method does not directly compute isolating regions but arbitrary good approximations of the complex roots. In [39], we introduced a variant of Yakoubsohn’s method, denoted by CEVAL, that computes isolating disks for the complex roots of an integer polynomial. There, an additional inclusion test (based on Pellet’s theorem with $k = 1$) has been used to show that a disk is isolating for a root. The methods from [50, 39] only consider box-quartering, and thus nothing better than linear convergence can be achieved. For the benchmark problem, the algorithm from [39] needs $\tilde{O}(n^2\tau)$ subdivision steps and its cost is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n^4\tau^2)$ bit operations. Yakoubsohn further mentions how to improve upon his method by combining the exclusion predicate with Graeffe iterations, which yields an improvement by a factor of size n with respect to the total number of produced boxes. In this paper, we follow the approach of combining a test based on Pellet’s theorem and Graeffe iteration. That is, we derive a corresponding method (i.e., the T_k^G -test) that even allows us exactly count the number of roots in a disk, thus going beyond a simple test to check whether a disk contains a root or not. In addition, we derive a variant of T_k^G that works with approximate arithmetic, and we give bounds on the precision demand in the worst case.

In our previous work [51], we provided the first complete algorithm for computing ϵ -clusters of roots of analytic functions. Like the present work, it is a subdivision approach based on the T_k -test of Pellet; but unlike this paper, it does not have quadratic convergence nor complexity analysis. In [51], we assumed that an analytic function is given when we also have interval evaluation of its derivatives of any desired order; this natural assumption is clearly satisfied by most common analytic functions. The algorithm from [51] does not compute isolating disks but arbitrary small regions containing clusters of roots, hence being also applicable to functions with multiple roots and for which separation bounds are not known.

We also want to mention two further important contributions [33, 29], which are similar to our approach in the sense that a classical subdivision algorithm, which yields only linear convergence, is combined with Newton iteration to speed up convergence. Renegar [33] combines the Schur-Cohn algorithm [15, Section 6.8] and Newton iteration. In addition, he introduces a subroutine for approximating the winding number of a polynomial F around the perimeter of some disk, and thus a method for counting the number of roots of F in a disk. The Schur-Cohn algorithm is used to derive some rough initial approximations of the roots, whereas Newton iteration (applied to the $(k - 1)$ -st derivative of F) guarantees quadratic convergence against clusters consisting of k roots. Renegar focuses on the arithmetic complexity of his algorithm for the problem of approximating the roots of F . For fixed degree n , his method performs near-optimal in this regard. However, its dependence on n is cubic. In [29], Pan describes a more involved algorithm that combines Weyl’s quadtree approach, an exclusion predicate based on Turan’s proximity test [46] and Graeffe iteration, root radii computation [40, Section 14], Newton iteration, and Renegar’s winding number algorithm. Pan also studies the arithmetic complexity of his method

for the problem of approximating all roots that are contained in some disk. For a "well isolating" disk Δ of constant size and a polynomial F of degree n , his algorithm computes approximations of the roots to an absolute error 2^{-L} in $O(kn \log n \log(nL))$ arithmetic operations, where k equals the number of roots in Δ . He further shows that the total number of boxes produced by his method is roughly k (up to some logarithmic factors depending on n , L , and the factor of isolation of the input disk). Both results compare well with the bounds that we obtain for our algorithm `CISOLATE`. Neither Renegar nor Pan analyze the precision demand or the Boolean complexity of their algorithms.

1.3 Structure of the Paper and Reading Guide

In Section 2, we summarize the most important definitions and notations, which we will use throughout the paper. We suggest the reader to print a copy of this section in order to quickly refer to the definitions. We introduce our novel test \tilde{T}_k^G for counting the roots in a disk in Section 3. The reader who is willing to skip all details of this section and who wants to proceed directly with the main algorithm should only consider Section 3.4, where we give the main properties of the \tilde{T}_k^G -test. The algorithm `CISOLATE` is given in Section 4. Its analysis is split into two parts. In Section 5.1, we derive bounds on the number of produced boxes, whereas, in Section 5.2, we estimate the bit complexity of our algorithm. Some of the (rather technical) proofs are outsourced to an appendix, and we recommend to skip these proofs in a first reading of the paper. In Section 6, we summarize and hint to some future research.

2 Notations, Definitions, and a Root Bound

Let F be a polynomial as defined in (1) with complex roots z_1, \dots, z_n . We fix the following definitions and notations:

- As already mentioned in the introduction, we assume the existence of an oracle that provides arbitrary good approximations of the coefficients. More precisely, for an arbitrary non-negative integer L , we may ask the oracle for dyadic approximations $\tilde{a}_i = \frac{m_i}{2^{L+1}}$ of the coefficients a_i such that $m_i \in \mathbb{Z} + i \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ are Gaussian integers and $|a_i - \tilde{a}_i| < 2^{-L}$ for all i . We also say that \tilde{a}_i approximates a_i to L bits after the binary point, and a corresponding polynomial $\tilde{F} = \tilde{a}_0 + \dots + \tilde{a}_n \cdot x^n$ with coefficients fulfilling the latter properties is called an *(absolute) L -bit approximation of F* . It is assumed that the cost for asking the oracle for such an approximation is the cost for reading the approximations.
- For any non-negative integer k , we denote by $[k]$ the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$ of size k . For any set S and any non-negative integer k , we write $\binom{S}{k}$ for the set of all subsets of S of size k .
- $\max_1(x_1, \dots, x_k) := \max(1, |x_1|, \dots, |x_k|)$ for arbitrary $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{C}$, $\log := \log_2$ the binary logarithm, and

$$\overline{\log}(x_1, \dots, x_k) := \lceil \max_1(\log \max_1(x_1, \dots, x_k)) \rceil.$$

Notice that, if $|z| \leq 2$ for some $z \in \mathbb{C}$, then $\overline{\log}(z)$ is 1. Otherwise, $\overline{\log}(z)$ equals $\log |z|$ rounded up to the next integer.

- $\tau_F := \overline{\log}(\|F\|_\infty)$ is defined as the maximal number of bits before the binary point in the binary representation of the coefficients of F , and
- $\Gamma_F := \overline{\log}(\max_{i=1}^n |z_i|)$ is defined as the *logarithmic root bound* of F ,
- $\text{Mea}(F) := |a_n| \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n \max_1(z_i)$ is defined as the *Mahler measure* of F ,
- $\sigma_F(z_i) := \min_{j \neq i} |z_i - z_j|$ is defined as the *separation of the root z_i* and $\sigma_F := \min_{i=1}^n \sigma_F(z_i)$ the *separation of F* .
- For an arbitrary region $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{C}$ in the complex space, we define $\sigma_F(\mathcal{R}) := \min_{i: z_i \in \mathcal{R}} \sigma_F(z_i)$, which we call the *separation of F restricted to \mathcal{R}* . We further denote by $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{R})$ the set of all roots of F that are contained in \mathcal{R} .
- We denote the interior of a disk in the complex plane with center $m \in \mathbb{C}$ and radius $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$ by $\Delta = \Delta(m, r)$. For short, we also write $\lambda \cdot \Delta$ to denote the disk $\Delta(m, \lambda \cdot r)$ that is centered at m and scaled by a factor $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We further use $F_\Delta(x)$ to denote the shifted and scaled polynomial $F(m + r \cdot x)$, that is, $F_\Delta(x) := F(m + r \cdot x)$.
- A disk Δ is *isolating* for a root z_i of F if it contains z_i but no other root of F . For a set S of roots of F and positive real values ρ_1 and ρ_2 with $\rho_1 \leq 1 \leq \rho_2$, we further say that a disk Δ is (ρ_1, ρ_2) -*isolating* for S if $\rho_1 \cdot \Delta$ contains exactly the roots contained in S and $\rho_2 \cdot \Delta \setminus \rho_1 \cdot \Delta$ contains no root of F .
- Throughout the paper, we only consider boxes

$$B = \{z = x + i \cdot y \in \mathbb{C} : x \in [x_{\min}, x_{\max}] \text{ and } y \in [y_{\min}, y_{\max}]\}$$

in the complex space that are *closed, axis-aligned, squared, and of width $w(B) = 2^\ell$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$* (i.e., $|x_{\max} - x_{\min}| = |y_{\max} - y_{\min}| = 2^\ell$), hence, for brevity, these properties are not peculiarly mentioned. Similar as for disks, for an integer λ , $\lambda \cdot B$ denotes the scaled box of size $\lambda \cdot 2^\ell$ centered at B .

According to Cauchy's root bound, we have $|z_i| \leq 1 + \max_{i=0}^n \frac{|a_i|}{|a_n|} < 1 + 4 \cdot 2^{\tau_F}$, and thus $\Gamma_F = O(\tau_F)$. In addition, it holds that $\tau_F \leq \overline{\log}(2^n \cdot \text{Mea}(F)) \leq n(1 + \Gamma_F) \leq 2n\Gamma_F$. Following [23, Theorem 1] (or [37, Section 6.1]), we can compute an integer approximation $\tilde{\Gamma}_P \in \mathbb{N}$ of Γ_P with $\Gamma_P + 1 \leq \tilde{\Gamma}_P \leq \Gamma_P + 8 \log n + 1$ using $\tilde{O}(n^2 \Gamma_P)$ many bit operations, where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ indicates that poly-logarithmic factors in the argument are omitted. For this, the coefficients of F need to be approximated to $\tilde{O}(n\Gamma_F)$ bits after the binary point. From $\tilde{\Gamma}_P$, we can then immediately derive an integer $\Gamma = 2^\gamma$, with $\gamma := \lceil \log \tilde{\Gamma}_P \rceil \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, such that

$$\Gamma_P + 1 \leq \tilde{\Gamma}_P \leq \Gamma \leq 2 \cdot \tilde{\Gamma}_P \leq 2 \cdot (\Gamma_P + 8 \log n + 1). \quad (2)$$

It follows that $2^\Gamma = 2^{O(\Gamma_P + \log n)}$ is an upper bound for the modulus of all roots of F , and thus we can always restrict our search for the roots to the set of all complex numbers of absolute value 2^Γ or less.

3 Counting Roots in a Disk

3.1 Pellet's Theorem and the T_k -Test

In what follows, let k be an integer with $0 \leq k \leq n = \deg F$, and let K be a real value with $K \geq 1$. We consider the following test, which allows us to compute the size of a cluster of roots contained in a specific disk:

Definition 1 (The T_k -Test). For a polynomial $F \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, the T_k -test on a disk $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ with parameter K holds if

$$T_k(m, r, K, F) : \quad \left| \frac{F^{(k)}(m)r^k}{k!} \right| > K \cdot \sum_{i \neq k} \left| \frac{F^{(i)}(m)r^i}{i!} \right| \quad (3)$$

or, equivalently, if $F^{(k)}(m) \neq 0$ and

$$T_k(m, r, K, F) : \quad \sum_{i < k} \left| \frac{F^{(i)}(m)r^{i-k}k!}{F^{(k)}(m)i!} \right| + \sum_{i > k} \left| \frac{F^{(i)}(m)r^{i-k}k!}{F^{(k)}(m)i!} \right| < \frac{1}{K}. \quad (4)$$

Sometimes, we also write $T_k(\Delta, K, F)$ for $T_k(m, r, K, F)$, or simply $T_k(\Delta, K)$ if it is clear from the context which polynomial F (or which disk Δ) is considered. Notice that if the T_k -test succeeds for some parameter $K = K_0$, then it also succeeds for any K with $K \leq K_0$. The reader may further notice that $T_k(m, r, K, F)$ is equivalent to $T_k(0, 1, K, F_\Delta)$, with $F_\Delta(x) := F(m + r \cdot x)$.

The following result is a direct consequence of Pellet's theorem, and, in our algorithm, it will turn out to be crucial in order to compute the size of a cluster of roots of F ; see [32, 51] for a proof.

Theorem 1. *If $T_k(m, r, K, F)$ holds for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ with $K \geq 1$ and some $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, then $\Delta(m, r)$ contains exactly k roots of F counted with multiplicities.*

In the remainder of this section, we derive criteria on the locations of the roots z_1, \dots, z_n of F under which the T_k -test succeeds under guarantee. For this, suppose that c_1 and c_2 are arbitrary real values that fulfill the following inequality

$$c_2 \cdot \ln \left(\frac{1 + 2K}{2K} \right) \geq c_1 \geq \frac{\max_1(k)}{\ln(1 + \frac{1}{8K})} \quad (5)$$

For our algorithm, we will particularly focus on the special case, where $K := \frac{3}{2}$, and thus $\frac{\max_1(k)}{\ln(1 + \frac{1}{8K})} \approx 12.49 \cdot \max_1(k)$ and $\ln \left(\frac{1+2K}{2K} \right) \approx 0.29$. In this case, we further choose $c_1 := 16 \cdot n$ and $c_2 := 64 \cdot n$. Hence, for simplicity, the reader may carry these special values in mind. The following theorem provides sufficient criteria expressed in terms of the locations of the roots of F such that the T_k -test succeeds.

Theorem 2. *Let k be an integer with $0 \leq k \leq n = \deg(F)$, let K be a real value with $K \geq 1$, and let c_1 and c_2 be constants that fulfill Inequality (5). For a disk $\Delta = \Delta(m, r)$, suppose that there exists a real λ with*

$$\lambda \geq \max(4c_2 \cdot \max_1(k) \cdot n^2, 16K \cdot \max_1(k)^2 \cdot n)$$

such that Δ is $(1, \lambda)$ -isolating for the roots z_1, \dots, z_k of F , then $T_k(c_1 \cdot \Delta, K, F)$ holds.

For the special case, where $K = \frac{3}{2}$, $c_1 = 16n$, $c_2 = 64n$, and $\lambda = 256n^5$, Theorem 2 immediately yields the following result, which we will use throughout this paper:

Corollary 1. *Let Δ be a disk in the complex space that is $(\frac{1}{16n}, 16n^4)$ -isolating for a set of k roots (counted with multiplicity) of F . Then, $T_k(\Delta, \frac{3}{2}, F)$ holds.*

We split the proof of Theorem 2 into the following two technical lemmas, whose proofs are given in the appendix:

Lemma 1. *Let $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ be a disk that is $(1, 4c_2 \cdot \max_1(k) \cdot n^2)$ -isolating for the roots z_1, \dots, z_k , then, for all $z \in c_2 \cdot n \cdot \Delta$, it holds that $F^{(k)}(z) \neq 0$. Furthermore,*

$$\sum_{i=k+1}^n \left| \frac{F^{(i)}(m)(c_1 \cdot r)^{i-k} k!}{F^{(k)}(m) i!} \right| < \frac{1}{2K}.$$

Lemma 2. *Let λ be a real value with $\lambda \geq 16K \cdot \max_1(k)^2 \cdot n$ and suppose that $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ is a disk that is $(1, \lambda)$ -isolating for the roots z_1, \dots, z_k of F , then*

$$\sum_{i < k} \frac{|F^{(i)}(m)|}{|F^{(k)}(m)|} \frac{(c_1 \cdot r)^{i-k} k!}{i!} < \frac{1}{2K}.$$

Notice that, in Lemma 1, we derive an upper bound, under the given assumptions from Theorem 2, for the second sum in (4), whereas, in Lemma 2, the first sum is bounded. In Lemma 1, we also state a bound on the minimal distance from a root of the k -th derivative $F^{(k)}$ of F to a cluster of k roots of F . Pawlowski [30] provides a similar but more general bound, which implies the first part of Lemma 1. However, compared to [30], our proof is significantly shorter and uses only simple arguments, hence we decided to integrate it in the appendix of this paper for the sake of a self-contained presentation.

3.2 The T_k^G -Test: Using Graeffe Iteration

Corollary 1 guarantees success of the $T_k(\Delta)$ -test, with $k = |\mathcal{Z}(\Delta)|$ if the disk Δ is $(\frac{1}{16n}, 16n^4)$ -isolating for a set of k roots. In this section, we use a well-known approach for squaring the roots of a polynomial, called Graeffe iteration [4], in order to improve upon the T_k -test. More specifically, we derive a variant of the T_k -test, which we denote T_k^G -test⁷, that allows us to exactly count the roots contained in some disk Δ if Δ is (ρ_1, ρ_2) -isolating for a set of k roots, with constants ρ_1 and ρ_2 of size $\rho_1 \approx 0.947$ and $\rho_2 = \frac{4}{3}$.

Definition 2 (Graeffe iteration). *For a polynomial $F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, write $F(x) = F_e(x^2) + x \cdot F_o(x^2)$, with*

$$\begin{aligned} F_e(x) &:= a_{2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} x^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} + a_{2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2} x^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} + \dots + a_2 x + a_0, \quad \text{and} \\ F_o(x) &:= a_{2\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor + 1} x^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} + a_{2\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor - 1} x^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor - 1} + \dots + a_3 x + a_1. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the first Graeffe iterate $F^{[1]}$ of F is defined as:

$$F^{[1]}(x) := (-1)^n [F_e(x)^2 - x \cdot F_o(x)^2].$$

⁷The superscript "G" indicates the use of Graeffe iteration.

Algorithm 1: Graeffe Iteration

Input : Polynomial $F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$, and a non-negative integer N .

Output : Polynomial $F^{[N]}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i^{[N]} x^i$. If F has roots z_1, \dots, z_n , then $F^{[N]}$ has roots $z_1^{2^N}, \dots, z_n^{2^N}$, and $a_n^{[N]} = a_n^{2^N}$

- 1 $F^{[0]}(x) := F(x)$
 - 2 **for** $i = 1, \dots, N$ **do**
 - 3 $F^{[i]}(x) := (-1)^n [F_e^{[i-1]}(x)^2 - x \cdot F_o^{[i-1]}(x)^2]$
 - 4 **return** $F^{[N]}(x)$
-

The first part of the following theorem is well-known (e.g. see [4]), and we give its proof only for the sake of a self-contained presentation. For the second part, we have not been able to find a corresponding result in the literature. Despite the fact that we consider the result (in particular, the lower bound for $\|F^{[1]}\|_\infty$) to be of independent interest, we will use it in the analysis of our approach.

Theorem 3. *Denote the roots of F by z_1, \dots, z_n , then it holds that $F^{[1]}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i^{[1]} x^i = a_n^2 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (x - z_i^2)$. In particular, the roots of the first Graeffe iterate $F^{[1]}$ are the squares of the roots of F . In addition, we have*

$$n^2 \cdot \max_1(\|F\|_\infty)^2 \geq \|F^{[1]}\|_\infty \geq \|F\|_\infty^2 \cdot 2^{-4n}.$$

Proof. See Appendix 7.1 □

We can now iteratively apply Graeffe iterations in order to square the roots of a polynomial $F(x)$ several times; see Algorithm 1.

In the previous section, we have shown that $T_k(\Delta, \frac{3}{2}, F)$ holds if the disk Δ is $(\frac{1}{16n}, 16n^4)$ -isolating for a set of k roots. That is, in order to guarantee success of the T_k -test, a cluster consisting of k roots must be separated from the remaining roots by a multiplicative factor that is polynomial in n (namely, $256n^5$). We can now reduce the “separation factor” to a constant value (in our case, this constant will be ≈ 1.41) when we run N , with $N = \Theta(\log \log n)$, Graeffe iterations first, and then apply the T_k -test; see Algorithm 2.

From Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, we now obtain the following result:

Lemma 3. *Let Δ be a disk in the complex plane and $F(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ a polynomial of degree n . Let*

$$N := \lceil \log(1 + \log n) \rceil + 5 \tag{6}$$

and

$$\rho_1 := \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \approx 0.943 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2 := \frac{4}{3} \tag{7}$$

Then, we have $2^N \sqrt{\frac{1}{16n}} > 0.947 > \rho_1$, and it holds:

- (a) If Δ is (ρ_1, ρ_2) -isolating for a set of k roots of F , then $T_k^G(\Delta, \frac{3}{2})$ succeeds.
- (b) If $T_k^G(\Delta, K)$ succeeds for some $K \geq 1$, then Δ contains exactly k roots.

