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#### Abstract

We survey influential quantitative results on the convergence of the Newton iterator towards simple roots of continuously differentiable maps defined over Banach spaces. We present a general statement of Kantorovich's theorem, with a concise proof from scratch, dedicated to wide audience. From it, we quickly recover known results, and gather historical notes together with pointers to recent articles.


## 1 Introduction

During the last decades, the Newton operator has become omnipresent in numeric and symbolic computations. On specific functions such as polynomials of degree two over real numbers, the behavior of this operator may be simple, but in general it is a difficult problem to determine whether the iterates of a given point converge to a zero or not. More precisely, let $\phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real function of class $\mathcal{C}^{1}$, which means differentiable with $\phi^{\prime}$ continuous. In theory, it is classical that Newton sequences $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 0}$ defined by $r_{k+1}=r_{k}-\frac{\phi\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}$ converge quadratically if their initial value $r_{0}$ is sufficiently close to a simple zero $r_{-}$of $\phi$, which means $\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{-}\right) \neq 0$. But for practice this information is not sufficient, and one needs to quantify what is meant by "sufficiently close".


Figure 1. Graph of $\phi$ and the first Newton iterates of $r_{0}$.

In Figure 1, we illustrate the typical behavior of the Newton sequence in a neighborhood of a simple zero $r_{-}$. It is a classical result that if $\phi$ is decreasing and convex in a range $\left[r_{0}, R\right]$, if $\phi\left(r_{0}\right)>0$, and $\phi(R)<0$, then there exits a unique zero $r_{-}$of $\phi$ in $\left[r_{0}, R\right]$, and the Newton sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 0}$ converges to $r_{-}$. In a sufficiently small neighborhood of $r_{-}$this convergence becomes quadratic, which means that the number of digits of the zero is essentially doubled at each iteration.

In general, for a complex function $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, the set of initial values leading to a sequence that converges to a prescribed zero of $f$ are intricate fractal sets, called Julia sets of the meromorphic function $z \mapsto z-f(z) / f^{\prime}(z)$. For practice, it is thus important to design simple criteria, with low complexity, ensuring that an initial point converges to a unique zero in its neighborhood. And we only expect necessary conditions, in the sense that if the criterion fails, then we cannot deduce whether the convergence holds or not. Several such criteria are intensively used in practice. Choosing or designing the most efficient criterion for a given purpose might be quite tedious, because one has to discover good compromises between speed and accuracy. The choice actually depends on the data structure to represent the map $f$, the way its derivative can be obtained, and also on the type of underlying arithmetic: hardware double precision, intervall or ball arithmetic, arbitrary precision, etc.

Our presentation begins with a standard extension of the seminal criterion due to Kantorovich. Then we show how other old and recent criteria can be recovered from it. We also propose brief comparisons and discussions on how to design other criteria offering alternative compromises. Historical notes are included at the end.

## 2 Kantorovich theorem

Until the end of the article, $\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbb{Y}$ represent Banach spaces over $\mathbb{C}$ (typically $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ in practice) endowed with the norm written $\|\cdot\|$. The class of functions, with values in $\mathbb{Y}$, having continuous derivatives to order $\ell$ in an open subset $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ is written $\mathcal{C}^{\ell}(\Omega, \mathbb{Y})$. If $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\ell}(\Omega, \mathbb{Y})$, then its $l$-th derivative is written $D^{l} f$ in general, and $f^{(l)}$ whenever $\mathbb{X}$ has dimension 1 . The open ball centered at $a \in \Omega$ and of radius $r$ is written $B(a, r)=\{x \in \mathbb{X} \mid\|x-a\|<r\}$; Its adherence is $\bar{B}(a, r)=\{x \in \mathbb{X} \mid\|x-a\| \leqslant r\}$. If $A$ is a linear map acting on $\mathbb{X}$, then we use the same notation for the following norm: $\|A\|=\sup _{\|x\|=1}\|A x\|$. We begin with a very classical lemma.
Lemma 1. Let $A: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ be a linear operator such that $\|A\|<1$, and let Id represent the identity map on $\mathbb{X}$. Then $\operatorname{Id}-A$ is invertible, of inverse $(\operatorname{Id}-A)^{-1}=\sum_{k \geqslant 0} A^{k}$, and we have $\left\|(\operatorname{Id}-A)^{-1}\right\| \leqslant$ $(1-\|A\|)^{-1}$.

