

A Generalization of Habicht's Theorem for Subresultants of Several Univariate Polynomials

Hoon Hong

Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University
Box 8205, Raleigh, NC 27695, USA
hong@ncsu.edu

Jiaqi Meng*, Jing Yang

SMS–HCIC–School of Mathematics and Physics,
Center for Applied Mathematics of Guangxi,
Guangxi Minzu University, Nanning 530006, China
mj252920@163.com; yangjing0930@gmail.com

Abstract

Subresultants of two univariate polynomials are one of the most classic and ubiquitous objects in computational algebra and algebraic geometry. In 1948, Habicht discovered and proved interesting relationships among subresultants. Those relationships were found to be useful for both structural understanding and efficient computation.

Often one needs to consider several (possibly more than two) polynomials. It is rather straightforward to generalize the notion of subresultants to several polynomials. However, it is not obvious (in fact, quite challenging) to generalize the Habicht's result to several polynomials. The main contribution of this paper is to provide such a generalization.

Keywords: Subresultant; generalized subresultant; Habicht's theorem; nested subresultant

1 Introduction

Subresultants of two polynomials are one of the most ubiquitous objects in computational algebra and algebraic geometry. It played a vital role in the development of many fundamental algorithms, such as triangular decomposition, quantifier elimination and parametric gcd. Therefore, extensive studies have been carried out on the underlying theories, efficient algorithms and various applications (just list a few [1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 38, 42, 44, 45, 46], [3, 5, 29, 31, 34, 37, 41] and [20, 33, 35]).

In 1948, Habicht discovered and proved interesting relationships among subresultants, which is the well known Habicht's theorem. The classical Habicht's theorem contains two results:

- relationship between a single subresultant and the pseudo-remainder of its two consecutive subresultants ;
- relationship between a single subresultant and the subresultant of two others.

*Corresponding author.

In [28], Hong and Yang generalize the *first* relationship to subresultants of *several* polynomials. In the current paper, we will generalize the *second* one to *several* polynomials.

To set a suitable context, let us review Habicht's second relation. Let F_0, F_1 be two univariate polynomials of degrees $d_0 \leq d_1$ without losing generality. Let $R_k(F_0, F_1)$ denote the $(d_0 - k)$ -th subresultant of F_0 and F_1 . (Note that we re-index the subresultant because it is helpful in generalizing the concept to several polynomials). Habicht posed the following interesting question: are there integers u, v, w_0, w_1 and a constant c such that the following equality holds?

$$c R_u(F_0, F_1) = R_v(R_{w_0}(F_0, F_1), R_{w_1}(F_0, F_1)) \quad (1)$$

If so, what are conditions on them? Habicht gave the following elegant answer in [22]: If

$$\begin{cases} w_1 = w_0 + 1 \\ v \geq 1 \\ u = w_0 + v \end{cases}$$

then the equality (1) holds where c is some power of the principal coefficient of $R_{w_0}(F_0, F_1)$ in terms of x . This inherent relationship says that a subresultant of lower degree can be computed from those of higher degree. By applying the relation repeatedly, one can find more relations.

In the case of more than two polynomials, one could compute the subresultants in a recursive way. However, it results in nested subresultants and often causes an exponential expansion of degree in parameters. Thus one is keen on constructing subresultants in a non-recursive way. For this purpose, one needs to define the notion of subresultant for several polynomials. It can be done in a very natural way (see [28]).

Let R_k denote for the k -th subresultant of several polynomials (of course, k is no longer a single number, but could be a vector of numbers). We pose the following question/challenge: are there integer vectors u, v, w_0, \dots, w_n and a constant c such that the following holds?

$$c R_u(F_0, \dots, F_n) = R_v(R_{w_0}(F_0, \dots, F_n), \dots, R_{w_n}(F_0, \dots, F_n)) \quad (2)$$

If so, what are conditions on them? In this paper, we give a (hopefully) elegant answer: If

$$\begin{cases} w_1 = w_0 + e_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_n = w_0 + e_n \\ v = (k, \dots, k) + e_i \\ u = w_0 + v \end{cases}$$

for some $k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq i \leq n$, then the equality (2) holds where c is some power of the principal coefficient of $R_{w_0}(F_0, \dots, F_n)$ in terms of x and where e_j stands for the j -th unit vector of length n .

Note that the generalized Habicht's theorem (given in this paper) has the essentially same structure as the original Habicht's theorem, i.e., a subresultant of several polynomials can be computed from some of their subresultants with higher degree of the given polynomials. By applying the relation repeatedly, one can find more relations.

The main difficulty for tackling this problem is that we have to overcome the following challenge. In the case of two polynomials, in order to identify the conditions for (1), one needs to consider nested subresultants, i.e., subresultants of subresultants, which are very complicated in their form. Thus, the multi-polynomial case faces the same kind of difficulty but in a much larger scale.

Related works:

1. In [28], for computing the greatest common divisor of several univariate polynomials with coefficients in an efficient way, Hong and Yang identified a relationship between subresultants and pseudo-remainders of these subresultants for several polynomials. Since the pseudo-remainder of two polynomials can be viewed as a special form of their subresultants, the relationship in [28] can be viewed as a special case of the equality (2). In this paper, we give a much more general condition for (2) to hold.

2. In [7, 12, 16, 21, 39, 40] and [6, 10], the authors generalized the subresultant of two univariate polynomials to that of multivariate polynomials while constraining the number of polynomials to be at most one more than the number of variables and investigated their algebraic properties such as irreducibility and relationship to a shape lemma. In this paper, we take another route for generalization. We generalize the subresultant of two univariate polynomials to several polynomials while staying univariate and investigate their underlying structure in order to generalize Habicht's theorem to several univariate polynomials.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we review some concepts of subresultants for several univariate polynomials. Then the main result is presented in Section 3. The following Section 4 provides a thorough explanation of its relationship with the classical Habicht's theorem. The proof of the main result is given in Section 5. The paper is concluded in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we review the followings: (1) subresultants of two polynomials and Habicht's theorem on them, and (2) a natural generalization of subresultants to several polynomials. We will do so using a **new indexing** scheme for them. The reason is that the new indexing will facilitate the generalization to several polynomials. Thus, we strongly encourage the readers (even though who know the classical theory) read this section in order to get familiar with the new indexing scheme.

Let \mathcal{Z} denote an integral domain such as \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{Q} , $\mathbb{Z}[a]$ and so on. The followings are taken directly from [28]. For readers' convenience, we reproduce them here.

2.1 Review on subresultants of two polynomials

Definition 1 (Determinant polynomial of matrix). *Let $M \in \mathcal{Z}^{p \times q}$ where $p \leq q$ (that is, M is square or wide).*

- The determinant polynomial of M , written as $\text{dp}(M)$, is defined by

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

where $c_j = \det [M_1 \cdots M_{p-1} M_{q-j}]$ and M_k stands for the k -th column of M .

- The principal coefficient of $\text{dp}(M)$, written as $\text{pcdp}(M)$, is defined by

$$\text{pcdp}(M) = \text{coeff}_{x^{q-p}}(\text{dp}(M))$$

Example 2. *Let*

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} m_{11} & m_{12} & m_{13} & m_{14} & m_{15} \\ m_{21} & m_{22} & m_{23} & m_{24} & m_{25} \\ m_{31} & m_{32} & m_{33} & m_{34} & m_{35} \end{bmatrix}$$

Note $p = 3$ and $q = 5$. Thus

- $\text{dp}(M) = c_2 x^2 + c_1 x^1 + c_0 x^0$ where

$$c_2 = \det [M_1 \ M_2 \ M_{5-2}] = \det \begin{bmatrix} m_{11} & m_{12} & m_{13} \\ m_{21} & m_{22} & m_{23} \\ m_{31} & m_{32} & m_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$c_1 = \det [M_1 \ M_2 \ M_{5-1}] = \det \begin{bmatrix} m_{11} & m_{12} & m_{14} \\ m_{21} & m_{22} & m_{24} \\ m_{31} & m_{32} & m_{34} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$c_0 = \det [M_1 \ M_2 \ M_{5-0}] = \det \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} m_{11} & m_{12} & m_{15} \\ m_{21} & m_{22} & m_{25} \\ m_{31} & m_{32} & m_{35} \end{array} \right]$$

- $\text{pcdp}(M) = c_2 = \det [M_1 \ M_2 \ M_{5-2}] = \det \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} m_{11} & m_{12} & m_{13} \\ m_{21} & m_{22} & m_{23} \\ m_{31} & m_{32} & m_{33} \end{array} \right]$

Definition 3 (Coefficient matrix of a list of polynomials). Let $P = (P_1, \dots, P_t)$ where

$$P_i = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq p_i} b_{ij} x^j \in \mathcal{Z}[x]$$

and $p_i = \deg P_i$. Let $m = \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} p_i$. Then the coefficient matrix of P , written as $\text{cm}(P)$, is defined as the $t \times (m+1)$ matrix whose (i, j) -th entry is the coefficient of P_i in the term x^{m+1-j} .

Example 4. Let $P = (P_1, P_2, P_3)$ where

$$P_1 = b_{03}x^3 + b_{02}x^2 + b_{01}x + b_{00}$$

$$P_2 = b_{13}x^3 + b_{12}x^2 + b_{11}x + b_{10}$$

$$P_3 = b_{22}x^2 + b_{21}x + b_{20}$$

Thus

$$\text{cm}(P) = \text{cm}(P_1, P_2, P_3) = \left[\begin{array}{cccc} b_{03} & b_{02} & b_{01} & b_{00} \\ b_{13} & b_{12} & b_{11} & b_{10} \\ & b_{22} & b_{21} & b_{20} \end{array} \right]$$

Notation 5 (Determinant polynomial of a list of polynomials). Let $P = (P_1, \dots, P_t)$ be such that $\text{cm}(P)$ is square or wide. Then we will use the following short hand notations.

- $\text{dp}(P) = \text{dp}(\text{cm}(P))$,
- $\text{pcdp}(P) = \text{pcdp}(\text{cm}(P))$.