Algorithm 2: $T_k^G(\Delta, K)$ -Test

Input : Polynomial $F(x)$, disk $\Delta = \Delta(m, r)$, real value K with $1 \leq K \leq \frac{3}{2}$

Output: True or False. If the algorithm returns True, Δ contains exactly k roots.

- 1 Call Algorithm 1 with input $F_\Delta(x) := F(m + r \cdot x)$ and $N := \lceil \log(1 + \log n) \rceil + 5$, which returns $F_\Delta^{[N]}$
 - 2 **return** $T_k(0, 1, K, F_\Delta^{[N]}(x))$
-

Proof. The lower bound on $\rho(n) := \sqrt[2^N]{\frac{1}{16n}}$ follows by a straight forward computation that shows that $\rho(n)$ (considered as a function in n only) is strictly increasing and that $\rho(2) \approx 0.947 > \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \approx 0.943$. Now, let $F_\Delta^{[N]}$ be the polynomial obtained from F_Δ after performing recursive N Graeffe iterations; for the definition of F_Δ , see Section 2. If Δ is (ρ_1, ρ_2) -isolating for a set of k roots of F , then the unit disk $\Delta' := \Delta(0, 1)$ is also (ρ_1, ρ_2) -isolating for a set of k roots of F_Δ . That is, Δ' contains k roots of F_Δ and all other roots of F_Δ have absolute value larger than $\frac{4}{3}$. Hence, we conclude that $F_\Delta^{[N]}$ has k roots of absolute value less than $\rho_1^{2^N} < \frac{1}{16n}$, whereas the remaining roots have absolute value larger than $\rho_2^{2^N} \geq 16n^4$. Hence, from Corollary 1, we conclude that $T_k(\Delta', \frac{3}{2}, F_\Delta^{[N]})$ succeeds. This shows (a). Part (b) is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and the fact that Graeffe iteration does not change the number of roots contained in the unit disk. \square

Notice that, in the special case where $k = 0$, the failure of $T_0^G(\Delta)$ already implies that $\frac{4}{3} \cdot \Delta$ contains at least one root.

We also fix the following result, which is a direct consequence of Theorem 3. We will later make use of it in the analysis of our algorithm:

Corollary 2. *Let F_Δ and $F_\Delta^{[N]}$ be defined as in Algorithm 2. Then, it holds:*

$$\log(\|F_\Delta^{[N]}(x)\|_\infty, \|F_\Delta^{[N]}(x)\|_\infty^{-1}) = O(\log n \cdot (n + \log(\|F_\Delta\|_\infty, \|F_\Delta\|_\infty^{-1}))).$$

3.3 The \tilde{T}_k^G -Test: Using Approximate Arithmetic

So far, the T_k -test is formulated in a way such that, in general, high-precision arithmetic, or even exact arithmetic, is needed in order to compute its output. Namely, if the two expressions on both sides of (3) are actually equal, then exact arithmetic is needed to decide equality. Notice that, in general, we cannot even handle this case as we have only access to (arbitrary good approximations of the coefficients of the input polynomial F . But even if the two expressions are different but almost equal, then we need to evaluate the polynomial F and its higher order derivatives with a very high precision in order to decide the inequality, which induces high computational costs. This is a typical problem that appears in many algorithms, where a sign predicate \mathcal{P} is used to draw conclusions, which in turn decide a branch of the algorithm. Suppose that, similar as for the T_k -test (with $E_\ell = \frac{|F^{(k)}(m)| \cdot r^k}{k!}$ and $E_r = \sum_{i \neq k} \frac{|F^{(i)}(m)| \cdot r^i}{i!}$),

there exist two non-negative expressions E_ℓ and E_r such that \mathcal{P} succeeds⁸ if and only if $E_\ell - E_r$ has a positive sign (or, equivalently, if $E_\ell > E_r$). We further denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\frac{3}{2}}$ the predicate that succeeds if and only if the stronger inequality $E_\ell - \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_r > 0$ holds.⁹ Then, success of $\mathcal{P}_{\frac{3}{2}}$ implies success of \mathcal{P} , however, a failure of $\mathcal{P}_{\frac{3}{2}}$ does, in general, not imply that \mathcal{P} fails as well. As already mentioned above for the special case, where $\mathcal{P} = T_k(m, r, 1, F)$, it might be computationally expensive (or even infeasible) to determine the outcome of \mathcal{P} , namely in the case where the two expressions E_ℓ and E_r are equal or almost equal. In order to avoid such undesirable situations, we propose to replace the predicate \mathcal{P} by a corresponding so-called *soft-predicate* [51], which we denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ does not only return True or False, but may also return a flag called “Undecided”. If it returns True or False, the result of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ coincides with that of \mathcal{P} . However, if $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ returns Undecided, we may only conclude that E_ℓ is a relative $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation of E_r (i.e., $\frac{2}{3} \cdot E_\ell < E_r < \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_\ell$). We briefly sketch our approach and give details in Algorithm 3: In the first step, we compute approximations \tilde{E}_ℓ and \tilde{E}_r of the values E_ℓ and E_r , respectively. Then, we check whether we can already compare the exact values E_ℓ and E_r by just considering their approximations and taking into account the quality of approximation. If this is the case, we are done as we can already determine the outcome of \mathcal{P} . Hence, we define that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ returns True (False) if we can show that $E_\ell > E_r$ ($E_\ell < E_r$). Otherwise, we iteratively increase the quality of the approximation until we can either show that $E_\ell > E_r$, $E_\ell < E_r$, or $\frac{2}{3} \cdot E_\ell \leq E_r \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_\ell$. We may consider the latter case as an indicator that comparing E_ℓ and E_r is difficult, and thus $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ returns Undecided in this case.

It is easy to see that Algorithm 3 terminates if and only if at least one of the two expressions E_ℓ and E_r is non-zero, hence we make this a requirement. In the following lemma, we further give a bound on the precision to which the expressions E_ℓ and E_r have to be approximated in order to guarantee termination of the algorithm.

Lemma 4. *Algorithm 3 terminates for an L that is upper bounded by*

$$L_0 := 2 \cdot (\lceil \log(\max(E_\ell, E_r)^{-1}) \rceil + 4).$$

Proof. Suppose that $L \geq \lceil \log(\max(E_\ell, E_r)^{-1}) \rceil + 4$. We further assume that $E_\ell = \max(E_\ell, E_r)$; the case $E_r = \max(E_\ell, E_r)$ is then treated in analogous manner. It follows that

$$E_r^+ \leq E_r + 2^{-L+1} \leq E_\ell + 2^{-L+1} \leq \frac{9}{8} \cdot E_\ell \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_\ell - 2^{-L+2} \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_\ell^-.$$

Hence, if, in addition, $\frac{2}{3} \cdot E_\ell^+ \leq E_r^-$, then the algorithm returns Undecided in Step 10. Otherwise, we have $\frac{9}{8} \cdot E_\ell \geq E_\ell + 2^{-L+1} \geq E_\ell^+ > \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_r^-$, and thus

$$E_\ell^- \geq E_\ell - 2^{-L+1} \geq \frac{7}{8} \cdot E_\ell \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot E_\ell + 2^{-L+1} \geq E_r^- + 2^{-L+1} \geq E_r^+,$$

which shows that the algorithm returns True in Step 6. Since we double L in each iteration, it follows that the algorithm must terminate for an L with $L < 2 \cdot (\lceil \log(\max(E_\ell, E_r)^{-1}) \rceil + 4)$. \square

⁸We assume that the predicate \mathcal{P} either returns “True” or “False”. We say that \mathcal{P} succeeds if it returns True. Otherwise, we say that it fails.

⁹You may replace $\frac{3}{2}$ by an arbitrary real constant K larger than 1.

Algorithm 3: Soft-predicate $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$

Input : A predicate \mathcal{P} defined by non-negative expressions E_ℓ and E_r , with $E_\ell \neq 0$ or $E_r \neq 0$; i.e. \mathcal{P} succeeds if and only if $E_\ell > E_r$.
Output: True, False, or Undecided. In case of True (False), \mathcal{P} succeeds (fails). In case of Undecided, we have $\frac{2}{3} \cdot E_\ell < E_r \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_\ell$.

```
1  $L := 1$ 
2 while True do
3   Compute  $L$ -bit approximations  $\tilde{E}_\ell$  and  $\tilde{E}_r$  of the expressions  $E_\ell$  and
    $E_r$ , respectively.
4    $E_\ell^\pm := \max(0, \tilde{E}_\ell \pm 2^{-L})$  and  $E_r^\pm := \max(0, \tilde{E}_r \pm 2^{-L})$ 
5   if  $E_\ell^- > E_r^+$  then
6     return True
   // It follows that  $E_\ell > E_r$ .
7   if  $E_\ell^+ < E_r^-$  then
8     return False
   // It follows that  $E_\ell < E_r$ .
9   if  $\frac{2}{3} \cdot E_\ell^+ \leq E_r^- < E_r^+ \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_\ell^-$ , then
10    return Undecided
   // It follows that  $\frac{2}{3} \cdot E_\ell \leq E_r \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot E_\ell$ .
11   $L := 2 \cdot L$ 
```

Notice that if $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ returns True, then \mathcal{P} also succeeds, however, this does not hold for the opposite direction. In addition, if $\mathcal{P}_{\frac{3}{2}}$ succeeds, then $E_\ell > E_r$ and E_ℓ cannot be a relative $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation of E_r . Hence, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ must return True. We conclude that our soft-predicate is somehow located "in between" the two predicates \mathcal{P} and $\mathcal{P}_{\frac{3}{2}}$.

We now return to the special case, where $\mathcal{P} = T_k(m, r, 1, F)$, with $E_\ell = \frac{|F^{(k)}(m)| \cdot r^k}{k!}$ and $E_r = \sum_{i \neq k} \frac{|F^{(i)}(m)| \cdot r^i}{i!}$ the two expressions on the left and the right side of (3), respectively. Then, success of \mathcal{P} implies that the disk $\Delta = \Delta(m, r)$ contains exactly k roots of F , whereas a failure of \mathcal{P} yields no further information. Now, let us consider the corresponding soft predicate $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ of $\mathcal{P} = T_k(\Delta, F)$. If $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ returns True, then this implies success of \mathcal{P} . In addition, notice that success of $T_k(\Delta, \frac{3}{2}, F)$ implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ returns True, and thus we may replace $T_k(\Delta, \frac{3}{2}, F)$ by $\tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ in the second part of Theorem 2. Similarly, in Lemma 3, we may also replace $T_k^G(\Delta, \frac{3}{2}, F)$ by the soft-version $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ of $T_k^G(\Delta, F)$. We give more details for the computation of $\tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ and $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ in Algorithm 4 and Algorithm 5, which are essentially applications of Algorithm 3 to the predicates $T_k(\Delta, F)$ and $T_k^G(\Delta, F)$. The lemma below summarizes our results. Based on Lemma 4, we also provide a bound on the precision L for which Algorithm 4 terminates and a bound for the bit complexity of Algorithm 4. A corresponding bound for the bit complexity of carrying out the $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ -test for all $k = 0, \dots, n$ is given in Lemma 5.

Lemma 5. *For a disk $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ in the complex plane and a polynomial*

Algorithm 4: $\tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ -test

Input : A polynomial $F(x)$ as in (1), a disk $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ in the complex plane, and an integer k with $0 \leq k \leq n$.

Output : True, False, Undecided. If the algorithm returns True, the disk $\Delta(m, r)$ contains exactly k roots.

```
1  $L := 1$ 
2 while True do
3   Compute an approximation  $\tilde{F}_\Delta(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n \tilde{f}_i x^i$  of the polynomial
    $F_\Delta(x) := \sum_{i=0}^n f_i \cdot x^i := F(m + r \cdot x)$  such that  $\tilde{f}_i \cdot 2^{L + \lceil \log(n+1) \rceil} \in \mathbb{Z}$ 
   and  $|f_i - \tilde{f}_i| < 2^{-L + \lceil \log(n+1) \rceil}$  for all  $i$ .
   //  $(L + \lceil \log(n+1) \rceil)$ -bit approximation of  $F_\Delta$ .
4    $f_i^- := \max(0, |\tilde{f}_i| - 2^{-L - \lceil \log(n+1) \rceil})$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n$ .
5    $f_i^+ := |\tilde{f}_i| + 2^{-L - \lceil \log(n+1) \rceil}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n$ .
   // lower and upper bounds for  $|f_i|$ .
6   if  $f_k^- - \sum_{i \neq k} f_i^+ > 0$  then
7     return True
   // It follows that  $T_k(\Delta, F)$  succeeds.
8   if  $\sum_{i \neq k} f_i^- - f_k^+ > 0$  then
9     return False
   // It follows that  $T_k(\Delta, F)$  fails.
10  if  $\sum_{i \neq k} f_i^- - \frac{2}{3} \cdot f_k^+ \geq 0$  and  $\frac{3}{2} \cdot f_k^- - \sum_{i \neq k} f_i^+ \geq 0$  then
11    return False
12   $L := 2 \cdot L$ 
```

$F \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ of degree n , the $\tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ -test terminates with an absolute precision L that is upper bounded by

$$L(\Delta, F) := L(m, r, F) := 2 \cdot (4 + \lceil \log(\|F_\Delta\|_\infty^{-1}) \rceil). \quad (8)$$

If $T_k(\Delta, \frac{3}{2}, F)$ succeeds, the $\tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ -test returns True. The cost for running the $\tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ -test for all $k = 0, \dots, n$ is upper bounded by

$$\tilde{O}(n(n \cdot \lceil \log(m, r) \rceil + \tau_F + L(\Delta, F)))$$

bit operations. The algorithm needs an $\tilde{O}(n \cdot \lceil \log(m, r) \rceil + \tau_F + L(\Delta, F))$ -bit approximation of F .

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P} := T_k(\Delta, 1, F)$ be the predicate that succeeds if and only if $E_\ell > E_r$, with $E_\ell := |f_k|$ and $E_r := \sum_{i \neq k} |f_i|$. Then, $E_\ell^\pm := f_k^\pm$ and $E_r^\pm := \sum_{i \neq k} f_i^\pm$ are lower and upper bounds for E_ℓ and E_r , respectively, such that $|E_\ell^\pm - E_\ell| \leq 2^{-L+1}$ and $|E_r^\pm - E_r| \leq 2^{-L+1}$. Hence, Lemma 4 yields that Algorithm 4 terminates for an L smaller than $2 \cdot (4 + \lceil \log(\max(E_\ell, E_r)^{-1}) \rceil) \leq L(\Delta, F)$.

We have already argued above that success of the predicate $\mathcal{P}_{\frac{3}{2}} = T_k(\Delta, \frac{3}{2}, F)$ implies that $\tilde{P} = \tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ returns True. Hence, it remains to show the claim on the bit complexity for carrying out the $\tilde{T}_k(\Delta, F)$ -test for all $k = 0, \dots, n$. For a given L , we can compute an $(L + \lceil \log(n+1) \rceil)$ -bit approximation $\tilde{F}_\Delta(x) =$

Algorithm 5: $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ -Test

Input : Polynomial $F(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, a disk $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ in the complex space.

Output : True, False, or Undecided. If the algorithm returns True, Δ contains exactly k roots.

- 1 Let $F_\Delta^{[N]}(x)$ be the N -th Graeffe iterate of $F_\Delta(x) := F(m + r \cdot x)$, where $N := \lceil \log(1 + \log n) \rceil + 5$
 - 2 Output $\tilde{T}_k(0, 1, F_\Delta^{[N]})$.
-

$\sum_{i=0}^n \tilde{f}_i x^i$ of F_Δ with a number of bit operations that is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(m, r) + L))$; e.g. see the first part of the proof of [38, Lemma 17]. For a fixed k , the computation of the signs of the sums in each of the three IF clauses needs n additions of dyadic numbers with denominators of bitsize $\lceil \log(n+1) \rceil + L$ and with numerators of bitsize $O(L + n \overline{\log}(r) + \tau_F)$, hence the cost is bounded by $O(n(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(r) + L))$ bit operations. Notice that, when passing from one k to a $k' \neq k$, the corresponding sums in one IF clause differ only by two terms, that is, f_k^\pm and $f_{k'}^\pm$. Hence, we can decide all IF clauses *for all* k using $O(n)$ additions. Furthermore, we double the precision L in each step, and the algorithm terminates for an L smaller than $L(\Delta, F)$. Hence, L is doubled at most $\log L(\Delta, F)$ many times, and thus the total cost for all k is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(m, r) + L(\Delta, F)))$ bit operations. \square

We now extend the above soft-variant of the T_k -test to a corresponding soft-variant of the T_k^G -test, which we denote \tilde{T}_k^G ; see Algorithm 5 for details. The following result, which can be considered as the "soft variant" of Lemma 3, then follows immediately from Lemma 3 and Lemma 5:

Lemma 6 (Soft-version of Lemma 3). *Let $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ be a disk in the complex plane, $F(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree n , and let N , ρ_1 and ρ_2 be defined as in Lemma 3. Then, it holds:*

- (a) *If Δ is (ρ_1, ρ_2) -isolating for a set of k roots of F , then $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ succeeds.*
- (b) *If $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ succeeds, then Δ contains exactly k roots.*

For the complexity analysis of our root isolation algorithm (see Section 4), we provide a bound on the total cost for running the $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta)$ -test for all $k = 0, \dots, n$:

Lemma 7. *The total cost for carrying out all $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ -tests, with $k = 0, \dots, n$, is bounded by*

$$\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(m, r) + L(\Delta, F)))$$

bit operations. For this, we need an $\tilde{O}(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(m, r) + L(\Delta, F))$ -bit approximation of F .

Proof. According to Lemma 5, the computation of $\tilde{T}_k(0, 1, F_\Delta^{[N]})$ needs an L -bit approximation $\tilde{F}_\Delta^{[N]}$ of $F_\Delta^{[N]}$, with L bounded by

$$\tilde{O}(n + \tau_{F_\Delta^{[N]}} + L(0, 1, F_\Delta^{[N]})) = \tilde{O}(n + \overline{\log}(\|F_\Delta^{[N]}\|_\infty, \|F_\Delta^{[N]}\|_\infty^{-1})). \quad (9)$$

Given such an approximation $\tilde{F}_\Delta^{[N]}$, the cost for running the test for all $k = 0, \dots, n$ is then bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(n + \tau_{F_\Delta^{[N]}} + L))$ bit operations. In each of the $N = O(\log \log n)$ Graeffe iterations, the size of $\overline{\log}(\|F_\Delta^{[i]}\|_\infty, \|F_\Delta^{[i]}\|_\infty^{-1})$ increases by at most a factor of two plus an additive term $4n$; see Theorem 3. Hence, we must have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\log}(\|F_\Delta^{[i]}\|_\infty, \|F_\Delta^{[i]}\|_\infty^{-1}) &= O(\log n \cdot \overline{\log}(\|F_\Delta\|_\infty, \|F_\Delta\|_\infty^{-1}) + n \log n) \\ &= \tilde{O}(n \overline{\log}(m, r) + \tau_F + L(\Delta, F)) \end{aligned}$$

for all $i = 0, \dots, N$. We conclude that the above bound (9) for L can be replaced by $\tilde{O}(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(m, r) + L(\Delta, F))$.