Proof. Since $\|A\|<1$ the sum $B=\sum_{k \geqslant 0} A^{k}$ converges and has norm bounded by $\sum_{k \geqslant 0}\|A\|^{k}=$ $(1-\|A\|)^{-1}$. Then it suffices to verify that $(\operatorname{Id}-A) \sum_{k \geqslant 0} A^{k}$ actually converges to Id.

For any $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\ell}(\Omega, \mathbb{Y})$, any two points $a, b$ in $\Omega$, and any integer $l \in\{0, \ldots, \ell\}$, we write

$$
R_{l}(f ; a, b)=f(b)-\sum_{k=0}^{l} D^{k} f(a) \frac{(b-a)^{k}}{k!}
$$

for the remainder of the Taylor expansion of $f$ to order $l$, centered at $a$ and evaluated at $b$. If $l+1 \leqslant \ell$, and if the segment $[a, b]$ is included in $\Omega$, then it admits the integral form

$$
R_{l}(f ; a, b)=\int_{[a, b]} D^{l+1} f(z) \frac{(b-z)^{l}}{l!} \mathrm{d} z
$$

From now, $x_{0}$ is a point in $\Omega$ such that $D f\left(x_{0}\right)$ is invertible. We assume we are given a constant $\beta \geqslant\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$, and a continuous non-negative and non-decreasing function $L:[0, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \geqslant 0$ satisfying the following Lipschitzian condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}(D f(b)-D f(a))\right\| \leqslant L(r)\|b-a\|, \text { for all } r \in[0, R] \text { and all } a, b \in \bar{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right) \cap \Omega \text {. } \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We consider the function

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi(r)=\beta-r+\int_{0}^{r} L(s)(r-s) \mathrm{d} s, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is defined in $[0, R]$. In order to compute its first derivative, we take a parameter $\varepsilon$ in a neighborhood of 0 , and calculate: $\int_{0}^{r+\varepsilon} L(s)(r+\varepsilon-s) \mathrm{d} s-\int_{0}^{r} L(s)(r-s) \mathrm{d} s=\int_{r}^{r+\varepsilon} L(s)(r+\varepsilon-$ $s) \mathrm{d} s+\int_{0}^{r} L(s)((r+\varepsilon-s)-(r-s)) \mathrm{d} s=\varepsilon \int_{0}^{r} L(s) \mathrm{d} s+O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right)$. We thus see that $\phi$ admits continuous derivatives to order 2 on $(0, R): \phi^{\prime}(r)=-1+\int_{0}^{r} L(s) \mathrm{d} s$ and $\phi^{\prime \prime}(r)=L(r)$. These derivatives naturally extend continuously at 0 from right and at $R$ from left.

Lemma 2. Condition (1) is equivalent to: for all segment $[a, b] \subset B\left(x_{0}, R\right)$ such that $\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|+$ $\|b-a\| \leqslant R$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}(D f(b)-D f(a))\right\| \leqslant \int_{\left\|x_{0}-a\right\|}^{\left\|x_{0}-a\right\|+\|b-a\|} L(s) \mathrm{d} s \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We let $r_{a}=\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|$ and $r_{b}=r_{a}+\|b-a\|$. We divide the segment $[a, b]$ into $N$ consecutive subsegments $\left[c_{i}, c_{i+1}\right]$ where $c_{i}=a+i \frac{b-a}{N}$. We also let $r_{i}=r_{a}+i \frac{r_{b}-r_{a}}{N}$, so that we have $\left\|c_{i+1}-c_{i}\right\|=r_{i+1}-r_{i}$ and $\max \left(\left\|c_{i+1}-x_{0}\right\|,\left\|c_{i}-x_{0}\right\|\right) \leqslant r_{i+1}$.

Assume that (1) holds, and apply it on each $\left[c_{i}, c_{i+1}\right]$ as follows:
$\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}(D f(b)-D f(a))\right\|=\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(D f\left(c_{i+1}\right)-D f\left(c_{i}\right)\right)\right\| \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} L\left(r_{i+1}\right)\left\|c_{i+1}-c_{i}\right\|$.
The latter sum converges to $\int_{r_{a}}^{r_{b}} L(s) \mathrm{d} s$ when $N$ tends to infinity, which gives the first implication.
Conversely, assume that condition (3) holds. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\left\|b-x_{0}\right\| \geqslant\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|$. Then, with $N$ sufficiently large, precisely such that $\left\|b-x_{0}\right\|+\|b-a\| /$ $N \leqslant R$, we have $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}(D f(b)-D f(a))\right\| \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(D f\left(c_{i+1}\right)-D f\left(c_{i}\right)\right)\right\| \leqslant$ $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_{\left\|c_{i}-x_{0}\right\|}^{\left\|c_{0}\right\|+\left\|c_{i+1}-c_{i}\right\|} L(s) \mathrm{d} s \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} L\left(\left\|c_{i}-x_{0}\right\|+\left\|c_{i+1}-c_{i}\right\|\right)\left\|c_{i+1}-c_{i}\right\| \leqslant L\left(\left\|b-x_{0}\right\|+\| b-\right.$ $a \| / N)\|b-a\|$. The latter expression converges to $L\left(\left\|b-x_{0}\right\|\right)\|b-a\|$ when $N$ tends to infinity.

