

# New Complexity Thresholds for Sparse Real Polynomials and $A$ -discriminants

J. Maurice Rojas\*      Casey E. Stella†

May 23, 2019

## 1 Introduction and Main Results

Let  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  denote the problem of deciding whether a given system of real polynomial equations has a real root or not. While  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  is arguably the most fundamental problem of real algebraic geometry, our current knowledge of its computational complexity is surprisingly coarse. This is a pity, for in addition to numerous practical applications [BGV03],  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  is also an important motivation behind effectivity estimates for the Real Nullstellensatz (e.g., [Ste74, Sch00]), the quantitative study of sums of squares [Ble04], and their connection to semidefinite programming [Par03].

So we give a new threshold for when  $m$  is large enough to make  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  be **NP**-hard for a single  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomial (Theorem 1 below). We also state some consequences of our new threshold for systems of multivariate polynomial equations and amoeba theory (Corollary 1 below), as well as an unusual connection between  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  and the  $A$ -discriminant. (The  $A$ -discriminant, recalled in Definition 2 below, includes the toric resultant and all classical resultants as special cases [GKZ94].) We then conclude by studying some new cases of  $A$ -discriminants whose vanishing can be decided within the polynomial hierarchy (Theorems 2 and 3 below).

### Theorem 1

Let  $f(x) := \sum_{i=1}^m c_i x^{a_i} \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  where  $x^{a_i} := x_1^{a_{i1}} \cdots x_n^{a_{in}}$  and  $c_i \neq 0$  for all  $i$ . We call such an  $f$  an  **$n$ -variate  $m$ -nomial** (with integer coefficients), and we say that  $f$  has **full Newton polytope** iff  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  do **not** lie in a common  $(n-1)$ -flat.<sup>1</sup> Also, let  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$  (resp.  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}^+$ ) denote the obvious analogue of  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  where we restrict to roots in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n := (\mathbb{R}^*)^n$  (resp. the positive orthant  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ ). Then, restricting to inputs consisting of a **single** polynomial, and measuring the **size** of  $f$  as the total number of decimal digits in the  $c_i$  and  $a_{i,j}$ , we have:

1.  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  is **NP**-hard for the family of  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomials with  $m \geq 6n + 6$ .
2.  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{NP}$ ,  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{P}$ , and  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ \in \mathbf{P}$ , each for the family of  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomials with  $m \leq n + 1$  and full Newton polytope.

The Newton polytope hypothesis in Assertion (2) is mild and in fact necessary (see Section 1.1). While it has been known since the late 1980's that  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{PSPACE}$  [Can88], it is already unknown whether  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{NP}$  for univariate trinomials (3-nomials), or whether  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  is **NP**-hard for  $n$ -variate polynomials for some particular **fixed**  $n$  [RY04].

**Remark 1** *The best previous threshold in the direction of Theorem 1 appears to have been **NP**-hardness of  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  for those  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomials with  $m = \Omega(n^3)$ . We do not know a reference*

\*Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University TAMU 3368, College Station, Texas 77843-3368, USA. e-mail: rojas@math.tamu.edu , web page: www.math.tamu.edu/~rojas . Partially supported by NSF individual grant DMS-0211458 and NSF CAREER grant DMS-0349309.

†Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, TAMU 3368, College Station, Texas 77843-3368, USA. e-mail: cstella@math.tamu.edu Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0211458.

<sup>1</sup>A  **$d$ -flat** is merely a translate of a subspace of dimension  $d$ .

explicitly stating this lower bound but it can be derived routinely from now standard reductions (e.g., [RY04, discussion preceding Thm. 2]). Also, while  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{P}$  for any fixed number of homogeneous quadratic polynomials, thanks to earlier work of Barvinok [Bar93], note that quadratic polynomials can also be thought of as special  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomials with  $m \leq (n+2)(n+1)/2$ . We are unaware of any earlier explicit statement that  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{NP}$  for  $m = O(n)$ .  $\diamond$

To state the implications of Theorem 1, let us first recall the notion of an **amoeba**.

**Definition 1** For any  $f \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , we define its (Archimedean) **amoeba** to be  $\text{Amoeba}(f) := \{(\log |x_1|, \dots, \log |x_n|) \mid x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n, f(x) = 0\}$ .  $\diamond$

Amoeba theory, and its non-Archimedean analogues, have recently proven quite important in phylogenetics [PS04], algorithmic number theory [Roj02, Roj04a], and enumerative algebraic geometry [Mik04], to name but a few areas. In particular, computing the topology of amoebae, and even drawing them, leads to many intriguing algorithmic questions [The04].

The proof of Theorem 1 then easily yields the following implications.

**Corollary 1** *The following problems are each NP-hard:*

1. Given a polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  ( $n \geq 1$ , fixed a priori), decide if  $\underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{n \text{ times}} \in \text{Amoeba}(f)$ .
2. Given a polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  ( $n \geq 1$ , fixed a priori), decide if  $\text{Amoeba}(f)$  intersects a coordinate hyperplane.
3.  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$ , restricted to  $n \times n$  polynomial systems consisting of linear trinomials and quadratic binomials ( $n$  varying).

