

An elegant Multi-Integral that implies an even more elegant determinant identity of Dougherty and McCammond

Tewodros Amdeberhan and Doron Zeilberger

Communicated by Ayman Badawi

MSC 2010 Classifications: Primary 05A15, 05A05; Secondary 30C15.

Keywords and phrases: Cauchy’s alternant formula, Vandermonde and Jacobian matrices and determinants, critical values, multi-integrals, anti-symmetric functions.

We wish to thank the referee and Peter Larcombe for insightful comments on an earlier draft.

Abstract. We state and prove an explicit evaluation of a certain multi-variate integral and use it to furnish a new, and shorter, proof of an elegant determinant identity of Michael Dougherty and Jon McCammond that came up in their study of critical values of a complex polynomial.

1 Introduction

Beardon-Carne-Ng [1] investigated invertibility of the Jacobian of the polynomials

$$p(z) = \int_0^z (w - z_1) \cdots (w - z_n) dw$$

given by the n -by- n matrix

$$\mathbf{J}(z) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} p(z_j) \right)_{i,j}^{1,n}.$$

Using Topological arguments and techniques from Several Complex variables, the authors [1] show that every n -tuple of complex numbers arises as the critical values of some polynomial by proving that the determinant $\det(\mathbf{J}) \neq 0$, as long as z_1, \dots, z_n are non-zero and distinct. More recently, Dougherty and McCammond [2] computed $\det(\mathbf{J})$, explicitly, and reproved the above-mentioned result of [1] with a different method.

Some nomenclature adopted in the sequel: bold-face lower case letters are reserved for vectors, such as $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^i = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)$. Given $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, denote $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} a_{2i-1}$ where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceiling function while $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function. Let $V_n(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_j - x_i)$ be the Vandermonde determinant of the Vandermonde matrix $\mathbf{M} = (x_j^{i-1})_{i,j}^{1,n}$. We write $d\mathbf{x} = dx_1 \cdots dx_n$, the dimension n being suppressed when it is clear from the context.

2 The Main Theorem

The first purpose of this note is to prove the following elegant identity.

Theorem 2.1. Let z_1, \dots, z_n be commuting indeterminates, let n be a positive integer, and let a_1, \dots, a_n , and b be non-negative integers. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_1} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{b_i} \prod_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} (x_j - z_k)^{a_k} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_j - x_i) dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\ &= (-1)^{\bar{\mathbf{a}}} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_j - z_i)^{a_i + a_j + 1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n z_i^{a_i + b + 1} \cdot \frac{b! \prod_{i=1}^n a_i!}{(n + b + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i)!}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

3 An Example

We offer an illustrative example for Theorem 2.1. Choose $n = 2, b = 2022, a_1 = 1, a_2 = 2$. Then Eq. (1) reads

$$\int_0^{z_2} \int_0^{z_1} (x_1 x_2)^{2022} (x_1 - z_1)(x_2 - z_1)(x_1 - z_2)^2 (x_2 - z_2)^2 (x_2 - x_1) dx_1 dx_2 = \frac{-(z_2 - z_1)^4 z_1^{2024} z_2^{2025}}{17025293698597800}.$$

4 An interesting consequence

The second purpose our work here is to deduce from Theorem 2.1 (and thereby give a shorter proof) of the following even more elegant identity, discovered, and first proved in [2].

Theorem 4.1. (Dougherty and McCammond) *Let*

$$p(Z) := \int_0^Z \prod_{i=1}^n (w - z_i)^{a_i} dw,$$

and let $\mathbf{J}(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be the $n \times n$ matrix whose (i, j) -entry is $\mathbf{J}(z_1, \dots, z_n)_{i,j} := \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} p(z_j)$, then

$$\det \mathbf{J}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n a_i!}{(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i)!} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (-z_j)^{a_j} \cdot \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i, j \leq n \\ i \neq j}} (z_i - z_j)^{a_j}. \quad (2)$$

Proof that Theorem 2.1 \implies Theorem 4.1: Let's rewrite the determinant and apply *Cauchy's alternant formula* so that

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\mathbf{J}) &= \det \left(-a_i \int_0^{z_j} \prod_{k=1}^n (w - z_k)^{a_k} \frac{dw}{w - z_i} \right) = \det \left(-a_i \int_0^{z_j} \prod_{k=1}^n (x_j - z_k)^{a_k} \frac{dx_j}{x_j - z_i} \right) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n (-a_i) \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_1} \prod_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} (x_j - z_k)^{a_k} \cdot \det \left(\frac{1}{x_j - z_i} \right)_{i,j}^{1,n} dx \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n (-a_i) \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_1} \prod_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} (x_j - z_k)^{a_k} \cdot \left[\frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_i - z_j)(x_j - x_i)}{\prod_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} (x_j - z_i)} \right] dx \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n (-a_i) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_i - z_j) \cdot \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_1} \prod_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} (x_j - z_k)^{a_k - 1} \cdot V_n(\mathbf{x}) dx. \end{aligned}$$