Lemma 3. For all segment $[a, b] \subset B\left(x_{0}, R\right)$ such that $\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|+\|b-a\| \leqslant R$, we have:

$$
\left\|R_{1}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f ; a, b\right)\right\| \leqslant R_{1}\left(\phi ;\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|,\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|+\|b-a\|\right) .
$$

Proof. We let $r_{a}=\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|, r_{b}=r_{a}+\|b-a\|$, and use Lemma 2 as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|R_{1}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f ; a, b\right)\right\| & =\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}(f(b)-f(a)-D f(a)(b-a))\right\| \\
& =\left\|\int_{a}^{b} D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}(D f(z)-D f(a)) \mathrm{d} z\right\| \\
& \leqslant \int_{r_{a}}^{r_{b}} \int_{r_{a}}^{r} L(s) \mathrm{d} r \mathrm{~d} s=\int_{r_{a}}^{r_{b}}\left(\phi^{\prime}(r)-\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{a}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} r=R_{1}\left(\phi ; r_{a}, r_{b}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Built on these lemmas, the following theorem gives necessary conditions that ensure convergence to a zero, and also uniqueness of this zero in a larger region. The central idea is the comparison of the convergence of the Newton iterates for $f$ with the ones for $\phi$.

Theorem 4. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^{1}(\Omega, \mathbb{Y})$, and let $x_{0} \in \Omega$ be such that $D f\left(x_{0}\right)$ is invertible. We assume we are given a constant $\beta \geqslant\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$, and a continuous non-negative and non-decreasing function $L:[0, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ satisfying (1) and $B\left(x_{0}, R\right) \subseteq \Omega$. The function $\phi$, as defined in (2), is supposed to admit a unique zero $r_{-}$in $[0, R)$, and to satisfy $\phi(R) \leqslant 0$.

Then the Newton sequence $r_{0}=0, r_{k+1}=r_{k}-\frac{\phi\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}$ is well defined in $\left[0, r_{-}\right]$, and converges to $r_{-}$. The sequence $x_{k+1}=x_{k}-D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{k}\right)$ is also well defined in $\bar{B}\left(x_{0}, r_{-}\right)$, and converges to the unique zero $\zeta$ of $f$ in $B\left(x_{0}, R\right)$. In addition, we have $\left\|\zeta-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant r_{-}-r_{k}$ and $\left\|x_{k+1}-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant r_{k+1}-r_{k}$.

Proof. First, we examine the convergence of the sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 0}$. Since $\phi^{\prime \prime} \geqslant 0$, it is classical that the sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 0}$ is non-decreasing, remains in $\left[0, r_{-}\right]$, and therefore converges to $r_{-}$, as pictured in Figure 1.

We shall prove by induction that $\left\|x_{k+1}-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant r_{k+1}-r_{k}$ holds for all $k \geqslant 0$. For $k=0$ this is true because $\left\|x_{1}-x_{0}\right\|=\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\| \leqslant \beta=r_{1}-r_{0}$. Now assume that the inequality holds up to some $k \geqslant 0$, and let us prove that it also holds for $k+1$. In order to bound $\left\|x_{k+1}-x_{k}\right\|=\left\|D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{k}\right)\right\|$, we bound $\left\|D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1} D f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$ and $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{k}\right)\right\|$ separately. As for the first expression, using the induction hypothesis, we obtain

$$
\left\|x_{k}-x_{0}\right\|=\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\left\|x_{i+1}-x_{i}\right\| \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\left(r_{i+1}-r_{i}\right)=r_{k}-r_{0}=r_{k} \leqslant r_{-},
$$

so that Lemma 2 gives us $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(D f\left(x_{k}\right)-D f\left(x_{0}\right)\right)\right\| \leqslant 1+\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)<1$, and Lemma 1 implies that $D f\left(x_{k}\right)$ is invertible with norm

