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ABSTRACT
Evaluating or finding the roots of a polynomial $f(z) = f_0 + \cdots + f_d z^d$ with floating-point number coefficients is a ubiquitous problem. By using a piecewise approximation of $f$ obtained with a careful use of the Newton polygon of $f$, we improve state-of-the-art upper bounds on the number of operations to evaluate and find the roots of a polynomial. In particular, if the coefficients of $f$ are given with $m$ significant bits, we provide for the first time an algorithm that finds all the roots of $f$ with a relative condition number lower than $2^m$, using a number of bit operations quasi-linear in the bit-size of the floating-point representation of $f$. Notably, our new approach handles efficiently polynomials with coefficients ranging from $2^{-d}$ to $2^d$, both in theory and in practice.

Evaluating or finding the roots of a polynomial with coefficients represented as floating-point numbers is widely used. Given two positive integer bounds $m$ and $\tau$, a floating number can be represented as $a2^b$ where $a$ and $b$ are integers with $|a| \leq 2^m$ and $|b| \leq \tau$. This representation notably allows to use a constant size $m + \log_2 \tau$ to represent numbers with different orders of magnitude [6, 14, 22].

In the literature, analysing the complexity for approximating the roots of a polynomial is usually done by considering a fixed-point representation for the coefficients ([2, 20, 21, 25] and references therein). In those analyses, the coefficients are either integers or represented as fixed-point numbers with a uniform error on all the coefficients. The drawback of those approaches is that finding the root of the polynomial $2^\tau - 2^{-\tau} z = 0$ will require $O(\tau)$ bit operations where $O(\cdot)$ means that we omit the logarithmic factors. On the other hand, this simple equation can be solved in $O(\log \tau)$ bit operations if we use floating-point arithmetic.

Polynomial where the coefficients have different orders of magnitude appear in several applications. For example, truncating a series expansion of a generalized hypergeometric function such as $e^z$ to order $d$ may return a polynomial where the $k$-th coefficient has a magnitude in $\Theta(1/k!)$. The characteristic polynomial of a matrix also has coefficients with different order of magnitude. Solving multivariate polynomial systems can be done by eliminating variables and reducing the problem to a univariate polynomial having coefficients with different orders of magnitude [1].

Some work in the literature address the problem of handling large orders of magnitudes for the root-finding problem, notably when using methods based on the Newton diagram and Graeffe iterations ([8, 18, 23, 24, 27] among others). In these approaches, intermediate values can have large orders of magnitudes and a process of normalisation can be applied to reduce their sizes [11, 13, 19]. However, the algorithm they describe is quadratic in the degree of the input polynomial.

Using the Newton polygon of $f$ we develop a new method adapted to the working relative precision of the input coefficients. Let $f$ be a polynomial of degree $d$ with floating-point coefficients of magnitude less than $2^\tau$ and represented with $m$ significant bits. We will compute a piecewise approximation of $f$ by $O(d/m)$ polynomials $g$ of degree $O(m)$, where the coefficients of each polynomial $g$ is represented with $O(m)$ significant digits. This representation will allow us to improve state-of-the-art bounds on the problems of evaluating $f$ on $d$ points and of finding its roots.

After stating formally our main results in Section 1, we will describe in Sections 2 and 3 how to compute such a piecewise approximation in $O(d(m + \log \tau))$ bit operations. Then we will show how to use this data-structure to evaluate $f$ (Section 4) and to approximate or isolate the roots of $f$ (Section 5). Finally we describe experimental results of our prototype implementations on different families of polynomials (Section 6).

1 PRELIMINARIES
In the article, our input is the polynomial $f(z) = f_0 + \cdots + f_d z^d$. We assume that the coefficients of $f$ are represented with floating-point numbers and our goal is to design fast algorithms for the evaluation or the root-finding problem, with the same error bounds as if we had used classical algorithms with floating-point arithmetic.

For that we will first compute in Sections 2 and 3 a piecewise polynomial approximation of $f$ defined on a partition of the complex plane. Before stating our main result, we recall two mathematical tools that will be fundamental in our algorithms: the condition number and the Newton polygon.

Notations. We will use the following notations to describe our piecewise polynomial approximation. For a complex number $\gamma$ and a positive real $\rho$, we denote by $D(\gamma, \rho)$ the disk of center $\gamma$ and radius $\rho$. For two positive real number $r_1, r_2$, we denote by $R(r_1, r_2)$
We can now state our main results, with some reasonable assumptions on the precision such as $m > \log d$ for a simpler presentation.

The first theorem shows that we can evaluate a polynomial of degree $d$ on $d$ points with a complexity quasi-linear in $d$ times the size of a floating-point representation of the coefficients. In particular, if the magnitudes of the coefficients are bounded by $2^e$, this means that our algorithm will be quasi-linear in $d \log r$. This is an improvement over a recent result [21] where the complexity was quasi-linear in $dr$.

**Theorem 1.1 (Evaluation).** Let $f$ be a polynomial of degree $d$ with complex floating-point coefficients of magnitudes less than $2^e$ and let $m$ be a positive integer. It is possible to compute in $O(d(m + \log r))$ bit operations a piecewise polynomial approximation $f_{p,w}$ such that

$$|f(z) - f_{p,w}(z)| \leq 2^{-m} \tilde{f}(z)$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Moreover, assuming that $m > \log d$, and given complex points $z_1, \ldots, z_d$ with $|z_j| \leq 2^e$, it is possible to evaluate:

(i) $f_{p,w}(z_1), \ldots, f_{p,w}(z_d)$ in $O(d(m + \log r))$ bit operations,

(ii) $f_{p,w}(z_1), \ldots, f_{p,w}(z_d)$ in $O(d(m + \log r))$ bit operations.