Example 6. Let $P = (P_1, P_2, P_3)$ be as in Example 4. Thus

- $\text{dp}(P) = \text{dp}(\text{cm}(P)) = \text{dp} \left[\begin{array}{cccc} b_{03} & b_{02} & b_{01} & b_{00} \\ b_{13} & b_{12} & b_{11} & b_{10} \\ & b_{22} & b_{21} & b_{20} \end{array} \right] = c_1 x + c_0$, where

$$c_1 = \det \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} b_{03} & b_{02} & b_{01} \\ b_{13} & b_{12} & b_{11} \\ & b_{22} & b_{21} \end{array} \right], \quad c_0 = \det \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} b_{03} & b_{02} & b_{00} \\ b_{13} & b_{12} & b_{10} \\ & b_{22} & b_{20} \end{array} \right]$$

- $\text{pcdp}(P) = \text{pcdp}(\text{cm}(P)) = c_1 = \det \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} b_{03} & b_{02} & b_{01} \\ b_{13} & b_{12} & b_{11} \\ & b_{22} & b_{21} \end{array} \right]$

Next we recall the concept of subresultant for two univariate polynomials.

Definition 7. Let $F_0, F_1 \in \mathcal{Z}[x]$ with $\deg(F_i) = d_i$ and $d_0 \leq d_1$. Let $0 < k \leq d_0$.

- The k -subresultant of F_0 and F_1 , written as $R_k(F_0, F_1)$, is defined by

$$R_k(F_0, F_1) = \text{dp}(x^{d_1-(d_0-k)-1} F_0, \dots, x^0 F_0, x^{k-1} F_1, \dots, x^0 F_1)$$

- The principal coefficient of $R_k(F_0, F_1)$, written as $r_k(F_0, F_1)$, is defined by

$$r_k(F_0, F_1) = \text{coeff}_{x^{d_0-k}}(R_k(F_0, F_1))$$

One can extend the above definition to the case when $k = 0$. In this case, it is required that $d_0 \neq d_1$. Then

$$R_0(F_0, F_1) = a_{0d_0}^{d_1-d_0-1} F_0$$

where a_{0d_0} is the leading coefficient of F_0 .

Example 8. Let

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 &= a_{03}x^3 + a_{02}x^2 + a_{01}x + a_{00} \\ F_1 &= a_{14}x^4 + a_{13}x^3 + a_{12}x^2 + a_{11}x + a_{10} \end{aligned}$$

Let $k = 2$. Then

$$P = (x^2 F_0, x^1 F_0, x^0 F_0, x^1 F_1, x^0 F_1)$$

Thus

- The 2-subresultant of F_0 and F_1 , written as $R_2(F_0, F_1)$, is

$$\begin{aligned} R_2(F_0, F_1) &= \text{dp}(P) \\ &= \text{dp}(\text{cm}(P)) \\ &= \text{dp} \left[\begin{array}{cccccc} a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} & & \\ & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} & \\ & & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} \\ \hline a_{14} & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} & a_{10} & \\ & a_{14} & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} & a_{10} \end{array} \right] \\ &= \det \left[\begin{array}{cccc} a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} \\ & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} \\ & & a_{03} & a_{02} \\ \hline a_{14} & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} \end{array} \right] x + \det \left[\begin{array}{cccc} a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} \\ & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} \\ & & a_{03} & a_{02} \\ \hline a_{14} & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} \end{array} \right] \end{aligned}$$

- The principal coefficient of $R_2(F_0, F_1)$, written as $r_2(F_0, F_1)$, is

$$\begin{aligned} r_2(F_0, F_1) &= \text{coeff}_{x^1}(R_2(F_0, F_1)) \\ &= \det \left[\begin{array}{cccc} a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} \\ & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} \\ & & a_{03} & a_{02} \\ \hline a_{14} & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} \\ & a_{14} & a_{13} & a_{12} \end{array} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Remark 9.

- Note that we are using a new indexing for subresultants. For instance, $R_k(F_0, F_1)$ in the new indexing would have been indexed as $R_{d_0-k}(F_0, F_1)$ in the classical indexing.
- Note that we are using the terminologies “subresultant” and “principal coefficient” as convention. In some other literatures, readers may also see the terminologies “subresultant” and “principal subresultant coefficient” (e.g., [9, 36]), or “polynomial subresultant” and “scalar subresultant” (e.g., [43]), “subresultant polynomial” and “subresultant” (e.g., [15]) as their alternatives.

Habicht discovered two intrinsic relationships among subresultants of two polynomials in [22]. The first is the similarity of a subresultant with the pseudo-remainder of its two consecutive subresultants and the second is the similarity of a subresultant with the subresultant of two others. It should be pointed out that the first result can be viewed as a specialization of the second one. In [28], the authors presented an analogy of the first result for several polynomials (which is not a generalization of the classical result). In this paper, we will generalize the second result to several polynomials. Therefore, we reproduce the second result below.

Theorem 10 (Habicht's Theorem [22]). *We have*

$$r_{w_0}^\epsilon(F_0, F_1) R_u(F_0, F_1) = R_v(R_{w_0}(F_0, F_1), R_{w_1}(F_0, F_1)) \quad (3)$$

if $u \leq d_0, v, w_0, w_1, \epsilon$ satisfy the following conditions:

$$\begin{cases} w_1 = w_0 + 1 \\ v \geq 0 \\ u = w_0 + v \\ \epsilon = 2v - 2 \end{cases}$$

2.2 Review on subresultants of several polynomials

For generalizing the classical Habicht's theorem to more than two polynomials, we need the notions/notations of generalized subresultants for several polynomials. In [28], the authors present a natural extension of the classical subresultant for two polynomials to multiple polynomials. For the readers' convenience, we reproduce them here.

Notation 11.

- $d = (d_0, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$;
- $a_i = (a_{i0}, \dots, a_{id_i})$ be indeterminates (parameters);
- $F = (F_0, \dots, F_n)$ where $F_i = \sum_{j=0}^{d_i} a_{ij}x^j \in \mathbb{Z}[a_i][x]$;
- $P(d_0, n) = \{(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n : |\delta| = \delta_1 + \dots + \delta_n \leq d_0\}$;
- $\mathcal{F}_k = x^{\delta_k-1}F_k, \dots, x^0F_k$ where $\delta_k \in \mathbb{N}$;
- $c(\delta) = \# \text{col cm}(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n)$.

Example 12. Let $d = (3, 3, 4)$. Then

$$P(d_0, n) = \{ (3, 0), (2, 1), (1, 2), (0, 3), (2, 0), (1, 1), (0, 2), (1, 0), (0, 1), (0, 0) \}$$

Choose $\delta = (1, 1) \in P(3, 2)$. We have

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = x^0F_1, \quad \mathcal{F}_2 = x^0F_2$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cm}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) &= \text{cm}(x^0F_1, x^0F_2) = \begin{bmatrix} & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} & a_{10} \\ a_{24} & a_{23} & a_{22} & a_{21} & a_{20} \end{bmatrix} \\ c(\delta) &= \# \text{col} \begin{bmatrix} & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} & a_{10} \\ a_{24} & a_{23} & a_{22} & a_{21} & a_{20} \end{bmatrix} = 5 \end{aligned}$$

Definition 13 (Subresultant). Let $\delta \in P(d_0, n)$.

- The δ -subresultant of F , written as $R_\delta(F)$, is defined by

$$R_\delta(F) = \text{dp cm}(\mathcal{F}_0, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n)$$

where again

$$\delta_0 = \begin{cases} c(\delta) - d_0 & \text{if } c(\delta) \geq d_0 \\ 1 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

- The principal coefficient of $R_\delta(F)$, written as $r_\delta(F)$, is defined by

$$r_\delta(F) = \text{coeff}_{x^{d_0 - |\delta|}}(R_\delta(F))$$

Remark 14. In the above, the particular expression for δ_0 is chosen because it naturally extends the formulation of subresultants for two polynomials. Roughly speaking, such choice of δ_0 makes the submatrix of $\text{cm}(\mathcal{F}_0, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n)$ involving the coefficients of F_0 the widest block while keeping the size of the matrix $\text{cm}(\mathcal{F}_0, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n)$ as small as possible.

Example 15. Let $d = (3, 3, 4)$ and $\delta = (1, 1)$. Note

$$c(\delta) = \# \text{col cm}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) = 5 \geq d_0, \quad \delta_0 = 5 - 3 = 2$$

Therefore

$$R_{(1,1)}(F) = \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} & & \\ & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} & \\ & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} & a_{10} & \\ a_{24} & a_{23} & a_{22} & a_{21} & a_{20} & \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} \\ & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} \\ & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} \\ a_{24} & a_{23} & a_{22} & a_{21} \end{bmatrix} x + \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & \\ & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{00} \\ & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{10} \\ a_{24} & a_{23} & a_{22} & a_{20} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$r_{(1,1)}(F) = \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} & a_{00} \\ & a_{03} & a_{02} & a_{01} \\ & a_{13} & a_{12} & a_{11} \\ a_{24} & a_{23} & a_{22} & a_{21} \end{bmatrix}$$

3 Main Result

In this section, we describe a generalization of Habicht's theorem for several polynomials. For this purpose, we need the following notation.

Notation 16. Let $e_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be the i -th unit vector of length n , that is, the vector whose i -th element is 1 and the remaining elements are all zeros. We choose the convention that $e_0 = (0, \dots, 0)$.

Assumption 17. From now on, we will assume that $d_0 \leq d_1, \dots, d_n$ and F_0 is monic, i.e., $a_{0d_0} = 1$.

Theorem 18 (Main Result). We have

$$r_{w_0}^\epsilon(F_0, \dots, F_n) R_u(F_0, \dots, F_n) = R_v(R_{w_0}(F_0, \dots, F_n), \dots, R_{w_n}(F_0, \dots, F_n)) \quad (5)$$

if $u \in P(d_0, n)$, $v, w_0, \dots, w_n, \epsilon$ satisfy the following conditions

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} w_1 = w_0 + e_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_n = w_0 + e_n \\ v = (k, \dots, k) + e_i \\ u = w_0 + v \\ \epsilon = |v + e_i| + k - 2 \end{array} \right.$$

for some $k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq i \leq n$.

Example 19. Let $d = (5, 5, 6)$.