Curiously, all known families of polynomials admitting  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{P}$  coincide with  $A$ -discriminants known to be computable in  $\mathbf{P}$ . This is clarified further in Section 1.2 below, but we can state our next main result in an elementary way as follows:

**Theorem 2** *Suppose  $f$  is a univariate  $m$ -nomial with integer coefficients. Let **CYCLOVAN** denote the problem of deciding whether  $f$  vanishes at an  $M^{\text{th}}$  root of unity. Then, relative to the same definition of input size as Theorem 1,  $\mathbf{CYCLOVAN} \in \mathbf{NP}^{\mathbf{NP}}$ .*

While we now know that **CYCLOVAN** is NP-hard [Pla84], no better upper bound than **PSPACE** was known earlier.

We review some further background in the remainder of this introduction, and prove our main results in Section 2.

## 1.1 The Hardness of Real Root Counting

Part of the motivation behind this paper is understanding the influence of sparsity on algorithmic real algebraic geometry; for many classical questions from computational algebraic geometry become much more subtle — not to mention more practically interesting — when transplanted from  $\mathbb{C}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

For instance, around the 1980's, Khovanski proved that there is a bound — depending only on  $m$  and  $n$ , and independent of the degree — for the number of connected components of the real zero set of any  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomial [Kho91]. More recently, his bound has been improved from  $2^{O(m^2)} n^{O(n)} n^{O(m)}$  (in the smooth case [Kho91, Sec. 3.14, Cor. 5]) to  $2^{O(m^2)} 2^{O(n)} n^{O(m)}$  (in complete

generality [LRW03, Cor. 2]). So large degree is less of an obstacle over  $\mathbb{R}$ , and one can reasonably ask if one can obtain **algorithmic** speed-ups via sparsity as well.

Toward this end, recall that counting real roots of a general degree  $D$  polynomial in  $\mathbb{R}[x_1]$  takes  $\Omega(D \log D)$  arithmetic operations [LM01]. (An analogous lower bound for deciding the existence of a real root appears to be unknown.) The role of sparsity in complexity bounds for univariate real root counting is then already far from trivial. For while sparsity allows us to break the  $\Omega(D \log D)$  barrier in certain cases, tetranomials (4-nomials) already yield open questions: It is now known that the real roots of the trinomial

$$a + bx^d + cx^D \in \mathbb{R}[x] \quad (0 < d < D)$$

can be counted using just  $O(\log^2 D)$  arithmetic operations [RY04], but tetranomials currently admit no arithmetic complexity upper bound better than the  $O(D \log^2 D \log \log D)$  bound known for dense (non-sparse) polynomials [LM01].

Even less is known about thresholds for the bit complexity of counting real roots, although we do know that over any fixed number field  $K$ , one can count (and even compute exactly!) all the roots of a sparse univariate polynomial in  $\mathbf{P}$  [Len99].

## 1.2 $A$ -Discriminants Characterize All Known Easy Examples

Perhaps more than coincidentally, the  **$A$ -discriminant** is computable in  $\mathbf{P}$  for all currently known families of polynomials<sup>2</sup> admitting  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{P}$ .

**Definition 2** *Given any  $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  not lying in some  $(\#A - 1)$ -flat in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and given the polynomial  $f(x) := \sum_{a \in A} c_a x^a$ , the  $A$ -discriminant is the unique (up to sign) polynomial  $\Delta_A \in \mathbb{Z}[c_a \mid a \in A]$  of minimal degree such that  $f$  has a degenerate root<sup>3</sup> in  $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n \implies \Delta_A(c_a \mid a \in A) = 0$  [GKZ94, Pgs. 271–272]. For convenience, we will usually write  $\Delta_A(f)$  in place of  $\Delta(c_a \mid a \in A)$ . We also call  $A$  the **support** (or **spectrum**) of  $f$  when  $c_a \neq 0$  for all  $a \in A$ .  $\diamond$*

**Example 1 (Simplices)** *The  $A$ -discriminant is defined to be 1 for any  $A$  that lies in an  $(\#A - 1)$ -flat [GKZ94, Pgs. 271–272]. (The theoretical motivation is that such polynomials never have degenerate roots in  $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ .) In particular, such  $A$  form the vertices of a  $\#A$ -simplex, and are exactly the cases covered by Assertion (2) of Theorem 1.  $\diamond$*