The second theorem allows us to find the roots of polynomials with a number of bit operations quasi-linear in $\log r$, and to handle polynomials with large coefficients such as resultant polynomials of two bivariate polynomials (see Section 6.2).

**Theorem 1.2 (Root Finding).** Let $f$ be a polynomial of degree $d$ with complex floating-point coefficients of magnitudes less than $2^e$ and let $m$ be a positive integer. It is possible to compute the $m$ most significant bits of all the roots of $f$ in $O(d(m + \log r) + \log k)$ bit operations.

Moreover, if $k = \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} |f(z)|$, it is possible to compute the $m$ most significant bits of all the roots of $f$ in $O(d(m + \log r + \log k))$ bit operations.

Our approach consists in computing a piecewise approximation in two steps. A first approximation is computed on a partition of the complex plane in concentric rings, and is described in Section 2. Then we refine our piecewise approximation by partitioning each ring uniformly in angular sectors, as described in Section 3.

## 2 PIECEWISE APPROXIMATION OVER RINGS

Our first piecewise approximation is based on a subdivision of the complex plane with concentric rings $R_n$ centered at the origin, as illustrated in Figure 2. In Algorithm 1, we compute the rings and we select dominant monomials of $f$. This returns a list of rings $R_n = R_n(f_n, f_{n+1})$ and a pair of indices $(t_n, u_n)$ associated to each ring such that evaluating $z^{\min} f_{t_nu_n}(z)$ on $R_n$ is sufficient to evaluate $f$ up to a given error bound. One of the goal of this algorithm is to choose the rings such that the sum of the number of monomials of the polynomials $f_{t_nu_n}$ is linear in $d$. The main result of this section is summarized in the following Lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** Given a polynomial $f$ of degree $d$ with floating-point coefficients with $m$-bits mantissa and magnitude less than $2^e$, it is...
possible to compute in $O(d(m + \log n))$ bit operations $R_n = R(r_{n+1}, r_{n+1})$ and extract $N$ polynomials $f_{u, u_n}$ of degrees $\delta_n$ such that:

\begin{align*}
\text{(i)} & \quad 2^{-\frac{m}{2}} \delta_n^2 \leq \delta_{n+1}^2 \leq 2^m \delta_n^2 \text{ if } \delta_n \geq 1, \text{ and} \\
\text{(ii)} & \quad \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\delta_n + 1) \leq 65d + 1.
\end{align*}

And for all $z \in R_n$:

\text{(iii)} & \quad |f(z) - z^m f_{u, u_n}(z)| \leq (d - \delta_n)2^{-m}f(|z|).

We use the Newton polygon associated to $f$ to compute such approximation polynomials, which allows us to reduce computing rings and indices that satisfy Lemma 2.1 to geometrical arguments.

In Section 2.1 we start by detailing Algorithm 1 and prove the inequalities (i) and (iii) of Lemma 2.1. Then in Section 2.2 we prove the inequality (ii) that is fundamental to bound the complexity of all the subsequent algorithms.

### 2.1 Algorithm

Our algorithm takes as input the Newton polygon $H$ of the polynomial $f$. The Newton polygon is the lower convex hull of the points $(j, -\log_2|f_j|)$ for $0 \leq j \leq d$ and in the general case, it can be computed in $O(d \log d)$ arithmetic operations [9], or $O(d)$ arithmetic operations when the points are sorted, which is the case here.

The main idea of Algorithm 1 is to swipe a line tangent to $H$, as illustrated in Figure 3. Given a line $L$ of slope $s$ tangent to $H$, the next line $L'$ of slope $s'$ tangent to $H$, with $s' > s$, is computed informally as follow:

1. Let $H_{-m}$ be the polygon $H$ shifted vertically by $-m$.
2. Let $\ell$ be the abscissa of the leftmost point of $H_{-m}$ below $L$.
3. For the new line $L'$, we denote by $u$ the abscissa of the rightmost point of $H_{-m}$ below $L'$, $m_\ell$ the vertical distance between $L$ and $L'$ at $\ell$, $m_u$ the vertical distance between $L$ and $L'$ at $u$.
4. Starting from the slope of $L$, increase the slope of $L'$ until $m/2 \leq m_\ell + m_u \leq m$. In Algorithm 1, line 10 addresses step 1 above. In line 11 we compute the maximal abscissa $u$ such that $m_\ell + m_u \leq m$. Then we choose $s' = s + m/(u - l + 1)$ for the new slope of $L'$; this implies that $m_\ell + m_u = m(u - l + 1)/(u - l + 1) \leq m$, and as soon as $u > l$, we have $m/2 \leq m_\ell + m_u \leq m$. Thus, if $\delta_n \geq 1$, we have $\left(r_{n+1}/r_n\right)\delta_n^2 = 2^m(u_{n-1} - f_n)/(u_n - f_n + 1)$ is between $2m/2$ and $2^m$, which proves the inequality (i) of Lemma 2.1.