It remains to bound the cost for computing an approximation $\tilde{F}_\Delta^{[N]}$ of $F_\Delta^{[N]}$ with $\|F_\Delta^{[N]} - \tilde{F}_\Delta^{[N]}\|_\infty < 2^{-L}$. Suppose that, for a given $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$ we have computed an approximation \tilde{F}_Δ of F_Δ , with $\|F_\Delta - \tilde{F}_\Delta\|_\infty < 2^{-\rho}$. According to [40, Theorem 8.4] (see also [18, Theorem 14] and [38, Lemma 17]), this can be achieved using a number of bit operations bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(n \overline{\log}(m, r) + \tau_F + \rho))$. In each Graeffe iteration, an approximation $\tilde{F}_\Delta^{[i]}$ of $F_\Delta^{[i]}$ is split into two polynomials $\tilde{F}_{\Delta,o}^{[i]}$ and $\tilde{F}_{\Delta,e}^{[i]}$ with coefficients of comparable bitsize (and half the degree), and an approximation $\tilde{F}_\Delta^{[i+1]}$ of $F_\Delta^{[i+1]}$ is then computed as the difference of $\tilde{F}_{\Delta,e}^{[i]}$ and $x \cdot \tilde{F}_{\Delta,o}^{[i]}$. If all computations are carried out with fixed point arithmetic and an absolute precision of ρ bits after the binary point, then the precision loss in the i -th step, with $i = 0, \dots, N$, is bounded by $O(\log n + \log \|F_\Delta^{[i]}\|_\infty) = O(2^i(\log n + \log \|F_\Delta\|_\infty)) = O(\log n(\log n + \log \|F_\Delta\|_\infty))$ bits after the binary point. The cost for the two multiplications and the addition is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\rho + \log \|F_\Delta^{[i]}\|_\infty))$. Since there are only $N = O(\log \log n)$ many iterations, we conclude that it suffices to start with an approximation \tilde{F}_Δ of F_Δ , with $\|F_\Delta - \tilde{F}_\Delta\|_\infty < 2^{-\rho}$ and $\rho = \tilde{O}(n \overline{\log}(m, r) + \tau_F + L(\Delta, F))$. The total cost for all Graeffe iterations is then bounded by $\tilde{O}(n\rho)$ bit operations, hence the claim follows. \square

3.4 A Short Summary

Before we proceed with the section, where we give our algorithm for isolating the complex roots of F , we briefly summarize the key properties of the \tilde{T}_k^G -test:

- If $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ holds for some disk Δ , then Δ contains exactly k roots.
- If Δ is (ρ_1, ρ_2) -isolating for a set of k roots of F , where $\rho_1 = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \approx 0.94$ and $\rho_2 = \frac{4}{3}$, then $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ succeeds.
- In particular, $\tilde{T}_0^G(\Delta, F)$ succeeds if $\frac{4}{3} \cdot \Delta$ contains no root.
- The cost for running the $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ -test for all k is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(m, r) + \overline{\log}(\|F_\Delta\|_\infty^{-1})))$ bit operations, and thus directly related to the size of Δ and the maximum absolute value that F takes on the disk Δ . Here, we use that $\max_{z \in \Delta} |F(z)|$ as shown in the proof of Theorem 3.

4 CIsolate: An Algorithm for Root Isolation

We can now formulate our algorithm, which we denote by CIsolate, to isolate all complex roots of a polynomial $F(x)$ that are contained in some given box¹⁰ $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{C}$. If the enlarged box $2\mathcal{B}$ contains only simple roots of F , then our algorithm returns isolating disks for all roots that are contained in \mathcal{B} . However, it might also return isolating disks for some of the roots that are not contained in \mathcal{B} but in the complement $2\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}$. In particular, in the important special case, where F is square-free and where we start with a box \mathcal{B} that is known to contain all complex roots of F , our algorithm isolates all complex roots of F . Before we give details, we need some further definitions, which we provide in Section 4.1. In Section 4.2, we first give an overview of our algorithm before we provide details and the proof for termination and correctness.

4.1 Connected Components

Given a set $S = \{B_1, \dots, B_m\}$ of boxes $B_1, \dots, B_m \subset \mathbb{C}$, we say that two boxes $B, B' \in S$ are connected in S ($B \sim_S B'$ for short) if there exist boxes $B_{i_1}, \dots, B_{i_{s'}} \in S$ with $B_{i_1} = B$, $B_{i_{s'}} = B'$, and $B_{i_j} \cap B_{i_{j+1}} \neq \emptyset$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s' - 1$. This yields a decomposition of S into equivalence classes $C_1, \dots, C_k \subset S$ that correspond to maximal connected and disjoint components $\bar{C}_\ell = \bigcup_{B_i \in C_\ell} B_i$, with $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. Notice that C_ℓ is defined as the set of boxes B_i that belong to the same equivalence class, whereas \bar{C}_ℓ denotes the closed region in \mathbb{C} that consists of all points that are contained in a box $B_i \in C_\ell$. However, for simplicity, we abuse notation and simply use C to denote the set of boxes B contained in a component C as well as to denote the set of points contained in the closed region \bar{C} . Now, let $C = \{B_1, \dots, B_s\}$ be a connected component consisting of equally sized boxes B_i of width w , then we define (see also Figure 1):

- B_C is the square axis-aligned closed box in \mathbb{C} of minimal width such that $C \subset B_C$ and

$$\min_{z \in B_C} \Re(z) = \min_{z \in C} \Re(z) \text{ and } \max_{z \in B_C} \Im(z) = \max_{z \in C} \Im(z),$$

where $\Re(z)$ denotes the real part and $\Im(z)$ the imaginary part of an arbitrary complex value z . We further denote m_C the center of B_C , and $\Delta_C := \Delta(m_C, \frac{3}{4}w(B_C))$ a disk containing B_C , and thus also C . Notice that $\rho_1 \cdot \Delta_C$, with $\rho_1 = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3}$, also contains C .

We further define the *diameter* $w(C)$ of the component C to be the width of B_C , i.e. $w(C) := w(B_C)$, and $r(C) := \frac{w(C)}{2}$ to be the *radius* of C .

- $C^+ := \bigcup_{B_i \in C} 2B_i$ is defined as the union of the enlarged boxes $2B_i$. Notice that C^+ is the open $\frac{w}{2}$ -neighborhood of C (w.r.t. max-norm).

¹⁰As already mentioned in Section 2, we only consider closed, axis-aligned and squared boxes $B \subset \mathbb{C}$. Hence, these properties are not further mentioned throughout the following considerations.

4.2 The Algorithm

We start with an informal description of our algorithm `CISOLATE`, where we focus on the main ideas explaining the ratio behind our choices. For the sake of comprehensibility, we slightly simplified some steps at the cost of exactness, hence, the considerations below should be taken with a grain of salt. A precise definition of the algorithm including all details is given in Algorithm 6 and the subroutines `NEWTONTTEST` (Algorithm 7) and `BISECTION` (Algorithm 8).

From a high-level perspective, our algorithm follows the classical subdivision approach of Weyl [47]. That is, starting from the input box \mathcal{B} , we recursively subdivide \mathcal{B} into smaller boxes, and we remove boxes for which we can show that they do not contain a root of F . Eventually, the algorithm returns regions that are isolating for a root of F . In order to discard a box B , with $B \subset \mathcal{B}$, we call the $\tilde{T}_0^G(\Delta_B, F)$ -test, with Δ_B the disk containing B . The remaining boxes are then clustered into maximal connected components. We further check whether a component C is well separated from all other components, that is, we test whether the distance from C to all other components is considerably larger than its diameter. If this is the case, we use the \tilde{T}_k^G -test, for $k = 1, \dots, n$, in order to determine the “multiplicity” k_C of the component C , that is, the number of roots contained in the enclosing disk Δ_C ; see Line 9 of Algorithm 6 and Figure 1 for details. If $k_C = 1$, we may return an isolating disk for the unique root. Otherwise, there is a cluster consisting of two or more roots, which still have to be separated from each other. A straight-forward approach to separate these roots from each other is to recursively subdivide each box into four equally sized boxes and to remove boxes until, eventually, each of the remaining components contains exactly one root that is well separated from all other roots; see also Algorithm 8 (`BISECTION`) and Figure 3. However, this approach itself yields only linear convergence to the roots, and, as a consequence, there might exist (e.g. for Mignotte polynomials) long sequences C_1, \dots, C_s of interlaced connected components with invariant multiplicity k , that is $C_1 \supset C_2 \supset \dots \supset C_s$ and $k = k_{C_1} = \dots = k_{C_s} > 1$. The main idea to traverse such sequences more efficiently is to consider a cluster of k roots as a single root of multiplicity k and to use Newton iteration (for multiple roots) to compute a better approximation of this root. For this, we use an adaptive trial and error approach similar to the quadratic interval refinement (QIR) method, first introduced by Abbott [1]; see Algorithm 7 (`NEWTONTTEST`) and Figure 2. In its original form, QIR has been combined with the secant method to efficiently refine an interval that is already known to be isolating for a real root of a real polynomial. Recent work [35] considers a modified approach of the QIR method that uses Newton iteration (for multiple roots) and Descartes’ Rule of Signs. It has been refined and integrated in almost optimal methods [38, 36] for isolating and approximating the real roots of a real (sparse) polynomial, where it constitutes the crucial ingredient for quadratic convergence. In this paper, we further extend the QIR approach for approximating complex roots of a polynomial. The main crux of the `NEWTONTTEST` (and the QIR method in general) is that we never have to check in advance whether Newton iteration actually yields an improved approximation of the cluster of roots. Instead, correctness is verified independently using the \tilde{T}_k^G -test. In order to achieve quadratic convergence in the presence of a well isolated root cluster, we assign, in each iteration, an integer N_C to each component C . The reader may think of N_C as the actual speed of convergence to the cluster of roots

Algorithm 6: \mathbb{C} ISOLATE

Input : A polynomial $F(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ as in (1) and a box $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{C}$ of width $w_0 := w(\mathcal{B}) = 2^{\ell_0}$, with $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$; F has only simple roots in $2\mathcal{B}$.

Output: A list \mathcal{O} of disjoint disks $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_s \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that, for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, the disk Δ_i as well as the enlarged disk $2\Delta_i$ is isolating for a root of F that is contained in $2\mathcal{B}$. In addition, for each root z contained in \mathcal{B} , there exists a disk $\Delta_i \in \mathcal{O}$ that isolates z .

```
1  $\mathcal{O} = \{\}$  // list of isolating disks
2  $\mathcal{C} = \{(\mathcal{B}, 4)\}$  // list of pairs  $(C, N_C)$ , where  $C$  is a connected
// component consisting of  $s_C$  equally sized boxes,
// each of width  $2^{\ell_C}$ , where  $\ell_C \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq \ell_0}$ .  $N_C$  is an
// integer with  $N_C = 2^{2^{n_C}}$  and  $n_C \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ .

// * Preprocessing */
3 repeat
4   Let  $(C, N_C)$  be the unique pair in  $\mathcal{C}$ 
// If  $\bigcup_{C:(C, N_C) \in \mathcal{C}} C = \mathcal{B}$ , then there exists a
// unique component  $C$  with  $(C, N_C) \in \mathcal{C}$ .
// * linear step */
5    $\{C'_1, \dots, C'_\ell\} := \text{BISECTION}(C)$  and  $\mathcal{C} = \{(C'_1, 4), \dots, (C'_\ell, 4)\}$ 
6 until  $\bigcup_{C:(C, N_C) \in \mathcal{C}} C \neq \mathcal{B}$ 

// * Main Loop */
7 while  $\mathcal{C}$  is non-empty do
8   Remove a pair  $(C, N_C)$  from  $\mathcal{C}$ .
9   if  $4\Delta_C \cap C' = \emptyset$  for each  $C' \neq C$  with  $(C', N_{C'}) \in \mathcal{C}$  and there exists a
 $k_C \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G(2\Delta_C, F)$  and  $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G(4\Delta_C, F)$  succeed then
// If the second condition holds,  $k_C$  equals the
// number of roots contained in  $2\Delta_C$  and  $4\Delta_C$ .
10  if  $k_C = 1$  then
|   Add the disk  $2\Delta_C$  to  $\mathcal{O}$ , continue
11  if  $k_C > 1$  then
12  |   Let  $x_C \in \mathcal{B} \setminus C$  be an arbitrary point with distance  $2^{\ell_C - 1}$ 
|   from  $C$  and distance  $2^{\ell_C - 1}$  or more from the boundary of  $\mathcal{B}$ .
|   // Existence of such a point follows from the
|   // proof of Theorem 4. It holds that  $F(x_C) \neq 0$ .
13  |   if  $\text{NEWTONTTEST}(C, N_C, k_C, x_C) = (\text{SUCCESS}, C')$  then
14  |   |   // * quadratic step */
|   |   Add  $(C', N_C^2)$  to  $\mathcal{C}$ , continue
|   // * linear step */
15  |    $\{C'_1, \dots, C'_\ell\} := \text{BISECTION}(C)$ .
16  |   Add  $(C'_1, \max(4, \sqrt{N_C}))$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $(C'_\ell, \max(4, \sqrt{N_C}))$  to  $\mathcal{C}$ .
17 return  $\mathcal{O}$ .
```

Algorithm 7: NEWTONTEST

Input : A tuple (C, N_C, k_C, x_C) : $C = \{B_1, \dots, B_{s_C}\}$ is a connected component consisting of equally sized and aligned boxes B_i contained in \mathcal{B} and of size 2^{ℓ_C} , N_C is an integer of the form 2^{2^c} with $n_C \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, k_C is the number of roots in $4\Delta_C$, and x_C is a point with $F(x_C) \neq 0$.

Output: Either FAILURE or (SUCCESS, C'), where $C' \subset C$ is a connected component that contains all roots contained in C . C' consists of at most 4 equally sized and aligned boxes, each of width $\frac{2^{\ell_C-1}}{N_C}$.

1 **if** Algorithm 3 does not return False for the input $E_\ell := 4r(C)|F'(x_C)|$
and $E_r := |F(x_C)|$ **then** // This implies $|F(x_C)| < 6r(C)|F'(x_C)|$.

2 **for** $L = 1, 2, 4, \dots$ **do**

3 Compute L -bit approximations of $F(x_C)$ and $F'(x_C)$ and derive an
 $(6 - \ell_C + \log N_C)$ -bit approximation \tilde{x}'_C of the Newton iterate

$$x'_C := x_C - k_C \cdot \frac{F(x_C)}{F'(x_C)} \quad \text{such that } |\tilde{x}'_C - x'_C| < \frac{1}{64} \cdot \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{N_C}. \quad (10)$$

 // For details, consider the similar computation
 // in [38, Step 2 of NEWTONTEST].

4 Let $\Delta' := \Delta(\tilde{x}'_C, \frac{1}{8} \cdot \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{N_C})$.

5 **if** $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G(\Delta', F)$ holds // This implies that Δ' contains all
 // roots that are contained in $2\Delta_C$.

6 **then**

7 Decompose each box B_i into $4N_C^2$ many equally sized subboxes $B_{i,j}$

8 **return** (SUCCESS, C'), with C' the unique connected component
 consisting of all boxes $B_{i,j}$ of width $\frac{2^{\ell_C-1}}{N_C}$ that intersect Δ' .

9 **return** FAILURE

contained in C . Then, in case of success of the NEWTONTEST, the component C is replaced by a component $C' \subset C$ of diameter $w(C') \approx w(C) \cdot N_C^{-1}$. In this case, we “square the speed” of convergence, that is, we set $N_{C'} := N_C^2$. If the NEWTONTEST fails, we fall back to bisection and decrease the speed of convergence, that is, we set $N_{C'} := \sqrt{N_C}$ for all components C' into which the component C is split. Our analysis shows that the NEWTONTEST is the crucial ingredient for quadratic convergence. More precisely, we prove that, in the worst-case, the length of each sequence C_1, \dots, C_s as above is logarithmic in the length of such a sequence if only bisection is used; see Lemma 10.

We now turn to the proof of termination and correctness of the algorithm. In addition, we derive further properties, which will turn out to be useful in the analysis.

Theorem 4. *The algorithm CISOLATE terminates and returns a correct result. In addition, at any stage of the algorithm, it holds that:*

(a) *For any $(C, N_C) \in \mathcal{C}$, the connected component C consists of disjoint,*

Algorithm 8: BISECTION

Input : A connected component $C = \{B_1, \dots, B_{s_C}\}$ consisting of aligned boxes B_i , each of width $w(B_i) = 2^{\ell_C}$.

Output: A list of components $C'_j \subset C$, each consisting of aligned and equally sized boxes of width 2^{ℓ_C-1} . The union of all C'_j contains all roots of F that are contained in C .

```

1  $C' := \emptyset$ 
2 for each  $B_i \in C$  do
3   Remove  $B_i$  from  $C$  and subdivide  $B_i$  into four equally sized sub-boxes
    $B_{i,j}$ , with  $j = 1, \dots, 4$ , and add these to  $C'$ .
4 for each  $B \in C'$  do
5   if  $\tilde{T}_0^G(\Delta_B, F)$  holds // This implies that  $B$  contains no root.
6   then
7     Remove  $B$  from  $C'$ .
8 Compute maximal connected components  $C'_1, \dots, C'_\ell$  from the boxes in  $C'$ .
9 return  $C'_1, \dots, C'_\ell$ 

```

aligned, and equally-sized boxes B_1, \dots, B_{s_C} , each of width 2^{ℓ_C} with some $\ell_C \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(b) For any two distinct pairs $(C_1, N_{C_1}) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $(C_2, N_{C_2}) \in \mathcal{C}$, the distance between C_1 and C_2 is at least $\max(2^{\ell_{C_1}}, 2^{\ell_{C_2}})$. In particular, the enlarged regions C_1^+ and C_2^+ are disjoint.

(c) The union of all connected components C covers all roots of F contained in \mathcal{B} . In mathematical terms,

$$F(z) \neq 0 \text{ for all } z \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \bigcup_{C: (C, N_C) \in \mathcal{C}} C.$$

(d) For each box B produced by the algorithm that is not equal to the initial box \mathcal{B} , the enlarged box $2B$ contains at least one root of F .

(e) Each component C considered by the algorithm consists of $s_C \leq 9 \cdot |\mathcal{Z}(C^+)|$ boxes. The total number of boxes in all components C is at most 9-times the number of roots contained in $2\mathcal{B}$, that is,¹¹

$$\sum_{C: \exists (C, N_C) \in \mathcal{C}} s_C \leq 9 \cdot |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|.$$

(f) For each component C produced by the algorithm, $w(C) \leq \frac{4w(\mathcal{B})}{N_C}$, and

(g) $\frac{\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^2}{2^{17} \cdot n^2 \cdot w(\mathcal{B})} \leq 2^{\ell_C} \leq w(\mathcal{B})$ and $4 \leq N_C \leq \left(\frac{2^9 \cdot w(\mathcal{B})}{\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})}\right)^2$, where $\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B}) := \min_{i: z_i \in 2\mathcal{B}} \sigma_F(z_i)$ is the separation of F restricted to $2\mathcal{B}$.

¹¹We will later prove that even the total number of boxes produced by the algorithm in all iterations is near linear in the number $|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|$ of roots contained in $2\mathcal{B}$.




Figure 1: A component $C_1 := C$ consisting of 5 boxes B_1, \dots, B_5 , the enclosing box \mathcal{B}_C with center $m := m_C$ and the disks Δ_C , $2\Delta_C$ and $4\Delta_C$. The disk $4\Delta_C$ intersects the component C_2 but does not intersect the component C_3 .

Proof. Part (a) follows almost immediately via induction. Namely, a component C consisting of boxes of size 2^{ℓ_C} is either replaced by a single connected component consisting of (at most 4) boxes of width $2^{\ell_C-1}/N_C$ in line 14 after NEWTONTEST was called, or it is replaced by a set of connected components $C' \subset C$, each consisting of boxes of size 2^{ℓ_C-1} in line 16 after BISECTION was called.

