

Effective alpha theory certification using interval arithmetic: alpha theory over regions

Kisun Lee¹[0000-0003-1191-1400]

Clemson University, Clemson SC 29634, USA kisun1@clemson.edu
<https://klee669.github.io>

Abstract. We reexamine Smale’s alpha theory as a way to certify a numerical solution to an analytic system. For a given point and a system, Smale’s alpha theory determines whether Newton’s method applied to this point shows the quadratic convergence to an exact solution. We introduce the alpha theory computation using interval arithmetic to avoid costly exact arithmetic. As a straightforward variation of the alpha theory, our work improves computational efficiency compared to software employing the traditional alpha theory.

Keywords: Newton’s method · numerical certification · analytic system · polynomial equations · alpha theory · interval arithmetic

1 Introduction

The primary focus of this paper is to *certify* a numerical solution to an analytic system $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ defined in an open set $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Certifying a solution is determining if a given point can be refined to an exact solution up to arbitrary precision. *Newton’s method* is a widely recognized method for this task. For an analytic system F , we define the *Newton operator* $N_F(x)$ for F by

$$N_F(x) = \begin{cases} x - JF(x)^{-1}F(x) & \text{if } JF(x) \text{ is invertible,} \\ x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This operator is applied iteratively at a point $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ to approximate the exact solution x^* of F . Especially, when the point x is “close” to x^* , it is known that x shows the quadratic convergence to x^* . Extensive research on the convergence of Newton’s method has led to the development of *Smale’s alpha theory* [1, Chapter 8], which establishes criteria for a point and a system to show the quadratic convergence of Newton’s method.

A drawback of employing the alpha theory for certification lies in the necessity for computationally expensive exact arithmetic to ensure its rigor. Although the Krawczyk method [2,3,10,11,12] utilizes faster arithmetic, it does not always guarantee the quadratic convergence.

This paper introduces the *alpha theory over regions*. It executes the alpha theory computation with an interval (vector) input containing a candidate solution

to enable efficient interval arithmetic. By developing the alpha theory over regions, our work introduces novel aspects; the enhancement of certification speed for numerical solutions, surpassing the method outlined in [9].

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we review the concepts of Smale's alpha theory and interval arithmetic. In Section 3, the alpha theory over regions is introduced, which is the main result of the paper. Some remarks for implementing the alpha theory over regions are discussed in Section 4. The experimental results are provided in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

We introduce the concepts needed for the alpha theory over regions. Initially, we discuss the alpha theory, followed by a review of interval arithmetic.

2.1 Smale's alpha theory

Let $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be an analytic system defined in an open set $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Then, for a point $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, the k -th Newton iteration $N_F^k(x)$ is defined by applying the Newton operator k times at x . For an exact solution x^* to the system F , suppose that we have $\|N_F^k(x) - x^*\| \leq (\frac{1}{2})^{2^k - 1} \|x - x^*\|$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, we say that x converges quadratically to x^* , and x is called an *approximate solution* to F with the *associated solution* x^* . In other words, certifying x means proving x is an approximate solution to F associated with x^* .

The alpha theory exploits three values obtained from x and F . If the Jacobian $JF(x)$ is invertible, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(F, x) &:= \beta(F, x)\gamma(F, x) & \gamma(F, x) &:= \sup_{k \geq 2} \left\| \frac{JF(x)^{-1} J^k F(x)}{k!} \right\|^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \\ \beta(F, x) &:= \|x - N_F(x)\| = \|JF(x)^{-1} F(x)\| \end{aligned}$$

where $J^k F(x)$ is a symmetric tensor whose components are k -th order partial derivative of F . The value $\beta(F, x)$ is the Euclidean norm of Newton step for F at x . The norm used in $\gamma(F, x)$ is the operator norm for $JF(x)^{-1} J^k F(x)$ which is induced from the norm on the k -fold symmetric power $S^k \mathbb{C}^n$ of \mathbb{C}^n . When $JF(x)^{-1}$ is not invertible, we define $\alpha(F, x) = \beta(F, x) = \gamma(F, x) = \infty$. Results of the alpha theory are like the following:

Theorem 1. [1, Section 8.2, Theorem 2, Theorem 4 and Remark 6] *Let $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be an analytic system, and x be a given point in U . Then,*