For the inequality (iii), let $z$ be such that $r_n \leq |z| \leq r_{n+1}$. This means that $\log |z|$ is between $s_n$ and $s_{n+1}$. Let $L''$ be the line of slope $\log |z|$ tangent to $H$. It is below $L'$ for the abscissae less than $\ell_n$, and below $L''$ for the abscissae greater than $u_n$. In particular, let $P = (k, y_k)$ be a vertex of $H$ contained in $L''$, and let $Q = (j, y_j)$ be a point of $H_{-m}$ such that $j < \ell_n$ or $j > u_n$ and $|f_j| \neq 0$. By construction, we have $y_k = -\log_2|f_k|$ and $y_j \neq -\log_2|f_j|$. Moreover we know that the line $L''$ is below $P_j$. Since $L''$ is a line of slope $\log |z|$ passing through $P_j$, this implies that $y_k + (j - k)\log_2|z| \leq y_j$. Equivalently, this means that $-\log_2|f_k| + (j - k)\log_2|z| \leq -\log_2|f_j|$. Taking the power of two, this implies that $|z|^{2-j}|f_k| \leq 2^{-m}|f_j|$, which can be rewritten as $|f_j||z|^j \leq 2^{-m}|f_k||z|^k$. This implies that for all $z \in R_n$ and all $j < \ell_n$ and all $j > u_n$, we have $|f_j||z|^j \leq 2^{-m}|f_j|(|z|)$, which in turn implies the inequality (iii).

**Algorithm 1: Rings and dominant monomials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>for $j$ from 1 to $d - 1$ do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$L$ ← lines tangent to $H$ through $(j, h_j - m)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$S_j^0$ ← lower slope of the 2 lines in $L$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$S_j^1$ ← upper slope of the 2 lines in $L$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>start ← slope of line through $(0, h_0)$ and $(1, h_1 - m)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>end ← slope of line through $(d - 1, h_{d-1})$ and $(d, h_d - m)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$n, s_n ← 1, \text{start}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$r_0, r_1, 0, u_0 ← 0, 2^{</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>while $s_n &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$\ell_n ← \text{minimal index } \ell \text{ such that } S_{\ell}^0 &gt; s_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$u_n ← \text{maximal index } u \text{ such that } \left(1 - \ell_n \right) S_u^0 - \left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$s_{n+1} ← s_n + \frac{m}{u_n - \ell_n} \text{ if } u_n &gt; \ell_n \text{ else } S_{u_n+1}^0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$r_{n+1}, u_n ← +\infty, d, d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$N ← n + 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>return $(r_n)<em>{0 \leq n \leq N}, (\ell_n)</em>{0 \leq n \leq N}, (u_n)_{0 \leq n \leq N}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Complexity

We can now prove the inequality (ii) that will allow us notably to bound the number of bit operations of Algorithm 1 in Section 2.2.2. 

#### 2.2.1 Bound on accumulated number of monomials

By the way the $\delta_n$ are computed, it is not obvious that their sum is linear in $d$. The proof comes from a geometrical argument. For each step, we can
define an area that has a size in $O(\delta m)$, and we will show that
the sum of the area is in $O(dm)$, as illustrated on Figure 4. More precisely, for $0 \leq n < N$ such that $\delta_n \geq 1$, let $V_n$ be the vertical band between the abscissae $\ell_n$ and $u_n$. Letting $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}'$ be the lines of slopes $\ell_n$ and $\ell_{n+1}$ respectively, we define two regions:

- $U_n$ the set of points of $V_n$ above $\mathcal{L}$ and below $\mathcal{L}'$
- $L_n$ the set of points of $V_n$ below $\mathcal{L}$ and above $\mathcal{L}'$

First, since $V_n$ has width $\delta_n$, and the difference of the slopes between $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}'$ is $m/(\delta_n + 1) \geq m/(2\delta_n)$, the sum of the areas of $L_n$ and $U_n$ is at least $\delta_n m/8$.

Then, let $U$ be the union of the $U_n$ for $0 \leq n < N$ and $\delta_n \geq 1$. By construction, for different indices $n$, the $U_n$ are pairwise distinct, such that the area of $U$ is greater than the sum of the area of $U_n$. Similarly, letting $L$ be the union of the $L_n$ we have that the area of $L$ is greater than sum of the area of $L_n$.

Finally, let $H_{-2m}$ be the polygon obtained by shifting the Newton polygon $H$ vertically by $-2m$. By construction, the index $u_n$ has been chosen such that the vertical distance between $\mathcal{L}$ and the point of abscissa $u_n$ of $H_{-m}$ is at most $m$. Thus the points where $\mathcal{L}$ exits $V_n$ on the right is above $H_{-2m}$. Moreover, at abscissa $\ell_n$, the line $\mathcal{L}$ is above $H_m$, so that in the vertical band $V_n$, the line $\mathcal{L}$ lies entirely above $H_{-2m}$. Similarly, we can prove that $\mathcal{L}'$ is above $H_{-2m}$ since it is below $\mathcal{L}$ at abscissa $u_n$, and at abscissa $\ell_n$, its vertical distance to $\mathcal{L}'$ is $m_\ell \leq m$. Thus $U_n$ and $L_n$ are contained in the band between $H$ and $H_{-2m}$. This implies that $U$ (resp. $L$) has an area less than $2dm$.

Gathering all the geometrical constraints, and letting $|U|$, $|L|$, $|U_n|$, $|L_n|$ be the areas of the corresponding regions, we have:

$$
\sum_{0 \leq n < N \mid \delta_n \geq 1} \frac{\delta_n m}{8} \leq \sum_{0 \leq n < N \mid \delta_n \geq 1} |U_n| + |L_n| \leq |U| + |L| \leq 4dm
$$

such that $\sum_{0 \leq n < N} \delta_n \leq 32d$. And for $\delta_n \geq 1$ we have $\delta_n + 1 \leq 2\delta_n$, which implies $\sum_{0 \leq n < N, \delta_n \geq 1} (\delta_n + 1) \leq 64d$.