For (b), we can also use induction on the number of iterations. Suppose first that a component C is obtained from processing a component D in line 16. If C is the only connected component obtained from D , then, by the induction hypotheses, it follows that the distance to all other components C' , with $C' \cap D = \emptyset$, is at least $\max(2^{\ell_D}, 2^{\ell_{C'}}) \geq \max(2^{\ell_C}, 2^{\ell_{C'}})$. If D splits into several components C_1, \dots, C_s , with $s > 1$, their distance to any component C' , with $C' \cap D = \emptyset$, is at least $\max(2^{\ell_D}, 2^{\ell_{C'}}) \geq \max(2^{\ell_{C_i}}, 2^{\ell_{C'}})$ for all i . In addition, the pairwise distance of two disjoint components C_i and C_j is at least $2^{\ell_C-1} = 2^{\ell_{C_i}}$ for all i . Finally, suppose that, in line 14, we replace a component D by a single component C . In this case, $C \subset D$ and C consists of boxes of width $2^{\ell-1}/N_C$. Hence, the distance from C to any other component C' is also lower bounded by $\max(2^{\ell_C}, 2^{\ell_{C'}})$.

For (c), notice that in line 7 of BISECTION, we discard a box B only if the $\tilde{T}_0^G(\Delta_B, F)$ -test succeeds. Hence, in this case, B contains no root of F . It remains to show that each root of F contained in C is also contained in C' , where $C' \subset C$ is a connected component as produced in line 14 after NEWTONTEST was called. If the $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G(\Delta', F)$ -test succeeds, then Δ' contains k_C roots; see Lemma 6. Hence, since Δ' is contained in $2\Delta_C$, and since $2\Delta_C$ also contains k_C roots (as $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G(2\Delta_C, F)$ holds), it follows that Δ' contains all roots that are contained in




Figure 2: The NEWTONTEST: If $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G(\Delta', F)$, with $\Delta' := \Delta(\tilde{x}'_C, \frac{2^{\ell_C-3}}{N_C})$, succeeds, then Δ' contains exactly k_C roots of F . Since $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G(2\Delta_C, F)$ also succeeds and $C^+ \subset 2\Delta_C$, it follows that Δ' contains all roots contained in C^+ . The sub-boxes $B_{i,j}$ of width $\frac{2^{\ell_C-1}}{N_C}$ that intersect Δ' yield a connected component C' of width at most $\frac{2^{\ell_C}}{N_C} \leq \frac{w(C)}{N_C}$. In addition, all roots that are contained in C are also contained in C' . Further notice that if \tilde{x}'_C is contained in C , then Δ' intersects at most four boxes $B_{i,j}$. Otherwise, it intersects at most three boxes. In each case, the boxes are connected with each other, and the corresponding connected component C' has width at most $\frac{2^{\ell_C}}{N_C} \leq \frac{w(C)}{N_C}$.

C . The disk Δ' intersects no other component $C' \neq C$ as the distance from C to C' is larger than 2^{ℓ_C} , and thus, by induction, we conclude that $(\Delta' \cap \mathcal{B}) \setminus C$ contains no root of F . This shows that C' already contains all roots contained in C .

We can now prove part (d) and part (e). Any box $B \neq \mathcal{B}$ that is considered by the algorithm either results from the BISECTION or from NEWTONTEST routine. If a box B results from the BISECTION routine, then the disk $\Delta_B = \Delta(m_B, w(B))$ contains at least one root of F , and thus also $2B$ contains at least one root. If a box B results from the NEWTONTEST routine, then $2B$ even contains two roots or more. Namely, in this case, the $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G$ -test succeeds for a disk $\Delta' = \Delta(m', r')$, with $r' = \frac{1}{4}w(B)$ and some $k_C > 1$, and thus Δ' contains k_C roots. Since $2B$ contains the latter disk, $2B$ must contain at least k_C roots. This shows (d). From (d), we immediately conclude that, for each component $C \neq \mathcal{B}$ produced by the algorithm, the enlarged component C^+ contains at least one root of F . In addition, since C^+ is contained in $2\mathcal{B}$, each of these roots must be contained in $2\mathcal{B}$. The first part in (e) now follows from the fact that, for a fixed root of F , there can be at most 9 different boxes B of the same size such that $2B$ contains this root. From part (b), it follows that, for any two distinct components C_1 and C_2 , the enlarged components C_1^+ and C_2^+ do not intersect, and thus the total number of boxes in all components is upper bounded by $9 \cdot |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|$, which




Figure 3: The BISECTION routine: The orange sub-boxes are all boxes on which the \tilde{T}_0^G -test does not hold. They are grouped together into three maximal connected components, which contain all roots contained in C . All other sub-boxes are discarded.

proves the second part in (e).

For (f), we may assume that $N_C > 4$ as, otherwise, the inequality becomes trivial. Notice that there is a unique maximal sequence C_1, \dots, C_s of components C_i , with $C_1 := \mathcal{B}$, $C_s = C$, and $C_i \supset C_{i+1}$, that connects \mathcal{B} with C . In order to reach N_C , there must have been quadratic steps from C_i to C_{i+1} for indices $i = i_m$, with $m = 1, \dots, \log \log \sqrt{N_C}$ and $N_{C_i} = 2^{2^m}$. Since, in each such quadratic step, the width of C_i is lowered by a factor $N_{C_i}^{-1}$ or more, and since, in each linear step, the width of C_i does not grow, we must have $w(C) \leq w(\mathcal{B}) \cdot (4 \cdot 16 \cdots \sqrt{N_C})^{-1} \leq w(\mathcal{B}) \cdot 2^{-(2^{n_C} + 1)} = \frac{2w(\mathcal{B})}{N_C}$.

We can now show that the algorithm terminates; the inequality in (g) will then follow from the proof of termination: Suppose that the algorithm produces a sequence C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s of connected components, with $s \geq \log n + 6$ and $C_1 \supset C_2 \supset \dots \supset C_s$. If, for at least one index $i \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$, C_{i+1} is obtained from C_i via a quadratic step, then $w(C_{i+1}) \leq w(C_i)/N_{C_i} \leq w(C_i)/4$. Hence, in this case, we also have $w(C_s) \leq \frac{w(C_1)}{4}$. Now, suppose that each C_{i+1} is obtained from C_i via a linear step, then each box in C_i has size $2^{\ell_{C_i} - i + 1}$, and thus $w(C_s) \leq 9n \cdot 2^{\ell_{C_1} - s + 1} \leq \frac{w(C_1)}{2}$. This shows that, after at most $\log n + 6$ iterations, the width of each connected component is halved. Hence, in order to prove termination of the algorithm, it suffices to prove that each component C of small enough width is terminal, that is C is replaced by an isolating disk in line 10 or discarded in NEWTONTEST or BISECTION. The following argument shows that each component C of width smaller than $w := \frac{1}{32} \cdot \sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})$ that is not discarded is replaced by an isolating disk. We have already shown that C^+ must contain a root ξ of F , and thus we have $|m_C - \xi| < 2w(C) < \sigma_F(\xi)/16$ and $r_C < \sigma_F(\xi)/16$. We conclude that the disks $2\Delta_C$ and $\Delta(m_C, 8r_C)$ are both isolating for ξ . Then, Lemma 6 guarantees that the $\tilde{T}_1^G(2\Delta_C, F)$ -test and the $\tilde{T}_1^G(4\Delta_C, F)$ -test succeed. Hence, if $4\Delta_C$ intersects no other component $C' \neq C$, then the algorithm replaces C by the isolating disk $2\Delta_C$ in line 10,

because the if-clause in line 9 succeeds with $k_C = 1$. It remains to show that the latter assumption is always fulfilled. Namely, suppose that $4\Delta_C$ intersects a component $C' \neq C$, and let B and B' be arbitrary boxes contained in C and C' , respectively. Then, the enlarged boxes $2B$ and $2B'$ contain roots ξ and ξ' , respectively, and ξ and ξ' must be distinct as C^+ and $(C')^+$ are disjoint. Hence, the distance between B and B' , and thus also the distance δ between C and C' , must be larger than $\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B}) - 2^{\ell_C} - 2^{\ell_{C'}} = 32w - 2^{\ell_C} - 2^{\ell_{C'}} \geq 31w - 2^{\ell_{C'}}$. Hence, if $2^{\ell_{C'}} \leq 25w$, then $4\Delta_C \subset \Delta(m_C, 6w)$ does not intersect C' . Vice versa, if $2^{\ell_{C'}} > 25w$, then the distance between C and C' is at least $\max(2^{\ell_C}, 2^{\ell_{C'}}) > 25w$, and thus $4\Delta_C$ does not intersect C' as well. Notice that (g) now follows almost directly from the above considerations. Indeed, let $C \neq \mathcal{B}$ be an arbitrary component C and D be any component that contains C . Since D is not terminal, we conclude that $w(D) \geq w$, and thus $N_D \leq \frac{4w(\mathcal{B})}{w}$ according to (f). Since N_C is smaller than or equal to the square of the maximum of all values N_D , the second inequality in (g) follows. The first inequality follows from the fact that $2^{\ell_C} \geq \min_{D:C \subset D} \frac{2^{\ell_D-1}}{N_D} \geq \frac{w}{9n \cdot \max_{D:C \subset D} N_D}$.

For correctness, we remark that each disk D returned by the algorithm is actually isolating for a root of F contained in $2\mathcal{B}$ and that $2D$ also isolates this root. Namely, for each component C produced by the algorithm, the enlarged component C^+ contains at least one root. Now, if the if-clause in line 9 succeeds on C with $k_C = 1$, the $\tilde{T}_1^G(2\Delta_C, F)$ -test succeeds, and thus the disk $2\Delta_C$ contains exactly one root ξ . Hence, since Δ_C contains C^+ , this root must be contained in C^+ . In addition, if also the $\tilde{T}_1^G(4\Delta_C, F)$ -test succeeds, then the disk $4\Delta_C$ isolates ξ as well. Finally, it remains to show that the algorithm returns an isolating disk for each root ξ that is contained in \mathcal{B} . From (a) and (c), we conclude that there is a unique maximal sequence $\mathcal{S} = C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s$ of connected components, with $C_1 \supset C_2 \supset \dots \supset C_s$, such that each C_i contains ξ . Now, when processing C_s , C_s cannot be replaced by other connected components $C' \subset C_s$ as one of these components would contain ξ , and this would contradict the assumption that the sequence \mathcal{S} is maximal. Since C_s contains ξ , it cannot be discarded in BISECTION or NEWTONTEST, hence C_s is replaced by an isolating disk for ξ in line 10. \square

Remarks. We remark that our requirement on the input polynomial F to have only simple roots in $2\mathcal{B}$ is only needed for the termination of the algorithm. Running the algorithm on an arbitrary polynomial (having multiple roots) yields connected components, which converge against the roots of F contained in \mathcal{B} . Namely, if \mathcal{B} is not discarded in the first iteration, then the enlargement C^+ of each component C contains at least one root. Since C consists of at most $9n$ boxes, each of size 2^{ℓ_C} , it holds that each point in C approximates a root of F to an error of less than $n \cdot 2^{\ell_C+4}$. In addition, the union of all components covers all roots contained in \mathcal{B} , and thus our algorithm yields L -bit approximations of all roots in \mathcal{B} if we iterate until $\ell_C \leq -4 - \log n - L$ for all components C . In the special situation, where we run the algorithm on an input box that is known to contain all roots and if, in addition, the number k of distinct roots of F is given as input, our algorithm can be used to return isolating regions for all roots. Namely, in this situation, we may proceed until the total number of connected components C equals k . Then, each of the enlarged components C^+ isolate a root of F . The latter problem is of special interest in the context of computing a cylindrical algebraic decomposition, where we have to isolate the

roots of a not necessarily square-free polynomial with algebraic coefficients. In this case, it might be easier to first compute k via a symbolic pre-computation and to consider sufficiently good approximations of the initial polynomial instead of computing approximations of the square-free part of F . A corresponding approach based on approximate polynomial factorization has been presented in [23], and we refer the reader to this work for more details and for a motivation of the problem.

5 Complexity Analysis

We split the analysis of our algorithm into two parts. In the first part, we focus on the number of iterations that are needed to isolate the roots of $F(x)$ that are contained in a given box \mathcal{B} . We will see that this number is near-linear¹² in $|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|$, the number of roots contained in the enlarged box $2\mathcal{B}$. We further remark that, for any non-negative constant ϵ , the total number iterations is near-linear in $|\mathcal{Z}((1 + \epsilon) \cdot \mathcal{B})|$, however, for the sake of a simplified analysis, we only provide details for the case $\epsilon = 1$. Hence, we conclude that our algorithm performs near-optimal with respect to the number of subdivision steps if the input box \mathcal{B} is chosen in a way such that each root contained in $(1 + \epsilon) \cdot \mathcal{B}$ is also contained in \mathcal{B} ; this is trivially fulfilled if \mathcal{B} is chosen large enough to contain all roots of F .

Then, in the second part, we give bounds on the number of bit operations that are needed to process a component C . This eventually yields a bound on the overall bit complexity that is stated in terms of the degree of F , the absolute values and the separations of the roots in $\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})$, and the absolute value of the derivative F' at these roots. For the special case, where our algorithm is used to isolate all roots of a polynomial of degree n with integer coefficients of bitsize less than τ , the bound on the bit complexity simplifies to $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2\tau)$.

5.1 Size of the Subdivision Tree

We consider the subdivision tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}$, or simply \mathcal{T} , induced by our algorithm, where \mathcal{B} is the initial box/component. More specifically, the nodes of the (undirected) graph \mathcal{T} are the pairs $(C, N_C) \in \mathcal{C}$ produced by the algorithm, and two nodes (C, N_C) and $(C', N_{C'})$ are connected via an edge if and only if $C \subset C'$ (or $C' \subset C$) and there exists no other component C'' with $C \subset C'' \subset C'$ ($C' \subset C'' \subset C$). In the first case, we say that (C, N_C) is a child of $(C', N_{C'})$, whereas, in the second case, (C, N_C) is a parent of $(C', N_{C'})$. For brevity, we usually omit the integer N_C , and just refer to C as the nodes of \mathcal{T} . Notice that, according to Theorem 4, the so obtained graph is indeed a tree rooted at \mathcal{B} . A node C is called *terminal* if and only if it has no children. We further use the following definition to refer to some special nodes:

Definition 3. *A node $(C, N_C) \in \mathcal{T}$ is called special, if one of the following conditions is fulfilled:*

- *The node (C, N_C) is terminal.*

¹²More precisely, it is linear in $|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|$ up to a factor that is polynomially bounded in $\log n$, $\log \log(w(\mathcal{B}))$, and $\log \log(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1})$. If $2\mathcal{B}$ contains no root, then there is only one iteration.

- The node (C, N_C) is the root of \mathcal{T} , that is, $(C, N_C) = (\mathcal{B}, 4)$.
- The node (C, N_C) is the last node for which `BISECTION` is called in the preprocessing phase of the algorithm. We call this node the base of \mathcal{T} . Notice that the first part of the tree consists of a unique path connecting the root and the base of the tree.
- For each child D of C , it holds that $\mathcal{Z}(D^+) \neq \mathcal{Z}(C^+)$.

Roughly speaking, except for the root and the base of \mathcal{T} , special nodes either isolate a root of F or they are split into two or more disjoint clusters each containing roots of F . More precisely, from Lemma 4, we conclude that, for any two distinct nodes $C, D \in \mathcal{T}$, the enlarged regions $\mathcal{Z}(C^+)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(D^+)$ are either disjoint or one of the nodes is an ancestor of the other one. In the latter case, we have $C^+ \subset D^+$ or $D^+ \subset C^+$. Since, for any two children D_1 and D_2 of a node C , the enlarged regions D_1^+ and D_2^+ are disjoint, we have $\sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{Z}(D_i^+) \leq \mathcal{Z}(C^+)$, where D_1 to D_k are the children of C . Hence, since each D_i^+ contains at least one root, the fourth condition in Definition 3 is violated if and only if C has exactly one child D and $\mathcal{Z}(C^+) = \mathcal{Z}(D^+)$. The number of special nodes is at most $2 \cdot (1 + |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|)$ as there is one root and one base, at most $|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|$ terminal nodes C with $C \neq \mathcal{B}$, and each occurrence of a special node, which fulfills the fourth condition, yields a reduction of the non-negative number $\sum_C (|\mathcal{Z}(C^+)| - 1)$ by at least one. The subdivision tree \mathcal{T} now decomposes into special nodes and sequences of non-special nodes C_1, \dots, C_s , with $C_1 \supset C_2 \supset \dots \supset C_s$, that connect two consecutive special nodes. The remainder of this section is dedicated to the proof that the length s of such a sequence is bounded by some value s_{\max} of size

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\max} &= O(\log n + \log \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B}) + \log \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1}))) \\ &= O(\log(n \cdot \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})) \cdot \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1}))). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

For the proof, we need the following lemma, which provides sufficient conditions for the success of the `NEWTONTTEST`.

Lemma 8 (Success of `NEWTONTTEST`). *Let $C = \{B_1, \dots, B_{s_C}\}$ be a non-terminal component with $\mathcal{B} \setminus C \neq \emptyset$, let \mathcal{B}_C be the corresponding enclosing box of width $w(C)$ and center $m = m_C$, and let $\Delta := \Delta_C = \Delta(m, r)$, with $r := \frac{3}{4}w(C)$, be the corresponding enclosing disk. Let z_1, \dots, z_k be the roots contained in the enlarged component C^+ , and suppose that all these roots are contained in a disk $\Delta'' := \Delta(m'', r'')$ of radius $r'' = 2^{-20 - \log n} \frac{r}{N_C}$. In addition, assume that the disk $\Delta(m, 2^{2 \log n + 20} N_C r)$ contains none of the roots z_{k+1}, \dots, z_n . Then, the algorithm `ISOLATE` performs a quadratic step, that is, C is replaced by a single component C' of width $w(C') \leq \frac{w(C)}{N_C}$.*

Proof. We first argue by contradiction that 4Δ does not intersect any other component C' , which implies that the first condition of the **and** in the if-clause in line 9 is fulfilled. If 4Δ intersects C' , then the distance between C and C' is at most $8r$, and thus $2^{\ell_{C'}} < 8r$ as the distance between C and C' is at least $\max(2^{\ell_C}, 2^{\ell_{C'}})$. Hence, we conclude that the disk $\Delta(m, 64r)$ completely contains $2B'$ for some box B' of C' . Since $2B'$ also contains at least one root and since each such root must be distinct from any of the roots z_1, \dots, z_k , we get a contradiction.