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1} D f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\| \leqslant \frac{1}{1-\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(D f\left(x_{k}\right)-D f\left(x_{0}\right)\right)\right\|} \leqslant \frac{1}{\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently $x_{k+1}$ is well-defined. Then, in order to bound $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{k}\right)\right\|$, we write the Taylor expansion of $f$ at $x_{k-1}$, and use the definition of $x_{k}$ :

$$
f\left(x_{k}\right)=f\left(x_{k-1}\right)+D f\left(x_{k-1}\right)\left(x_{k}-x_{k-1}\right)+R_{1}\left(f ; x_{k-1}, x_{k}\right)=R_{1}\left(f ; x_{k-1}, x_{k}\right) .
$$

Combining Lemma 3, inequality $\left\|x_{k}-x_{k-1}\right\| \leqslant r_{k}-r_{k-1}$, and the definition of $r_{k}$, we obtain:

$$
\left\|R_{1}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f ; x_{k-1}, x_{k}\right)\right\| \leqslant R_{1}\left(\phi ; r_{k-1}, r_{k}\right)=\phi\left(r_{k}\right)-\phi\left(r_{k-1}\right)-\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k-1}\right)\left(r_{k}-r_{k-1}\right)=\phi\left(r_{k}\right) .
$$

We thus have achieved $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{k}\right)\right\| \leqslant \phi\left(r_{k}\right)$, which combined to (4) leads to

$$
\left\|x_{k+1}-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant-\frac{\phi\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}=r_{k+1}-r_{k}
$$

whence the induction hypothesis at $k+1$. At this point of the proof we know that $\left(x_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\bar{B}\left(x_{0}, r_{-}\right)$. Consequently it converges to a zero $\zeta$ of $f$ in $\bar{B}\left(x_{0}, r_{-}\right)$. It remains to show that $\zeta$ is the unique zero of $f$ in $B\left(x_{0}, R\right)$.

Let $\xi$ be a zero of $f$ in $B\left(x_{0}, R\right)$, and let $\theta=\frac{\left\|\xi-x_{0}\right\|}{R}<1$. We shall prove by induction that $\left\|\xi-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant \theta^{2^{k}}\left(R-r_{k}\right)$ holds for all $k \geqslant 0$, which will yield $\zeta=\xi$. The induction hypothesis clearly holds for $k=0$. Assume that it holds up to some value of $k \geqslant 0$.

Writing $x_{k+1}-\xi=D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1}\left(f(\xi)-f\left(x_{k}\right)-D f\left(x_{k}\right)\left(\xi-x_{k}\right)\right)$, we aim at bounding $\left\|D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1} D f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$ and $\left\|R_{1}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f ; x_{k}, \xi\right)\right\|$. Using that $\phi^{\prime \prime}=L$ is non-decreasing, the latter bound can been achieved via Lemma 3:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|R_{1}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f ; x_{k}, \xi\right)\right\| & \leqslant R_{1}\left(\phi ; r_{k}, r_{k}+\left\|\xi-x_{k}\right\|\right)=\int_{r_{k}}^{r_{k}+\left\|\xi-x_{k}\right\|} \phi^{\prime \prime}(s)\left(r_{k}+\left\|\xi-x_{k}\right\|-s\right) \mathrm{d} s \\
& \leqslant \theta^{2^{k+1}} \int_{r_{k}}^{R} \phi^{\prime \prime}(s)(R-s) \mathrm{d} s=\theta^{2^{k+1}}\left(\phi(R)-\phi\left(r_{k}\right)-\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)\left(R-r_{k}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Combined to inequality (4), we deduce $\left\|\xi-x_{k+1}\right\| \leqslant \theta^{2^{k+1}} \frac{\phi(R)-\phi\left(r_{k}\right)-\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)\left(R-r_{k}\right)}{-\phi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}$. Since $\phi(R) \leqslant 0$, this yields $\left\|\xi-x_{k+1}\right\| \leqslant \theta^{2 k+1}\left(R-r_{k+1}\right)$, whence the induction hypothesis at $k+1$.

## 3 Other criteria

In this section we show how the latter theorem allows one to retrieve both Kantorovich's original theorem, subsequent variants for higher orders, and recent formulations in terms of majorant series.

### 3.1 Order two

In order to use Theorem 4 in practice, it is worth considering functions $L$, and thus $\phi$, which are polynomial of low degrees. Taking $\phi$ of degree one would force $L$ to be identically 0 hence $D f$ to be constant which is not of interest. Taking $\phi$ of degree two corresponds to the original case due to Kantorovich.