To conclude the proof of the inequality (ii) of Lemma 2.1, we need to take also into account the case where $\delta_n = 0$. This case happens when $\ell_n = u_n$. The values $\ell_n$ such that $\delta_n = 0$ are all distinct, such that $\sum_{0 \leq n < N, \delta_n = 0} (\delta_n + 1) \leq d + 1$.

2.2.2 Bound on the complexity of Algorithm 1. We prove here that the number of bit operations of Algorithm 1 is in $O(d(m + \log r))$. Let $N$ be the number of iterations of the while loop.

First, the lists $S^0$ and $S^1$ can be computed with $O(d)$ arithmetic operations. Second, since the indices $\ell$ and $u$ are non-decreasing, computing the sequences $(\ell_n)_{n \leq N}$ and $(u_n)_{n \leq N}$ amount to $O(N + d)$ comparisons. Third, the terms of the sequence $(r_n)_{n \leq N}$ can be computed using Arithmetic-Geometric means [5]. This method is quasi-linear in required number of correct significant bits. The $h_i$ have a magnitude bounded by $r$. Thus, the variable $s$ has a magnitude in $O(\tau)$ and it is sufficient to perform the arithmetic operations and the exponentiation with $O(m + \log d + \log \tau)$ correct significant digits in order to get the required precision for a term $r_n$.

Finally, using inequality (ii) of Lemma 2.1, $N$ is in $O(d)$ which concludes the proof.

3 PIECEWISE APPROXIMATION OVER ANGULAR SECTORS

In the previous section, we computed a first piecewise approximation of $f$ by polynomials $z^n f_{\ell_n,u_n}(z)$ over a partition of the complex plane in concentric rings $R_n$. Even though the total number of monomials of those polynomials is linear in $d$, it is possible that a single approximating polynomial $f_{\ell_n,u_n}$ has a degree $d$. Thus we need to further truncate the polynomials so that subsequent evaluations or root finding methods are faster. This is done by dividing uniformly each ring $R_n$ in angular sectors $A_{n,k}$, and by computing a Taylor polynomial in each sector. More precisely, let $y_{n,k}$ be the center and $|\rho_{n,k}|$ be the radius of a disk that contains $A_{n,k}$. Then we approximate $f_{\ell_n,u_n}$ by computing the first $4m + 1$ coefficients of the polynomial $f_{\ell_n,u_n}$ composed with the polynomial $y_{n,k} + \rho_{n,k} z$. We denote by $g_{n,k}$ the resulting polynomial. The main result of this section is summarized in the following Lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** Given a polynomial $f_{\ell_n,u_n}$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 2.1, it is possible to compute in $O(\delta m (m + \log \tau))$ bit operations the parameters of $K$ affine changes of variable $z = y_{n,k} + \rho_{n,k} z$ and $K$ polynomials $g_{n,k}$ of degree $\min(\delta_n, 4m)$ such that:

(i) $R_n$ is included in the union of the disks $D(y_{n,k}, |\rho_{n,k}|)$,

(ii) $\|f_{\ell_n,u_n}(y_{n,k} + \rho_{n,k} z) - g_{n,k}(z)\|_1 \leq (\delta_n + 1)2^{-m} f_{\ell_n,u_n}(r_n)r_n^{-\tau}$.

We use Algorithm 2 to compute those approximations. We describe it and provide its complexity analysis in Section 3.1, and we prove the inequalities (i) and (ii) in Section 3.2.

3.1 Algorithm and complexity analysis

In Algorithm 2 we focus on one ring $R_n$ defined by two circles of radii $r_n$ and $r_{n+1}$. The algorithm is a variant of the algorithm used in a previous work where the rings were given by explicit formulas [21, §3]. The main differences are that we need to handle arbitrary rings, and we need to guarantee a different error bound for the approximation polynomials $g_{n,k}$.

We start by computing the parameters of the disks covering the ring $R_n$, where $\gamma$ is the middle point between $r_n$ and $r_{n+1}$, whereas $\rho$ is $3/2$ the radius of the interval $[r_n, r_{n+1}]$. With those parameters, we can check that the disk $D(\gamma, \rho)$ contains an angular sector of $R_n$ of angle $2\rho / \gamma$ (Lemma 3.2). The number of disks necessary to cover $R_n$ is thus bounded by $K \leq (3\delta/m) + 2$, which is in $O(\max(\delta, \rho)/m)$. Then we want to compute the first $4m + 1$ coefficients of the polynomials in $f$ obtained after the change of variable $z = (\gamma + \rho t) e^{i2\pi k}/K$ for all $0 \leq k < K$ in the polynomial $f_{\ell_n,u_n}$. Next we show how to do it with bit complexity $O(5m)$ using a baby-step giant-step or rectangular splitting approach [6].

For that, remark that when computing the fast Fourier transforms, the $e^{2\pi i k}/K$ are equal for indices that are equal modulo $K$. Rémi Imbach and Guillaume Moroz
Thus for a given \( k \) between 0 \( \leq k < K \), we can gather the terms of index \( k \) modulo \( K \) in the polynomial \( r_k = \sum_{j=0}^{\delta} h_j k^j \) before computing the fast Fourier transform. This will allow us to reorder our computations to compute the \( g_n,k \) in \( O(\delta m) \) bit operations.