According to our assumptions, each of the two disks Δ and 8Δ contains the roots z_1, \dots, z_k but no other root of F . Hence, according to Lemma 6, both tests $\tilde{T}_k^G(2\Delta, F)$ and $\tilde{T}_k^G(4\Delta, F)$ must succeed. Since we assumed C to be non-terminal, we must have $k \geq 2$, and thus the algorithm reaches line 11 and the `NEWTONTEST` is called. We assumed that C does not entirely cover the initial box \mathcal{B} , hence, in a previous iteration, we must have discarded a box of width 2^{ℓ_C} or more whose boundary shares at least one point with the boundary of C . Hence, we can choose a point in such a box as the point $x_C \in \mathcal{B} \setminus C$ in the `NEWTONTEST` such that the distance from x_C to C is equal to 2^{ℓ_C-1} and such that the distance from x_C to the boundary of \mathcal{B} is at least 2^{ℓ_C-1} . Notice that also the distance from x_C to any other component C' is at least 2^{ℓ_C-1} , and thus the distance from x_C to any root of F is at least 2^{ℓ_C-1} , which is larger than or equal to $\frac{r}{27n}$ as C consists of at most $9n$ boxes. From our assumptions, we thus conclude that

$$|x_C - m''| \leq 4r \quad \text{and} \quad |x_C - z_i| \geq \frac{r}{27n} \quad \text{for } i \leq k,$$

and

$$|x_C - z_i| \geq 2^{20} n^2 N_C \cdot r - 4r > 2^{19} n^2 N_C \cdot r \quad \text{for } i > k.$$

Using the fact that $\frac{F'(x)}{F(x)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x-z_i}$ for any x with $F(x) \neq 0$, we can bound the distance from the Newton iterate x'_C as defined in (10) to the "center" m'' of the cluster of roots:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{k} \frac{(x_C - m'')F'(x_C)}{F(x_C)} - 1 \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{x_C - m''}{x_C - z_i} + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i>k} \frac{x_C - m''}{x_C - z_i} - 1 \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{z_i - m''}{x_C - z_i} + \sum_{i>k} \frac{x_C - m''}{x_C - z_i} \right| \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{|z_i - m''|}{|x_C - z_i|} + \sum_{i>k} \frac{|x_C - m''|}{|x_C - z_i|} \\ &\leq \frac{r''}{r/(27n)} + \frac{n-k}{k} \frac{4r}{n^2 2^{19} N_C r} < \frac{27nr}{rn^2 2^{20} N_C} + \frac{4nr}{rn^2 2^{20} N_C} \leq \frac{1}{2^{14} n N_C}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there is an $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}$, with $|\varepsilon| < \frac{1}{2^{14} n N_C}$, such that $\frac{1}{k} \frac{(x_C - m'')F'(x_C)}{F(x_C)} = 1 + \varepsilon$. This implies that $\frac{|F'(x_C)|}{|F(x_C)|} \geq \frac{1}{|x_C - m''|} \geq \frac{1}{4r}$, and thus the `NEWTONTEST` must reach line 2 as Algorithm 3 must return True or Undecided. With $x'_C = x_C - k \cdot \frac{F(x_C)}{F'(x_C)}$, it further follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |m'' - x'_C| &= |m'' - x_C| \cdot \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\frac{1}{k} \frac{(x_C - m'')F'(x_C)}{F(x_C)}} \right| = |m'' - x_C| \cdot \left| 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{\varepsilon(m'' - x_C)}{1 + \varepsilon} \right| \leq \frac{4r}{2^{13} n N_C} \leq \frac{r}{2^{11} n N_C} < \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{128 N_C}. \end{aligned}$$

We can therefore bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{x}'_C - m''| &\leq |\tilde{x}'_C - x'_C| + |x'_C - m''| \leq \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{64 N_C} + |x'_C - m''| \\ &\leq \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{64 N_C} + \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{128 N_C} < \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{32 N_C}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the distance from m'' to any of the roots z_1, \dots, z_k is also smaller than $r'' < \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{32N_C}$, we conclude that the disk $\Delta(\tilde{x}'_C, \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{16N_C})$ contains all roots z_1, \dots, z_k . Hence, we conclude that $\Delta' := \Delta(\tilde{x}'_C, \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{8N_C})$ is $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{3})$ -isolating for the roots z_1, \dots, z_k , and thus the $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta', F)$ -test must succeed according to Lemma 6. This shows that we reach line 8 and that the NEWTONTEST returns SUCCESS. \square

In essence, the above lemma states that, in case of a well separated cluster of roots contained in some component C , our algorithm performs a quadratic step. That is, it replaces the component C by a component C' of width $w(C') \leq \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{N_C} \leq \frac{w(C)}{N_C}$, which contains all roots that are contained in C . Now, suppose that there exists a sequence C_1, \dots, C_s of non-special nodes, with $C_1 \supset \dots \supset C_s$, such that C_s has much smaller width than C_1 . Then, C_1 contains a cluster of nearby roots but no other root of F . We will see that, from a considerably small (i.e., comparable to the bound in (11)) index on, this cluster is also well separated from the remaining roots (with respect to the size of C_i) such that the requirements in the above lemma are fulfilled. As a consequence, only a small number of steps from C_i to C_{i+1} are linear, which in turn implies that the whole sequence has small length. For the proof, we need to consider a sequence $(s_i)_i = (x_i, n_i)_i$, which we define in a rather abstract way. The rationale behind our choice for s_i is that, for all except a small number of indices and a suitable choice for s_i , the sequence $(s_i)_i$ behaves similarly as the sequence $(2^{\ell_{C_i}}, \log \log N_{C_i})_i$. We remark that $(s_i)_i$ has already been introduced in [38], where it serves as a crucial ingredient for the analysis of the real root isolation method ANEWDSC.

Lemma 9 ([38], Lemma 25). *Let $w, w' \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be two positive reals with $w > w'$, and let $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ be a positive integer. We recursively define the sequence $(s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}} := ((x_i, n_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$ as follows: Let $s_1 = (x_1, n_1) := (w, m)$, and*

$$s_{i+1} = (x_{i+1}, n_{i+1}) := \begin{cases} (\epsilon_i \cdot x_i, n_i + 1) & \text{with an } \epsilon_i \in [0, \frac{1}{N_i}], & \text{if } \frac{x_i}{N_i} \geq w' \\ (\delta_i \cdot x_i, \max(1, n_i - 1)) & \text{with a } \delta_i \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], & \text{if } \frac{x_i}{N_i} < w', \end{cases}$$

where $N_i := 2^{2^i}$ and $i \geq 1$. Then, the smallest index i_0 with $x_{i_0} \leq w'$ is bounded by $8(n_1 + \log \log \max(4, \frac{w}{w'}))$.

We are now ready to prove the claimed bound on the maximal length of a sequence of non-special nodes:

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathcal{P} = (C_1, N_1), \dots, (C_s, N_s)$, with $C_1 \supset \dots \supset C_s$, be a sequence of consecutive non-special nodes. Then, we have $s \leq s_{\max}$ with an s_{\max} of size*

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\max} &= O(\log n + \log \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})) + \log \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(B^+)^{-1})) \\ &= O(\log(n \cdot \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})) \cdot \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1}))). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We distinguish two cases. We first consider the special case, where \mathcal{P} is an arbitrary sub-sequence of the unique initial sequence from the child of the root of the tree to the parent of the base of the tree; if there exists no non-special root in between the root and the base of the tree, there is nothing to prove. Due to Theorem 4, part (e), C_s consists of at most $9 \cdot |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|$ boxes. It follows that $2^{2^s} \leq 9n$ as C_i consists of at least 2^{2^i} boxes. This yields $s = O(\log n)$.

We now come to the case, where we can assume that each C_i is a successor of the base of the tree. In particular, we have $\mathcal{B} \setminus C_i \neq \emptyset$. W.l.o.g., we may further assume that z_1, \dots, z_k are the roots contained in the enlarged component C_1^+ . Since all C_i are assumed to be non-special, each C_i^+ contains z_1 to z_k but no other root of F . Let $w_i := w(C_i)$ be the width of the component C_i , $r_i := \frac{3}{4} \cdot w_i$ be the radius of the enclosing disk $\Delta_i := \Delta_{C_i}$, and $2^{\ell_i} := 2^{\ell_{C_i}}$ be the width of each of the boxes into which C_i decomposes. Notice that, for each index i , the enlarged component C_i^+ is contained in the disk $2\Delta_i$ of radius $\frac{3}{2} \cdot w_i$, and thus the disk $2\Delta_s$ of radius $\frac{3}{2} \cdot w_s$ contains the roots z_1 to z_k . We now split the sequence \mathcal{P} into three (possibly empty) subsequences $\mathcal{P}_1 = (C_1, N_1), \dots, (C_{i_1}, N_{i_1})$, $\mathcal{P}_2 = (C_{i_1+1}, N_{i_1+1}), \dots, (C_{i_2}, N_{i_2})$, and $\mathcal{P}_3 = (C_{i_2+1}, N_{i_2+1}), \dots, (C_s, N_s)$, where i_1 and i_2 are defined as follows:

- i_1 is the first index with $2^{\ell_1} > 2^{3 \log n + 32} \cdot N_{i_1} \cdot 2^{\ell_{i_1}}$. If there exists no such index, we set $i_1 := s$. Further notice that, for any index i larger than i_1 , we also have $2^{\ell_1} > 2^{3 \log n + 32} \cdot N_i \cdot 2^{\ell_i}$, which follows from induction and the fact that 2^{ℓ_i} and N_i are replaced by $\frac{2^{\ell_i}}{2N_i}$ and N_i^2 in a quadratic step.
- i_2 is the first index larger than or equal to i_1 such that the step from i_2 to $i_2 + 1$ is quadratic and $2^{\ell_s} \cdot 2^{3 \log n + 32} \cdot N_{i_2} \geq 2^{\ell_{i_2}}$. If there exists no such index i_2 , we set $i_2 := s$.

From the definition of i_2 , it is easy to see that \mathcal{P}_3 has length bounded by $O(\log n)$. Namely, if $i_2 = s$, there is nothing to prove, hence we may assume that the step from i_2 to $i_2 + 1$ is quadratic and $2^{\ell_s} \geq 2^{-3 \log n - 32} \cdot N_{i_2}^{-1} \cdot 2^{\ell_{i_2}} = 2^{-3 \log n - 31} \cdot 2^{\ell_{i_2+1}}$. Hence, we conclude that $s - (i_2 + 1) \leq 3 \log n + 31$ as ℓ_i is reduced by at least 1 in each step.

Let us now consider an arbitrary index i from the sequence \mathcal{P}_2 . The distance from an arbitrary point in C_i^+ to the boundary of C_1^+ is at least $2^{\ell_1 - 1} \geq 2^{3 \log n + 31} \cdot N_i \cdot 2^{\ell_i} > 2^{2 \log n + 20} \cdot N_i \cdot r_i$, where the latter inequality follows from $r_i = \frac{3}{4} w_i \leq \frac{3}{4} \cdot 9n \cdot 2^{\ell_i}$. Since C_1^+ contains only the roots z_1, \dots, z_k , this implies that the distance from an arbitrary point in C_i^+ to an arbitrary root z_{k+1}, \dots, z_n is larger than $2^{2 \log n + 20} \cdot N_i \cdot r_i$. Hence, the second requirement from Lemma 8 is fulfilled for each component C_i with $i \geq i_1$. Now, suppose that $2^{\ell_s} \cdot 2^{3 \log n + 32} \cdot N_i < 2^{\ell_i}$, then the roots z_1 to z_k are contained in a disk of radius $\frac{3}{2} \cdot 9n \cdot 2^{\ell_s} < 2^{-20 - \log n} \cdot N_i^{-1} \cdot r_i$, and thus also the first requirement from Lemma 8 is fulfilled. Hence, from the definition of i_2 , we conclude that the algorithm performs a quadratic step if and only if $2^{\ell_s} \cdot 2^{3 \log n + 32} \cdot N_i < 2^{\ell_i}$. We now define the sequence $s_i := (2^{\ell_i}, \log \log N_i)$, where i runs from i_1 to the first index, denoted i'_1 , for which $2^{\ell_{i'_1}} < 2^{\ell_s} \cdot 2^{-3 \log n - 32}$. Then, according to Lemma 9, it holds that $i'_1 - i_1 \leq 8(m + \log \log \max(4, \frac{w}{w'}))$, with $w := 2^{\ell_{i_1}}$, $m := \log \log N_{i_1}$, and $w' := 2^{\ell_s} \cdot 2^{3 \log n + 32}$. Theorem 4 (g) yields that $m = O(\log \log(w(\mathcal{B})) + \log \log(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1}))$. Hence, since $i_2 - i'_1 \leq 3 \log n + 32$, we conclude that $i_2 - i_1 \leq O(\log n + \log \log(w(\mathcal{B})) + \log \log(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1}))$.

It remains to show that the latter bound also applies to i_1 . From the upper bound on the numbers N_i , it follows the existence of an m_{\max} of size $O(\log n + \log \log(w(\mathcal{B})) + \log \log(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1}))$ such that each sequence of consecutive quadratic steps has length less than m_{\max} , and such that after m_{\max} consecutive linear steps, the number N_i drops to 4. Since the number ℓ_i decreases by at least 1 in each step, there exists an index i' of size $O(\log n)$ such that $2^{\ell_{i'}} \cdot 2^{3 \log n + 34} < 2^{\ell_1}$. Now, if the sequence $C_{i'}, C_{i'+1}, \dots$ starts with

m_{\max} or more consecutive linear steps, we must have $N_{i'+m_{\max}} = 4$, and thus $2^{\ell_{i'+m_{\max}}} \cdot 2^{3 \log n + 32} N_{i'+m_{\max}} < 2^{\ell_1}$. Hence, we conclude that $i_1 \leq i' + m_{\max}$ in this case. Otherwise, there must exist an index i'' , with $i' \leq i'' < i' + m_{\max}$, such that the step from i'' to $i'' + 1$ is quadratic, whereas the step from $i'' + 2$ is linear. Then, it holds that

$$N_{i''+2} = \sqrt{N_{i''+1}} = N_{i''} \quad \text{and} \quad 2^{\ell_{i''+2}} \leq 2^{\ell_{i''+1}} = \frac{2^{\ell_{i''}}}{2N_{i''}} < 2^{-3 \log n - 32} \frac{2^{\ell_1}}{N_{i''}},$$

which implies that $i_1 \leq i'' + 2 \leq i' + m_{\max} + 1 = O(\log n + \log \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})) + \log \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1}))$. Hence, the claimed bound on i_1 follows. \square

We can now state the first main result of this section, which immediately follows from the above bound on s_{\max} and the fact that there exists at most $2 \cdot (|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| + 1)$ special nodes:

Theorem 5. *The subdivision tree \mathcal{T} induced by CISOLATE has size*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{T}| &\leq 2 \cdot (|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| + 1) \cdot s_{\max} \\ &= O(|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| \cdot \log(n \cdot \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})) \cdot \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1}))). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

If \mathcal{B} contains all complex roots of F , and if $\overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})) = O(\Gamma_F + \log n)$,¹³ then the above bound writes as

$$O(n \cdot \log(n \cdot \Gamma_F \cdot \overline{\log}(\sigma_F^{-1}))). \tag{13}$$

We can also give simpler bounds for the special case, where our input polynomial has integer coefficients. Suppose that $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ has integer coefficients of bitsize less than τ . We first divide f by its leading coefficient $\text{lcf}(f)$ to obtain the polynomial $F := f / \text{lcf}(f)$, which meets our requirement from (1) on the leading coefficient. Then, we have $\Gamma_F = O(\tau)$ and $\sigma_F = 2^{-O(n(\log n + \tau))}$; e.g. see [52] for a proof of the latter bound. Hence, we obtain the following result:

Corollary 3. *Let f be a polynomial of degree n with integer coefficients of bitsize less than τ , $F := f / \text{lcf}(f)$, and let \mathcal{B} be a box of width $2^{O(\Gamma_F + \log n)}$. Then, the algorithm CISOLATE (with input F and \mathcal{B}) uses*

$$O(|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| \cdot \log(n\tau)) = O(n \cdot \log(n\tau))$$

iterations to isolate all roots of F that are contained in \mathcal{B} .

The above results show that our algorithm performs near-optimal with respect to the number of components that are produced by the algorithm. In addition, since each component consists of at most $9n$ boxes, we immediately obtain an upper bound for the total number of boxes produced by the algorithm that exceeds the bound from (13) by a factor of n . Indeed, we will see that the actual number of boxes is considerably smaller, that is, of size $O(|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| \cdot s_{\max} \cdot \log n)$, which exceeds the bound in (13) only by a factor $\log n$. For the proof, we consider two mappings ϕ and ψ , where ϕ maps a component $C = \{B_1, \dots, B_{s_C}\}$ to a root $z_i \in C^+$, and ψ maps a box B_j to a root $z_i \in 4B_j \cap C^+$. The claimed bound for

¹³Notice that we can compute such a box \mathcal{B} with $\tilde{O}(n^2 \Gamma_F)$ bit operations; see Section 2.

the total number of boxes then follows from the fact that we can define ϕ and ψ in a way such that the pre-image of an arbitrary root $z_i \in 2\mathcal{B}$ (under each of the two mappings) has size $O(s_{\max} \cdot \log n)$. The rest of this section is dedicated to the definitions of ϕ and ψ and the proof of the latter claim. In what follows, we may assume that $2\mathcal{B}$ contains at least one root as, otherwise, all four sub-boxes of \mathcal{B} are already discarded in the first iteration of the preprocessing phase.

Definition 4. For a root $\xi \in 2\mathcal{B}$, we define the canonical path \mathcal{P}_ξ of ξ as the unique path in the subdivision tree $\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{B}$ that consists of all nodes C with $\xi \in C^+$.

Notice that the canonical path is well-defined as, for any two nodes C_1 and C_2 , either C_1^+ and C_2^+ are disjoint or one of the two components contains the other one. We can now define the maps ϕ and ψ :

Definition 5 (Maps ϕ, ψ). Let $C = \{B_1, \dots, B_{s_C}\}$ be a node in the subdivision tree $\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{B}$, and let $B := B_j$ be an arbitrary box in C . Then, we define maps ϕ and ψ as follows:

(ϕ) Starting at C , we descend in the subdivision tree as follows: If the current node D is a non-terminal special node, we go to the child E that minimizes $|\mathcal{Z}(E^+)|$. If D is terminal, we stop. If D is non-special, then there is a unique child of D to proceed with. Proceeding this way, the number $|\mathcal{Z}(D^+)|$ is at least halved in each non-terminal special node D , except for the base node. Hence, since any sequence of consecutive non-special nodes has length at most s_{\max} , it follows that after at most $s_{\max} \cdot (\log \lceil |\mathcal{Z}(C^+)| \rceil + 1) \leq s_{\max} \cdot (\log n + 2)$ many steps we reach a terminal node F . We define $\phi(C)$ to be an arbitrary root contained in $\mathcal{Z}(F^+)$.

(ψ) According to part (d) of Theorem 4, the enlarged box $2B$ contains at least one root ξ . Now, consider the unique maximal subpath $P'_\xi = C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s$ of the canonical path P_ξ that starts at $C_1 := C$. If $s \leq \lceil \log(18n) \rceil$, we define $\psi(B) := \xi$. Otherwise, consider the component $C' := C_{\lceil \log(18n) \rceil}$ and define $\psi(B) := \phi(C')$.

It is clear from the above definition that $\phi(C)$ is contained in C^+ as each root contained in the enlarged component F^+ corresponding to the terminal node F is also contained in C^+ . It remains to show that $\psi(B) \in 4B \cap C^+$. If the length of the sub-path P'_ξ is $\lceil \log(18n) \rceil$ or less, then $\psi(B) = \xi \in 2B$, hence, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, the boxes in C' have width less than $\frac{w(B)}{18n}$. Since C' can contain at most $9n$ boxes, we conclude that $w(C') < \frac{w(B)}{2}$, and since ξ is contained in B^+ as well as in $(C')^+$, we conclude that $(C')^\dagger \subset 4B$, and thus $\psi(B) = \phi(C') \in 4B \cap (C')^+ \subset 4B \cap C^+$.

Now, consider the canonical path $P_\xi = C_1, \dots, C_s$, with $C_1 := \mathcal{B}$, of an arbitrary root $\xi \in 2\mathcal{B}$. Then, a component C can only map to ξ via ϕ if $C = C_i$ for some i with $s - i \leq s_{\max} \cdot (\log |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| + 1)$. Hence, the pre-image of ξ has size $O(s_{\max} \cdot \overline{\log} |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|)$. For the map ψ , notice that a box B can only map to ξ if B is contained in a component $C = C_i$ for some i with $s - i = s_{\max} \cdot (\log |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| + 1) + \lceil \log(18n) \rceil$. Since, for each component C_i , there exist at most a constant number of boxes $B' \in C_i$ with $\xi \in 4B'$, we conclude that the pre-image of ξ under ψ is also of size $O(s_{\max} \cdot \overline{\log} |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|)$. Hence, the total number of boxes produced by our algorithm is bounded by $O(|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| \cdot s_{\max} \cdot \overline{\log} |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|)$. We summarize:

Theorem 6. *Let $\xi \in 2\mathcal{B}$ be a root of F contained in the enlarged box $2\mathcal{B}$. Then, with mappings ϕ and ψ as defined in Definition 5, the pre-image of ξ under each of the two mappings has size $O(s_{\max} \cdot \log |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|)$. The total number of boxes produced by the algorithm `ISOLATE` is bounded by*

$$O(s_{\max} \cdot |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| \cdot \log |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|) = \tilde{O}(n \cdot \log(\log(w(\mathcal{B})) \cdot \log(\sigma_F(2\mathcal{B})^{-1})))$$

We can also state a corresponding result for polynomials with integer coefficients:

Corollary 4. *Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ and $F := f/\text{lcf}(f)$ be polynomials and \mathcal{B} be a box as in Corollary 3. Then, for isolating all roots of f contained in \mathcal{B} , the algorithm `ISOLATE` (with input polynomial F) produces a number of boxes bounded by*

$$O(|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| \cdot \log(n\tau) \cdot \log n) = O(n \log^2(n\tau)).$$

5.2 Bit Complexity

We first assume that the input box \mathcal{B} fulfills the following conditions

$$w(\mathcal{B}) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \tag{14}$$

$$\max_{z \in 2\mathcal{B}} \log(z) \leq 4 + \Gamma = O(\Gamma_F + \log n), \text{ and} \tag{15}$$

$$\max_{z \in 2\mathcal{B}} \log(z) \leq 4 + \min_{z \in 2\mathcal{B}} \log z, \tag{16}$$

where $\Gamma = 2^\gamma$, with $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$, is the upper bound for Γ_F as computed in Section 2.