- Let $w_0 = (1, 1)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 0$. Then

$$\omega_1 = (2, 1), \quad \omega_2 = (1, 2), \quad v = (1, 1), \quad u = (2, 2), \quad \epsilon = |(1, 1)| + 1 - 2 = 1$$

Thus we have

$$r_{(1,1)}^1(F) R_{(2,2)}(F) = R_{(1,1)} (R_{(1,1)}(F), R_{(2,1)}(F), R_{(1,2)}(F))$$

- Let $w_0 = (1, 1)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 1$. Then

$$\omega_1 = (2, 1), \quad \omega_2 = (1, 2), \quad v = (2, 1), \quad u = (3, 2), \quad \epsilon = |(3, 1)| + 1 - 2 = 3$$

Thus we have

$$r_{(1,1)}^3(F) R_{(3,2)}(F) = R_{(2,1)} (R_{(1,1)}(F), R_{(2,1)}(F), R_{(1,2)}(F))$$

- Let $w_0 = (1, 1)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 2$. Then

$$\omega_1 = (2, 1), \quad \omega_2 = (1, 2), \quad v = (1, 2), \quad u = (2, 3), \quad \epsilon = |(1, 3)| + 1 - 2 = 3$$

Thus we have

$$r_{(1,1)}^3(F) R_{(2,3)}(F) = R_{(1,2)} (R_{(1,1)}(F), R_{(2,1)}(F), R_{(1,2)}(F))$$

4 Relation to the Classical Habicht's Theorem

After setting $n = 1$ in Theorem 18, the theorem reduces to the following:

$$r_{w_0}^\epsilon(F_0, F_1) R_u(F_0, F_1) = R_v(R_{w_0}(F_0, F_1), R_{w_1}(F_0, F_1))$$

if $u \in P(d_0, 1)$ (i.e., $u \leq d_0$), v, w_0, w_1, ϵ satisfy the following conditions

$$\begin{cases} w_1 = w_0 + 1 \\ v = k + e_i \\ u = w_0 + v \\ \epsilon = |v + e_i| + k - 2 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

for some $k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq i \leq 1$. Let $i = 0$. Then the the condition (6) simplifies to

$$\begin{cases} w_1 = w_0 + 1 \\ v = k \\ u = w_0 + k \\ \epsilon = 2k - 2 \end{cases}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} w_1 = w_0 + 1 \\ v \geq 1 \\ u = w_0 + v \\ \epsilon = 2v - 2 \end{cases}$$

as in Theorem 10. Thus we conclude that the classical Habicht's theorem is indeed a specialization of the generalized version presented in this paper.

In the remaining part of this section, we make a further analysis on the similarity between the generalized Habicht's theorem (Theorem 18) and the classical one (Theorem 10), which gives readers a deeper understanding on the content of the generalized Habicht's theorem. For the sake of simplicity, when F is clear from the context, we can abbreviate $R_\delta(F)$ and $r_\delta(F)$ as R_δ and r_δ , respectively.

First, we note that the relationship (3) in the classical Habicht's theorem (Theorem 10) can be illustrated as

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_{w_0+e_0} \\ R_{w_0+e_1} \end{bmatrix} \implies [R_{w_0+1+e_1}] \cdots [R_{w_0+k+e_1}]$$

This diagram is interpreted as: $R_{w_0+j+e_1}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ can be computed from $R_{w_0+e_0}$ and $R_{w_0+e_1}$. Note that $R_{w_0+(j-1)+e_1} = R_{w_0+j+e_0}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. Thus, the above relationship can be equivalently converted to the following:

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_{w_0+e_0} \\ R_{w_0+e_1} \end{bmatrix} \implies \begin{bmatrix} R_{w_0+1+e_0} \\ R_{w_0+1+e_1} \end{bmatrix} \cdots \begin{bmatrix} R_{w_0+k+e_0} \\ R_{w_0+k+e_1} \end{bmatrix}$$

This diagram is interpreted as: $R_{w_0+j+e_i}$ for $i = 0, 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, k$ can be computed from $R_{w_0+e_0}$ and $R_{w_0+e_1}$.

The same pattern can be found in the generalized Habicht's theorem. More explicitly, let $d = (d_0, \dots, d_n)$ where $d_0 = \min_{0 \leq i \leq n} d_i$ and $k' = (k, \dots, k)$ for $k \geq 1$, then $v \in \{k' + e_i : i = 0, \dots, n\}$. The relationship (5) in the generalized Habicht's theorem (Theorem 18) can be illustrated as

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_{w_0+e_0} \\ R_{w_0+e_1} \\ \vdots \\ R_{w_0+e_n} \end{bmatrix} \implies \begin{bmatrix} R_{w_0+1'+e_0} \\ R_{w_0+1'+e_1} \\ \vdots \\ R_{w_0+1'+e_n} \end{bmatrix} \cdots \begin{bmatrix} R_{w_0+k'+e_0} \\ R_{w_0+k'+e_1} \\ \vdots \\ R_{w_0+k'+e_n} \end{bmatrix}$$

The diagram is again interpreted as: $R_{w_0+j'+e_i}$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, k$ can be computed from $R_{w_0+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}$.

To have a better understanding of the similarity between the classical Habicht's theorem and the generalized version, we introduce the concepts of cluster and cluster chain of adjacent subresultants, which might be helpful for identifying more relationships among subresultants.

Definition 20. We call $(R_{w_0}, R_{w_0+e_1}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n})$ a cluster of subresultants for F , denoted by C_{w_0} . Then $\dots, C_{w_0}, C_{w_0+1'}, \dots$ is called the cluster chain of subresultants.

With the above definition, we re-interpret the generalized Habicht's theorem as follows. Given a cluster C_{w_0} of subresultants, we can compute all the subresultants in the clusters in the right of C_{w_0} along the cluster chain. Note that the degrees of subresultants are decreasing along to the right. With the degree becoming smaller, the subresultants tend to become complicated because the determinant polynomials they are obtained from are with higher order. Thus in the classical subresultants, one often computes subresultants with lower degree (corresponding to higher-order determinant polynomials) from those with higher degree (corresponding to lower-order determinant polynomials).

We hope that this interpretation would have an impact on establishing inherent relationships between subresultants of multiple polynomials and pseudo-remainders, which would, in turn, lead to the efficient computation of subresultants. For instance, in what follows, we apply the generalized Habicht's theorem repeatedly to find further relations among subresultants.

Example 21. Let $d = (5, 5, 6)$. We would like to reduce $R_{(3,2)}(F)$ to $R_{(*,0)}(F)$ or $R_{(0,*)}(F)$ by repeatedly applying Theorem 18. There are several approaches to achieve this. We will illustrate two approaches.

1. Approach A.

- (a) $r_{(2,1)}(F) R_{(3,2)}(F) = R_{(1,1)}(R_{(2,1)}(F), R_{(3,1)}(F), R_{(2,2)}(F))$ using $w_0 = (2, 1)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 0$.
(b) $r_{(1,0)}(F) R_{(2,1)}(F) = R_{(1,1)}(R_{(1,0)}(F), R_{(2,0)}(F), R_{(1,1)}(F))$ using $w_0 = (1, 0)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 0$.
 $r_{(2,0)}(F) R_{(3,1)}(F) = R_{(1,1)}(R_{(2,0)}(F), R_{(3,0)}(F), R_{(2,1)}(F))$ using $w_0 = (2, 0)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 0$.
 $r_{(1,1)}(F) R_{(2,2)}(F) = R_{(1,1)}(R_{(1,1)}(F), R_{(2,1)}(F), R_{(1,2)}(F))$ using $w_0 = (1, 1)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 0$.
(c) $r_{(0,0)}(F) R_{(1,1)}(F) = R_{(1,1)}(R_{(0,0)}(F), R_{(1,0)}(F), R_{(0,1)}(F))$ using $w_0 = (0, 0)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 0$.
 $r_{(0,1)}(F) R_{(1,2)}(F) = R_{(1,1)}(R_{(0,1)}(F), R_{(1,1)}(F), R_{(0,2)}(F))$ using $w_0 = (0, 1)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 0$.

Thus we have reduced $R_{(3,2)}(F)$ to

$$R_{(0,0)}(F), R_{(0,1)}(F), R_{(0,2)}(F), R_{(1,0)}(F), R_{(2,0)}(F), R_{(3,0)}(F)$$

repeatedly using $R_{(1,1)}$. Schematically, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
02 & \xrightarrow{1} & 12 & \xrightarrow{1} & 22 & \xrightarrow{1} & 32 \\
& \nearrow^1 & \uparrow & \nearrow^1 & \uparrow & \nearrow^1 & \uparrow \\
01 & \xrightarrow{1} & 11 & \xrightarrow{1} & 21 & \xrightarrow{1} & 31 \\
& \nearrow^1 & \uparrow & \nearrow^1 & \uparrow & \nearrow^1 & \uparrow \\
00 & & 10 & & 20 & & 30
\end{array}$$

2. Approach B.

- (a) $r_{(1,0)}^A(F) R_{(3,2)}(F) = R_{(2,2)}(R_{(1,0)}(F), R_{(2,0)}(F), R_{(1,1)}(F))$ using $w_0 = (1, 0)$, $k = 2$ and $i = 0$.
(b) $r_{(0,0)}(F) R_{(1,1)}(F) = R_{(1,1)}(R_{(0,0)}(F), R_{(1,0)}(F), R_{(0,1)}(F))$ using $w_0 = (0, 0)$, $k = 1$ and $i = 0$.

Thus we have reduced $R_{(3,2)}(F)$ to

$$R_{(0,0)}(F), R_{(0,1)}(F), R_{(1,0)}(F), R_{(2,0)}(F)$$

using $R_{(2,2)}$ and $R_{(1,1)}$. Schematically, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
01 & \xrightarrow{1} & 11 & \xrightarrow{2} & 32 \\
& \nearrow^1 & \uparrow & \nearrow^2 & \uparrow^2 \\
00 & & 10 & & 20
\end{array}$$

The above two approaches provide two ways for reducing subresultants of high order to nested subresultants of low orders. Their results differ in two aspects.

- The subresultants in the inner layers involved in Approach B are of lower order compared with those involved in Approach A;
- The subresultants in the outer layers involved in Approach B are of higher order compared with those involved in Approach A.

5 Proof of the Generalized Habicht's Theorem (Theorem 18)

This section is devoted to proving the generalized Habicht's theorem. The proof will be given by induction on k , starting from $k = 1$ as the induction base. The proof for the induction base is given in Subsection 5.2 and the proof for the induction step is given in Subsection 5.3. Those proofs depend on certain properties of determinant polynomials. Thus we begin by introducing and proving those properties in Subsection 5.1 before we carry out induction.

5.1 Some useful properties of determinant polynomials

In this subsection, we derive or recall several properties of determinant polynomials, which will be used in the following two subsections.