1. *if $\alpha(F, x) < \frac{13-3\sqrt{17}}{4}$, then x is an approximate solution to F . Moreover, $\|x - x^*\| \leq 2\beta(F, x)$ where x^* is the associated solution to x , and*
2. *if $\alpha(F, x) < 0.03$ and $\|x - y\| < \frac{1}{20\gamma(F, x)}$ for some $y \in U$, then x and y are approximate solutions to the same associated solution to F . In addition, there is a unique solution x^* to F in the ball $B(x, \frac{1}{20\gamma(F, x)})$ centered at x with the radius $\frac{1}{20\gamma(F, x)}$.*

The first part of Smale's alpha theory checks if a point x is an approximate solution to a system F . The second part of the alpha theory identifies when two different points have the same associated solution to F , that is, it certifies distinct numerical solutions.

The most challenging part of implementing the alpha theory is the computation of the gamma value. To resolve this issue, a known approach is to find an upper limit for the gamma value. For a polynomial $f = \sum_{|\nu| \leq d} a_\nu x^\nu$ of degree d , we define the *Bombieri-Weyl norm* $\|f\|^2 = \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{|\nu| \leq d} \nu!(d - |\nu|)! |a_\nu|^2$. This norm extends to a polynomial system $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ with $\|F\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|^2$. For a point $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we define $\|(1, x)\|^2 = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2$. Let d_i be the degree of each polynomial f_i , and set $D = \max_i \{d_i\}$. Finally, define the diagonal matrix $\Delta_F(x)$ whose diagonal entry is given by $\Delta_F(x)_{ii} := \sqrt{d_i} \|(1, x)\|^{d_i-1}$. Then, the following result provides an upper bound for $\gamma(F, x)$ for a polynomial system F :

Proposition 1. [15, Section I-3, Proposition 3] *Consider a polynomial system $F : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ and a point $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $JF(x)$ is invertible. We define $\mu(F, x) := \max\{1, \|F\| \|JF(x)^{-1} \Delta_F(x)\|\}$ with the operator norm for $JF(x)^{-1} \Delta_F(x)$. Then, $\gamma(F, x) \leq \frac{\mu(F, x) D^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2 \|(1, x)\|}$.*

Upper bounds for the gamma value have been studied in various instances of systems of equations. In the case of systems involving polynomial-exponential equations, [7] accomplished this. Additionally, for a broader range of systems, [3] introduced an upper bound for the gamma value when dealing with systems with univariate D -finite functions.

There are known implementations of the alpha theory. For standalone software, `alphaCertified` [8] is used. On the other hand, the `Macaulay2` package `NumericalCertification` [11] provides a specialized implementation for computation in `Macaulay2` [6].

2.2 Interval arithmetic

Interval arithmetic introduces operations between intervals to perform conservative computations to produce a certified result. For example, for two intervals $[a, b]$ and $[c, d]$ over \mathbb{R} , and an arithmetic operation \odot , we define $[a, b] \odot [c, d] := \{x \odot y \mid x \in [a, b], y \in [c, d]\}$. For explicit formulas for the standard arithmetic operations (e.g. $+$, $-$, \cdot , $/$), see [12]. Interval arithmetic can be extended to \mathbb{C} by introducing an interval with real and imaginary parts, that is, $I = \Re(I) + i\Im(I)$.

For an interval I in \mathbb{R} , we define the minimum absolute value over the points in I by $\lfloor I \rfloor = \min_{x \in I} |x|$. Consider an interval vector $I = (I_1, \dots, I_n)$ in \mathbb{R}^n . We define $\|I\|^2 = \sum_i \lfloor I_i \rfloor^2$. Note that $\|I\|$ is the minimum of 2-norms over all points

in I , and it can be extended to intervals in \mathbb{C} naturally. For a function $F : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ and an interval vector I in \mathbb{C}^n , we define an *interval closure* $\square F(I)$ of F over I which is a set containing $\{F(x) \mid x \in I\}$. Usually, the smallest interval in \mathbb{C}^m that contains $\{F(x) \mid x \in I\}$ is used for $\square F(I)$. For a function F that consists of elementary functions (e.g. polynomials), the interval closure is obtained by interval arithmetic. Note that the interval closure of a function is not unique in general.