Corollary 5. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^{1}(\Omega, \mathbb{Y})$, and let $x_{0} \in \Omega$ be such that $D f\left(x_{0}\right)$ is invertible. We assume we are given constants $\beta, \lambda$ satisfying $\beta \geqslant\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|, 0<\beta \lambda<1 / 2, B\left(x_{0}, r_{+}\right) \subset \Omega$, and such that for all $a, b \in B\left(x_{0}, r_{+}\right)$,

$$
\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}(D f(b)-D f(a))\right\| \leqslant \lambda\|b-a\|, \text { where } r_{-}=\frac{2 \beta}{1+\sqrt{1-2 \beta \lambda}} \text { and } r_{+}=\frac{1+\sqrt{1-2 \beta \lambda}}{\lambda}
$$

Then, with $\varphi(r)=\lambda r^{2} / 2-r+\beta$, the Newton sequence $r_{0}=0, r_{k+1}=r_{k}-\frac{\varphi\left(r_{k}\right)}{\varphi^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}$ is well defined in $\left[0, r_{-}\right]$, and converges to $r_{-}$. The sequence $\left(x_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 0}$ defined by $x_{k+1}=x_{k}-D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{k}\right)$ is well defined in $\bar{B}\left(x_{0}, r_{-}\right)$and converges to the unique zero $\zeta$ of $f$ in $B\left(x_{0}, r_{+}\right)$.
Proof. We simply invoke Theorem 4 with $L(r)=\lambda, R=r_{+}$, so that $\phi=\varphi$.
This criterion is clearly sharp for equations of degree two, and more precisely when $f=\varphi$. This corollary may also be completed with an explicit formula for $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 0}$, which is obtained from the auxiliary sequence $t_{k}=\frac{r_{k}-r_{-}}{r_{k}-r+}$, that satisfies $t_{k+1}=t_{k}^{2}$.
Example 6. Consider $\mathbb{X}=\mathbb{Y}=\mathbb{C}$, $f(x)=x^{3} / 128+x^{2} / 4-x+9 / 10, x_{0}=0$, and $\beta=\left|f(0) / f^{\prime}(0)\right|=$ $9 / 10$. Since $f^{\prime \prime}(x)=3 x / 64+1 / 2$, for all candidate value for $R$, one necessarily takes $\lambda$ larger than $3 R / 64+1 / 2$. Since the closest root to $x_{0}$ is $\zeta \simeq 1.4475$, Corollary 5 does not apply. However we shall show later that the Newton iterates of $x_{0}$ converge to $\zeta$.

### 3.2 Higher orders

Now we examine what happens when $\ell \geqslant 2$. We still assume we are given a constant $\beta \geqslant$ $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$, but also additional constants $\gamma_{i} \geqslant\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{i} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$ for $i \in\{2, \ldots, \ell\}$, and a continuous non-negative and non-decreasing function $L_{\ell}:[0, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ satisfying:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(D^{\ell} f(b)-D^{\ell} f(a)\right)\right\| \leqslant L_{\ell}(r)\|b-a\|, \text { for all } r \in[0, R] \text { and all } a, b \in \bar{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right) \cap \Omega \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We consider the function $\phi_{\ell}(r)=\beta-r+\gamma_{2} \frac{r^{2}}{2!}+\cdots+\gamma_{\ell} \frac{r^{\ell}}{\ell!}+\int_{0}^{r} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{(r-s)^{\ell}}{\ell!} \mathrm{d} s$, defined in $[0, R]$. In order to compute its derivatives, we take a parameter $\varepsilon$ in a neighborhood of 0 , and calculate: $\int_{0}^{r+\varepsilon} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{(r+\varepsilon-s)^{\ell}}{\ell!} \mathrm{d} s-\int_{0}^{r} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{(r-s) \ell}{\ell!} \mathrm{d} s=\int_{r}^{r+\varepsilon} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{(r+\varepsilon-s)^{\ell}}{\ell!} \mathrm{d} s+\int_{0}^{r} L_{\ell}(s)\left(\frac{(r+\varepsilon-s)^{\ell}}{\ell!}-\right.$ $\left.\frac{(r-s)^{\ell}}{\ell!}\right) \mathrm{d} s=\varepsilon \int_{0}^{r} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{(r-s)^{\ell-1}}{(\ell-1)!} \mathrm{d} s+O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right)$. By a straightforward induction, this shows that the derivative to order $l \leqslant \ell$ of $\int_{0}^{r} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{(r-s)^{\ell}}{\ell!} \mathrm{d} s$ exists and equals $\int_{0}^{r} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{(r-s)^{\ell-l}}{(\ell-l)!} \mathrm{d} s$. Consequently $\phi_{\ell}$ is of class $\mathcal{C}^{\ell+1}([0, R], \mathbb{R})$.