Proposition 22. *Let $P = (P_1, \dots, P_t)$ where $P_i = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq p_i} b_{ij}x^j$ and $p_i = \deg P_i$. Let $m = \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} p_i$. If $t \leq m + 1$, then we have*

$$\text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_t) = \sum_{i=1}^t c_i P_i$$

where

$$c_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t = 1; \\ 0 & \text{if } t > 1 \wedge \forall_{j \neq i} p_j < p_i; \\ (-1)^{t+i} \text{pcdp}(P_1, \dots, P_{i-1}, P_{i+1}, \dots, P_t) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Proof. If $t = 1$, it is clear that $\text{dp}(P_1) = c_1 P_1$ where $c_1 = 1$. Next we consider the case where $t > 1$. By the multi-linearity of determinant, we have

$$\text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_t) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-t+1} \det \begin{bmatrix} b_{1m} & \cdots & b_{1(m-t+2)} & b_{1i} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ b_{tm} & \cdots & b_{t(m-t+2)} & b_{ti} \end{bmatrix} x^i = \det \begin{bmatrix} b_{1m} & \cdots & b_{1(m-t+2)} & \sum_{i=0}^{m-t+1} b_{1i}x^i \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ b_{tm} & \cdots & b_{t(m-t+2)} & \sum_{i=0}^{m-t+1} b_{ti}x^i \end{bmatrix}$$

where $b_{ij} := 0$ for $j > p_i$. Adding the i -th column multiplied by x^{m+1-i} to the last column, we get

$$\text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_t) = \det \begin{bmatrix} b_{1m} & \cdots & b_{1(m-t+2)} & \sum_{i=0}^m b_{1i}x^i \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ b_{tm} & \cdots & b_{t(m-t+2)} & \sum_{i=0}^m b_{ti}x^i \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} b_{1m} & \cdots & b_{1(m-t+2)} & P_1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ b_{tm} & \cdots & b_{t(m-t+2)} & P_t \end{bmatrix}$$

Then the expansion of the matrix along the last column results in

$$\text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_t) = \sum_{i=1}^t (-1)^{t+i} \det(M^{(i)}) \cdot P_i$$

where

$$M^{(i)} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{1m} & \cdots & b_{1(m-t+2)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ b_{(i-1)m} & \cdots & b_{(i-1)(m-t+2)} \\ b_{(i+1)m} & \cdots & b_{(i+1)(m-t+2)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ b_{tm} & \cdots & b_{t(m-t+2)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

Let $c_i = (-1)^{t+i} \det(M^{(i)})$, then $\text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_t) = \sum_{i=1}^t c_i P_i$. Now we consider the following two cases for c_i , depending on whether $\forall_{j \neq i} p_j < p_i$ holds or not.

C1: $\forall_{j \neq i} p_j < p_i$.

In this case, we have $b_{jm} = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, t$. By (7),

$$c_i = \sum_{i=1}^t (-1)^{t+i} \det(M^{(i)}) = 0$$

C2: $\exists_{j \neq i} p_j \geq p_i$. In this case, $\det(M^{(i)}) = \text{pcdp}(P_1, \dots, P_{i-1}, P_{i+1}, \dots, P_t)$. Then

$$c_i = \sum_{i=1}^t (-1)^{t+i} \det(M^{(i)}) = (-1)^{t+i} \text{pcdp}(P_1, \dots, P_{i-1}, P_{i+1}, \dots, P_t)$$

The proof is completed. □

The following result was first presented in [28]. It is a specialization of Proposition 22 when P is specialized with $(x^{\delta_0-1}F_0, \dots, x^0F_0, \dots, x^{\delta_n-1}F_n, \dots, x^0F_n)$.

Corollary 23. *Let $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n) \in P(n, d_0)$ and $F = (F_0, \dots, F_n)$ in Notation 11. Then we have*

$$R_\delta(F) = \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^{\delta_i-1} c_{ij} x^j F_i$$

where $c_{ij} \in \mathcal{Z}[a_0, \dots, a_n]$. In particular, when $i > 0$ and $\delta_i \neq 0$,

$$c_{i, \delta_i-1} = (-1)^{\sigma_i+1} r_{\delta-e_i}(F)$$

where $\sigma_i = \delta_i + \dots + \delta_n$.

Lemma 24. *Let $P = (P_1, \dots, P_{t_1})$, $Q = (Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2})$ with $\deg P_i = p_i$ and $\deg Q_i = q_i$ be such that $t_1, t_2 \geq 1$ and $m_1 = \max_{1 \leq i \leq t_1} p_i \geq m_2 = \max_{1 \leq i \leq t_2} q_i$. If $t_1 + t_2 \leq m_1 + 1$ and $m_2 \leq m_1 - t_1 + 1$, then we have the following:*

$$\text{dp}(P, Q) = \begin{cases} (1) \text{ dp}(\text{dp}(P), Q) & \text{if } m_2 = m_1 - t_1 + 1; \\ (2) \text{ pcdp}(P) \cdot \text{dp}(Q) & \text{if } m_2 = m_1 - t_1 \text{ or } m_2 < m_1 - t_1 \wedge t_2 = 1; \\ (3) 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Assume $P_i = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq p_i} b_{ij} x^j$, $Q_i = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq q_i} b_{ij}^* x^j$. Let $M^{(1)} = \text{cm}(P_1, \dots, P_{t_1}, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2})$, that is

$$M^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{1m_1} & \cdots & b_{1(m_1-t_1+1)} & b_{1(m_1-t_1)} & \cdots & b_{10} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ b_{t_1 m_1} & \cdots & b_{t_1(m_1-t_1+1)} & b_{t_1(m_1-t_1)} & \cdots & b_{t_1 0} \\ & & b_{1(m_1-t_1+1)}^* & b_{1(m_1-t_1)}^* & \cdots & b_{10}^* \\ & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & & b_{t_2(m_1-t_1+1)}^* & b_{t_2(m_1-t_1)}^* & \cdots & b_{t_2 0}^* \end{bmatrix}$$

where $b_{ij} := 0$ when $j > p_i$ and $b_{ij}^* := 0$ when $j > q_i$. Next we simplify $\text{dp}(M^{(1)})$. For this purpose, let $U_1 = \text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_{t_1})$. By Proposition 22, we have

$$U_1 = \text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_{t_1}) = c_1 P_1 + \cdots + c_{t_1} P_{t_1}$$

where

$$c_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_1 = 1; \\ 0 & \text{if } t_1 > 1 \wedge \forall_{j \neq i} p_j < p_i; \\ (-1)^{t_1+i} \text{pcdp}(P_1, \dots, P_{i-1}, P_{i+1}, \dots, P_{t_1}) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Now we proceed to analyze $\text{dp}(M^{(1)})$ separately under the two conditions of $t_1 > 1$ and $t_1 = 1$.

Case(i) : $t_1 = 1$.

In this case, $U_1 = \text{dp}(P_1) = P_1$. Then we have

$$\text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{dp}(P_1, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2}) = \text{dp}(U_1, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2})$$

Case(ii) : $t_1 > 1$.

Without loss of generality, we suppose that $p_{t_1} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq t_1} p_i$, i.e., $c_{t_1} \neq 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{t_1} \text{dp}(M^{(1)}) &= \text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_{t_1-1}, c_{t_1} P_{t_1}, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2}) \\ &= \text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_{t_1-1}, U_1, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2}) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Consider $M^{(2)} = \text{cm}(P_1, \dots, P_{t_1-1}, U_1, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2})$. We partition $M^{(2)}$ in the following way:

$$M^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} N^{(1)} & N^{(2)} \\ & N^{(3)} \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$N^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{1m_1} & \cdots & b_{1(m_1-t_1+2)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ b_{(t_1-1)m_1} & \cdots & b_{(t_1-1)(m_1-t_1+2)} \end{bmatrix}, N^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{1(m_1-t_1+1)} & \cdots & b_{10} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ b_{(t_1-1)(m_1-t_1+1)} & \cdots & b_{(t_1-1)0} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$N^{(3)} = \text{dp}(U_1, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2}) = \begin{bmatrix} u_{m_1-t_1+1} & \cdots & u_0 \\ b_{1(m_1-t_1+1)}^* & \cdots & b_{10}^* \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ b_{t_2(m_1-t_1+1)}^* & \cdots & b_{t_20}^* \end{bmatrix}$$

where u_i is the coefficient of U_1 in the term x^i . Next we show that when $m_2 \leq m_1 - t_1 + 1$, $\text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{dp}(N^{(3)})$.

Let $M_i^{(2)}$, $N_i^{(1)}$, $N_i^{(2)}$ and $N_i^{(3)}$ be the i -th column of $M^{(2)}$, $N^{(1)}$, $N^{(2)}$ and $N^{(3)}$, respectively. By the definition of determinant polynomial, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dp}(M^{(2)}) &= \sum_{i=t_1+t_2}^{m_1+1} \det \begin{bmatrix} M_1^{(2)} & \cdots & M_{t_1+t_2-1}^{(2)} & M_i^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \cdot x^{m_1+1-i} \\ &= \sum_{i=t_2+1}^{m_1-t_1+2} \det \begin{bmatrix} N_1^{(1)} & \cdots & N_{t_1-1}^{(1)} & N_1^{(2)} & \cdots & N_{t_2}^{(2)} & N_i^{(2)} \\ & & & N_1^{(3)} & \cdots & N_{t_2}^{(3)} & N_i^{(3)} \end{bmatrix} \cdot x^{m_1-t_1+2-i} \end{aligned}$$

Since $N^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} N_1^{(1)} & \cdots & N_{t_1-1}^{(1)} \end{bmatrix}$ is a square matrix of order $t_1 - 1$, we have

$$\text{dp}(M^{(2)}) = \det N^{(1)} \cdot \sum_{i=t_2+1}^{m_1-t_1+2} \det \begin{bmatrix} N_1^{(3)} & \cdots & N_{t_2}^{(3)} & N_i^{(3)} \end{bmatrix} x^{m_1-t_1+2-i}$$

$$= \det(N^{(1)}) \cdot \text{dp}(N^{(3)}) \quad (9)$$

The substitution of (9) into (8) yields

$$c_{t_1} \cdot \text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{dp}(M^{(2)}) = \det(N^{(1)}) \cdot \text{dp}(N^{(3)})$$

Noting that $c_{t_1} = \text{pcdp}(P_1, \dots, P_{t_1-1}) = \det(N^{(1)})$, we have

$$\text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{dp}(N^{(3)})$$

Therefore, we can deduce that for both the scenarios where $t_1 = 1$ and $t_1 > 1$, the following equation holds:

$$\text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{dp}(U_1, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2}) = \text{dp}(N^{(3)}) \quad (10)$$

Next, we consider the following four cases for $m_2 \leq m_1 - t_1 + 1$ and specialize the above results for these cases.

Case (1): $m_2 = m_1 - t_1 + 1$.