**Example 2 ( $n$ -variate Quadratics)** *Let  $\mathbf{O}$  and  $e_i$  respectively denote the origin and  $i^{\text{th}}$  standard basis vector of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and let  $A := \mathbb{Z}^n \cap \{u + v \mid u, v \in \{\mathbf{O}, e_1, \dots, e_n\}\}$ . Then  $f(x) = \sum_{a \in A} c_a x^a$  is a general quadratic polynomial, and an exercise in Cramer’s Rule for linear equations yields  $\Delta_A(f)$  as an  $(n + 1)$ -variate  $\binom{n + 2}{2}$ -nomial, evaluated at an  $n$ -tuple of determinants of  $n \times n$  matrices with entries chosen from  $\{c_a \mid a \in A\}$ . In particular, via now standard methods circumventing the coefficient explosion of Gaussian elimination (e.g., [BCSS98, Ch. 15, Pgs. 292–296]),  $\Delta_A(f)$  can be evaluated in  $\mathbf{P}$ .  $\diamond$*

Curiously, the currently known algorithms for  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  underlying these cases (Assertion (2) of Theorem 1 and [Bar93]) are rather dissimilar, and none makes use of the  $A$ -discriminant.

The following example illustrates the next open cases we should try to understand.

<sup>2</sup>...when just one polynomial is used as an input to  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$ .

<sup>3</sup>That is, a root  $\zeta$  with  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}|_{x=\zeta} = \dots = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}|_{x=\zeta} = 0$ .

**Example 3 (Trinomials and Circuits)** Given  $A = \{0, d, D\}$  with  $0 < d < D$  and  $\gcd(d, D) = 1$ , we have  $\Delta_A(a + bx^d + cx^D) = D^D a^{D-d} c^d - (D-d)^{D-d} d^d b^D$ . Note in particular that this  $A$ -discriminant can be evaluated within a number of arithmetic operations polynomial in  $\log D$  via recursive squaring. The preceding formula is but a specialization of a more general formula that yields the discriminant of an  $n$ -variate  $(n+2)$ -nomial with full Newton polytope [GKZ94, Prop. 1.8, Pg. 274]. In the notation of [GKZ94], one would say that the underlying  $A$  is a **circuit**.<sup>4</sup>  $\diamond$

Note in particular that the only known  $f$  with support a circuit, **and** admitting real root counting within polynomially many arithmetic operation, are univariate trinomials. Recent work of Bertrand, Bihan, and Sottile does at least reveal that the number of connected components of the zero set in  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$  of such a polynomial is linear in  $n$  for certain special circuits [Ber04]. We are willing to conjecture that the correct upper bound is polynomial in  $n$  for general circuits, and that  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{NP}$  for input a single polynomial with support a circuit.

Let  $\mathbf{ADISCVAN}$  denote the problem of deciding whether  $\Delta_A$  vanishes for a given polynomial with integer coefficients and support equal to  $A$ , and let  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{C}}$  denote the obvious analogue of  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}$  for complex polynomials and complex roots. Since resultants can easily be expressed as  $A$ -discriminants [GKZ94, The Cayley Trick, Prop. 1.7, pp. 274], it is worth noting that one can decide certain analogues of  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{C}}$  (over certain compact **toric varieties**<sup>5</sup> [GKZ94, Roj03]) by a simple reduction to  $\mathbf{ADISCVAN}$ . For instance, one can decide whether a system of  $n+1$  homogeneous  $(n+1)$ -variate polynomials has a complex root via a suitable instance of  $\mathbf{ADISCVAN}$ .

Theorem 2 can then be reinterpreted as nearly tight upper and lower complexity bounds on  $\mathbf{ADISCVAN}$  for input  $(f, x_1^M - 1)$ , where  $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1]$ . Perhaps surprisingly,  $\mathbf{ADISCVAN}$  is  $\mathbf{NP}$ -hard already for the special case  $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$  [KS99]. In greater generality we can say the following:

**Theorem 3** *We have:*

1.  $\mathbf{ADISCVAN} \in \mathbf{BPP}$  for  $A$  a circuit.
2.  $\mathbf{ADISCVAN} \in \mathbf{AM}$ , assuming the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis (GRH).
3. Assuming RIPIT (an even weaker hypothesis allowing certain failures of GRH [Roj04b]), we have  $\mathbf{ADISCVAN} \in \mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{NP}^{\mathbf{NP}}}$ .

In Assertion (2),  $\mathbf{AM}$  denotes the **Arthur-Merlin** class [BM88], which is known to lie in  $\mathbf{coRP}^{\mathbf{NP}}$  [BM88]. The hypothesis RIPIT would require more space than allowed here to detail fully. However, what is important to note is that RIPIT can hold even in the face of a bad failure of GRH.

Briefly, to any number field  $K$  one can associate a function  $\zeta_K$  analytic on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$ . GRH (which dates back to work of Riemann in 1859) is then the assertion that, for all  $K$ , the zeroes of  $\zeta_K$  with positive real part all have real part  $\frac{1}{2}$  [BS96, LO77]. (The **Riemann Hypothesis**, or RH, is the special case  $K = \mathbb{Q}$ .) GRH has tremendous algorithmic implications (see, e.g., [BS96, Koi96, Roj01]) and is widely suspected to be true, but some experts have expressed the possibility of failures like the presence of real zeroes in the open interval  $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  (so-called **Siegel** zeroes). RIPIT in fact allows the existence of an infinite sequence  $((K_i, \rho_i))_{i=1}^{\infty}$  with  $\zeta_{K_i}(\rho_i) = 0$  and  $\rho_i \rightarrow 1$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , provided the  $\rho_i$  do not increase too fast [Roj04b, Thm. 4].