Corollary 7. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\ell}(\Omega, \mathbb{Y})$, with $\ell \geqslant 2$, and let $x_{0} \in \Omega$ be such that $D f\left(x_{0}\right)$ is invertible. We assume given $\beta, \gamma_{2}, \ldots, \gamma_{\ell}, L_{\ell}$ and $\phi_{\ell}$ as defined above, satisfying (5), and such that $\phi_{\ell}$ admits a unique zero $r_{-}$in $[0, R)$, with $B\left(x_{0}, R\right) \subseteq \Omega$ and $\phi(R) \leqslant 0$.

Then the Newton sequence $r_{0}=0, r_{k+1}=r_{k}-\frac{\phi_{\ell}\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi_{\ell}^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}$ is well defined in $\left[0, r_{-}\right]$, and converges to $r_{-}$. The Newton sequence $x_{k+1}=x_{k}-D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{k}\right)$ is also well defined in $\bar{B}\left(x_{0}, r_{-}\right)$, and converges to the unique zero $\zeta$ of $f$ in $B\left(x_{0}, R\right)$. In addition, we have $\left\|\zeta-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant r_{-}-r_{k}$ and $\left\|x_{k+1}-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant r_{k+1}-r_{k}$.

Proof. We define $L(r)=\phi_{\ell}^{\prime \prime}(r)=\gamma_{2}+\cdots+\gamma_{\ell} \frac{r^{\ell-2}}{(\ell-2)!}+\int_{0}^{r} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{(r-s)^{\ell-2}}{(\ell-2)!} \mathrm{d} s$ and $r_{a}=\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|$. We claim that $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{2} f(a)\right\| \leqslant L\left(r_{a}\right)$, so that $L$ satisfies hypotheses of Theorem 4 with $\phi(r)=$ $\beta-r+\int_{0}^{r} L(s)(r-s) \mathrm{d} s=\phi_{\ell}(r)$, which concludes the proof. In order to prove the latter claim, we notice that Lemma 2 applied to $D^{\ell-1} f$ yields $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(D^{\ell} f(a)-D^{\ell} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right)\right\| \leqslant \int_{0}^{r_{a}} L_{\ell}(s) \mathrm{d} s$, and we begin with

$$
D^{2} f(a)=\sum_{l=2}^{\ell} D^{l} f\left(x_{0}\right) \frac{\left(a-x_{0}\right)^{l-2}}{(l-2)!}+R_{\ell-2}\left(D^{2} f ; x_{0}, a\right) .
$$

If $\ell=2$, then $R_{\ell-2}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{2} f ; x_{0}, a\right)=D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(D^{2} f(a)-D^{2} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right)$, hence has norm at most $\int_{0}^{r_{a}} L_{\ell}(s) \mathrm{d} s=R_{\ell-2}\left(\phi_{\ell}^{\prime \prime} ; 0, r_{a}\right)$. Otherwise, if $\ell \geqslant 3$, the integral form of the Taylor remainder of $D^{2} f$ to order $\ell-3$ leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{\ell-2}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{2} f ; x_{0}, a\right) & =R_{\ell-3}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{2} f ; x_{0}, a\right)-D^{\ell} f\left(x_{0}\right) \frac{\left(a-x_{0}\right)^{\ell-2}}{(\ell-2)!} \\
& =\int_{\left[x_{0}, a\right]}\left(D^{\ell} f(z)-D^{\ell} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right) \frac{(a-z)^{\ell-3}}{(\ell-3)!} \mathrm{d} z .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that

$$
\left\|R_{\ell-2}\left(D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{2} f ; x_{0}, a\right)\right\| \leqslant \int_{0}^{r_{a}} \int_{0}^{r} L_{\ell}(s) \frac{\left(r_{a}-r\right)^{\ell-3}}{(\ell-3)!} \mathrm{d} r \mathrm{~d} s=R_{\ell-2}\left(\phi_{\ell}^{\prime \prime} ; 0, r_{a}\right)
$$

whence the claimed bound $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{2} f(a)\right\| \leqslant \sum_{l=2}^{\ell} \gamma_{l} \frac{r_{a}^{l-2}}{(l-2)!}+R_{\ell-2}\left(\phi_{\ell}^{\prime \prime} ; 0, r_{a}\right)=\phi_{\ell}^{\prime \prime}\left(r_{a}\right)$.
The first case of use concerns $\ell=2$, with $L(r)$ being a constant say $\nu$, so that $\phi_{2}(r)=\beta-r+$ $\gamma_{2} \frac{r^{2}}{2!}+\nu \frac{r^{3}}{3!}$. Since $\phi_{2}(r)$ admits a unique negative root, it admits two distinct positive roots $r_{-}$and $r_{+}$if, and only if, its discriminant is positive. In this case, the previous corollary applies with $R=r_{+}$ in a way similar to the case $\ell=1$.