In this case, $N^{(3)} = \text{cm}(U_1, Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2}) = \text{cm}(\text{dp}(P), Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2})$. By (10),

$$\text{dp}(P, Q) = \text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{dp}(\text{dp}(P), Q_1, \dots, Q_{t_2})$$

Case (2): $m_2 = m_1 - t_1$.

Let $U_1 = \text{dp}(P_1, \dots, P_{t_1})$. Since u_i is the coefficient of U_1 in the term x^i , we have $u_{m_1-t_1+1} = \text{pcdp}(P)$. Since $m_2 = m_1 - t_1$, $b_{j(m_1-t_1+1)}^* = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, t_2$, Equation (10) can be simplified into the following:

$$\text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} u_{m_1-t_1+1} & u_{m_1-t_1} & \cdots & u_0 \\ & b_{1(m_1-t_1)}^* & \cdots & b_{10}^* \\ & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & b_{t_2(m_1-t_1)}^* & \cdots & b_{t_20}^* \end{bmatrix} = u_{m_1-t_1+1} \cdot \text{dp}(Q) = \text{pcdp}(P) \cdot \text{dp}(Q)$$

Case (3) $m_2 < m_1 - t_1 \wedge t_2 = 1$.

Since $t_2 = 1$ and $m_2 < m_1 - t_1$, by (10),

$$\text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} u_{m_1-t_1+1} & u_{m_1-t_1} & \cdots & u_0 \\ & b_{1(m_1-t_1)}^* & \cdots & b_{10}^* \end{bmatrix} = u_{m_1-t_1+1} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m_1-t_1} b_{1i}^* \cdot x^i \quad (11)$$

where $b_{ij}^* := 0$ when $j > q_i$. Noting that $u_{m_1-t_1+1} = \text{pcdp}(P)$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{m_1-t_1} b_{1i}^* \cdot x^i = Q_1 = \text{dp}(Q)$, we easily attain

$$\text{dp}(M^{(1)}) = \text{pcdp}(P) \cdot \text{dp}(Q)$$

Case (4) $m_2 < m_1 - t_1 \wedge t_2 \geq 2$.

Let $m_2 = m_1 - t_1 - k$. Hence $b_{j(m_1-t_1+1)}^* = \cdots = b_{j(m_1-t_1-k+1)}^* = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, t_2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dp}(M^{(1)}) &= \text{dp}(N^{(3)}) \\ &= \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} u_{m_1-t_1+1} & u_{m_1-t_1} & \cdots & u_0 \\ b_{1(m_1-t_1+1)}^* & b_{1(m_1-t_1)}^* & \cdots & b_{10}^* \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ b_{t_2(m_1-t_1+1)}^* & b_{t_2(m_1-t_1)}^* & \cdots & b_{t_20}^* \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} u_{m_1-t_1+1} & u_{m_1-t_1} & \cdots & u_{m_1-t_1-k+1} & u_{m_1-t_1-k} & \cdots & u_0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_{1(m_1-t_1-k)}^* & \cdots & b_{10}^* \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_{t_2(m_1-t_1-k)}^* & \cdots & b_{t_20}^* \end{bmatrix} \\
&= u_{m_1-t_1+1} \cdot \text{dp} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_{1(m_1-t_1-k)}^* & \cdots & b_{10}^* \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_{t_2(m_1-t_1-k)}^* & \cdots & b_{t_20}^* \end{bmatrix} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. \square

5.2 Induction base (i.e. $k = 1$)

Note that when $k = 1$, v and ϵ can be explicitly written as

$$v = \begin{cases} (k, \dots, k) + e_0 = (k, \dots, k) & \text{if } i = 0; \\ (k, \dots, k) + e_i = (k, \dots, k, k+1, k, \dots, k) & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} |v + e_0| + k - 2 = (nk) + k - 2 = (n+1)k - 2 & \text{if } i = 0; \\ |v + e_i| + k - 2 = (nk+2) + k - 2 = (n+1)k & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

respectively, depending on whether i is zero or not. For the sake of simplicity, let $k' = (k, \dots, k)$. By using (12) and (13), we can provide an equivalent theorem of Main Result (Theorem 18) for $k = 1$, which facilitates the proof.

Theorem 25 (Main Result for $k = 1$). *Let $w_0 \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $i \in [0, \dots, n]$ be such that $w_0 + 1' + e_i \in P(d_0, n)$. Then we have*

$$\begin{cases} r_{w_0}^{n-1}(F)R_{w_0+1'}(F) = R_{1'}(R_{w_0+e_0}(F), R_{w_0+e_1}(F), \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}(F)) & (14) \\ r_{w_0}^{n+1}(F)R_{w_0+1'+e_i}(F) = R_{1'+e_i}(R_{w_0+e_0}(F), R_{w_0+e_1}(F), \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}(F)) & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Here we give a sketch of the main idea adopted in the proof of induction base. We start with a subresultant of the input polynomials with higher order (i.e., $w_0 + 1' + e_i$). First, we use the multi-linearity of determinant polynomial to rewrite it into a determinant polynomial of a polynomial set consisting of the given polynomials and the subresultants with lower orders. The tool we adopt in the rewriting process is the observation that every subresultant belongs to the ideal generated by the input polynomials. Then we employ the notable properties of determinant polynomials discovered in Subsection 5.1 to further simplify the determinant polynomial obtained in the previous step, which will produce the result we want.

5.2.1 Proof of Eq. (14)

Proof of Eq. (14). Note that

$$R_{1'}(R_{w_0+e_0}, R_{w_0+e_1}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}) = \text{dp} (R_{w_0+e_1}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n})$$

Let $\delta = w_0 = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n)$. Thus we only need to show

$$r_{\delta}^{n-1} R_{\delta+1'} = \text{dp} (R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

Let $G_{k,j} = x^j F_k$ and $H_{k,j} = (G_{k,j}, \dots, G_{k,0})$. Then we have

$$R_{\delta+1'} = \text{dp}(x^{\delta_0} F_0, \dots, x^0 F_0, \dots, x^{\delta_n} F_n, \dots, x^0 F_n)$$

$$= \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n})$$

and for $i \geq 1$,

$$R_{\delta+e_i} = \begin{cases} \text{dp}(G_{0,\delta_0}, H_{0,\delta_0-1}, \dots, H_{i-1,\delta_{i-1}-1}, H_{i,\delta_i}, H_{i+1,\delta_{i+1}-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}) & \text{if } d_i + \delta_i = d_0 + \delta_0; \\ \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, \dots, H_{i-1,\delta_{i-1}-1}, H_{i,\delta_i}, H_{i+1,\delta_{i+1}-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By Proposition 22 and Corollary 23, $R_{\delta+e_i}$ can be written as the linear combination of $G_{i,j}$'s, i.e.,

$$R_{\delta+e_i} = \sum_{0 \leq t \leq n} \sum_{j=0}^{\delta_t-1} c_{i,j}^{(i)} G_{t,j} + c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} G_{i,\delta_i} + \begin{cases} c_{0\delta_0}^{(0)} G_{0,\delta_0} & \text{if } d_i + \delta_i = d_0 + \delta_0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where

$$c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\sigma_i+1} \text{pcdp}(G_{0,\delta_0}, H_{0,\delta_0-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}) & \text{if } d_i + \delta_i = d_0 + \delta_0; \\ (-1)^{\sigma_i+1} \text{pcdp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

and $\sigma_i = \delta_i + \dots + \delta_n$. From the definition of subresultant, we have

$$r_\delta = \text{pcdp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1})$$

Since $\deg G_{0,\delta_0} > \deg G_{i,j}$ for $i \geq 0$ and $0 \leq j \leq \delta_i - 1$, we simplify the first case of (17) and obtain

$$\text{pcdp}(G_{0,\delta_0}, H_{0,\delta_0-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}) = \text{pcdp}(G_{0,\delta_0}) \cdot \text{pcdp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}) = a_{0d_0} \cdot r_\delta = r_\delta \quad (18)$$

Then substituting (18) into the (17), we have

$$c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} = (-1)^{\sigma_i+1} r_\delta \quad (19)$$

Hence

$$\prod_{i=1}^n c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} = \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{\sigma_i+1} r_\delta = r_\delta^n \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{\sigma_i+1}$$

We introduce the short-hands $\psi = \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{\sigma_i+1}$ and $\rho = r_\delta^n$. Then $\prod_{i=1}^n c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} = \psi \cdot \rho$. Now we consider the product of ψ , ρ and $R_{\delta+1'}$ and carry out the following simplification:

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi \rho R_{\delta+1'} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, \underbrace{G_{1,\delta_1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, G_{n,\delta_n}, H_{n,\delta_n-1}}_{H_{1,\delta_1} \quad H_{n,\delta_n}}) \\ &= \psi \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, G_{1,\delta_1}, \dots, G_{n,\delta_n}) \quad \text{by reordering the arguments of dp} \\ &= \psi \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} G_{1,\delta_1}, \dots, c_{n\delta_n}^{(n)} G_{n,\delta_n}) \quad \text{by pushing } c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{ into dp} \\ &= \psi \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{using (16)} \\ &= \psi \text{dp}(\underbrace{G_{0,\delta_0}, H_{0,\delta_0-1}}_{H_{0,\delta_0}}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \psi a_{0d_0} \operatorname{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{by Lemma 24-(2)} \\
&= \psi \operatorname{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{since } a_{0d_0} = 1
\end{aligned}$$

The cancellation of ψ from the first and last expressions yields

$$\rho R_{\delta+1'} = \operatorname{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

Partitioning the polynomial matrix in the right-hand side of the above equation, we have $\rho R_{\delta+1'} = \operatorname{dp}(B_1, B_2)$ where

$$B_1 = (H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}), \quad B_2 = (R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

Denote $\max(\deg B_1)$, $\max(\deg B_2)$ and the number of polynomials in B_1 by m_1 , m_2 and $\#B_1$, respectively. Then we have $m_1 = d_0 + \delta_0 - 1$, $m_2 = d_0 - |\delta| - 1$ and $\#B_1 = \delta_0 + |\delta|$. It follows that

$$m_2 = m_1 - \#B_1$$

By Lemma 24-(2), we have

$$r_\delta^n R_{\delta+1'} = \rho R_{\delta+1'} = \operatorname{pcdp}(B_1) \cdot \operatorname{dp}(B_2) \quad (20)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\operatorname{dp}(B_1) = \operatorname{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}) = R_\delta$$

which immediately implies that $\operatorname{pcdp}(B_1) = r_\delta$. Substituting it into (20) yields

$$r_\delta^n R_{\delta+1'} = \operatorname{pcdp}(B_1) \cdot \operatorname{dp}(B_2) = r_\delta \cdot \operatorname{dp}(R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

It follows that

$$r_\delta^{n-1} R_{\delta+1'} = \operatorname{dp}(R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

Eq. (14) is proved. □

5.2.2 Proof of Eq. (15)

Proof of Eq. (15). Without loss of generality, we only prove the case when $i = 1$, that is,

$$R_{1'+e_1}(R_{w_0+e_0}, R_{w_0+e_1}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}) = \operatorname{dp}(R_{w_0+e_0}, xR_{w_0+e_1}, R_{w_0+e_1}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n})$$

The other cases of $i > 0$ can be proved with the same procedure.