Lastly, we consider an *interval matrix*, a matrix with interval entries. For an $n \times n$ -interval matrix M , we say that an $n \times n$ -interval matrix is an *inverse interval matrix* of M if it contains the set $\{N^{-1} \mid N \in M\}$, which is denoted by M^{-1} . Note that M^{-1} may not be unique. We discuss how to compute the inverse interval matrix in Section 4.2.

3 The alpha theory over regions

The goal of this section is to extend the results from Section 2.1 to the case when the input is given by an interval vector rather than a point. Let $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be an analytic system defined in an open set $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, and I be an interval vector that is contained in U . Then, we define the three values given by F and I like the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(F, I) &:= \beta(F, I)\gamma(F, I) \\ \beta(F, I) &:= \max_{x \in I} \beta(F, x) \\ \gamma(F, I) &:= \max_{x \in I} \gamma(F, x) \end{aligned} .$$

If $JF(x)$ is not invertible at some point $x \in I$, we define $\alpha(F, I) = \beta(F, I) = \gamma(F, I) = \infty$.

We state the results of the alpha theory over regions.

Theorem 2. *Let $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be an analytic system, and I be an interval vector in U . Then,*

1. *if $\alpha(F, I) < \frac{13-3\sqrt{17}}{4}$, then all points in I are approximate solutions to F with the associated solution x^* that is contained in $\bigcap_{x \in I} B(x, 2\beta(F, I))$, and*
2. *if $\alpha(F, I) < 0.03$, then all points in $\bigcup_{x \in I} B(x, \frac{1}{20\gamma(F, I)})$ are approximate solutions to the same associated solution to F .*

Proof. 1. We begin by noting $\alpha(F, x) \leq \alpha(F, I)$ for any point $x \in I$. Thus, $\alpha(F, I) < \frac{13-3\sqrt{17}}{4}$ implies that $\alpha(F, x) < \frac{13-3\sqrt{17}}{4}$, and hence, any point $x \in I$ is an approximate solution to F by Theorem 1. As $\alpha(F, I) < \infty$, we have the continuity of the k -th Newton iteration $N_F^k(x)$ over I for all k . Hence, all points in I must converge to the same associated solution x^* . Since x^* is contained in $B(x, 2\beta(F, I))$ for each point $x \in I$, we have that x^* is contained in $\bigcap_{x \in I} B(x, 2\beta(F, I))$.

2. Since $\alpha(F, I) < 0.03$, for any point $x \in I$, all points in $B(x, \frac{1}{20\gamma(F, I)})$ are approximate solutions. By the first part of this theorem, all points in I have the same associated solution to F so that the result is proved. \square

Since the alpha theory over regions certifies all points in a certain region at once, the process of certifying distinct solutions is more relaxed than the known method in [9]. We introduce it as the following corollary:

Corollary 1. *Let $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be an analytic system, and I_1 and I_2 be interval vectors in U with $\alpha(F, I_1) < \frac{13-3\sqrt{17}}{4}$ and $\alpha(F, I_2) < \frac{13-3\sqrt{17}}{4}$. Then, if $I_1 \cap I_2 \neq \emptyset$, then I_1 and I_2 have the same associated solution to F . On the other hand, if $\text{dist}(I_1, I_2) > 2\beta(F, I_1) + 2\beta(F, I_2)$, then I_1 and I_2 have different associated solutions to F . Here, $\text{dist}(I_1, I_2) = \min\{\|x_1 - x_2\| \mid x_1 \in I_1, x_2 \in I_2\}$.*

Proof. The first part is clear by applying Theorem 2(1) on I_1 and I_2 . The second part follows from the fact that the associated solution of I_i is contained in $B(x_i, 2\beta(F, I_i))$ for any point $x_i \in I_i$. \square

Note that the corollary allows a larger alpha value than that of Theorem 1(2). Hence, it can be used for certifying distinct solutions with a more relaxed condition.

Finally, for the case with a polynomial system, we state the interval version of Proposition 1. For a polynomial system $F : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ and an interval vector I , we define $\mu(F, I) := \max_{x \in I} \mu(F, x)$. Then, the proposition below provides an upper bound for $\gamma(F, I)$.