<sup>4</sup>Strictly speaking, a circuit  $A$  also satisfies the condition that every proper subset is affinely independent.

<sup>5</sup>Those unfamiliar with toric varieties can substitute complex  $n$ -dimensional projective space  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  for a concrete example.

## 2 The Proofs of Our Main Results

Let us first recall a very useful simple change of variables.

**Definition 3** For any ring  $R$ , let  $R^{m \times n}$  denote the set of  $m \times n$  matrices with entries in  $R$ . For any  $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , let  $x^A := (x_1^{a_{11}} \cdots x_n^{a_{n1}}, \dots, x_1^{a_{1n}} \cdots x_n^{a_{nn}})$ . We call  $x^A$  a **monomial change of variables**. Also, for any  $y := (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ , we let  $xy := (x_1 y_1, \dots, x_n y_n)$ .  $\diamond$

**Proposition 1** For any  $x, y \in (\mathbb{R}^*)^n$  and  $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ , we have  $(xy)^{AB} = (x^A)^B (y^A)^B$ . Also, if  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $\det A \neq 0$ , then the function  $u_A(x) := x^A$  is an analytic automorphism of  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ , preserving smooth points and singular points of zero sets of analytic functions. Finally, if  $A \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$  then  $u^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) = \mathbb{R}_+^n = u(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$  and  $u$  maps distinct open orthants of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to distinct open orthants of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .  $\blacksquare$

We will also need a particular matrix factorization to put our  $m$ -nomials into a useful normal form.

**Definition 4** [Ili89, Sto98] Let  $\text{GL}_m(\mathbb{Z})$  denote the set of all matrices in  $\mathbb{Z}^{m \times m}$  with determinant  $\pm 1$  (the set of **unimodular matrices**). Then, given any  $M \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ , a **Hermite factorization of  $M$**  is an identity of the form  $UM = H$  where  $U \in \text{GL}_m(\mathbb{Z})$  and  $H = [h_{ij}] \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$  is upper triangular, with all off-diagonal entries nonnegative and with magnitude smaller than the positive diagonal entry in the same column. Finally, a **Smith factorization of  $M$**  is an identity of the form  $UMV = S$  where  $U \in \text{GL}_m(\mathbb{Z})$ ,  $V \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ , and  $S = [s_{ij}] \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  diagonal, with  $s_{i,i} | s_{i+1,i+1}$  for all  $i$ .  $\diamond$

**Lemma 1** [Ili89, Sto98] For any  $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ , the Hermite and Smith factorizations of  $M$  exist and are unique, and can be computed within  $O(n^4 \log^3(n \max_{i,j} |a_{ij}|))$  bit operations. Furthermore, in the notation of Definition 4, the entries of  $U$ ,  $V$ ,  $S$ , and  $H$  all have bit size  $O(n^3 \log^2(2n + \max_{i,j} |a_{ij}|))$ .  $\blacksquare$

As a consequence, we can now easily see why the full Newton polytope assumption of Theorem 1 is mild and necessary.

**Corollary 2** Given any  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomial  $f$  without a full Newton polytope, we can find (within  $\mathbf{P}$ ) a monomial change of variables  $x \mapsto x^U$ , with  $U \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ , such that  $g(x) := f(x^A)$  is an  $n'$ -variate  $m$ -nomial with (a)  $n' < m$ , (b) full Newton polytope, and (c) a root in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^{n'}$  iff  $f$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$ .  $\blacksquare$

That  $n + 1$  exponents chosen randomly from  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  will result in a full Newton polytope with high probability follows easily from the fact that a random  $n \times n$  matrix has nonzero determinant with high probability, thanks to Schwartz' Lemma [Sch80].

To begin our proof of Theorem 1, we will first need simple methods for deciding the existence of roots in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ .

**Lemma 2** Suppose  $f(x) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k x^{a_i} - \sum_{i=k+1}^n x^{a_i}$ . Also let  $A$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix whose columns are  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  and  $S = [s_{ij}] = UAV$  the Smith factorization of  $A$ . Then

1.  $f$  has a root in  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$  iff  $k < n$ .
2.  $f$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$  iff  $[k < n$  or the rank (over  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ ) of the mod 2 reduction of  $A$  is positive.]