More precisely, in step B. (the baby-step) we compute the powers of the polynomials \( y + \rho T \) modulo \( T^{4m+1} \) up to the exponent \( K \) which is in \( O(\delta m + 1) \). At each step of the loop, normalizing the linear factor can be done in \( O(m + \log \tau) \) bit operations using floating-point arithmetic since \( y \) and \( \rho \) have a magnitude in \( O(2^\delta) \). Then each polynomial multiplication can be done in \( O(\min(\delta, m) m) \) bit operations. Thus all the polynomials \( g_n \) can be computed in \( O(\min(\delta, m) K m + K(m + \log \tau)) \), or \( O(\delta m + K \log \tau) \) since \( K \) is in \( O(\max(\delta, m)) \).

Then in step C. (the giant-step) we compute the coefficients of the polynomials \( r_k \) of \( g_n,k \) in \( O(T^{4m+1} \log \delta) \) by using a combination of fast Taylor shift (\cite[Theorem 8.4]{27}) and fast composition (\cite[Theorem 2.2]{26}). This can be done with an absolute error on the coefficients less than \( 2^{-4m} \) in \( O(T^{4m+1}(\min(\deg(p_k)\deg(q_n), m)m)) \) bit operations. Since the degree of \( q_n \) is \( K \) and the degree of \( p_k \) is \( m' \leq \delta/K \), the degree \( \deg(p_k)\deg(q_k) \) of \( p_k \circ q_k \) is in \( O(\delta) \) and all the \( r_k \) can be computed in \( O(\min(\delta, m) K m) \) bit operations. Finally, \( K \) is in \( O(\max(\delta, m)) \), such that step C.2 can be done in \( O(\delta m) \) bit operations. Moreover, as in step B., normalizing the coefficients of \( p_k \) in step C.1 costs \( O(\delta(m + \log \tau)) \).

Finally in step D. we compute the polynomials \( g_n,k \) using \( \min(\delta, 4m) \) fast Fourier transforms with an absolute error less than \( 2^{-4m} \) (\cite{27}). This can be done in \( O(\min(\delta, m) K m) \) bit operations, that is in \( O(\delta m) \).

Thus, the total number of bit operations of Algorithm 2 is in \( O(\delta(m + \log \tau)) \).

## 3.2 Correctness

We prove here inequalities (i) and (ii) of Lemma 3.1.

### 3.2.1 Ring cover. For the inequality (i) of Lemma 3.1, the ring \( R_\tau \) is contained in the union of the \( K_n \) disks \( D(y,nk,\rho_n,k) \) if the following Lemma holds.

**Lemma 3.2.** The disk \( D(y,nk,\rho_n,k) \) contains an angular sector of \( R_\tau \) of angle \( \frac{\pi}{\tau} \). Furthermore, \( \frac{\pi}{\tau} < 1 + \frac{3\delta}{m} \).

**Proof.** The angular sector covered by \( D(y,nk,\rho_n,k) \) has an angle \( 2\beta \), where \( \beta \) is the angle between two sides of lengths \( y \) and \( r_{n+1} \), in a triangle with sides of lengths \( y, r_{n+1}, \rho \). We have \( 2\beta \geq 2(1 - \cos(\beta)) \). Then using arguments from the triangle geometry to bound \( \cos(\beta) \), we deduce \( 2\beta > (2/3)\sqrt{3}/2 \rho/y \rho > 1/y \).

Then for the bound on \( \frac{\pi}{\tau} \), we remark that it is equal to \( (2/3)(r_{n+1}/r_n)/(r_{n+1}/r_n - 1) \). Moreover, \( r_{n+1} \geq 4m^{1/20} \geq 1 + (\log(2)/2)/m/\delta. \) With \( 2/3 < 1 \) and \( 4/(\log(2)/2) < 3 \), this allows us to complete the proof. \( \square \)

### 3.2.2 Approximation bound. To prove the bound on the approximation inequality (ii) of Lemma 3.3, we need to bound two errors: the error appearing while truncating at order \( 4m \) the polynomials \( f_{n,u_n}(y + \rho T) \), and the error appearing on the coefficients while computing with an absolute error in \( 2^{-4m} \) in Algorithm 2.

First we bound the error coming from the error on the coefficients. In steps B. and C.1, we normalize the polynomials such that the sum of the absolute value of their coefficients is less than 1. Thus, at the end, the absolute error on each coefficient of \( g_{n,k} \) is less than \( (\delta+1)2^{-4m} M \). We show that it is bounded by \( (\delta+1)2^{-4m-1} f(r_n)/r_n^{2m} \) using the following bound on \( M \).

**Lemma 3.3.** For all \( m \geq 1 \):

\[
\|g_{n,k}\|_1 \leq (\delta+1)2^{-4m-1} f(r_n)/r_n^{2m}
\]
Then, we can notice that it belongs to, then compute \( (r_n/\gamma)^{k} \). As previously, we can bound \( |f_j|^{\log_2(2)/4} \) by \( m_2^{\log_2(2)/4} |r_n/\gamma|^k \). The second factor can be bounded for all \( k \geq 4m \) by \( m_2^{\log_2(2)/4} (k/4)(\ell/\gamma)^k \). Thus the sum of all the coefficients of degree \( 4m + 1 \) or more is bounded by \( 2^{4m} |r_n/\gamma|^k 2^{4m} \). Adding the errors for \( j \) from \( t_n \) to \( u_n \), we get a bound for the error on the remainder of \( (\delta + 1) |f(r_n)/r_n^k|^{2m-1} \).