Proposition 2. *Consider a polynomial system $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$, and an interval vector $I = (I_1, \dots, I_n)$ in \mathbb{C}^n . Then, $\gamma(F, I) \leq \frac{\mu(F, I)D^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2\|(1, I)\|}$ where $(1, I) = ([1, 1] + i[0, 0], I_1, \dots, I_n)$ is the interval vector in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} .*

Proof. Consider any point in $x \in I$. Then,

$$\gamma(F, x) \leq \frac{\mu(F, x)D^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2\|(1, x)\|} \leq \frac{\mu(F, I)D^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2\|(1, x)\|} \leq \frac{\mu(F, I)D^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2\|(1, I)\|}.$$

Since x is an arbitrary point, the result follows. \square

In the actual implementation of alpha theory over regions, we use interval closures $\square\beta(F, I)$ and $\square\mu(F, I)$ instead of $\beta(F, I)$ and $\mu(F, I)$. Computing these interval closures requires the computation of the interval matrix inverse due to $\square JF(I)^{-1}$.

The expected usage of the alpha theory over regions is to replace the usual alpha theory. For a given numerical solution, we apply the alpha theory on an interval vector containing this numerical solution with preferably a small radius.

4 Implementation details

This section points out remarks when implementing the alpha theory over regions. The first part is about the use of the interval arithmetic library MPFI [14] with arbitrary precision. Secondly, we discuss a special type of interval arithmetic for computing a tight inverse interval matrix using LU decomposition.

4.1 MPFI for arbitrary precision interval arithmetic

One of the typical ways to get input for the alpha theory over regions is by constructing an interval vector with a certain radius from a given candidate solution of a system. To execute reliable computation, one may require high precision for interval arithmetic. MPFI is a library written in C for arbitrary precision interval arithmetic using MPFR [4]. The purpose of using MPFI is to achieve guaranteed computation results without losing accuracy from the rounding error. The comparison of alpha values according to the change of precision is presented in Section 5.2. One possible drawback of using high precision is, however, that as the precision used in the computation increases, the speed of the calculation may decrease. The comparison of elapsed time between machine precision and MPFI is presented in Section 5.3.

4.2 Inverse interval matrix computation via LU decomposition

For computing the inverse interval matrix, LU decomposition may be considered for efficiency compared to other methods (e.g. cofactor expansion). We desire a tight inverse interval matrix since an unnecessarily large inverse makes the alpha value greater than what it could be. To achieve this, we introduce interval arithmetic in a special type.

For an interval I in \mathbb{C} , we define its *dual interval* that is denoted by I^* . This dual interval I^* has the same endpoints of I with the following arithmetic:

$$I + (-I^*) = I - I^* = [0, 0],$$

$$I \times \frac{1}{I^*} = \frac{I}{I^*} = [1, 1] \quad \text{if } 0 \notin I.$$

Also, we define $(I^*)^* = I$ to make the addition and multiplication commutative. Including the dual intervals introduces *Kaucher arithmetic* with a broader collection of intervals than that of usual interval arithmetic. It has a more algebraic structure than the usual interval arithmetic while it executes the conservative computation. More specifically, the set of intervals with dual intervals is a group in addition, and the set of intervals not containing zero with dual intervals is a group in multiplication. The more general version of this interval arithmetic is introduced in [5]. The interval arithmetic with dual intervals is used for partial pivoting for LU decomposition. For other subtractions and divisions that occur except for pivoting, the usual interval arithmetic is used.

We briefly elaborate on how to compute the inverse interval matrix. For an $n \times n$ interval matrix M and an n -dimensional interval vector B , consider an interval linear system $M\mathbf{x} = B$. Solving this system using the interval LU decomposition of M , we have an interval vector \mathbf{x} satisfying only $B \subseteq M\mathbf{x}$ in general (See [13, Section 4.5], for example). Using this fact, iterative solving of interval linear systems returns an inverse interval matrix M^{-1} (that is, it returns a set of interval matrices containing $\{N^{-1} \mid N \in M\}$). In particular, using interval arithmetic with dual intervals may return a tighter M^{-1} than the usual interval arithmetic.