**Proof:** Assume henceforth that  $x \in (\mathbb{R}^*)^n$ . Note that  $f(x) = 0$  iff

$$(\star) \quad x^A = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \text{ and } 1 + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k - \alpha_{k+1} - \dots - \alpha_n = 0$$

for some  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^*)^n$ . Assertion (1) then follows almost trivially:  $k = n$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  imply that  $f(x) = 1 + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n > 0$ , so there can be no roots for  $f$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ . Taking the

inverse implication, suppose  $k < n$ . Then we can set  $\alpha := \left( \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_k, \underbrace{\frac{k+1}{n-k}, \dots, \frac{k+1}{n-k}}_{n-k} \right)$  to obtain

$1 + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k - \alpha_{k+1} - \dots - \alpha_n = 0$ . So if we can solve  $x^A = \alpha$  over  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ , we will have found a root in  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$  for  $f$ . Proposition 1 tells us that we can indeed, so we are done.

We now focus on Assertion (2). Letting  $y := x^U$ , note that

$$x^A = \alpha \iff y^S = y^{UAV} = (x^A)^V = \alpha^V,$$

thanks to Proposition 1. So we'll be able to find a root in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$  for  $f$  iff

$$(\heartsuit) \text{ There are } \alpha, y \in (\mathbb{R}^*)^n \text{ with } y^S = \alpha^V \text{ and } 1 + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k - \alpha_{k+1} - \dots - \alpha_n = 0.$$

Let us now separately prove the two directions of the implication of Assertion (2):

( $\Leftarrow$ ): If  $k < n$  then Assertion (1) tells us that  $f$  in fact has a root in  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ . So assume  $k = n$ . Note that the mod 2 reduction of  $A$  has positive  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ -rank implies that  $s_1$  is odd, since left and right multiplication by matrices in  $\mathbb{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$  preserves  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ -rank. (Indeed, the mod 2 reduction of a matrix in  $\mathbb{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$  is invertible mod 2.) Now take  $\alpha = (\pm n, \pm 1, \dots, \pm 1)$  where the signs are chosen so that  $\text{sign}(\alpha^V) = (-1, 1, \dots, 1)$ . (Proposition 1 guarantees that this can be done since  $V \in \mathbb{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ .) Clearly then,  $y^S = \alpha^V$  has a solution in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$  and thus, by ( $\heartsuit$ ) and our choice of  $\alpha$ ,  $f$  indeed has a root in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ): Taking the contrapositive, suppose that  $k = n$  and that the mod 2 reduction of  $A$  has  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ -rank 0. Then, since left and right multiplication by matrices in  $\mathbb{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$  preserves  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ -rank,  $s_1, \dots, s_n$  must be even. We then obtain, via Proposition 1, that  $y^S = \alpha^V$  has **no** roots in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$  unless  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ . But then  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  implies that  $1 + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n > 0$ , so there can be **no** roots for  $f$  in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$ . ■

While the preceding lemma appears to be rather narrow, it actually deals with a canonical form that any  $n$ -variate  $(n+1)$ -nomial can be converted into over  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$ . This is the crux of our proof of Theorem 1.

## 2.1 The Proof of Theorem 1

**Assertion (2):** First note that  $f$  has a nonzero constant term iff  $f$  does **not** have  $\mathbf{0}$  as a root. So we can assume  $f$  has a nonzero constant term and then any root of  $f$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  must lie in some coordinate subspace of positive minimal dimension. On any such subspace,  $f$  restricts to an  $n'$ -variate  $m'$ -nomial with  $m' \leq n' + 1$ . So, by Proposition 1, we'll have  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathbf{NP}$  provided we can prove  $\mathbf{FEAS}_{\mathbb{R}}^* \in \mathbf{P}$ .

By permuting the  $a_i$ , and dividing by a suitable nonzero constant, we can assume the constant term is  $c_{n+1} = 1$ . Letting  $A$  be the matrix whose columns are  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ , our full Newton polytope assumption then clearly implies that  $\det A \neq 0$ . Next, by permuting coordinates as necessary, and via the change of variables  $x \mapsto (|c_1|, \dots, |c_n|)^{-A^{-1}} x$ , we can assume that  $f(x) = 1 + x^{a_1} + \dots + x^{a_k} - x^{a_{k+1}} - \dots - x^{a_n}$ .

From here, Assertion (2) of Lemma 2 tells us that deciding the positivity of the  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ -rank of the mod 2 reduction of  $A$  (which can be done in  $\mathbf{P}$  via Gaussian elimination) suffices to decide the existence of roots for  $f$  in  $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$ . ■

**Assertion (1):** By a result of Plaisted [Pla84, Thm. 5.1, pg. 133], it is **NP**-hard to decide if a **univariate**  $m$ -nomial has a root on the complex unit circle. So it suffices to reduce problems of this form to instances of **FEAS** $_{\mathbb{R}}$  with input an  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomial with  $m \leq 6n + 6$ .