Summing the two errors lead to the required bound for the inequality (ii) of Lemma 3.1.

5 ROOT FINDING

Our algorithm to isolate the roots of \( f \) consists in computing first a piecewise approximation of \( f \), then finding the approximations of \( \zeta \) to the roots of each approximate polynomial, and finally, for each approximate root \( \zeta \), computing a disk centered on \( \zeta \) that contains a root \( \zeta \) of \( f \) if \( \zeta \) is well-conditioned. It is described in more details in Algorithm 3.

The main lemma that guarantees that our algorithm approximates correctly all the well-conditioned roots of \( f \) is the following.

**Lemma 5.1.** With the notations of Algorithm 3:

(i) each \( D(\zeta, r) \subset \bar{D} \) contains a unique root \( \zeta \) of \( f \) and the Newton algorithm starting at any point in the disk converges toward \( \zeta \).

(ii) each root \( \zeta \) of \( f \) such that \( 2 \log(|\zeta|/\delta_1) + 3 \log_2(d + 1) + 11 < m \) is contained in a disk \( D(\zeta, r) \subset \bar{D} \).

To ensure that we find all the root \( \zeta \) such that \( \log(|\zeta|/\delta_1) \leq 2m \), it suffices to change \( m \) by \( 2m + 3 \log_2(d + 1) + 11 \) before running the algorithm. We prove inequality (i) in Section 5.1 and inequality (ii) in Section 5.2.

For the complexity of the algorithm, the dominating parts are: the computation of the piecewise approximation in step A, the \( O(d/m) \) root approximations in step B, and the approximate evaluations \( \tilde{F} \) and \( \tilde{F} \) in step C. The computation of the piecewise approximation and the evaluation can be done in \( O(d(m + \log r)) \) bit operations, and each root approximation can be done in \( O(m^2) \) bit operations, which prove the complexity stated in Theorem 1.2.

5.1 Guarantee that the each returned disk isolate a root of \( f \)

Given a root \( \zeta \) of \( f \), the Newton basin of \( \zeta \) is the set of initial points such that the Newton method converges toward \( \zeta \). Using a bound on the second derivative of \( f \), the Kantorovich’s theory allows us to give a bound on the radius of a disk centered at \( \zeta \) that is included in the Newton basin of \( \zeta \) [7, §3.2], [21, Lemma 1]. Namely, let \( r > 2|f(\zeta)/f'(\zeta)| \) and \( K > |f''(y)/f'(z)| \) for all \( y \in D(\zeta, 4r) \). If \( 5K \leq 1 \) then, \( f \) has a unique root \( \zeta \) in \( D(\zeta, r) \), and for all \( z \in D(\zeta, r) \), the Newton sequence starting from \( z \) converges to \( \zeta \).

In our case, remark that for all \( z \) such that \( |z| = |\zeta|^{2/d} \), we have \( |f''(z)| \leq 2|f''(z)/f'(z)| \leq 2d^2|f''(z)|/|\zeta|^2 \leq 2d^2|f''(z)/|\zeta|^2| \). This ensures that the number of roots computed on line 13 of Algorithm 3 is an upper bound on max \( z \in D(\zeta, r) |f''(z)/f'(\zeta)| \).
Then we show that the Kantorovich criterion on line 14 is satisfied.

First it is known ([12, Theorem 6.4.e], [3, Theorem 9]) that for a given point \( \theta \), the distance between \( \theta \) and the closest root \( \hat{\theta} \) of \( \hat{g} \) is bounded by \( \text{deg}(\hat{g}) \hat{g}(\theta) |\hat{g}'(\theta)| \leq d |\hat{g}(\theta)| |\hat{g}'(\theta)| \). Then by construction, \( \hat{g} \) satisfies \( |\hat{g}(\theta) - \hat{\theta}| \leq 2^{-4m} \|g\|_1 \) and \( |\hat{g}'(\theta) - \hat{\theta}'| \leq d 2^{-4m} \|g\|_1 \).

Using Lemma 3.3 we have \( \|g\|_1 \leq (\delta + 2) 2^{-3m-1} \bar{f}(\xi)/\|\xi\|_6 \). With the triangular inequality, combining the inequality on \( |\hat{g}(\theta) - \hat{\theta}| \) with the inequalities (ii) of Lemma 5.1 and (ii) of Lemma 3.1, leads to \( |\hat{g}(\theta)| \leq 2 (d+1) 2^{-m} \bar{f}(\xi)/\|\xi\|_6 \).

For the derivative, we can show with similar arguments that \( |\rho f'_{\theta,\tau} (r + \rho \bar{R}) - \rho f'_{\theta,\tau} (r)| \) is bounded by \( 2 (d+1)^2 \bar{f}(\xi)/\|\xi\|_6 \). We can also deduce from inequality (ii) of Lemma 2.1 that \( \rho f'(\xi) - \xi f'_{\theta,\tau} (r) \) is bounded by \( \rho d^2 \bar{f}(\xi)/\|\xi\|_6 \). Finally, remark that \( |\xi|/\rho \leq r_{\rho+1}/(3/4(r_{\rho+1} - r\rho)) \leq (4/3)(1/(1 - r\rho r_{\rho+1})) \leq (4/3)(1/(1 - 2^{-m/2d})) \leq (4/3)(2/d + 1) \). This implies that \( m \geq 4 \) and \( d \geq 1 \) we have \( |\xi|/\rho \leq d + 1 \) and \( |\rho f'(\xi) - f'\xi|/\|\xi\|_6 \leq 3 \rho (d + 1)^2 2^{-m} \bar{f}(\xi)/\|\xi\|_6 \).