5 Experiments

This section provides computational and experimental results as a proof of concept for the alpha theory over regions. The implementation is in C++ into two versions, one with double machine precision (in a correct rounding manner for reliable computation), and the other with arbitrary precision using MPFI [14]. It computes alpha, beta, and gamma values from a given square polynomial system and a point. All computations in this section are executed in a Macbook M2 pro 3.5 GHz, 16 GB RAM. The code and examples are available at

<https://github.com/klee669/alphaTheoryOverRegions>

5.1 Alpha values according to the radius of the input interval

We analyze the impact of the radius of the interval vector on alpha values. It is expected that as the size of the interval increases, the alpha value will also increase. To check this, we consider the cyclic system with 6 variables; $f_l = \sum_{j=1}^6 \prod_{k=j}^{j+l} x_j$ for $l = 1, \dots, 5$ and $f_6 = \prod_{j=1}^6 x_j - 1$ with a numerical solution $a = (a_1, -a_1, a_2, a_3, -a_3, -a_2)$ where $a_1 = .782290 + .622915i$, $a_2 = .866025 - .5i$ and $a_3 = .148315 + .988940i$ whose distance from the nearest exact solution is $8.261221e - 7$. Defining the interval vector centered at a , we compute three constant values using our implementation with double precision while we change the radius of the interval (see Table 1). For reference, values computed by `alphaCertified` [8] with exact arithmetic are also recorded.

From the result, each constant gets larger as the radius increases. The improvement in alpha and beta are more noticeable than that of gamma because the beta value is affected by the value of $F(x)$ which is more sensitive to the change of the size of the input interval than the bound for gamma value given in Proposition 2. Once the radius gets small enough, due to the conservative computation from interval arithmetic, it shows only a slight improvement on three constant values.

5.2 Alpha values according to precision

In this section, we explore how precision affects the values. We consider the same cyclic-6 system, and the interval box with the radius $1e - 20$ centered at

radius	alpha	beta	gamma
$1e-5$	$1.15611e+1$	$4.03387e-3$	$2.86602e+3$
$1e-7$	$1.66585e-2$	$1.26115e-5$	$1.32089e+3$
$1e-10$	$1.62002e-5$	$1.23899e-8$	$1.30754e+3$
$1e-15$	$5.75515e-11$	$4.40158e-14$	$1.30752e+3$
$1e-20$	$1.63550e-11$	$1.25084e-14$	$1.30752e+3$
$1e-30$	$1.63550e-11$	$1.25084e-14$	$1.30752e+3$
aC	$1.53040e-13$	$1.17046e-16$	$1.30752e+3$

Table 1. The values of alpha, beta, and gamma constants for the cyclic-6 system according to the change of the radius of the input interval. All computations were conducted with double precision. The last row shows the values obtained by the software `alphaCertified` with exact arithmetic.

the solution a used in Section 5.1. The comparison of alpha, beta, and gamma values according to the change of precision is given in Table 2.

precision	alpha	beta	gamma
16	$4.44465e-2$	$3.39918e-5$	$1.30757e+3$
32	$4.42851e-7$	$3.38696e-10$	$1.30752e+3$
64	$2.03482e-13$	$1.55624e-16$	$1.30752e+3$
128	$2.02057e-13$	$1.54534e-16$	$1.30752e+3$
256	$2.02057e-13$	$1.54534e-16$	$1.30752e+3$
double	$1.63550e-11$	$1.25084e-14$	$1.30752e+3$

Table 2. The values of alpha, beta, and gamma constants for the cyclic-6 system according to the change of precision.

The result shows that the smaller alpha and beta values are returned as the larger precision is used. The value of gamma does not improve much since the beta value is affected by the value of $F(x)$ which is more sensitive to the change of precision. The changes in all three values become insignificant when the precision higher than 128 is used.

5.3 Time comparison with `alphaCertified`

We provide a time comparison with the software `alphaCertified`. We experiment with the Fano problem studied in [16]. The Fano problem of type (n, k, d) where $d = (d_1, \dots, d_l)$ is the problem of finding n -dimensional planes lying in a complete intersection of l hypersurfaces f_1, \dots, f_l in \mathbb{P}^k with degrees $\deg f_1 = d_1, \dots, \deg f_l = d_l$. Fano problems can be described as problems of solving a square polynomial system. For example, Fano problems of $(1, 5, (2, 4))$ is related to a square polynomial system of 8 variables with 1280 solutions (up to multiplicity), and $(1, 8, (2, 2, 2, 4))$ is related to a square polynomial systems of 14 variables with 47104 solutions (up to multiplicity). We find numerical solutions

of these two systems with `Macaulay2` expressed in floating point arithmetic, and certify them using our implementation and `alphaCertified` by varying the number of candidate solutions. For our implementation, we compute alpha, beta, and gamma values for each candidate solution using both double precision and MPFI with 256 precision. For `alphaCertified`, calculations are performed both using exact arithmetic and floating-point arithmetic for comparison even though floating-point arithmetic only provides soft verification. The result is recorded in Table 3.