We remark that the above assumptions are only needed for the sake of a simplified analysis. That is, they are actually not needed in the algorithm and we are confident that a refined analysis would yield the same complexity results. In an implementation, we propose to just run the algorithm on an initial box of interest, no matter whether it meets the above requirement or not. Of special interest is the case, where our input box \mathcal{B} is chosen large enough such that it contains all roots of F ; e.g. this is the case if the vertices of \mathcal{B} are the four points $\pm 2^\Gamma \pm i \cdot 2^\Gamma$. Unfortunately, \mathcal{B} does not fulfill the third condition 16, however, we will later show how to efficiently compute a set of disjoint boxes B_1, \dots, B_m such that each B_i fulfills all of the above conditions and such that each root of F is contained in at least one, but at most a constant number of, boxes. We can then run our algorithm on each of the boxes B_i and, finally, merge isolating disks that isolate the same root.

Now, let \mathcal{B} be an input box fulfilling the above conditions, let $C = \{B_1, \dots, B_{s_C}\}$ be a component produced by the algorithm, and let

$$S_C := \{\xi \in C^+ \text{ a root of } F \text{ with } \xi = \phi(C) \text{ or } \xi = \psi(B_i) \text{ for some } i\} \tag{17}$$

be the images of C and the boxes B_i under the maps ϕ and ψ as defined in Definition 5. The following analysis will then show that the cost for processing the component C can be related to values that depend only on the roots in S_C , such as their separations or their absolute values. More specifically, we will prove that the bit-complexity of processing C is bounded by

$$\sum_{\xi \in S_C} \tilde{O}(n \cdot (\tau_F + n \cdot \log(\xi) + \log(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \log(F'(\xi)^{-1}))). \tag{18}$$

When summing up the above cost over all components C produced by our algorithm, each root $\xi \in 2\mathcal{B}$ is considered at most $O(s_{\max} \cdot \log(|\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|)) = O(s_{\max} \cdot \log n)$ many times; see Theorem 6. Hence, we obtain the upper bound

$$\sum_{\xi \in 2\mathcal{B}} \tilde{O} \left(n \cdot (\tau_F + n \cdot \log(\xi) + \log(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \log(F'(\xi)^{-1})) \right)$$

for the overall bit-complexity of the algorithm. For the proof of the bound in (18), we need the following lemma, which provides a lower bound on the maximal value that $|F(x)|$ takes on a disk $\Delta(m, r)$. The bound is related to some value K , with $K > 1$, such that the enlarged disk $K \cdot \Delta$ contains at least two roots, the number of roots contained in $K \cdot \Delta$, and the separation as well as the absolute value of the derivative F' at an arbitrary such root.

Lemma 11. *Let $\Delta := \Delta(m, r) \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a disk and K , with $K > 1$, be a real number such that the enlarged disk $\hat{\Delta} := K \cdot \Delta$ contains at least two roots of F . Then, it holds that*

$$\max_{z \in \hat{\Delta}} |F(z)| > \sigma_F(z_i) \cdot |F'(z_i)| \cdot (nK)^{-\mu} \cdot 2^{-3n},$$

where z_i is an arbitrary root of F contained in $\hat{\Delta}$, and μ denotes the number of roots contained in $\hat{\Delta}$.

Proof. See Appendix 7.3. □

When processing a component $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_{s_C}\}$, our algorithm calls the \tilde{T}_k^G -test in up to three steps. More specifically, in line 9 of `CISOLATE` the $\tilde{T}_k^G(2\Delta_C, F)$ - and the $\tilde{T}_k^G(4\Delta_C, F)$ -test are called for $k = 1, \dots, n$. In `NEWTONTEST`, the $\tilde{T}_{k_C}^G(\Delta', F)$ -test is called, with Δ' as defined in line 4 in `NEWTONTEST`. Finally, in `BISECTION`, the $\tilde{T}_0^G(\Delta_{B_{i,j}}, F)$ -test is called for each of the 4 sub-boxes $B_{i,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, 4$, into which each box B_i of C is decomposed. The following lemma provides bounds for the cost of each of these calls:¹⁴

Lemma 12. *When processing a component C , the cost for each call of a \tilde{T}_k^G -test is bounded by*

$$\tilde{O} \left(n \cdot (\tau_F + n \cdot \log(\xi) + \log(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \log(F'(\xi)^{-1})) \right)$$

bit operations, where ξ is an arbitrary root of F contained in C^+ . If C^+ contains no root, then the cost is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + n \log w(C)))$ bit operations.¹⁵ As input, the algorithm requires an L -bit approximation of F with

$$L = \tilde{O} \left(\tau_F + n \cdot \log(\xi) + \log(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \log(F'(\xi)^{-1}) \right).$$

Proof. We may assume that C^+ contains at least one root; see Footnote 15. We first consider the special case, where $4\Delta_C$ contains exactly one root z_{i_0} . In this

¹⁴Notice that the cost for calling the $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ -test for a specific k is comparable to the cost for calling it for all $k = 0, \dots, n$.

¹⁵ Notice that this can only happen if $C = \mathcal{B}$ and $2\mathcal{B}$ contains no root. In this case, the algorithm performs four $\tilde{T}_0^G(\Delta_C, F)$ -tests in the preprocessing phase and then discards C . Due to Lemma 7, the cost for this test is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + n \log w(C)))$ as $|z| = 2^{O(\log w(C) + \log n)}$ for all $z \in C$ and $L(\Delta_C, F) \geq |F(m_C)| \geq |a_n| \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n |m_C - z_i| \geq \frac{1}{2^{n+2}}$.

situation, the algorithm produces a sequence C_1, \dots, C_s of components, with $C_1 = C$, $s = O(\log n)$, and C_s terminal. Further notice that the `NEWTONTEST` is never called, and thus each step from C_i to C_{i+1} must be linear. Hence, we only have to estimate the cost for calling the \tilde{T}_k^G -test on a disk $\Delta = \Delta(m, r)$, where $\Delta = 2\Delta_C$, $\Delta = 4\Delta_C$, or $\Delta = \Delta_{B_{i,j}}$. In each case, it holds that $\overline{\log}(m, r) = O(1) + \overline{\log}(z_{i_0})$ due to the fact that $z_{i_0} \in C^+$ and due to our assumption (16). Further notice that there exists a point $z \in \Delta$ whose distance to z_{i_0} is at least $r/4$ and whose distance to all other roots of F is larger than $1/4$. Since $r = 2^{-O(\log n)}$, we conclude that $|F(z)| = 2^{-O(n)}$, and thus $L(\Delta, F) = 2^{O(n)}$. From Lemma 7, it now follows that the cost for each \tilde{T}_k^G -test is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(n\overline{\log}(z_{i_0}) + \tau_F))$ bit operations.

We now come to the case, where $4\Delta_C$ contains at least two roots. Then, we have $\sigma_F(z_i) \leq n \cdot 2^{\ell_C + 5}$ for each root $z_i \in C^+$ as C has at most $9n$ boxes, and thus the distance between any two points in $4\Delta_C$ is smaller than $27n \cdot 2^{\ell_C} < n \cdot 2^{\ell_C + 5}$. We have already shown that $N_C \leq \frac{4 \cdot w(\mathcal{B})}{w(C)}$, see Theorem 4, part (f). This implies that $\log N_C = O(\Gamma_F + \log n + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(z_i)^{-1}))$, with z_i an arbitrary root in C^+ . Now, let $\Delta = \Delta(m, r)$ be a disk for which the \tilde{T}_k^G -test is called, that is, either $\Delta = 2\Delta_C$, $\Delta = 4\Delta_C$, $\Delta = \Delta'$, or $\Delta = \Delta_{B_{i,j}}$. We show that

$$\log(\max_{z \in \Delta} |F(z)|^{-1}) = O(\overline{\log}(\sigma_F(z_i)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(|F'(z_i)|^{-1}) + n \overline{\log}(z_i) + n \log n), \quad (19)$$

where z_i is an arbitrary root contained in C^+ . In the cases, where $\Delta = 2\Delta_C$ or $\Delta = 4\Delta_C$, we may choose a point $z \in C^+$ whose distance to z_i equals $\frac{\sigma_F(z_i)}{64n}$. Notice that such a point exists as $\frac{\sigma_F(z_i)}{64n} < 2^{\ell_C - 1}$, and thus the boundary of the disk $\Delta(z_i, \sigma_F(z_i)/(64n))$ intersects C^+ in some point. Then, the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 11 shows that $|F(z)| \geq \sigma_F(z_i) \cdot |F'(z_i)| \cdot 2^{-n-5}$. Hence, the bound in (19) applies. In the case, where $\Delta = \Delta(m, r) = \Delta_{B_{i,j}}$, we consider the enlarged disk $\hat{\Delta} := \Delta(m, K \cdot r)$, with $K := 144n$. Notice that the latter disk completely contains C^+ , and thus Lemma 11 yields that

$$\max_{z \in \Delta} |F(z)| > \sigma_F(z_i) \cdot |F'(z_i)| \cdot (144n^2)^{-n} \cdot 2^{-3n},$$

where z_i is an arbitrary root in C^+ . Again, the bound in (19) applies. It remains to discuss the case, where $\Delta = \Delta' = \Delta(m', r')$ with $r' = 2^{\ell_C - 4}/N_C$ and m' as defined in line 4 of `NEWTONTEST`. Again, we want to apply Lemma 11, where we consider the enlarged disk $\hat{\Delta} = \Delta(m', K \cdot r')$, with $K := 2^{10} \cdot N_C$. Notice that K is chosen large enough such that $\hat{\Delta}$ contains the component C^+ . Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z \in \Delta} |F(z)| &\geq \sigma_F(z_i) \cdot |F'(z_i)| \cdot 2^{-3n} (nK)^{-|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|} \\ &\geq \sigma_F(z_i) \cdot |F'(z_i)| \cdot 2^{-13n - n \log n} N_C^{-|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|} \\ &\geq \sigma_F(z_i) \cdot |F'(z_i)| \cdot 2^{-13n - n \log n} \left(\frac{4w(\mathcal{B})}{w(C)} \right)^{-|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|}, \end{aligned}$$

where z_i is an arbitrary root in C^+ . From condition (16), we conclude that $w(\mathcal{B}) = 2^{O(\overline{\log}(z_i))}$, and thus $w(\mathcal{B})^{-|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|} = 2^{-O(n \overline{\log}(z_i))}$. Hence, it remains to show that $\log w(C)^{-|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|}$ can be upper bounded by $O(\overline{\log}(\sigma_i^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(|F'(z_i)|^{-1}) +$

$n \log n + \tau_F + n \overline{\log}(z_i)$). Indeed, this follows from the following computation, which relates the value $w(C)^{|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|}$ to the absolute value of the derivative F' at an arbitrary, but fixed, root $z_i \in C^+$:

$$\begin{aligned}
|F'(z_i)| &= |F_n| \cdot \prod_{j \neq i: z_j \in \hat{\Delta}} |z_i - z_j| \prod_{j: z_j \notin \hat{\Delta}} |z_i - z_j| \\
&\leq |F_n| \cdot (2K\rho)^{|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|-1} \frac{\text{Mea}(F(z_i - x))}{|F_n|} \leq 2^{2n+\tau_F} (K\rho)^{|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|-1} \max_1(z_i)^n \\
&\leq 2^{2n+\tau_F} (2^{\ell_C+6})^{|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|-1} \max_1(z_i)^n \\
&\leq 2^{2n+\tau_F} (w(C) \cdot 2^6)^{|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|-1} \max_1(z_i)^n \\
&\leq 2^{8n+\tau_F} \cdot \max_1(z_i)^n \cdot \left(w(C)^{|\mathcal{Z}(\hat{\Delta})|}\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that the bound on the precision demand for the input polynomial F follows directly from Lemma 7 and the above considerations. \square

We can now bound the total cost of the algorithm `CISOLATE`:

Theorem 7. *Let \mathcal{B} be a box fulfilling the conditions (14) to (16), and let C be a component produced by the algorithm `CISOLATE` on the input \mathcal{B} and the polynomial F . Then, the cost for processing C is bounded by*

$$\tilde{O} \left(\sum_{\xi \in S_C} n \cdot (\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(w(C)) + n \cdot \overline{\log}(\xi) + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1})) \right) \quad (20)$$

bit operations, with S_C as defined in (17). The total cost of the algorithm is bounded by¹⁶

$$\tilde{O} \left(n^2 \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})) + \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})} n \cdot (\tau_F + n \cdot \overline{\log}(\xi) + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1})) \right) \quad (21)$$

bit operations. As input, the algorithm requires an L -bit approximation of F with

$$L = \tilde{O} \left(n \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})) + \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})} (\tau_F + n \cdot \overline{\log}(\xi) + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1})) \right).$$

Proof. We first consider the case, where $2\mathcal{B}$ contains no root. Then, we have already argued in the proof of Lemma 12 that the total cost for processing \mathcal{B} is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B}))))$ and that the algorithm requires a $\tilde{O}(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B})))$ -bit approximation of F .

If $2\mathcal{B}$ contains at least one root, then, for each processed component $C = \{B_1, \dots, B_{s_C}\}$, the enlarged component C^+ contains at least one root. Hence, according to Lemma 12, when processing C , each call of a $\tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta, F)$ -test needs

$$\tilde{O} \left(n \cdot (\tau_F + n \cdot \overline{\log}(\xi) + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1})) \right)$$

¹⁶Notice that if $2\mathcal{B}$ contains at least one root, then, up to a constant, the term $n^2 \overline{\log}(w(\mathcal{B}))$ is of the same size as $n^2 \overline{\log}(\xi)$ for some $\xi \in \mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})$. Hence, in this case, the bit complexity is $\tilde{O} \left(\sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})} n \cdot (\tau_F + n \cdot \overline{\log}(\xi) + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1})) \right)$.

bit operations, where ξ is an arbitrary root contained in C^+ .

Hence, by choosing $\xi := \psi(B_{i,j})$ for $\Delta = \Delta_{B_{i,j}}$ and $\xi := \phi(C)$ otherwise, we obtain the bound

$$\sum_{\xi \in S_C} \tilde{O}(n \cdot (\tau_F + n \cdot \overline{\log}(\xi) + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1})))$$

for the total cost of these calls. Since each root $\xi \in 2\mathcal{B}$ is contained in at most $O(s_{\max} \log n)$ many sets S_C , it follows that the total cost for all \tilde{T}_k^G -tests called by \mathbb{C} ISOLATE is bounded by (21).

Notice that the cost for all other steps, except for the computation of the Newton iterate x'_C as defined in (10), are negligible. Namely, the total number N of boxes produced by the algorithm is bounded by $O(s_{\max} \cdot |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})| \cdot \log |\mathcal{Z}(2\mathcal{B})|) = O(s_{\max} \cdot n \log n)$. In addition, the bitsize b_C of a box in a component C is bounded by $O(\Gamma_F + \log n + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\phi(C))^{-1})) = O(\tau_F + \log n + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\phi(C))^{-1}))$. Hence, each combinatorial step, such as grouping together boxes into maximal connected components in line 8 of BISECTION, needs $\tilde{O}(N)$ arithmetic operations with a precision $O(b_C)$, and thus a number of bit operations bounded by $\tilde{O}(N \cdot b_C)$, which is dominated by (20). Summing up the latter bound over all components C then yields a bound that is again dominated by the bound in (21).

It remains to bound the computation of the Newton iterate x'_C , or more precisely, of an approximation \tilde{x}'_C of x'_C with $|\tilde{x}'_C - x'_C| < \frac{1}{64} \cdot \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{N_C}$. In line 12 of \mathbb{C} ISOLATE we choose a point $x_C \in \mathcal{B} \setminus C$ whose distance to C is $2^{\ell_C - 1}$ and whose distance to the boundary of \mathcal{B} is at least $2^{\ell_C - 1}$. Since the union of all components covers all roots of F that are contained in \mathcal{B} , and since the distance from C to any other component is at least 2^{ℓ_C} , it follows that the distance from x_C to any root of F is larger than $2^{\ell_C - 1}$. We may further assume that $4\Delta_C$ contains at least two roots as, otherwise, the NEWTONTEST is not called. With $\Delta := \Delta_{2^{\ell_C - 3}}(x_C)$ and $\hat{\Delta} := \Delta(x_C, 9n \cdot 2^{\ell_C + 4})$, it holds that $|F(x_C)| \geq 2^{-n} \cdot \max_{z \in \Delta} |F(z)|$ and $4\Delta_C \subset \hat{\Delta}$. Hence, we can use Lemma 11 to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \log |F(x_C)|^{-1} &\geq \log(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1} \cdot |F'(\xi)|^{-1} \cdot (9n \cdot 2^7)^n \cdot (2n)^n \cdot 2^n) \\ &= O(n \log n + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1})), \end{aligned}$$

where ξ is an arbitrary root in C^+ . It is then guaranteed that we succeed in Algorithm 3 (soft-predicate) with an absolute precision L_0 of size $O(n \log n + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log} F'(\xi)^{-1} + \overline{\log}(w(C))) = O(n \log n + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1}))$. Notice that, when proceeding with the NEWTONTEST in Line 2, we also have

$$\overline{\log}(|F'(x_C)|^{-1}) = O(n \log n + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1}) + \Gamma_F)$$

as $|F(x_C)| < 6r \cdot |F'(x_C)|$ must be satisfied and $\overline{\log} w(C)^{-1} = O(\log n + \Gamma_F + \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}))$. Hence, computing an approximation \tilde{x}'_C of x'_C with $|\tilde{x}'_C - x'_C| < \frac{1}{64} \cdot \frac{2^{\ell_C}}{N_C}$ needs

$$\tilde{O}(n(\overline{\log}(\sigma_F(\xi)^{-1}) + \overline{\log}(F'(\xi)^{-1}) + \tau_F + n \cdot \overline{\log}(\xi)))$$

bit operations, where we again use that $N_C \leq \frac{4w(\mathcal{B})}{w(C)}$. This proves the claimed bound on the cost for processing C . For the total cost of computing all Newton iterates x'_C , we sum up the above bound over all components C , where we choose $z_i := \phi(C)$. The so obtained bound is comparable to the bound in (21). \square

Again, we provide simpler bounds for the special case, where the input polynomial f has integer coefficients:

Theorem 8. *Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be an integer polynomial of degree n with integer coefficients of bitsize less than τ , let $F := f/\text{lcf}(f)$, and let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a box fulfilling the conditions in (14) to (16). For isolating all roots of F contained in \mathcal{B} , the algorithm $\mathbb{C}\text{ISOLATE}$ needs $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2\tau)$ bit operations.*

Proof. The claimed bound follows immediately from (21) and the fact that each of the two sums $\sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(z_i)^{-1})$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\log}(F'(z_i)^{-1})$ is upper bounded by $\tilde{O}(n\tau)$, and that $\sum_{i=1}^n \log \max_1(z_i) \leq \log \text{Mea}(F) = O(\log n + \tau)$; e.g. see [38, Section 2.5] for more details. \square

Notice that, so far, our bit complexity results do not directly apply to a box \mathcal{B} that contains all roots of F as, in general, such a box does not fulfill the third condition (16). Hence, instead of considering one large input box, we first compute a covering of all roots by means of disjoint boxes that fulfill each of the conditions (14)-(16). Then, we run our algorithm on each of these boxes and merge the solutions.