Toward this end, let  $g(z) := \sum_{i=1}^m c_i z^{a_i}$  be a univariate  $m$ -nomial. We can then easily convert  $f$  to a system of quadratic binomials and linear trinomial equations by first noting that  $z^a$  can be expressed as an SLP of length  $O(\log a)$  via the standard trick of recursive squaring. Clearly then,  $z^a = Z_N$  where

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} Z_0 &= z \\ &\vdots \\ Z_N &= Z_i Z_j, \end{aligned}$$

$N = O(\log a)$ , and the intermediate equations are of the form  $Z_j = Z_{j-1}^2$  or  $Z_k = Z_j Z_i$  for some  $i, j < k$ . Moreover, note that  $g(z) = 0$  iff the following trinomial system has a root:

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} W_1 &= c_2 z^{a_2} + c_1 z^{a_1} \\ W_2 &= c_3 z^{a_3} + W_1 \\ &\vdots \\ W_{m-1} &= c_m z^{a_m} + W_{m-2} \end{aligned}$$

So, combining  $m$  systems of the form (1) and then substituting them into (2), we clearly obtain that  $g(z) = 0$  iff a system of linear trinomials and quadratic binomials — which we'll call  $G$  — has a root  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_N, W_1, \dots, W_{m-1})$  with  $Z_1 = z$ . In particular, the number of variables and the number of equations are both  $\mathcal{N}' := \mathcal{N} + m$ .

Now note that  $z = x + iy$  and  $w = u + iv$  for  $x, y, u, v \in \mathbb{R}$  implies that the real and imaginary parts of  $zw$  are respectively  $ux - vy$  and  $uy + vx$ . So  $G$  can be replaced by a new system  $H = (h_1, \dots, h_{\mathcal{N}''})$ , still consisting of quadratic binomials and linear trinomials, with exactly  $\mathcal{N}'' := 2\mathcal{N}'$  variables. In particular, we see that  $g(z) = 0$ , with  $x = \mathbf{Re}(z)$  and  $y = \mathbf{Im}(z)$ , iff  $H$  has  $(X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_{\mathcal{N}''}, Y_{\mathcal{N}''})$  as a **real** root and  $(X_1, Y_1) = (x, y)$ .

To conclude, note that  $f(X, Y) := h_1^2(X, Y) + \dots + h_{\mathcal{N}''}^2(X, Y) + (X_1^2 + Y_1^2 - 1)^2$  is an  $n$ -variate  $m$ -nomial with  $n = \mathcal{N}''$  and  $m \leq 6n + 6$ . (Since the square of a trinomial has no more than 6 monomial terms.) In particular,  $f$  has a real root iff  $H$  has a real root  $(X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_{\mathcal{N}''}, Y_{\mathcal{N}''})$  with  $X_1 + iY_1$  lying on the unit circle iff  $g$  has a root on the unit circle. So we are done. ■

Note also that Corollary 1 now follows immediately from proof.

## 2.2 The Proof of Theorem 2

Let **SPARSE-POLY-DIVIS** denote problem of deciding whether  $x^N - 1$  is a factor of  $p_1(x) \cdots p_k(x)$ , where  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  are univariate sparse polynomials. Plaisted showed that **SPARSE-POLY-DIVIS** is **coNP**-complete in [Pla84, Thm. 4.1, pg. 130].

Now note that  $f$  vanishes at an  $M^{\text{th}}$  root of unity iff  $f$  vanishes at a primitive  $d^{\text{th}}$  root of unity for some  $d|M$ , and that the latter condition holds iff  $x^d - 1$  divides  $f(x) \prod_{\substack{q|d \\ q < d \text{ a prime power}}} (x^q - 1)$ .

The latter condition is but an instance of **SPARSE-POLY-DIVIS**, and the existence of a divisor

of  $M$  can clearly be checked in **NP**. So by Plaisted’s result, and the fact that the number of primes dividing  $M$  is  $O(\log M)$ , **CYCLOVAN**  $\in$  **NP**<sup>**NP**</sup>. ■

### 2.3 The Proof of Theorem 3

**Assertion (1):** By [GKZ94, Prop. 1.8, Pg. 274], we can express the  $A$ -discriminant of any circuit  $A = \{a_0, \dots, a_{n+1}\}$  as a **binomial** as follows: First, without loss of generality, we can assume that  $a_0 = \mathbf{0}$  (dividing by a suitable monomial) and that  $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}$  generate  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  as a lattice (substituting  $y = x^U$  for some suitable  $U$  if necessary, via Proposition 1 and Lemma 1). We then let  $m = (m_0, \dots, m_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  be the unique vector such that (a) the coordinates of  $m$  have greatest common divisor 1, (b)  $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} m_i a_i = \mathbf{0}$ , and (c)  $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} m_i = 0$ . One in fact has  $|m_i| := \text{Vol}(\text{Conv}(A \setminus \{a_i\}))$  [GKZ94, Pg. 274], provided one normalizes volume so that  $\text{Vol}(\text{Conv}\{\mathbf{0}, e_1, \dots, e_n\}) = 1$ . Finally, assume without loss of generality (permuting the  $a_i$  if necessary) that  $m_i > 0$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and  $m_i < 0$  for all  $i \in \{l, \dots, n+1\}$ .