Combining all the previous inequalities, this implies that for \( m \geq \log_2 (\text{cond}(f, \xi)) + 3 \log_2 (d + 1) \leq 4 \), we have:

\[
\frac{|\xi - \hat{\xi}|}{\|\xi\|_6} \leq 4 (d + 1) 2^{-m} \text{cond}(f, \xi)
\]

5.2.2 Guarantee that each well-conditioned root is contained in a returned disk

Thus using the Kantorovich’s theory, this ensures that when the criterion on line 14 of Algorithm 3 is satisfied, the returned disk isolates a root of \( f \). Moreover, if two such disks intersect, then the root is in their intersection since the Newton method starting from any point in their intersection will converge toward a unique root in the their intersection.

5.2 Guarantee that each well-conditioned root is contained in a returned disk

Given a root \( \xi \) of \( f \), the proof of inequality (ii) of Lemma 5.1 is done in two steps. First we show that \( \hat{f} \) contains a root close enough to \( \xi \).

Thus we show that the Kantorovich criterion on line 14 is satisfied.

In this section, we assume that \( \xi \) belongs to an angular sector \( A_{\theta,\rho} \), and we let \( g \) be the corresponding approximate polynomial, and \( y \) and \( \rho \) be the parameters for the change of variable \( z = y + \rho t \). Then \( \hat{g} \) denotes the approximate polynomial of \( g \) obtained by factorization in line 4 of Algorithm 3. Finally, let \( \hat{\xi} \) be the closest point to \( \xi \) such that \( \hat{g}(\hat{\xi} - y)/\rho = 0 \), and let \( \theta = (\xi - y)/\rho \) and \( \hat{\theta} = (\hat{\xi} - y)/\rho \), such that \( f(\xi) = 0 \) and \( \hat{g}(\hat{\theta}) = 0 \).

5.2.1 Bound on the distance of the approximated roots. In this section we compute an upper bound on the distance between \( \xi \) and \( \hat{\xi} \).

Thus using the Kantorovich’s theory, this ensures that when the criterion on line 14 of Algorithm 3 is satisfied, the returned disk isolates a root of \( f \). Moreover, if two such disks intersect, then the root is in their intersection since the Newton method starting from any point in their intersection will converge toward a unique root in the their intersection.

5.2 Guarantee that each well-conditioned root is contained in a returned disk

Given a root \( \xi \) of \( f \), the proof of inequality (ii) of Lemma 5.1 is done in two steps. First we show that \( \hat{f} \) contains a root close enough to \( \xi \). Then we show that the Kantorovich criterion on line 14 is satisfied.

In this section, we assume that \( \xi \) belongs to an angular sector \( A_{\theta,\rho} \), and we let \( g \) be the corresponding approximate polynomial, and \( y \) and \( \rho \) be the parameters for the change of variable \( z = y + \rho t \). Then \( \hat{g} \) denotes the approximate polynomial of \( g \) obtained by factorization in line 4 of Algorithm 3. Finally, let \( \hat{\xi} \) be the closest point to \( \xi \) such that \( \hat{g}(\hat{\xi} - y)/\rho = 0 \), and let \( \theta = (\xi - y)/\rho \) and \( \hat{\theta} = (\hat{\xi} - y)/\rho \), such that \( f(\xi) = 0 \) and \( \hat{g}(\hat{\theta}) = 0 \).

5.2.1 Bound on the distance of the approximated roots. In this section we compute an upper bound on the distance between \( \xi \) and \( \hat{\xi} \).
We demonstrate their practical efficiency for several families of well-conditioned polynomials that are random polynomials associated with hyperbolic, elliptic and flat distributions, as well as more structured polynomials as resultant of random bivariate polynomials appearing when solving multi-variate systems with elimination.

For $d > 0$ we define the hyperbolic, elliptic and flat bases as

$$(\mathcal{H}_i)_{0 \leq i \leq d} := (1)_{0 \leq i \leq d},$$

$$(\mathcal{E}_i)_{0 \leq i \leq d} := \left(\sqrt[2]{i!}\right)_{0 \leq i \leq d}$$

and

$$(\mathcal{F}_i)_{0 \leq i \leq d} := \left(1/\sqrt{i!}\right)_{0 \leq i \leq d}.$$  

A polynomial $f$ can be decomposed as

$$f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} a_i \mathcal{H}_i z^i = \sum_{i=0}^{d} b_i \mathcal{E}_i z^i = \sum_{i=0}^{d} c_i \mathcal{F}_i z^i.$$  

$f$ is said random hyperbolic (respectively elliptic, flat) when the $a_i$'s (respectively the $b_i$'s, $c_i$'s) are random numbers.

6.1 Implementation

Our prototype implementation\(^1\) in C of the algorithms presented in this article is based on the C libraries Arb\(^3\) (which provides multi-precision ball arithmetic) and MPSolve\(^4\) (see [4], which provides a solver for univariate polynomials relying on Ehrlich’s, aka Aberth’s, iterations with multiprecision floating point arithmetic).