Lemma 13. *Using $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2 \overline{\log} \text{Mea}(F))$ bit operations, we can compute a set $\mathbf{B}' = \{B_1, \dots, B_m\}$ of squared and axis-aligned boxes $B = B_i$ such that the following properties are fulfilled:*

- (a) *Each box B has size $w(B) = 2^j$, with $-1 \leq j \leq \Gamma + 1$.*
- (b) *For each B , $\max_{z \in 2B} \overline{\log}(z) \leq 4 + \min_{z \in 2B} \overline{\log}(z)$ and $\max_{z \in 2B} \overline{\log}(z) \leq \Gamma + 4$. In particular, we have $\overline{\log} w(B) = O(1) + \overline{\log}(z)$ for any $z \in 2B$.*
- (c) *For each B , the enlarged box $2B$ contains a root of F .*
- (d) *The union of all B covers all roots of F .*
- (e) *Each root of F is contained in a constant number of boxes B .*

For the computation, we need a $\tilde{O}(n^2 + n \overline{\log} \text{Mea}(F))$ -bit approximation of F .

For the proof of the above lemma, we need the following definitions: For $i = 0, 1, \dots, \Gamma + 2$, let $\mathcal{B}_i \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the box of size 2^i that is centered at the origin. Notice that the boxes \mathcal{B}_i cover all roots of F as 2^Γ is an upper bound on the absolute value of all roots. We further define $\Delta_{-1} := \emptyset$ and $\Delta_i := \Delta(0, 3 \cdot 2^{i-2})$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, \Gamma + 2$, such that $\mathcal{B}_i \subset \Delta_i \subset \mathcal{B}_{i+1}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, \Gamma + 1$, let C_i be the connected component consisting of 12 boxes of size 2^{i-2} and 12 boxes of size 2^{i-1} such that the set of points contained in C_i equals $\mathcal{B}_{i+1} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{i-1}$. We further define $C_0 := \mathcal{B}_1$; see Figure 4 for an illustration. We fix some trivial, however crucial, properties:

Lemma 14. *Let $\mathbf{B} := \{B : B \in C_i \text{ for some } i\}$ be the set of all boxes of which all components C_i consists. Then, it holds:*

- (a) *Each point $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is contained in at most a constant number of enlarged boxes $2B$, with $B \in \mathbf{B}$.*
- (b) *For each point $z \in 2B$, with $B \in C_i$ and $i \geq 1$, we have $2^{i-2} \leq |z| \leq 2^{i+2}$. In particular, $\overline{\log} w(B) = O(1) + \overline{\log}(z)$.*




Figure 4: On the left side are the interlaced squared boxes \mathcal{B}_i of size 2^i , with $i = 0, 1, \dots, \Gamma + 2$, each centered at the origin. On the right side is the connected component C_3 that corresponds to \mathcal{B}_3 . In total, it consists of 24 boxes. Half of the boxes have size 2, whereas the remaining boxes have size 4. For $i \geq 1$, the set of points contained in C_i equals $\mathcal{B}_{i+1} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{i-1}$.

Proof. Trivial. □

We can now compute a subset $\mathbf{B}' \subset \mathbf{B}$ of \mathbf{B} that fulfills the properties from Lemma 13 as follows: In the first step, we determine a subset $\mathbf{C}' \subset \mathbf{C} := \{C_0, \dots, C_{\Gamma+1}\}$ of the set of all C_i such that each $C_i \in \mathbf{C}'$ contains at least one root of F , and such that the union of all $C_i \in \mathbf{C}'$ covers all roots of F . Then, in the second step, we remove all boxes $B \in C_i$ (for all $C_i \in \mathbf{C}'$) for which the $\tilde{T}_0^G(\Delta_B)$ -test succeeds. The set \mathbf{B}' consisting of all remaining boxes then fulfills the above properties as stated in Lemma 13.

For the first step, consider the result obtained from applying the \tilde{T}_k^G -test, for all $k = 0, \dots, n$, to the disks Δ_i . For $i = 0, \dots, \Gamma + 2$, we define

$$\delta_i := \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if none of the tests } \tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta_i), \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n, \text{ succeeds} \\ k & \text{if } \tilde{T}_k^G(\Delta_i) \text{ succeeds.} \end{cases}$$

In addition, let $\delta_{-1} := -1$. Notice that, for $\delta_i \neq -1$, we may conclude that Δ_i contains exactly δ_i roots. In addition, it holds:

Lemma 15. *Let $\mathbf{C}' := \{C_i : \delta_i = -1 \text{ or } \delta_{i-1} \neq \delta_i \neq 0\}$, then it holds:*

- (a) *Each $C_i \in \mathbf{C}'$ contains at least one root of F .*
- (b) *The union of all $C_i \in \mathbf{C}'$ covers all roots of F .*

Proof. We first consider the case $\delta_i = -1$. According to Lemma 6, we may conclude that the annulus $\frac{4}{3} \cdot \Delta_i \setminus \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \cdot \Delta_i$ contains at least one root. Since this annulus is contained in C_i , it follows that C_i contains at least one root. If $\delta_i > 0$, then may conclude that Δ_i contains δ_i roots. If, in addition, $\delta_{i-1} \neq \delta_i$, then the annulus $\Delta_i \setminus \Delta_{i-1}$ contains at least one root, and thus also C_i contains at least one root. Hence, the first part follows.

For the second part, let ξ be an arbitrary root of F . Then, there must be an index i with $\xi \in \Delta_i \setminus \Delta_{i-1}$. If $\delta_i = -1$, then ξ is contained in C_i , which is an

element of \mathbf{C}' . If $\delta_i = 0$, this would contradict the fact that Δ_i contains ξ , hence we can assume that $\delta_i > 0$. Since Δ_{i-1} contains at least one root less than Δ_i , we must have $\delta_{i-1} \neq \delta_i$, and thus $C_i \in \mathbf{C}'$. \square

The following lemma states that the set \mathbf{C}' can be efficiently computed.

Lemma 16. *\mathbf{C}' can be computed with a number of bit operations bounded by*

$$\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2 \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F))).$$

Proof. Let $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ be the set of indices i for which $\delta_i = -1$ or $\delta_{i-1} \neq \delta_i \neq 0$. Since each component C_{i_j} contains at least one root and since each root of F is contained in a constant number of components C_i , we must have $|I| = O(n)$. In order to compute I , suppose that i_1, \dots, i_j are already computed. In order to determine i_{j+1} , we apply the \tilde{T}_k^G -test (for all k) to Δ_{i_j+1} . If $\delta_{i_j+1} = -1$ or $0 \neq \delta_{i_j+1} \neq \delta_{i_j}$, then we have $i_{j+1} = i_j + 1$. Otherwise, we have to determine the first index ℓ , with $\ell > i_j + 1$, for which $\delta_\ell \neq \delta_{i_j}$. This can be achieved via a binary search, where we have to apply the \tilde{T}_k^G -test to $O(\log \Gamma)$ many disks Δ_i with an index $i \leq 2\ell$. In order to estimate the cost for this computation, let ξ be an arbitrary root contained in the component C_ℓ . Using Lemma 14, we conclude that $(4|\xi|)^2 \geq 2^i$ for all $i \leq 2 \cdot \ell$. In addition, it holds that $\max_{z \in \Delta_i} |F(z)| \geq (\frac{1}{4n})^{n+1}$ for all i as there exists a point in z whose distance to any root of F is at least $\frac{1}{4n}$, and thus, $L(\Delta_i, F) = O(n)$ for all i . Hence, according to Lemma 7, the cost for determining the index i_{j+1} is bounded by $\tilde{O}(\log \Gamma \cdot n(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(\xi)))$. If we now sum up the latter bound over all indices that need to be determined, then each root of F occurs only a constant number of times as each root is contained in only a constant number of components C_i . Hence, we obtain the bound $\tilde{O}(\log \Gamma \cdot n^2(n + \tau_F + \overline{\log} \text{Mea}(F))) = \tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2 \overline{\log} \text{Mea}(F))$ for the overall bit complexity, where we used that $\overline{\log}(\tau_F) = O(n + \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)))$. \square

We can now finalize the proof of Lemma 13. Suppose that \mathbf{C}' is already computed. Then, for each $C_i \in \mathbf{C}'$, we remove each box $B \in C_i$ for which the $\tilde{T}_0^G(\Delta_B)$ -test succeeds; the remaining boxes then fulfill the properties from Lemma 13. The cost for each such call of the \tilde{T}_0^G -test is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + n \overline{\log}(\xi)))$, with ξ an arbitrary root in C_i , where we again use that $\overline{\log} w(B) = O(1) + \overline{\log}(\xi)$. Since each root is considered a constant number of times, summing up the latter complexity bound over all boxes B yields the bound $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2 \overline{\log} \text{Mea}(F))$ for the total bit-complexity of this step.

We are now ready to prove our main result:

Theorem 9 (Main Theorem). *Let $F \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ be a polynomial as in (1). Then, using the algorithm `CISOLATE`, we can isolate all complex roots of F with*

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{O}(n \cdot (n^2 + n \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) + \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\log}(F'(z_i)^{-1}))) \\ & = \tilde{O}(n(n^2 + n \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) + \overline{\log}(\text{Disc}(F)^{-1}))). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

bit operations, where $\text{Disc}(F) := |A_n|^{2n-2} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_j - z_i)^2$ is the discriminant of F . The coefficients of F have to be approximated to

$$\tilde{O}(n^2 + n \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) + \overline{\log}(\text{Disc}(F)^{-1}))$$

bits after the binary point.

For $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ a polynomial of degree n and with integer coefficients of bitsize less than τ , we can use the algorithm `CISOLATE` to isolate all complex roots of $F := f/\text{lcf}(f)$ with $\tilde{O}(n^3 + n^2\tau)$ bit operations.

Proof. Suppose that we have already computed a set $\mathbf{B}' = \{B_1, \dots, B_m\}$ of boxes as in Lemma 13. We can now run our algorithm `CISOLATE` on each of the boxes B_i . Then, for each i , our algorithm returns isolating disks $\Delta_{i,1}$ to Δ_{i,m_i} for all roots contained in B_i . However, since some of these disks might isolate a root contained in $2B_i \setminus B_i$, there might be disks $\Delta_{i,j}$ and $\Delta_{i',j'}$, with $i \neq i'$, that isolate the same root. If $\Delta := \Delta_{i,j}$ isolates a root ξ , then the enlarged disk 2Δ is also isolating for ξ , and thus either two disks $\Delta_{i,j}$ and $\Delta_{i',j'}$ isolate the same root or the disks must be disjoint. Hence, we may post-process all disks $\Delta_{i,j}$ by first grouping them together into maximal connected components, and then replacing each such component by an arbitrary disk in this component. The so-obtained disks then isolate all complex roots of F . Notice that the total number of disks $\Delta_{i,j}$ is bounded by $O(n)$ as each root is contained in only a constant number of boxes $2B_i$. In addition, the binary representation of each disk needs $O(\tau_F + \log n + \max_1(\sigma_F^{-1}))$ bit operations. Hence, using a near-optimal algorithm for computing the maximal connected components of the disks $\Delta_{i,j}$, the cost for the post-processing is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n(\tau_F + \log n + \max_1(\sigma_F^{-1})))$ bit operations. For the overall bit-complexity of this method, we sum up the complexity bound in (21) over all boxes B_i . Again, using the fact that each root is contained in only a constant number of enlarged boxes $2B_i$, the bound (22) follows, where we use that $\sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\log}(z_i) = O(\overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) + n)$, $\tau_F = O(n + \overline{\log} \text{Mea}(F))$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\log}(\sigma_F(z_i)^{-1}) = O(n^2 + n \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) + \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\log}(F'(z_i)^{-1}))$, and $\sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\log}(F'(z_i)^{-1}) = O(n\tau_F + n^2 + n \overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) + \overline{\log}(\text{Disc}(F)^{-1}))$; see [38, Section 2.5] and the proof of [38, Theorem 31] for proofs of the latter bounds.

For an integer polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ with coefficients of bitsize less than τ , we remark that $\overline{\log}(\text{Mea}(F)) = O(\tau + \log n)$ and $\overline{\log}(\text{Disc}(F)^{-1}) = \overline{\log}(\text{lcf}(f)^{-(2n-2)})$. $\text{Disc}(f)^{-1} \leq \overline{\log}(\text{lcf}(f)^{-(2n-2)}) = O(n\tau)$, where $F := f/\text{lcf}(f)$. Hence, the claimed bound follows from (22). \square

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a simple and efficient subdivision algorithm to isolate the complex roots of a polynomial with arbitrary complex coefficients. Our algorithm achieves complexity bounds that are comparable to the best known bounds for this problem, which are achieved by methods based on fast polynomial factorization [23, 27, 13]. Compared to these methods, we see a series of advantages of our algorithm. One advantage is that it can be used to isolate only the roots contained in a given input box, in which case it does not have to compute approximations of all roots. Also, the complexity of our algorithm scales with parameters depending only on the roots in the box, hence its complexity is locally adaptive. Another advantage of `CISOLATE` is its simplicity and that only fast algorithms for polynomial multiplication and Taylor shift computation are used but no other, more involved, asymptotically fast subroutines. Hence, also by providing a self-contained presentation and pseudo-code for all subroutines of the algorithm, we hope that there will soon be implementations of our method. So far,

we have not discussed a series of questions concerning an efficient implementation, including heuristics and filtering techniques to speed up the computations in practice. This will be subject of future research.

Another possible direction of future research is to extend our current Newton-bisection technique and complexity analysis to the analytic roots algorithm in [51]. See [44] for an alternative approach for the computation of the real roots of analytic functions obtained by composing polynomials and the functions \log , \exp , and \arctan .

At the end of Section 4.2, we sketched how to use our algorithm to isolate the roots of a not necessarily square-free polynomial for which the number of distinct complex roots is given as additional input. Also, we may use our algorithm to further refine the isolating disks for the roots of a polynomial. We have not analyzed these extensions, however, we are confident that our approach yields similar bit complexity bounds as provided in [23] for the modified variant of Pan's method. This will be subject of future work.

References

- [1] J. Abbott. Quadratic Interval Refinement for Real Roots. *Communications in Computer Algebra*, 28:3–12, 2014. Poster presented at the International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC), 2006.
- [2] A. G. Akritas and A. Strzeboński. A comparative study of two real root isolation methods. *Nonlinear Analysis:Modelling and Control*, 10(4):297–304, 2005.
- [3] R. Becker. The Bolzano Method to isolate the real roots of a bitstream polynomial. Bachelor thesis, Saarland University, Saarbrücken, Germany, 2012.
- [4] G. Best. Notes on the Graeffe method of root squaring. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 56(2):91–94, 1949.
- [5] D. Bini and G. Fiorentino. Design, Analysis, and Implementation of a Multiprecision Polynomial Rootfinder. *Numerical Algorithms*, 23:127–173, 2000.
- [6] M. Burr and F. Krahmer. Sqfreeeval: An (almost) optimal real-root isolation algorithm. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 47(2):153–166, 2012.
- [7] G. E. Collins. Continued fraction real root isolation using the Hong bound. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 2014. in press.
- [8] G. E. Collins and A. G. Akritas. Polynomial real root isolation using Descartes' rule of signs. In *Symposium on symbolic and algebraic computation (SYMSAC)*, pages 272–275, 1976.
- [9] G. E. Collins and W. Krandick. An efficient algorithm for infallible polynomial complex root isolation. In *Papers from the International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ISSAC '92*, pages 189–194, New York, NY, USA, 1992. ACM.

- [10] Z. Du, V. Sharma, and C. Yap. Amortized bounds for root isolation via Sturm sequences. In *Symbolic Numeric Computation (SNC)*, pages 113–130, 2007.
- [11] A. Eigenwillig. *Real Root Isolation for Exact and Approximate Polynomials Using Descartes’ Rule of Signs*. PhD thesis, Saarland University, 2008.
- [12] A. Eigenwillig, L. Kettner, W. Krandick, K. Mehlhorn, S. Schmitt, and N. Wolpert. A Descartes algorithm for polynomials with bit-stream coefficients. In *Computer Algebra in Scientific Computation (CASC)*, pages 138–149, 2005.
- [13] I. Z. Emiris, V. Y. Pan, and E. P. Tsigaridas. Chapter 10: Algebraic algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/1311.3731, 2013.
- [14] S. Fortune. An iterated eigenvalue algorithm for approximating roots of univariate polynomials. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 33(5):627–646, 2002.
- [15] P. Henrici. *Applied and computational complex analysis: Special functions, integral transforms, asymptotics, continued fractions*. Pure and applied mathematics. J. Wiley & Sons, 1974.
- [16] P. Kirrinnis. Partial Fraction Decomposition in $\mathbb{C}(z)$ and Simultaneous Newton Iteration for Factorization in $\mathbb{C}[z]$. *Journal of Complexity*, 14(3):378 – 444, 1998.
- [17] A. Kobel, F. Rouillier, and M. Sagraloff. personal communication.
- [18] A. Kobel and M. Sagraloff. Fast approximate polynomial multipoint evaluation and applications. *CORR*, abs/1304.8069, 2013.
- [19] J. McNamee and V. Y. Pan. Efficient polynomial root-refiners: A survey and new record efficiency estimates. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 63(1):239 – 254, 2012.
- [20] J. M. McNamee. A 2002 update of the supplementary bibliography on roots of polynomials. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 142(2):433–434, 2002.
- [21] J. M. McNamee. *Numerical Methods for Roots of Polynomials*. Number 1 in Studies in Computational Mathematics. Elsevier Science, 2007.
- [22] J. M. McNamee and V. Y. Pan. *Numerical Methods for Roots of Polynomials*. Number 2 in Studies in Computational Mathematics. Elsevier Science, 2013.
- [23] K. Mehlhorn, M. Sagraloff, and P. Wang. From approximate factorization to root isolation with application to cylindrical algebraic decomposition. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 66:34–69, 2015. A preliminary version appeared in the proceedings of the International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC), 2013.
- [24] B. Mourrain and E. P. Tsigaridas. On the complexity of complex root isolation. In *Proc. 10th Int. Symp. on Effective Methods in Algebraic Geometry (MEGA)*, Barcelona, Spain, 2009.

- [25] B. Mourrain, M. Vrahatis, and J. Yakoubsohn. On the complexity of isolating real roots and computing with certainty the topological degree. *Journal of Complexity*, 18(2):612 – 640, 2002.
- [26] C. Neff and J. H. Reif. An efficient algorithm for the complex roots problem. *Journal of Complexity*, 12(2):81 – 115, 1996.
- [27] V. Pan. Univariate Polynomials: Nearly Optimal Algorithms for Numerical Factorization and Root Finding. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 33(5):701–733, 2002.
- [28] V. Y. Pan. Solving a polynomial equation: Some history and recent progress. *SIAM Review*, 39(2):187–220, 1997.
- [29] V. Y. Pan. Approximating complex polynomial zeros: Modified weyl’s quadtree construction and improved newton’s iteration. *Journal of Complexity*, 16(1):213 – 264, 2000.
- [30] P. Pawlowski. The location of the zeros of the higher order derivatives of a polynomial. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 127(5):pp. 1493–1497, 1999.
- [31] J. R. Pinkert. An exact method for finding the roots of a complex polynomial. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 2(4):351–363, Dec. 1976.
- [32] Q. Rahman and G. Schmeisser. *Analytic Theory of Polynomials*. London Mathematical Society monographs. Clarendon Press, 2002.
- [33] J. Renegar. On the worst-case arithmetic complexity of approximating zeros of polynomials. *Journal of Complexity*, 3(2):90–113, 1987.
- [34] F. Rouillier and P. Zimmermann. Efficient isolation of [a] polynomial’s real roots. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 162:33–50, 2004.
- [35] M. Sagraloff. When Newton meets Descartes: A simple and fast algorithm to isolate the real roots of a polynomial. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ISSAC ’12, pages 297–304, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.
- [36] M. Sagraloff. A near-optimal algorithm for computing real roots of sparse polynomials. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ISSAC ’14, pages 359–366, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.
- [37] M. Sagraloff. On the complexity of the Descartes method when using approximate arithmetic. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 65(0):79 – 110, 2014.
- [38] M. Sagraloff and K. Mehlhorn. Computing real roots of real polynomials. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 73:46 – 86, 2016.
- [39] M. Sagraloff and C. K. Yap. A simple but exact and efficient algorithm for complex root isolation. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ISSAC ’11, pages 353–360, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.