Example 8. With $f$ as in Example 6, we may take $\ell=2, \beta=\left|f^{\prime}(0)^{-1} f(0)\right|=9 / 10, \gamma_{2}=1 / 2$, $L(r)=\nu=3 / 64$, so that $\phi_{\ell}(r)$ has positive discriminant. It follows that the Newton iterates of $x_{0}$ converge quadratically to the root $\zeta$ of $f$, where $\zeta \simeq 1.4475$.

When $\ell=2$, this corollary is sharp for polynomials of degree 3 , and we could build upon it conditions in degree 4,5 , etc. In fact using higher order Kantorovich conditions might be tempting to work for instance with low floating point precision. However computing even rough bounds on high order derivatives becomes as much expensive as the dimension of the ambient space grows up. It is therefore in general recommended to restrict to degree 2 .

### 3.3 Majorant series

In a context of analytic and meromorphic functions, it is natural to consider generating series of norms of derivatives, thus taking poles into accounts. Considering the limit of the previous case when $\ell$ tends to infinity, we obtain an other corollary:

Corollary 9. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{Y})$, and let $x_{0} \in \Omega$ be such that $D f\left(x_{0}\right)$ is invertible. We assume we are given a constant $\beta \geqslant\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$, and a sequence of constants $\gamma_{i} \geqslant\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{i} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$ for $i \geqslant 2$. We define the function $\phi_{\infty}:[0, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\phi_{\infty}(r)=\beta-r+\sum_{l \geqslant 2} \gamma_{l} \frac{r^{l}}{l!}$, assuming that this sum converges, and that $\phi_{\infty}$ admits a unique zero $r_{-} \geqslant 0$ in $[0, R)$, such that $B\left(x_{0}, R\right) \subseteq \Omega$ and $\phi_{\infty}(R) \leqslant 0$.

Then the Newton sequence $r_{0}=0, r_{k+1}=r_{k}-\frac{\phi_{\infty}\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}$ is well defined in $\left[0, r_{-}\right]$, and converges to $r_{-}$. The Newton sequence $x_{k+1}=x_{k}-D f\left(x_{k}\right)^{-1} f\left(x_{k}\right)$ is also well defined in $\bar{B}\left(x_{0}, r_{-}\right)$, and converges to the unique zero $\zeta$ of $f$ in $B\left(x_{0}, R\right)$. In addition, we have $\left\|\zeta-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant r_{-}-r_{k}$ and $\left\|x_{k+1}-x_{k}\right\| \leqslant r_{k+1}-r_{k}$.

Proof. We define $L(r)=\phi_{\infty}^{\prime \prime}(r)=\sum_{l \geqslant 2} \gamma_{l} \frac{r^{l-2}}{(l-2)!}$. By considering the Taylor expansion of $D^{2} f$ at $x_{0}$, we obtain that $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} D^{2} f(a)\right\| \leqslant L\left(\left\|a-x_{0}\right\|\right)$ holds for all $a \in B\left(x_{0}, R\right)$, so that $L$ satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 4 with $\phi(r)=\beta-r+\int_{0}^{r} L(s)(r-s) \mathrm{d} s=\phi_{\infty}(r)$.

The first case of practical interest is for when $\phi_{\infty}$ is a rational function with a numerator of degree 2 and a denominator of degree 1. We thus assume given a constant $\gamma \geqslant\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} \frac{D^{l} f\left(x_{0}\right)}{l!}\right\|^{\frac{1}{l-1}}$ for all $l \geqslant 2$, and take $\gamma_{l}=l!\gamma^{l-1}$ so that $\phi_{\infty}(r)=\beta-r+\frac{\gamma r^{2}}{1-\gamma r}=\frac{\beta-(\alpha+1) r+2 \gamma r^{2}}{1-\gamma r}$, where $\alpha=\beta \gamma$. Conditions of Corollary 9 rewrite into $R<1 / \gamma$, and $\alpha<3-2 \sqrt{2}$. This special case is known as the $\alpha$-Theorem. This case of Kantorovich theorem has the advantage to fix the parameter $R$ in terms of $\gamma$. It therefore turns out to be useful for analyzing the complexity of numerical algorithms. In practice some specific class of functions might benefit from it, such as algebraic and holonomic functions, where one might expect to rely on external machinery to compute candidate values for $\gamma$.