Let $\delta = w_0 = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n)$. Thus we only need to show that

$$r_\delta^{n+1} R_{\delta+1'+e_1} = \operatorname{dp}(R_{\delta+e_0}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

Let $G_{k,j} = x^j F_k$ and $H_{k,j} = (G_{k,j}, \dots, G_{k,0})$. Then we have

$$R_{\delta+1'+e_1} = \begin{cases} \operatorname{dp}(G_{0,\delta_0+1}, H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1+1}, H_{2,\delta_2}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n}) & \text{if } d_1 + \delta_1 = d_0 + \delta_0; \\ \operatorname{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1+1}, H_{2,\delta_2}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Recall (16), that is, for $i \geq 1$,

$$R_{\delta+e_i} = \sum_{0 \leq t \leq n} \sum_{j=0}^{\delta_t-1} c_{t,j}^{(i)} G_{t,j} + c_{i,\delta_i}^{(i)} G_{i,\delta_i} + \begin{cases} c_{0,\delta_0}^{(0)} G_{0,\delta_0} & \text{if } d_i + \delta_i = d_0 + \delta_0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where

$$c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} = (-1)^{\sigma_i+1} r_\delta \quad (22)$$

and $\sigma_i = \delta_i + \dots + \delta_n$.

By (22), we have

$$c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} = (-1)^{\sigma_1+1} r_\delta \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{\sigma_i+1} r_\delta = (-1)^{\sigma_1+1} \cdot r_\delta^{n+1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{\sigma_i+1}$$

Again we introduce the short-hands $\psi = (-1)^{\sigma_1+1} \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{\sigma_i+1}$ and $\rho = r_\delta^{n+1}$. Then $c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} = \psi \cdot \rho$. Now we consider the following two cases for the product of ψ , ρ and $R_{\delta+1'+e_1}$, depending on whether $d_1 + \delta_1 = d_0 + \delta_0$ holds or not.

Case (1): $d_1 + \delta_1 = d_0 + \delta_0$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi \rho R_{\delta+1'+e_1} \\ &= c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0+1}, H_{1,\delta_1+1}, H_{2,\delta_2}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n}) \\ &= c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0+1}, \underbrace{G_{1,\delta_1+1}, G_{1,\delta_1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}}_{H_{1,\delta_1+1}}, \underbrace{G_{2,\delta_2}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}}_{H_{2,\delta_2}}, \dots, \underbrace{G_{n,\delta_n}, H_{n,\delta_n-1}}_{H_{n,\delta_n}}) \\ &= \psi c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0+1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, G_{1,\delta_1+1}, G_{1,\delta_1}, G_{2,\delta_2}, \dots, G_{n,\delta_n}) \\ & \quad (\text{by reordering the arguments of dp}) \\ &= \psi \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0+1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} G_{1,\delta_1+1}, c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} G_{1,\delta_1}, c_{2\delta_2}^{(2)} G_{2,\delta_2}, \dots, c_{n\delta_n}^{(n)} G_{n,\delta_n}) \\ & \quad (\text{by pushing } c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{ into dp}) \\ &= \psi \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0+1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{by (21)} \\ &= \psi \text{dp}(\underbrace{G_{0,\delta_0+1}, G_{0,\delta_0}, H_{0,\delta_0-1}}_{H_{0,\delta_0+1}}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \\ &= \psi a_{0d_0}^2 \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{by Lemma 24-(2)} \\ &= \psi \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{since } a_{0d_0} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

Case (2): $d_1 + \delta_1 \neq d_0 + \delta_0$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi \rho R_{\delta+1'+e_1} \\ &= c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1+1}, H_{2,\delta_2}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n}) \\ &= c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, \underbrace{G_{1,\delta_1+1}, G_{1,\delta_1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}}_{H_{1,\delta_1+1}}, \underbrace{G_{2,\delta_2}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}}_{H_{2,\delta_2}}, \dots, \underbrace{G_{n,\delta_n}, H_{n,\delta_n-1}}_{H_{n,\delta_n}}) \\ &= \psi c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, G_{1,\delta_1+1}, G_{1,\delta_1}, G_{2,\delta_2}, \dots, G_{n,\delta_n}) \\ & \quad (\text{by reordering the arguments of dp}) \\ &= \psi \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} G_{1,\delta_1+1}, c_{1\delta_1}^{(1)} G_{1,\delta_1}, c_{2\delta_2}^{(2)} G_{2,\delta_2}, \dots, c_{n\delta_n}^{(n)} G_{n,\delta_n}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{(by pushing } c_{i\delta_i}^{(i)} \text{ into dp)} \\
& = \psi \text{ dp}(H_{0,\delta_0}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{by (21)} \\
& = \psi \text{ dp}(\underbrace{G_{0,\delta_0}, H_{0,\delta_0-1}}_{H_{0,\delta_0}}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \\
& = \psi a_{0d_0} \text{ dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{by Lemma 24-(2)} \\
& = \psi \text{ dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad \text{since } a_{0d_0} = 1
\end{aligned}$$

It can be seen that regardless of whether $d_1 + \delta_1 = d_0 + \delta_0$ holds or not, the following equation is always true:

$$\psi \rho R_{\delta+1'+e_1} = \psi \text{ dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

The cancellation of ψ in the left-hand side and right-hand side of above expressions yields

$$\rho R_{\delta+1'+e_1} = \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad (23)$$

Partitioning the polynomial matrix in the right-hand side of (23), we have $\rho R_{\delta+1'+e_1} = \text{dp}(B_1, B_2)$, where

$$B_1 = (H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, H_{2,\delta_2-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}), \quad B_2 = (xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

Denote $\max(\deg B_1)$, $\max(\deg B_2)$ and the number of polynomials in B_1 by m_1 , m_2 and $\#B_1$, respectively. Then we have $m_1 = d_0 + \delta_0 - 1$, $m_2 = d_0 - |\delta|$ and $\#B_1 = |\delta| + \delta_0$. It follows that

$$m_2 = m_1 - \#B_1 + 1$$

By Lemma 24-(1), we have

$$r_{\delta}^{n+1} R_{\delta+1'+e_1} = \rho R_{\delta+1'+e_1} = \text{dp}(\text{dp}(B_1), B_2) \quad (24)$$

It easy to know

$$\text{dp}(B_1) = \text{dp}(H_{0,\delta_0-1}, H_{1,\delta_1-1}, \dots, H_{n,\delta_n-1}) = R_{\delta} \quad (25)$$

The substitution of (25) into (24) yields

$$r_{\delta}^{n+1} R_{\delta+1'+e_1} = \text{dp}(R_{\delta}, xR_{\delta+e_1}, R_{\delta+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$$

Eq. (15) is proved. \square

5.3 Inductive step (i.e. from $k = j$ to $k = j + 1$)

Similarly to the simplification as done in the case $k = 1$ (i.e., Theorem 25), we let $k' = (k, \dots, k)$. Again by using (12) and (13), we provide an equivalent theorem of Main Result (Theorem 18) for $k \geq 2$, which facilitates the proof.

Theorem 26 (Main Result for $k \geq 2$). *Assume Theorem 18 holds for $v = j' + e_i$ (i.e., $k = j$), that is,*

$$r_{w_0}^{(n+1)j-2} R_{w_0+j'} = R_{j'}(R_{w_0+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0'+e_n}) \quad (26)$$

$$r_{w_0}^{(n+1)j} R_{w_0+j'+e_i} = R_{j'+e_i}(R_{w_0+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}) \quad \text{for } i > 0 \quad (27)$$

where $n + 1 = \#F$. Then the theorem is true for $v = j' + 1' + e_i$ (i.e., $k = j + 1$), that is,

$$r_{w_0}^{(n+1)(j+1)-2} R_{w_0+j'+1'} = R_{j'+1'}(R_{w_0+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}) \quad (28)$$

$$r_{w_0}^{(n+1)(j+1)} R_{w_0+j'+1'+e_i} = R_{j'+1'+e_i}(R_{w_0+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}) \quad \text{for } i > 0 \quad (29)$$

Here we give a sketch of the main idea adopted in the inductive proof. In the inductive step, we first use the relationship proved in the induction base to write the subresultant of the input polynomials with higher order (i.e., $w_0 + j' + 1' + e_i$) into a determinant polynomial of subresultants of order $w_0 + j' + e_\tau$, where $\tau = 0, \dots, n$. This is the most key step in the inductive proof. Then we use the same techniques (i.e., multi-linearity of determinant polynomial and the membership of subresultant in the ideal generated by the defining polynomials) as in the induction base to simplify the nested subresultants in the right-hand side of (28) and (29). The only difference from the induction base is that the defining polynomials of the internal subresultant is, by induction, subresultants in the previous step. Again we employ the properties of determinant polynomials in Subsection 5.1 to further simplify the determinant polynomial obtained in the previous step, which will produce the result we want.

5.3.1 Proof of Eq. (28) from Eqs. (26)–(27)

The goal of this part is to prove

$$r_{w_0}^{(n+1)(j+1)-2} R_{w_0+j'+1'} = R_{j'+1'}(R_{w_0+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n})$$

with (26) and (27) assumed to be true.