(1, 5, (2, 4)), a square system with 8 variables.

(1, 8, (2, 2, 2, 4)), a square system with 14 variables.

#sols	double	256 prec.	aC exact	aC float	#sols	double	256 prec.	aC exact	aC float
20	.06	.67	92.92	.16	20	.41	7.78	8743.73	1.51
50	.11	1.59	242.00	.27	50	.86	18.26	22500.32	2.28
200	.31	6.13	1067.02	.84	200	3.07	72.10	89455.63	6.73
1000	1.39	32.83	7649.28	3.92	1000	14.73	400.51	–	27.61

Table 3. Elapsed time in seconds for certifying solutions for Fano problems of using the implementation of alpha theory over regions, and the software `alphaCertified`. The symbol – means that the computation does not terminate within 2 days.

The result shows that the alpha theory over regions shows less elapsed time on computation than `alphaCertified` with exact arithmetic. The implementation with 256 precision may take more time than `alphaCertified` with floating point arithmetic, but it returns more reliable results than computation with floating point arithmetic. The implementation with double precision takes less time than that with MPFI.

Note that comparing the elapsed time of two software might not be fair since `alphaCertified` performs further analysis to classify distinct solutions. Nonetheless, the result shows the potential of the alpha theory over regions as it produces reliable results in a significantly shorter time than the computation with exact arithmetic.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Michael Burr and Thomas Yahl for helpful discussions. We also thank the anonymous referees for their constructive comments.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

1. Blum, L., Cucker, F., Shub, M., Smale, S.: Complexity and real computation. Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, Germany (2012)
2. Breiding, P., Rose, K., Timme, S.: Certifying zeros of polynomial systems using interval arithmetic. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* **49**(1), 1–14 (2023)

3. Burr, M., Lee, K., Leykin, A.: Effective certification of approximate solutions to systems of equations involving analytic functions. In: Proceedings of the 2019 on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation. pp. 267–274 (2019)
4. Fousse, L., Hanrot, G., Lefèvre, V., Pélissier, P., Zimmermann, P.: MPFR: A multiple-precision binary floating-point library with correct rounding. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* **33**(2), 13–es (jun 2007). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1236463.1236468>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/1236463.1236468>
5. Goldsztejn, A., Chabert, G.: A generalized interval LU decomposition for the solution of interval linear systems. In: International Conference on Numerical Methods and Applications. pp. 312–319. Springer (2006)
6. Grayson, D.R., Stillman, M.E.: Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www2.macaulay2.com>
7. Hauenstein, J.D., Levandovskyy, V.: Certifying solutions to square systems of polynomial-exponential equations. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **79**, 575–593 (2017)
8. Hauenstein, J.D., Sottile, F.: alphaCertified: Software for certifying numerical solutions to polynomial equations. Available at <https://math.tamu.edu/~sottile/research/stories/alphaCertified> (2011)
9. Hauenstein, J.D., Sottile, F.: Algorithm 921: alphaCertified: certifying solutions to polynomial systems. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)* **38**(4), 1–20 (2012)
10. Krawczyk, R.: Newton-Algorithm zur Bestimmung von Nullstellen mit Fehlersranken. *Computing* **4**, 187–201 (1969)
11. Lee, K.: Certifying approximate solutions to polynomial systems on macaulay2. *ACM Communications in Computer Algebra* **53**(2), 45–48 (2019)
12. Moore, R.E., Kearfott, R.B., Cloud, M.J.: Introduction to interval analysis. SIAM (2009)
13. Neumaier, A.: Interval methods for systems of equations. No. 37, Cambridge university press (1990)
14. Revol, N., Rouillier, F.: Motivations for an arbitrary precision interval arithmetic and the MPFI library. *Reliable computing* **11**(4), 275–290 (2005)
15. Shub, M., Smale, S.: Complexity of Bézout’s theorem. I. Geometric aspects. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **6**(2), 459–501 (1993)
16. Yahl, T.: Computing Galois groups of Fano problems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **119**, 81–89 (2023)