PWEval implements the evaluation process described in Sec. 4 and PWRoots the root isolation algorithm 3; they take in input a polynomial an $f$ and an $m$ and compute a piecewise approximation of $f$ using ball arithmetic. PWRoots outputs a set of $d'$ pairwise disjoint complex discs. If $d' = d$, each root of $f$ is isolated in a disc of the output. Step 4 of algorithm 3 is achieved by applying the solver using secular equations of MPSolve. PWEval also takes in input a set $Z$ of points in $C$ and output for each $z \in Z$ a disc containing $f(z)$ of radius less than $2^{-m}df(|z|)$. Points are evaluated one by one (without multi-point evaluation).

We introduced in our implementation a slight variation of Algo. 1: in step 12, we compute $s_{n+1}$ as $s_n + c_n m \log d^{-1} z$ where $c$ is a real positive parameter in $O(1)$. While preserving the bit complexity of the overall approach this changes the subdivision of the complex plane in sectors and the piecewise approximation in the following way: the greatest is $c$, the widest are the rings, the less are the numbers of angular sectors in rings and the degrees of approximations and the fastest is the computation of the piecewise approximation because there are less approximations to compute.

Figures 8 and 9 show the Newton polygons and the sectors partitions of the complex plane for hyperbolic, elliptic and flat random polynomials obtained with our implementation with $c = 1$.

We observed that the bottleneck in PWEval was the computation of the piecewise approximation; we choose $c = 7/2$ in PWEval which makes this step faster. PWRoots, the dominant step is the approximation of the roots of the approximating polynomials with MPSolve which complexity is quadratic in their degrees; we choose $c = 2/5$ to produce approximations with smaller degrees.

6.2 Numerical results

All the times given below are sequential times in seconds on a Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-8700 CPU @ 3.20GHz machine on Linux.

The input polynomials we consider in our tests are 53-bits floating point approximations of random dense hyperbolic, elliptic and flat polynomials which integers coefficient factors with a uniform law in the interval $[2^{-5}, 2^{5}]$. For root isolation, we also consider 53-bits floating point approximations of resultant polynomials of two bivariate random dense hyperbolic polynomials.

We generate sets of random complex points with rational real and imaginary parts with numerator and denominators uniformly chosen in $[2^{-16}, 2^{16}]$.

6.2.1 Evaluation. We used PWEval to evaluate random dense hyperbolic, elliptic and flat polynomials of increasing degree $d$ at $d$ points. We compare the running time of PWEval with the time required to evaluate $f$ at the same set of $d$ points with the a rectangular splitting algorithm (see [6, 16]) available in Arb. We choose $m$ (the output precision for PWEval) and the precision for Arb so that the medians of the $log_{52}$ of the errors relative to $\hat{f}$ of the evaluations is about $-50 \pm 10\%$. In our tests, evaluations with Horner’s rule were always slower than evaluations with rectangular splitting.

Figure 5 shows those running times in an histogram while detailing for PWEval the time for computing the piecewise approximation and the time for evaluating it at the $d$ points (respectively called “pw comp” and “pw eval” in fig. 5). PWEval becomes faster than the evaluation with rectangular splitting of $f$ for degrees above 4000. Notice also that once the piecewise approximation is computed, evaluating it at a single point is several orders of magnitude faster than one evaluation (at a single point) with rectangular splitting.

6.2.2 Root isolation. We used PWRoots to isolate the roots of the polynomials of our test suite with $m = 2(30 + \log_{5}(d + 1))$ which allowed PWRoots to always isolate all the roots.

We first compare the running times of PWRoots and HCRoots which is a C implementation of the root finding algorithm of [21][Sec 5, Algo. 3]. HCRoots computes a piecewise approximation at a given precision $m$ which is dedicated to hyperbolic polynomials; the root isolation process is embedded in a loop where $m$ is doubled while all the roots are not isolated. When $m$ reaches $d$, a subdivision root isolator with a complexity quadratic in $d$ is used. We give in table 1 running times of PWRoots and HCRoots for small values of $d$. For hyperbolic polynomials, the running times of both HCRoots and PWRoots are more or less linear in $d$; HCRoots is faster by a constant factor due to specificities of the implementations. HCRoots is not well adapted to other weights than the hyperbolic ones and in these cases its running time is dominated by the one of the quadratic solver for $f$, as depicted in table 1 (elliptic and flat cases).

We also compare PWRoots and MPSolve for hyperbolic, elliptic and flat random dense polynomials of degrees up to 20000 in fig. 6 where one can observe the linear complexity in $d$ of PWRoots (for the well conditioned polynomials in consideration) in contrast to the one of MPSolve which is quadratic in $d$.

Figure 7 compares PWRoots and MPSolve for isolating the roots of a resultant polynomial of degree $d$ of two bivariate random dense hyperbolic polynomials of degree $\sqrt{d}$, for $\sqrt{d}$ up to 100. PWRoots becomes faster than MPSolve for $d$ above $60^2$.
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A BENCHMARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d</th>
<th>PWRoots</th>
<th>HCRoots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Running times in seconds for isolating the complex roots of random dense hyperbolic, elliptic and flat polynomials of increasing degrees d with PWRoots and HCRoots.
Figure 8: Newton polygon of a hyperbolic (top left), elliptic (bottom left), and flat (right) polynomial of degree 50.

Figure 9: Sector partitions associated to a hyperbolic (left), elliptic (middle) and flat (right) polynomial of degree 10,000.