Proof of Eq. (28). By Lemma 25, we get

$$\begin{aligned} r_{w_0+j'}^{n-1} R_{w_0+j'+1'} &= R_{1'}(R_{w_0+j'+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0+j'+e_n}) \\ &= \text{dp}(R_{w_0+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{w_0+j'+e_n}) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta = w_0 = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n)$. Thus we only need to show that

$$\text{dp}(R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) = r_\delta^{2-(n+1)(j+1)} r_{\delta+j'}^{n-1} R_{j'+1'}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad (30)$$

By induction (i.e. (27)), for $i > 0$,

$$r_\delta^{(n+1)j} R_{\delta+j'+e_i} = R_{j'+e_i}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad (31)$$

Let $\hat{G}_{i,s} = x^s R_{\delta+e_i}$ and $\hat{H}_{i,s} = (\hat{G}_{i,s}, \dots, \hat{G}_{i,0})$. Then we have

$$R_{j'+e_i}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) = \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{i-1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{i,j}, \hat{H}_{i+1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1})$$

for $i > 0$. Thus

$$r_\delta^{(n+1)j} R_{\delta+j'+e_i} = \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{i-1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{i,j}, \hat{H}_{i+1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1})$$

By Corollary 23, we deduce that

$$r_\delta^{(n+1)j} R_{\delta+j'+e_i} = \sum_{t=0}^n \sum_{h=0}^{j-1} u_{th}^{(i)} \hat{G}_{t,h} + u_{ij}^{(i)} \hat{G}_{i,j} \quad (32)$$

for $i > 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{ij}^{(i)} &= (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} \text{pcdp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{i-1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{i,j-1}, \hat{H}_{i+1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}) \\ &= (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} \text{pcdp}(\underbrace{\hat{G}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{0,j-2}, \dots, \hat{H}_{i-1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{i,j-1}, \hat{H}_{i+1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}}_{\hat{H}_{0,j-1}}) \\ &= (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} \text{pcdp}(\hat{G}_{0,j-1}) \cdot \text{pcdp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-2}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{i-1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{i,j-1}, \hat{H}_{i+1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}) \\ &= (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} r_\delta \cdot r_{j'}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

In addition, by the assumption (26), we have

$$r_\delta^{(n+1)j-2} r_{\delta+j'} = r_{j'}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad (34)$$

The substitution of (34) into (33) yields

$$u_{ij}^{(i)} = (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} r_\delta \cdot r_\delta^{(n+1)j-2} r_{\delta+j'} = (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} r_{\delta+j'} \quad (35)$$

By (35), we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \left((-1)^{(n+1-i)j} r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} r_{\delta+j'} \right) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} \right) \cdot (r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} r_{\delta+j'})^n$$

Now we introduce the short-hands $\psi_j = \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{(n+1-i)j}$ and $\rho_j = r_\delta^{(n+1)j}$. Then

$$\prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} = \psi_j \cdot (\rho_j r_\delta^{-1} r_{\delta+j'})^n$$

Next we consider the product of ψ_j , $(\rho_j r_\delta^{-1} r_{\delta+j'})^n$ and $R_{j'+1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$ and carry out the following simplification:

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_j (\rho_j r_\delta^{-1} r_{\delta+j'})^n R_{j'+1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{1,j}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \underbrace{\hat{G}_{1,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{G}_{n,j}, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}}_{\hat{H}_{1,j}}, \dots, \underbrace{\hat{G}_{n,j}, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}}_{\hat{H}_{n,j}}) \\ &= \psi_j \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, \hat{G}_{1,j}, \dots, \hat{G}_{n,j}) \text{ by reordering the arguments of dp} \\ &= \psi_j \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, u_{1j}^{(1)} \hat{G}_{1,j}, \dots, u_{nj}^{(n)} \hat{G}_{n,j}) \text{ by pushing } u_{ij}^{(i)} \text{ into dp} \\ &= \psi_j \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, \rho_j R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \dots, \rho_j R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \text{ by (32)} \\ &= \psi_j \rho_j^n \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \text{ by pulling out } \rho_j \text{ out of dp} \end{aligned}$$

The cancellation of $\psi_j \rho_j^n$ from the first and last expressions yields

$$r_{\delta+j'}^n r_\delta^{-n} R_{j'+1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) = \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \quad (36)$$

Partitioning the polynomial matrix in the right-hand side of (36), we have

$$r_{\delta+j'}^n r_\delta^{-n} R_{j'+1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) = \text{dp}(B_1, B_2) \quad (37)$$

where

$$B_1 = (\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}), \quad B_2 = (R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n})$$

Denote $\max(\deg B_1)$, $\max(\deg B_2)$ and the number of polynomials in B_1 by m_1 , m_2 and $\#B_1$, respectively. Then we have $m_1 = d_0 - |\delta| + j - 1$, $m_2 = d_0 - |\delta| - nj - 1$ and $\#B_1 = (n+1)j$. It follows that

$$m_2 = m_1 - \#B_1$$

By Lemma 24-(2), we derive the following

$$\text{dp}(B_1, B_2) = \text{pcdp}(B_1) \cdot \text{dp}(B_2) \quad (38)$$

In order to have an explicit expression of $\text{pcdp}(B_1)$, we carry out the following deduction:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dp}(B_1) &= \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}) \\ &= \text{dp}(\underbrace{\hat{G}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{0,j-2}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}}_{\hat{H}_{0,j-1}}) \\ &= \text{pcdp}(\hat{G}_{0,j-1}) \cdot \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-2}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}) \quad \text{by Lemma 24-(2)} \\ &= \text{pcdp}(\hat{G}_{0,j-1}) \cdot R_{j'}(R_\delta, \dots, R_{\delta'+e_n}) \\ &= r_\delta \cdot r_\delta^{(n+1)j-2} R_{\delta+j'} \quad \text{by the assumption (26)} \\ &= r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} R_{\delta+j'} \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\text{pcdp}(B_1) = r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} R_{\delta+j'}$. After substituting it into (38), we have

$$\text{dp}(B_1, B_2) = r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} R_{\delta+j'} \cdot \text{dp}(R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \quad (39)$$

Combining (37) and (39), we have

$$r_{\delta+j'}^n r_\delta^{-n} R_{j'+1'}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) = r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} R_{\delta+j'} \text{dp}(R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n})$$

which can be simplified into (30) after pushing the coefficients to the left-hand side. The proof of Eq. (28) is completed. \square

5.3.2 Proof of Eq. (29) from Eqs. (26)–(27)

The goal of this part is to prove

$$r_{w_0}^{(n+1)(j+1)} R_{w_0+j'+1'+e_i} = R_{j'+1'+e_i}(R_{w_0+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0+e_n}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (40)$$

with (26) and (27) assumed to be true.

Proof of Eq. (29). Without loss of generality, we proceed to prove it is true for the case when $i = 1$. The other cases can be proved with the same procedure.

By using Theorem 25 with w_0 specified as $w_0 + j'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{w_0+j'}^{n+1} R_{w_0+j'+1'+e_1} &= R_{1'+e_1}(R_{w_0+j'+e_0}, \dots, R_{w_0+j'+e_n}) \\ &= \text{dp}(R_{w_0+j'}, xR_{w_0+j'+e_1}, R_{w_0+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{w_0+j'+e_n}) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta = w_0 = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n)$. Thus we only need to show the following equivalence of (40):

$$\text{dp}(R_{\delta+j'}, xR_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) = r_\delta^{-(n+1)(j+1)} r_{\delta+j'}^{n+1} R_{j'+1'+e_1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \quad (41)$$

Let $\hat{G}_{i,s} = x^s R_{\delta+e_i}$ and $\hat{H}_{i,s} = (\hat{G}_{i,s}, \dots, \hat{G}_{i,0})$. Then we have

$$R_{j'+1'+e_1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) = \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j+1}, \hat{H}_{2,j}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j})$$

Recall (31), (32) and (35). We further deduce that

$$r_\delta^{(n+1)j} R_{\delta+j'+e_i} = \sum_{t=0}^n \sum_{h=0}^{j-1} u_{th}^{(i)} \hat{G}_{t,h} + u_{ij}^{(i)} \hat{G}_{i,j}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (42)$$

where $u_{ij}^{(i)} = (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} r_{\delta+j'}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{1j}^{(1)} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} &= (-1)^{nj} r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} r_{\delta+j'} \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} r_{\delta+j'} \right) \\ &= (-1)^{nj} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{(n+1-i)j} \right) \cdot (r_\delta^{(n+1)j-1} r_{\delta+j'})^{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

Now we introduce the short-hands $\psi_j = (-1)^{nj} \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{(n+1-i)j}$ and $\rho_j = r_\delta^{(n+1)j}$. Then

$$u_{1j}^{(1)} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} = \psi_j \cdot (\rho_j r_\delta^{-1} r_{\delta+j'})^{n+1}$$

Next we consider the product of ψ_j , $(\rho_j r_\delta^{-1} r_{\delta+j'})^{n+1}$ and $R_{j'+1'+e_1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n})$ and carry out the following simplification:

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi_j \cdot (\rho_j r_\delta^{-1} r_{\delta+j'})^{n+1} R_{j'+1'+e_1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \\ &= u_{1j}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j+1}, \hat{H}_{2,j}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j}) \\ &= u_{1j}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \underbrace{\hat{G}_{1,j+1}, \hat{G}_{1,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}}_{\hat{H}_{1,j+1}}, \underbrace{\hat{G}_{2,j}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}}_{\hat{H}_{2,j}}, \dots, \underbrace{\hat{G}_{n,j}, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}}_{\hat{H}_{n,j}}) \\ &= \psi_j \cdot u_{1j}^{(1)} \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ij}^{(i)} \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, \hat{G}_{1,j+1}, \hat{G}_{1,j}, \hat{G}_{2,j}, \dots, \hat{G}_{n,j}) \\ &\quad (\text{by reordering the arguments of dp}) \\ &= \psi_j \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, u_{1j}^{(1)} \hat{G}_{1,j+1}, u_{1j}^{(1)} \hat{G}_{1,j}, u_{2j}^{(2)} \hat{G}_{2,j}, \dots, u_{nj}^{(n)} \hat{G}_{n,j}) \\ &\quad (\text{by pushing } u_{ij}^{(i)} \text{ into dp}) \\ &= \psi_j \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, \rho_j x R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \rho_j R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, \rho_j R_{\delta+j'+e_2}, \dots, \rho_j R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \\ &\quad (\text{by (42)}) \\ &= \psi_j \rho_j^{n+1} \text{ dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, x R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \\ &\quad (\text{by pulling out } \rho_j \text{ out of dp}) \end{aligned}$$

The cancellation of $\psi_j \rho_j^{n+1}$ from the first and last expressions yields

$$\begin{aligned} &r_\delta^{-n-1} r_{\delta+j'}^{n+1} R_{j'+1'+e_1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \\ &= \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}, x R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Partitioning the polynomial matrix in the right-hand side of (43), we have

$$r_\delta^{-n-1} r_{\delta+j'}^{n+1} R_{j'+1'+e_1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) = \text{dp}(B_1, B_2) \quad (44)$$

where

$$B_1 = (\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}), \quad B_2 = (x R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n})$$