We then have that  $\Delta_A(c_0, \dots, c_{n+1}) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^k m_i^{m_i} \right) \left( \prod_{i=l}^n c_i^{-m_i} \right) - \left( \prod_{i=l}^n m_i^{-m_i} \right) \left( \prod_{i=1}^k c_i^{m_i} \right)$ . Note also that the bit sizes of the  $m_i$  are polynomial in the bit sizes of the  $a_i$ , via the Hadamard determinant inequality. In particular, by recursive squaring again, it is clear that  $\Delta_A(c_0, \dots, c_{n+1}) \stackrel{?}{=} 0$ , for a given  $(c_0, \dots, c_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and circuit  $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ , can be decided within **P** <sub>$\mathbb{R}$</sub> . The latter complexity class is the analogue of **P** for the BSS model over  $\mathbb{R}$  with equality [BCSS98].

[Koi93, Thm. 9] then tells us that the Boolean part of **P** <sub>$\mathbb{R}$</sub>  is contained in **BPP**. For the problem over  $\mathbb{R}$  we are examining, this means that **ADISCVAN**  $\in$  **BPP** and we are done. ■

**Assertions (2) and (3):** We will first make a reduction from **ADISCVAN** to **FEAS** <sub>$\mathbb{C}$</sub> : Note that  $\Delta_A(c) = 0$  vanishes for some  $c \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^m \iff$  there is an  $x \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$  with  $f(x) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}|_x = \dots = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}|_x = 0$  [GKZ94, Ch. 10]. The latter problem is not an instance of **FEAS** <sub>$\mathbb{C}$</sub> , due to the restriction to nonzero coordinates, but can be converted into a bona fide instance of **FEAS** <sub>$\mathbb{C}$</sub>  with just an extra gesture: The last system of equations clearly has a solution in  $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$  iff there is an  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}$  with  $f(x) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}|_x = \dots = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}|_x = yx_1 \dots x_n - 1 = 0$ . The latter system clearly has size polynomial in the size of  $f$ .

Assertion (2) then follows immediately from the fact that **FEAS** <sub>$\mathbb{C}$</sub>   $\in$  **AM** assuming GRH [Koi96]. Assertion (3) follows from the fact that **FEAS** <sub>$\mathbb{C}$</sub>   $\in$  **P**<sup>**NP**</sup><sup>**NP**</sup> assuming RIPIT [Roj04b]. ■

## References

- [BM88] Babai, László and Moran, Shlomo, “Arthur-Merlin Games: A Randomized Proof System and a Hierarchy of Complexity Classes,” *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 36:254–276, 1988.
- [BS96] Bach, Eric and Shallit, Jeff, *Algorithmic Number Theory, Vol. I: Efficient Algorithms*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996.
- [Bar93] Barvinok, Alexander I., “Feasibility testing for systems of real quadratic equations,” *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 10 (1993), no. 1, pp. 1–13.
- [BGV03] Basu, Saugata and Gonzalez-Vega, Laureano, *Algorithmic and Quantitative Real Algebraic Geometry*, Papers from the DIMACS Workshop on Algorithmic and Quantitative Aspects of Real Algebraic Geometry in Mathematics and Computer Science held at Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ (March 12–16, 2001), DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, 60.

- [Ber04] Bertrand, Benoit, presentation at MSRI, April 2004.
- [Ble04] Blekherman, Grigoriy, “*Convexity properties of the cone of nonnegative polynomials,*” *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 32 (2004), no. 3, pp. 345–371.
- [BCSS98] Blum, Lenore; Cucker, Felipe; Shub, Mike; and Smale, Steve, *Complexity and Real Computation*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [Can88] Canny, John F., “*Some Algebraic and Geometric Computations in PSPACE,*” Proc. 20<sup>th</sup> ACM Symp. Theory of Computing, Chicago (1988), ACM Press.
- [GKZ94] Gel’fand, Israel Moseyevitch; Kapranov, Misha M.; and Zelevinsky, Andrei V.; *Discriminants, Resultants and Multidimensional Determinants*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
- [Ili89] Iliopoulos, Costas S., “*Worst Case Complexity Bounds on Algorithms for Computing the Canonical Structure of Finite Abelian Groups and the Hermite and Smith Normal Forms of an Integer Matrix,*” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 18 (1989), no. 4, pp. 658–669.
- [Kap00] Kapranov, Mikhail M., “*Amoebas Over Non-Archimedean Fields,*” manuscript, University of Toronto, 2000.
- [KS99] Karpinski, Marek and Shparlinski, Igor, “*On the computational hardness of testing square-freeness of sparse polynomials,*” *Applied algebra, algebraic algorithms and error-correcting codes* (Honolulu, HI, 1999), pp. 492–497, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, 1719, Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- [Kho91] Khovanski, Askold, *Fewnomials*, AMS Press, Providence, Rhode Island, 1991.
- [Koi93] Koiran, Pascal, “*A Weak Version of the Blum, Shub, & Smale Model,*” 34th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Palo Alto, CA, 1993), pp. 486–495, IEEE Comput. Soc. Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 1993.
- [Koi96] Koiran, Pascal, “*Hilbert’s Nullstellensatz is in the Polynomial Hierarchy,*” DIMACS Technical Report 96-27, July 1996. (This preprint considerably improves the published version which appeared *Journal of Complexity* **12** (1996), no. 4, pp. 273–286.)
- [LO77] Lagarias, Jeff and Odlyzko, Andrew, “*Effective Versions of the Chebotarev Density Theorem,*” *Algebraic Number Fields: L-functions and Galois Properties* (Proc. Sympos. Univ. Durham, Durham, 1975), 409–464, Academic Press, London, 1977.
- [Len99] Lenstra (Jr.), Hendrik W., “*Finding Small Degree Factors of Lacunary Polynomials,*” *Number Theory in Progress*, Vol. 1 (Zakopane-Kóscielisko, 1997), pp. 267–276, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.
- [LM01] Lickteig, Thomas and Roy, Marie-Francoise, “*Sylvester-Habicht Sequences and Fast Cauchy Index Computation,*” *J. Symbolic Computation* (2001) **31**, pp. 315–341.
- [LRW03] Li, Tien-Yien; Rojas, J. Maurice; and Wang, Xiaoshen, “*Counting Real Connected Components of Trinomial Curve Intersections and  $m$ -nomial Hypersurfaces,*” *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 30 (2003), no. 3, pp. 379–414.
- [Mik04] Mikhalkin, Grigory, “*Enumerative tropical algebraic geometry in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ,*” [math.AG/0312530](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0312530).