- [40] A. Schönhage. Asymptotically fast algorithms for the numerical multiplication and division of polynomials with complex coefficients. In J. Calmet, editor, *Computer Algebra, EUROCAM '82, European Computer Algebra Conference, Marseille, France, 5-7 April, 1982, Proceedings*, volume 144 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–15. Springer, 1982.
- [41] A. Schönhage. The fundamental theorem of algebra in terms of computational complexity, 1982; updated 2004. Manuscript, Department of Mathematics, University of Tübingen.
- [42] V. Sharma. Complexity of real root isolation using continued fractions. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 409:292–310, 2008.
- [43] V. Sharma and P. Batra. Near optimal subdivision algorithms for real root isolation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ISSAC '15*, pages 331–338, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.
- [44] A. Strzeboński. Real root isolation for exp–log–arctan functions. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 47(3):282 – 314, 2012.
- [45] E. P. Tsigaridas and I. Z. Emiris. On the complexity of real root isolation using continued fractions. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 392(1-3):158–173, 2008.
- [46] P. Turán, G. Halâasz, and J. Pintz. *On a new method of analysis and its applications*. A Wiley-Interscience publication. Wiley-Interscience, 1984.
- [47] H. Weyl. Randbemerkungen zu Hauptproblemen der Mathematik. II. Fundamentalsatz der Algebra and Grundlagen der Mathematik. *Math. Z.*, 20:131–151, 1924.
- [48] H. S. Wilf. A global bisection algorithm for computing the zeros of polynomials in the complex plane. *J. ACM*, 25(3):415–420, July 1978.
- [49] J.-C. Yakoubsohn. Finding a cluster of zeros of univariate polynomials. *Journal of Complexity*, 16(3):603 – 638, 2000.
- [50] J.-C. Yakoubsohn. Numerical analysis of a bisection-exclusion method to find zeros of univariate analytic functions. *Journal of Complexity*, 21(5):652 – 690, 2005.
- [51] C. Yap, M. Sagraloff, and V. Sharma. Analytic Root Clustering: A Complete Algorithm Using Soft Zero Tests. In P. Bonizzoni, V. Brattka, and B. Löwe, editors, *The Nature of Computation. Logic, Algorithms, Applications - 9th Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2013, Milan, Italy, July 1-5, 2013. Proceedings*, volume 7921 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 434–444. Springer, 2013.
- [52] C. K. Yap. *Fundamental Problems of Algorithmic Algebra*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

7 Appendix

7.1 Missing proofs in Section 3.1

Lemma (Restatement of Lemma 1). *Let $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ be a disk that is $(1, 4c_2 \cdot \max_1(k) \cdot n^2)$ -isolating for the roots z_1, \dots, z_k , then, for all $z \in c_2 \cdot n \cdot \Delta$, it holds that $F^{(k)}(z) \neq 0$. Furthermore,*

$$\sum_{i=k+1}^n \left| \frac{F^{(i)}(m)(c_1 \cdot r)^{i-k} k!}{F^{(k)}(m) i!} \right| < \frac{1}{2K}.$$

Proof. 1. For the first part, we may assume that $k \geq 1$. Then, for the k 'th derivative of F and any complex z that is not a root of F , it holds that

$$\frac{F^{(k)}(z)}{F(z)} = \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \prod_{j \in J} \frac{1}{z - z_j} = \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{z - z_j} + \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{k}, J \neq [k]} \prod_{j \in J} \frac{1}{z - z_j}.$$

By way of contradiction, assume $F^{(k)}(z) = 0$ for some $z \in c_2 n \cdot \Delta$. Then,

$$\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{|z - z_j|} \leq \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{k}, J \neq [k]} \prod_{j \in J} \frac{1}{|z - z_j|}.$$

Assuming $k \leq n/2$, we proceed to show

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{k}, J \neq [k]} \frac{|z - z_1| \cdots |z - z_k|}{\prod_{j \in J} |z - z_j|} \\ &= \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \sum_{J \in \binom{[k]}{k'}} \sum_{J' \in \binom{[n] \setminus [k]}{k-k'}} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^k |z - z_i|}{\prod_{i \in J} |z - z_i| \cdot \prod_{j \in J'} |z - z_j|} \\ &\leq \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{k'} \binom{n-k}{k-k'} \left(\frac{2c_2 nr}{4c_2 kn^2 r - c_2 nr} \right)^{k-k'} \\ &\leq \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{k'} \binom{n-k}{k-k'} \left(\frac{1}{2kn} \right)^{k-k'} \\ &\leq \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \frac{k^{k-k'}}{(k-k')!} (n-k)^{k-k'} \left(\frac{1}{2kn} \right)^{k-k'} \\ &\leq \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} (1/2)^{k-k'} / (k-k')! \\ &< e^{1/2} - 1 < 1, \text{ a contradiction.} \end{aligned}$$

The preceding argument assumes $k \leq n/2$ because this allows us to freely

choose J and J' as indicated. But suppose $k > n/2$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\leq \sum_{I \in \binom{[n]}{k} \setminus [k]} \frac{|z - z_1| \cdots |z - z_k|}{|z - z_{i_1}| \cdots |z - z_{i_k}|} \\
&= \sum_{k'=1}^{n-k} \sum_{J \in \binom{[k]}{k-k'}} \sum_{J' \in \binom{[n] \setminus [k]}{k'}} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^k |z - z_i|}{\prod_{i \in J} |z - z_i| \cdot \prod_{j \in J'} |z - z_j|} \\
&\leq \sum_{k'=1}^{n-k} \binom{k}{k-k'} \binom{n-k}{k'} \left(\frac{2c_2nr}{4c_2kn^2r - c_2nr} \right)^{k'} \\
&< \sum_{k'=1}^{n-k} \binom{k}{k-k'} \binom{n-k}{k'} \left(\frac{2}{3kn} \right)^{k'} \\
&\leq \sum_{k'=1}^{n-k} \frac{k^{k'}}{k'!} (n-k)^{k'} \left(\frac{2}{3kn} \right)^{k'} \\
&\leq \sum_{k'=1}^{n-k} \frac{1}{k'!} \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^{k'} \leq e^{2/3} - 1 < 1, \text{ again a contradiction.}
\end{aligned}$$

2. Similar as above, with $z_1^{(k)}, \dots, z_{n-k}^{(k)}$ denoting the roots of $F^{(k)}$, it holds that

$$\left| \frac{F^{(k+i)}(m)}{F^{(k)}(m)} \right| \leq \sum_{J \in \binom{[n-k]}{i}} \prod_{j \in J} \frac{1}{|m - z_j^{(k)}|} \leq \frac{\binom{n-k}{i}}{(c_2nr)^i},$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=k+1}^n \left| \frac{F^{(i)}(m)(c_1r)^{i-k}k!}{F^{(k)}(m)i!} \right| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \left| \frac{F^{(k+i)}(m)}{F^{(k)}(m)} \right| \frac{(c_1r)^i}{i!} \quad | \text{ since } \frac{k!}{(k+i)!} \leq \frac{1}{i!} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \frac{\binom{n-k}{i} (c_1r)^i}{c_2^i n^i r^i i!} \\
&< \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \left(\frac{c_1}{c_2} \right)^i \frac{1}{i!} \leq e^{c_1/c_2} - 1 \leq \frac{1}{2K},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (5) for the last inequality. \square

Lemma (Restatement of Lemma 2). *Let λ be a real value with $\lambda \geq 16K \cdot \max_1(k)^2 \cdot n$ and suppose that $\Delta := \Delta(m, r)$ is a disk that is $(1, \lambda)$ -isolating for the roots z_1, \dots, z_k of F , then*

$$\sum_{i < k} \frac{|F^{(i)}(m)| (c_1 \cdot r)^{i-k} k!}{|F^{(k)}(m)| i!} < \frac{1}{2K}.$$

Proof. We may assume that $k \geq 1$. Write $F(x) = G(x)H(x)$ with $G(x) = \prod_{i=1}^k (x - z_i)$ and $H(x) = \prod_{j=k+1}^n (x - z_j)$. By induction, one shows that

$F^{(i)}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^i \binom{i}{j} G^{(i-j)}(x) H^{(j)}(x)$ and $F^{(k)}(x) = k! \sum_{I \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \prod_{i \notin I} (x - z_i) = k! \cdot \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{n-k}} \prod_{j \in J} (x - z_j)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|F^{(k)}(m)| &= k! \cdot \left| \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{n-k}} \prod_{j \in J} (m - z_j) \right| = \\
&k! \cdot |H(m)| \cdot \left| \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{n-k}} \frac{\prod_{j \in J} (m - z_j)}{\prod_{i=k+1}^n |m - z_i|} \right| \\
&\geq k! \cdot |H(m)| \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{n-k}: J \neq \{k+1, \dots, n\}} \frac{\prod_{j \in J} |m - z_j|}{\prod_{i=k+1}^n |m - z_i|} \right) \\
&\geq k! \cdot |H(m)| \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\min(k, n-k)} \sum_{J_1, J_2: J_1 \subset [k]: |J_1|=j \text{ and } J_2 \subset [n] \setminus [k]: |J_2|=n-k-j} \frac{\prod_{j \in J_1} |m - z_j|}{(\lambda r)^j} \right) \\
&\geq k! \cdot |H(m)| \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\min(k, n-k)} \binom{k}{j} \binom{n-k}{n-k-j} \frac{r^j}{(\lambda r)^j} \right) \\
&\geq k! \cdot |H(m)| \cdot \left(2 - \sum_{j=0}^n k^j \binom{n}{j} \frac{1}{\lambda^j} \right) \\
&\geq k! \cdot |H(m)| \cdot \left(2 - \left(1 + \frac{k}{\lambda} \right)^n \right) \\
&\geq k! \cdot |H(m)| \cdot \left(2 - e^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{k! \cdot |H(m)|}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For G , we have $G^{(i)}(x) = i! \sum_{J \in \binom{[k]}{i}} \prod_{j \notin J} (x - z_j)$, and thus $|G^{(i)}(m)| \leq i! \binom{k}{i} r^{k-i}$. In addition,

$$\left| \frac{H^{(i)}(m)}{H(m)} \right| \leq \sum_{J \in \binom{[n]}{i}} \prod_{j \in J} \frac{1}{|m - z_j|} \leq i! \cdot \binom{n-k}{i} \frac{1}{(\lambda r)^i}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
|G^{(i-j)}(m) H^{(j)}(m)| &\leq |H(m)| \cdot (i-j)! \binom{k}{i-j} r^{k-(i-j)} \cdot j! \binom{n-k}{j} \frac{1}{(\lambda r)^j} \\
&= |H(m)| \cdot (i-j)! j! \binom{k}{i-j} \binom{n-k}{j} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda^j} r^{k-i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it holds that (where we use that $\lambda \geq 16Kk^2 \cdot n$ and $c_1 \geq \frac{k}{\ln(1+\frac{1}{8K})}$)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{|F^{(i)}(m)|}{|F^{(k)}(m)|} \frac{(c_1 r)^{i-k} k!}{i!} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \sum_{j=0}^i \frac{|G^{(i-j)}(m) H^{(j)}(m)|}{|F^{(k)}(m)|} \frac{\binom{i}{j} (c_1 r)^{i-k} k!}{i!} \\
& \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \sum_{j=0}^i \frac{|H(m)|}{|F^{(k)}(m)|} (i-j)! j! \binom{k}{i-j} \binom{n-k}{j} \binom{i}{j} \frac{c_1^{i-k} k!}{\lambda^j i!} \\
& \leq 2c_1^{-k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{i} c_1^i + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^i \binom{k}{i-j} \binom{n-k}{j} \frac{c_1^{i-k}}{\lambda^j} \\
& \leq 2c_1^{-k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{i} c_1^i + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^i \binom{n-k}{j} \frac{k^j}{\lambda^j} \ln^{k-i} \left(1 + \frac{1}{8K}\right) \\
& = 2c_1^{-k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{i} c_1^i + \frac{k-1}{8Kk} + \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} \sum_{j=2}^i \frac{2}{(16Kk)^j} \\
& < 2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} c_1^{-j} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4K} \leq 2 \left(e^{k/c_1} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4K} \leq \frac{1}{2K}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

7.2 Missing Proofs in Section 3.2

Theorem (Restatement of Theorem 3). *Denote the roots of F by z_1, \dots, z_n , then it holds that $F^{[1]}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i^{[1]} x^i = a_n^2 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (x - z_i^2)$. In particular, the roots of the first Graeffe iterate $F^{[1]}$ are the squares of the roots of F . In addition, we have*

$$n^2 \cdot \max_1(\|F\|_\infty)^2 \geq \|F^{[1]}\|_\infty \geq \|F\|_\infty^2 \cdot 2^{-4n}.$$

Proof. Notice that $a_n^{[1]} = a_n^2$ follows directly from the definition of $F^{[1]}$. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F^{[1]}(z_i^2) &= (-1)^n \cdot [F_e(z_i^2)^2 - z_i^2 \cdot F_o(z_i^2)^2] \\
&= (-1)^n \cdot [F_e(z_i^2) - z_i \cdot F_o(z_i^2)] \cdot [F_e(z_i^2) + z_i \cdot F_o(z_i^2)] \\
&= (-1)^n \cdot [F_e(z_i^2) - z_i \cdot F_o(z_i^2)] \cdot F(z_i) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Going from F to an arbitrary small perturbation \tilde{F} (which has only simple roots and for which $\tilde{z}_i^2 \neq \tilde{z}_j^2$ for all pairs of distinct roots \tilde{z}_i and \tilde{z}_j of \tilde{F}), we conclude that each root z_i^2 of $F^{[1]}$ has multiplicity $\text{mult}(z_i^2, F^{[1]}) = \sum_{j: z_j^2 = z_i^2} \text{mult}(z_j, F)$. Hence, the first claim follows. For the second claim, notice that the left inequality follows immediately from the fact that each coefficient of $F^{[1]}$ is the sum of at most n^2 many products of the form $\pm a_i \cdot a_j$, and each of these products has absolute value smaller than or equal to $\max_1(\|F\|_\infty)^2$. For the right inequality we have to work harder: W.l.o.g., we may assume that $|z_i| < 2$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and that $|z_i| \geq 2$ for $i = k+1, \dots, n$. Let z_{\max} be a point in the closure of the unit disk $\Delta(0, 1)$ such that $|F(z_{\max})| = \max_{z: |z| \leq 1} |F(z)|$. Since F takes its maximum on the boundary of $\Delta(0, 1)$, we must have $|z_{\max}| = 1$, and using Cauchy's Integral Theorem to write the coefficients of F in terms of an integral,

we conclude that $|F(z_{\max})| \geq \|F\|_\infty$. In addition, it holds that $|F(z_{\max})| \leq \sum_{i=0}^n |a_i| \cdot |z_{\max}|^n = \sum_{i=0}^n |a_i| \leq (n+1) \cdot \|F\|_\infty$, and thus

$$\|F\|_\infty \leq |F(z_{\max})| = \max_{z:|z|\leq 1} |F(z)| \leq (n+1) \cdot \|F\|_\infty.$$

Applying the latter result to the polynomial $g(x) := \prod_{i=1}^k (z - z_i^2)$ yields the existence of a point z' with $|z'| = 1$ and $|g(z')| \geq 1$. Hence, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |F^{[1]}(z')| &= |a_n|^2 \prod_{i=1}^k |z' - z_i^2| \prod_{i=k+1}^n |z' - z_i^2| \geq |a_n|^2 \prod_{i=k+1}^n |(\sqrt{z'} - z_i) \cdot (\sqrt{z'} + z_i)| \\ &\geq |a_n|^2 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{|z_{\max} - z_i|^2}{9} \cdot \prod_{i=k+1}^n \frac{|z_{\max} - z_i|^2}{9} \geq \frac{|F(z_{\max})|^2}{9^n}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $|x - y| < 3$ for arbitrary complex points x, y with $|x| = 1$ and $|y| < 2$, and that $|x - z| \geq \frac{|y-z|}{3}$ for arbitrary complex points x, y, z with $|x| = |y| = 1$ and $|z| \geq 2$. We conclude that

$$\|F^{[1]}\|_\infty \geq \frac{|F^{[1]}(z')|}{n+1} \geq \frac{|F(z_{\max})|^2}{(n+1) \cdot 9^n} \geq \|F\|_\infty^2 \cdot 2^{-4n}. \quad \square$$

7.3 Missing Proofs in Section 5.2

Lemma (Restatement of Lemma 11). *Let $\Delta := \Delta(m, r) \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a disk and K , with $K > 1$, be a real number such that the enlarged disk $\hat{\Delta} := K \cdot \Delta$ contains at least two roots of F . Then, it holds that*

$$\max_{z \in \Delta} |F(z)| > \sigma_F(z_i) \cdot |F'(z_i)| \cdot (nK)^{-\mu} \cdot 2^{-3n},$$

where z_i is an arbitrary root of F contained in $\hat{\Delta}$, and μ denotes the number of roots contained in $\hat{\Delta}$.

Proof. Consider a fixed i with $z_i \in \hat{\Delta}$, and let $m' \in \Delta(m, r/2)$ be a point such that the distance from m to any root of F is at least $r/(2n)$. Notice that such a point exists because the union of all disks $\Delta(z_i, r/(2n))$ covers an area of at most $n \cdot \pi \cdot \frac{r^2}{4n^2} < \pi \cdot (r/2)^2$, and thus there must be a point in $\Delta(m, r/2)$ that is not contained in any disk $\Delta(z_i, r/(2n))$. If z_j is a root not contained in $\hat{\Delta}$, then $\frac{|z_i - z_j|}{|m' - z_j|} \leq \frac{|z_i - m'| + |m' - z_j|}{|m' - z_j|} \leq 1 + \frac{|z_i - m'|}{|m' - z_j|} \leq 1 + \frac{2Kr}{Kr - r/2} \leq 8$. If $z_j \in \hat{\Delta}$, then $\frac{|z_i - z_j|}{|m' - z_j|} \leq \frac{2Kr}{r/(2n)} = 4nK$. Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |F(m')| &= |F_n| \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n |m' - z_j| = |F'(z_i)| \cdot |m' - z_i| \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{|m' - z_j|}{|z_j - z_i|} \\ &\geq |F'(z_i)| \cdot |m' - z_i| \cdot (4nK)^{-\mu+1} \cdot 8^{-n+\mu} \\ &> |F'(z_i)| \cdot |m' - z_i| \cdot (nK)^{-\mu+1} \cdot 2^{-3n+2} \\ &> |F'(z_i)| \cdot \frac{\sigma_F(z_i)}{4nK} \cdot (nK)^{-\mu+1} 2^{-3n+2} = \sigma_F(z_i) \cdot |F'(z_i)| \cdot (nK)^{-\mu} 2^{-3n}, \end{aligned}$$

where, in the last inequality, we used that $\hat{\Delta}$ contains at least two roots, and thus $\sigma_F(z_i) \leq 2Kr$. \square