Denote $\max(\deg B_1)$, $\max(\deg B_2)$ and the number of polynomials in B_1 by m_1 , m_2 and $\#B_1$, respectively. Then we have $m_1 = d_0 - |\delta| + j$, $m_2 = d_0 - |\delta| - nj$ and $\#B_1 = (n+1)j + 1$. It follows that

$$m_2 = m_1 - \#B_1 + 1$$

By Lemma 24-(1), we derive the following

$$\text{dp}(B_1, B_2) = \text{dp}(\text{dp}(B_1), B_2) \quad (45)$$

In order to have an explicit expression of $\text{dp}(B_1)$, we carry out the following deduction:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dp}(B_1) &= \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}) \\ &= \text{dp}(\underbrace{\hat{G}_{0,j}, \hat{G}_{0,j-1}, \hat{H}_{0,j-2}}_{\hat{H}_{0,j}}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}) \\ &= \text{pcdp}(\hat{G}_{0,j}, \hat{G}_{0,j-1}) \cdot \text{dp}(\hat{H}_{0,j-2}, \hat{H}_{1,j-1}, \hat{H}_{2,j-1}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,j-1}) \quad \text{by Lemma 24-(2)} \\ &= r_\delta^2 \cdot R_{j'}(R_\delta, \dots, R_{\delta'+e_n}) \\ &= r_\delta^2 \cdot r_\delta^{(n+1)j-2} R_{\delta+j'} \quad \text{by the assumption (26)} \\ &= r_\delta^{(n+1)j} R_{\delta+j'} \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

After substituting (46) into (45), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dp}(B_1, B_2) &= \text{dp}(r_\delta^{(n+1)j} R_{\delta+j'}, xR_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \\ &= r_\delta^{(n+1)j} \text{dp}(R_{\delta+j'}, xR_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Combining (44) and (47), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &r_\delta^{-n-1} r_{\delta+j'}^{n+1} R_{j'+1'+e_1}(R_{\delta+e_0}, \dots, R_{\delta+e_n}) \\ &= r_\delta^{(n+1)j} \text{dp}(R_{\delta+j'}, xR_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_1}, R_{\delta+j'+e_2}, \dots, R_{\delta+j'+e_n}) \end{aligned}$$

which can be simplified into (41) after pushing the coefficients to the left-hand side. The proof of Eq. (29) is completed. \square

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we present a generalization of the well known Habicht's theorem to several polynomials, that is, expressing a subresultant of several polynomials with higher order to the subresultant of other subresultants with lower orders. With the help of this discovery, we can identify many non-trivial inherent relationships among subresultants of several polynomials and thus can explore the nice hidden structure of subresultants in a more efficient and systematic way.

In the classical subresultant theory, Habicht's theorem has been proved to be a productive tool for the theory development, from which people discovered the famous gap structure of subresultant chain for two polynomials. We hope that the generalized Habicht's theorem can also become a powerful tool for people to investigate similar structures for subresultants of multiple polynomials.

One may also notice that in the classical Habicht's theorem, in some special degeneracy cases, the subresultant of two polynomials is proportional to the pseudo-remainder of other two subresultants, which means the Habicht's theorem can be stated in a uniform way. However, for the multi-polynomial case, it is no longer true. That is, the result in [28] and that in the current paper are independent. Therefore, a natural question is how to formulate them in a uniform way, which is also worthy of further investigation in the future.

Acknowledgements. Hoon Hong's work was supported by National Science Foundations of USA (Grant Nos: CCF 2212461 and CCF 2331401). Jing Yang and Jiaiqi Meng's work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos.: 12261010 and 12326353) and the Natural Science Cultivation Project of GXMZU (Grant No.: 2022MDKJ001).

References

- [1] Stephen Barnett. Greatest common divisor of several polynomials. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 70(2):263–268, 1971.
- [2] Alin Bostan, Carlos D’Andrea, Teresa Krick, Agnes Szanto, and Marcelo Valdetaro. Subresultants in multiple roots: an extremal case. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 529:185–198, 2017.
- [3] Alin Bostan, Teresa Krick, Agnes Szanto, and Marcelo Valdetaro. Subresultants of $(x - \alpha)^m$ and $(x - \beta)^n$, Jacobi polynomials and complexity. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 101:330–351, 2020.
- [4] W Stanley Brown and Joseph F Traub. On Euclid’s algorithm and the theory of subresultants. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 18(4):505–514, 1971.
- [5] Laurent Busé and Carlos D’Andrea. Inversion of parameterized hypersurfaces by means of subresultants. In *Proceedings of the 2004 international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation*, pages 65–71, 2004.
- [6] Laurent Busé and Carlos D’Andrea. On the irreducibility of multivariate subresultants. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 338(4):287–290, 2004.
- [7] M. Chardin. Multivariate subresultants. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 101:129–138, 1995.
- [8] George E. Collins. Subresultants and Reduced Polynomial Remainder Sequences. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 14:128–142, 1967.
- [9] George E. Collins. Quantifier elimination for real closed fields by cylindrical algebraic decomposition: a synopsis. *ACM SIGSAM Bulletin*, 10(1):10–12, 1976.
- [10] David Cox and Carlos D’Andrea. Subresultants and the Shape Lemma. *Mathematics of Computation*, 92(343):2355–2379, 2023.
- [11] Carlos D’Andrea and Alicia Dickenstein. Explicit formulas for the multivariate resultant. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 164(1-2):59–86, 2001.
- [12] Carlos D’Andrea and Alicia Dickenstein. Explicit formulas for the multivariate resultant. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 164(1):59–86, 2001.
- [13] Carlos D’Andrea, Hoon Hong, Teresa Krick, and Agnes Szanto. An elementary proof of Sylvester’s double sums for subresultants. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 42(3):290–297, 2007.
- [14] Carlos D’Andrea, Hoon Hong, Teresa Krick, and Agnes Szanto. Sylvester’s double sums: The general case. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 44(9):1164–1175, 2009.
- [15] Carlos D’Andrea, Teresa Krick, and Agnes Szanto. Multivariate subresultants in roots. *Journal of Algebra*, 302(1):16–36, 2006.
- [16] Carlos D’Andrea, Teresa Krick, and Agnes Szanto. Multivariate subresultants in roots. *Journal of Algebra*, 302(1):16–36, 2006.
- [17] Carlos D’Andrea, Teresa Krick, and Agnes Szanto. Subresultants in multiple roots. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 438(5):1969–1989, 2013.
- [18] Carlos D’Andrea, Teresa Krick, and Agnes Szanto. Subresultants, Sylvester sums and the rational interpolation problem. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 68:72–83, 2015.
- [19] Carlos D’Andrea, Teresa Krick, Agnes Szanto, and Marcelo Valdetaro. Closed formula for univariate subresultants in multiple roots. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 565:123–155, 2019.

- [20] Gema M. Diaz-Toca and Laureano Gonzalez-Vega. Various new expressions for subresultants and their applications. *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing*, 15(3):233–266, 2004.
- [21] L. González-Vega. A subresultant theory for multivariate polynomials. *Extracta Math*, 5(3):150–152, 1990.
- [22] Walter Habicht. Eine Verallgemeinerung des Sturmschen Wurzelzählverfahrens. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 21(1):99–116, 1948.
- [23] Chung-Jen Ho. *Topics in Algebraic Computing: Subresultants, GCD, Factoring and Primary Ideal Decomposition*. PhD thesis, New York University, 1989.
- [24] Hoon Hong. Subresultant under composition. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 23(4):355–365, 1997.
- [25] Hoon Hong. Subresultants in roots. Technical report, Department of Mathematics. North Carolina State University, 1999.
- [26] Hoon Hong. Ore principal subresultant coefficients in solutions. *Journal of Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing*, 11(3):227–237, 2001.
- [27] Hoon Hong. Ore subresultant coefficients in solutions. *Journal of Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing*, 12(5):421–428, 2001.
- [28] Hoon Hong and Jing Yang. Computing greatest common divisor of several parametric univariate polynomials via generalized subresultant polynomials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00408*, 2023.
- [29] Xiaorong Hou and Dongming Wang. Subresultants with the Bézout matrix. In *Computer Mathematics*, pages 19–28. World Scientific, 2000.
- [30] Alston S. Householder. Bigradients and the problem of Routh and Hurwitz. *SIAM Review*, 10(1):56–66, 1968.
- [31] Maximilian Jaroschek. Improved polynomial remainder sequences for Ore polynomials. *ACM Communications in Computer Algebra*, 46(3/4):100–101, 2013.
- [32] Kunio Kakié. The resultant of several homogeneous polynomials in two indeterminates. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, pages 1–7, 1976.
- [33] Teresa Krick, Agnes Szanto, and Marcelo Valdetaro. Symmetric interpolation, Exchange Lemma and Sylvester sums. *Communications in Algebra*, 45(8):3231–3250, 2017.
- [34] Alain Lascoux and Piotr Pragacz. Double Sylvester sums for subresultants and multi-Schur functions. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 35(6):689–710, 2003.
- [35] Ziming Li. A subresultant theory for Ore polynomials with applications. In *Proceedings of the 1998 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 132–139, 1998.
- [36] Bhubaneswar Mishra. *Algorithmic Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1993.
- [37] Marie-Françoise Roy and Aviva Szpirglas. Sylvester double sums, subresultants and symmetric multivariate Hermite interpolation. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 96:85–107, 2020.
- [38] James Joseph Sylvester. On a theory of syzygetic relations of two rational integral functions, comprising an application to the theory of Sturm’s function, and that of the greatest algebraical common measure. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London*, (143):407–548, 1853.
- [39] A. Szanto. Solving over-determined systems by subresultant methods (with an appendix by Marc Chardin). *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 43(1):46–74, 2008.

- [40] A. Szanto. Multivariate subresultants using Jouanolou matrices. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 214:1347–1369, 2010.
- [41] Akira Terui. Recursive polynomial remainder sequence and its subresultants. *Journal of Algebra*, 320(2):633–659, 2008.
- [42] Antonis I. G. Vardulakis and Peter N. R. Stoye. Generalized resultant theorem. *IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 22(3):331–335, 1978.
- [43] Joachim von zur Gathen and Thomas Lücking. Subresultants revisited. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 297(1):199–239, 2003.
- [44] Dongming Wang. Decomposing polynomial systems into simple systems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 25(3):295–314, 1998.
- [45] Dongming Wang. Computing triangular systems and regular systems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 30(2):221–236, 2000.
- [46] Weidong Wang and Jing Yang. Subresultants of several univariate polynomials in Newton basis. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 128:102378, 2025.