- [PS04] Pachter, Lior and Sturmfels, Bernd, “*Tropical Geometry of Statistical Models*,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, in press.
- [Par03] Parrilo, Pablo A., “*Semidefinite programming relaxations for semialgebraic problems*,” Algebraic and geometric methods in discrete optimization, Math. Program. 96 (2003), no. 2, Ser. B, pp. 293–320.
- [Pla84] Plaisted, David A., “*New NP-Hard and NP-Complete Polynomial and Integer Divisibility Problems*,” Theoret. Comput. Sci. 31 (1984), no. 1–2, 125–138.
- [Roj00] Rojas, J. Maurice, “*Some Speed-Ups and Speed Limits for Real Algebraic Geometry*,” Journal of Complexity, FoCM 1999 special issue, vol. 16, no. 3 (sept. 2000), pp. 552–571.
- [Roj01] Rojas, J. Maurice, “*Computational Arithmetic Geometry I: Diophantine Sentences Nearly Within the Polynomial Hierarchy*,” invited paper, Journal of Computer and System Sciences, vol. 62, no. 2, march 2001, pp. 216–235.
- [Roj02] Rojas, J. Maurice, “*Additive Complexity and the Roots of Polynomials Over Number Fields and  $p$ -adic Fields*,” Proceedings of ANTS-V (5th Annual Algorithmic Number Theory Symposium, University of Sydney, July 7–12, 2002), Lecture Notes in Computer Science #2369, Springer-Verlag (2002), pp. 506–515.
- [Roj03] Rojas, J. Maurice, “*Why Polyhedra Matter in Non-Linear Equation Solving*,” paper corresponding to an invited talk delivered at a conference on Algebraic Geometry and Geometric Modelling (Vilnius, Lithuania, July 29–August 2, 2002), Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 334, pp. 293–320, AMS Press, 2003.
- [Roj04a] Rojas, J. Maurice, “*Arithmetic Multivariate Descartes’ Rule*,” American Journal of Mathematics, vol. 126, no. 1, February 2004, pp. 1–30.
- [Roj04b] Rojas, J. Maurice, “*Dedekind Zeta Functions and the Complexity of Hilbert’s Nullstellensatz*”, Math ArXiv preprint [math.NT/0301111](https://arxiv.org/abs/math.NT/0301111).
- [RY04] Rojas, J. Maurice and Ye, Yinyu, “*On Solving Fewnomials Over an Interval in Fewnomial Time*,” Journal of Complexity, special issue for the 2002 Foundations of Computation Mathematics (FOCM) meeting, to appear.
- [Sch00] Schmid, Joachim, “*On the Complexity of the Real Nullstellensatz in the 0-Dimensional Case*,” J. Pure Appl. Algebra **151** (2000), no. 3, pp. 301–308.
- [Sch80] Schwartz, Jacob T., “*Fast Probabilistic Algorithms for Verification of Polynomial Identities*,” J. of the ACM **27**, 701–717, 1980.
- [Sto98] Storjohann, Arne, “*Computing Hermite and Smith normal forms of triangular integer matrices*,” Linear Algebra Appl. **282** (1998), no. 1–3, pp. 25–45.
- [Ste74] Stengle, G., “*A nullstellensatz and a positivstellensatz in semialgebraic geometry*,” Math. Ann. **207** (1974) pp. 87–97.
- [The04] Theobald, Thorsten, “*On the frontiers of polynomial computations in tropical geometry*,” [math.CO/0411012](https://arxiv.org/abs/math.CO/0411012).