In terms of $\alpha, \beta$, and $\gamma$, the sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 0}$ may be computed explicitly by introducing the auxiliary sequence $t_{k}=\frac{r_{k}-r_{-}}{r_{k}-r+}$ :

$$
t_{k+1}=\frac{r_{k}-r_{-}-\frac{\phi_{\infty}\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}}{r_{k}-r_{+}-\frac{\phi_{\infty}\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}}=t_{k} \frac{\frac{\phi_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi_{\infty}\left(r_{k}\right)}-\frac{1}{r_{k}-r_{-}}}{\frac{\phi_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(r_{k}\right)}{\phi_{\infty}\left(r_{k}\right)}-\frac{1}{r_{k}-r_{+}}}=t_{k} \frac{\frac{1}{r_{k}-r_{+}}+\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma r_{k}}}{\frac{1}{r_{k}-r_{-}}+\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma_{r_{k}}}}=t_{k}^{2} \frac{1-\gamma r_{+}}{1-\gamma r_{-}} .
$$

## 4 Historical notes

Corollary 5 essentially corresponds to the first occurrence of Kantorovich's theorem in the literature, published in [38, Глава IV, p. 170], which was requiring $f \in \mathcal{C}^{2}(\Omega, \mathbb{X})$ and was using separate bounds on $\left\|D f\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1}\right\|$ and $\left\|D^{2} f\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|$. Then variants and improvements have been proposed by various authors [50, 52, 60], before being merged by Gragg and Tapia, who introduced the Lipschitzian condition of Corollary 5, and detailed the limit case $r_{-}=r_{+}$, where the quadratic convergence does not hold anymore [33]. Gragg and Tapia also provided the sharp a priori convergence bound from the explicit formula for $r_{k}$ that was borrowed from [51, Appendix F]. Our Section 3.1 is actually inspired from [33].

The extension to degree three (given as an example of Corollary 7) has been first presented in [37]. Explicit convergence bounds have then been given in [35]. Theorem 4 first appeared in [65], under assumption (3), which is shown to be equivalent to the more classical Lipschitzian condition (1) in our Lemma 2. Corollary 7 is inspired from [25, Theorem 1], which admits variants in [15, 24], that had been developed independently of [65]. In fact our Section 3.2 highlights the fact that higher order assumptions are essentially specializations of the general case handled by Theorem 4.

The $\alpha$-theorem first appeared in an article by Smale [59] with the non-optimal condition $\alpha<$ 0.130707. At the same time a one dimensional version was also designed by Kim [40, 41]. Subsequent improvements of the latter constant are due to Wang and Han [64] (see also [63]). Wang also made explicit the relationship between the $\alpha$-theorem and Kantorovich's theorem [65]. The systematic treatment in terms of majorant series emerged in [32], from which Corollary 9 is extracted. Important applications to complexity of numeric polynomial system solving started in [56, 57, 58].

Classical books for Kantorovich's theorem and historical notes are [8, 13, 23, 39, 49]. For the $\alpha$-theorem and its applications to polynomial system solving by homotopy methods, we refer the reader to [18, 21]. Let us also mention the survey [53], and the article [20] for detailled recent proofs of Kantorovich's original theorem with slight variants.

A plethora of literature is dedicated to variations of assumptions on $f$ and its derivatives: Other kinds of Lipschitzian conditions (centered, or in balls or annuli) and comparisons between them [3, $4,6,26,28,30,61,66]$; Mixed centered Lipschitzian conditions extending the $\alpha$-theorem [14]; Weak continuity of the derivative [12]; Hölder conditions [19]. Convergence rate and error bounds have been refined in [5, 47]; A posteriori bounds can be found in [54, 69, 70, 71, 72].

Finally, let us mention that Kantorovich's technique has been successfully applied and extended to other Newton-like operators in wider contexts: Robust variant [67]; Modified Newton method [22, 44]; Inexact Newton method [7, 17, 31, 34, 48, 55, 68]; Gauss-Newton method [11, 36, 42, 43]; Halley's method (extension of Newton operator to order 3) [2, 9, 16, 16, 27, 45, 46]; Extensions to differential vector fields on Riemannian manifolds [1, 10, 29, 62] (Theorem 4 is for instance extended in [1]).
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