But by Theorem 2.1, with $b = 0$ and (a_1, \dots, a_n) replaced by $(a_1 - 1, \dots, a_n - 1)$, this equals

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\mathbf{J}) &= (-1)^{\bar{\mathbf{a}} - \lceil n/2 \rceil} \prod_{i=1}^n (-a_i) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_i - z_j) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_j - z_i)^{a_i + a_j - 1} \prod_{i=1}^n z_i^{a_i} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n (a_i - 1)!}{(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i)!} \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n a_i!}{(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i)!} \prod_{i=1}^n (-z_j)^{a_j} \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i, j \leq n \\ i \neq j}} (z_i - z_j)^{a_j}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5 Proof of Theorem 2.1:

Proceed by induction on n and b . When $n = 1$ and $b = 0$, whose proof is left to the reader's five-year-old, the claim is saying $\int_0^{z_1} (x_1 - z_1)^{a_1} dx_1 = (-1)^{a_1} \frac{z_1^{a_1+1}}{a_1+1}$.

Let's denote the statement of Theorem 2.1 by $\mathbf{A}(n, b)$.

Proof that $\mathbf{A}(n, b) \implies \mathbf{A}(n, b + 1)$:

Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. We claim that *both* sides of Eq. (1), let's call them $L(\mathbf{a}; b)$ and $R(\mathbf{a}; b)$ respectively, satisfy the recurrence

$$X(\mathbf{a}; b + 1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \frac{z_j}{z_j - z_i} \right) \cdot X(a_1, \dots, 1 + a_i, \dots, a_n; b) + \left(\prod_{j=1}^n z_j \right) \cdot X(\mathbf{a}; b). \quad (3)$$

In other words, if you replace X by either L or R you get a true statement. Regarding the left-hand side of (1), in fact, this identity is already true if you replace X by the **integrand** of the left side of (1), since there are no x_i 's in sight, it is still true when you integrate with respect to x_1, \dots, x_n . We leave both checks as pleasant exercises for the curious reader. \square

Proof that $\mathbf{A}(n - 1, b)$ for all $b \implies \mathbf{A}(n, 0)$:

Fix a_1, \dots, a_n . Notations: $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $V_n(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_j - x_i)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$. Define the multi-variable polynomial

$$F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) := \prod_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} (x_j - z_k)^{a_k}.$$

We claim (check! this reduces to the Laplace expansion $V_n(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i V_{n-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i) x_i^{n-1}$) that

$$\left(n + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right) F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) V_n(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i V_{n-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - z_j) \cdot F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Applying $\int_0^{z_n} \dots \int_0^{z_1} (\dots) dx_1 \dots dx_n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(n + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right) \int_0^{z_n} \dots \int_0^{z_1} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) V_n(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i \int_0^{z_n} \dots \int_0^{z_1} V_{n-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - z_j) \cdot F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \right] \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i \int_0^{z_n} \dots \int_0^{z_{i+1}} \int_0^{z_{i-1}} \dots \int_0^{z_1} V_{n-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i) \, d\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i \times \int_0^{z_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - z_j) \cdot F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \right] \, dx_i. \end{aligned}$$

By the *Fundamental Theorem of Calculus*, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{z_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - z_j) \cdot F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \right] \, dx_i &= \prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - z_j) \cdot F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \Big|_{x_i=0}^{x_i=z_i} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - z_j)^{a_j+1} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ i' \neq i}}^n \prod_{1 \leq i' \leq n} (x_{i'} - z_j)^{a_j} \Big|_{x_i=0}^{x_i=z_i} \\ &= - \prod_{j=1}^n (-z_j)^{a_j+1} \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i' \leq n \\ i' \neq i}} (x_{i'} - z_j)^{a_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Going back, we have that the left side of Eq. (1), when $b = 0$, is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{-1}{n + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n (-z_j)^{a_j+1} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_{i+1}} \int_0^{z_{i-1}} \cdots \int_0^{z_1} V_{n-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i) \\ & \quad \times \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i' \leq n \\ i' \neq i}} (x_{i'} - z_j)^{a_j} d\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i \\ & = \frac{-1}{n + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n (-z_j)^{a_j+1} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_{i+1}} \int_0^{z_{i-1}} \cdots \int_0^{z_1} V_{n-1}(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \\ & \quad \times \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (y_i - z_j)^{a_j} dy_1 \cdots dy_{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We now claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_{i+1}} \int_0^{z_{i-1}} \cdots \int_0^{z_1} V_{n-1}(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (y_i - z_j)^{a_j} dy_1 \cdots dy_{n-1} \\ & = \int_{z_1}^{z_n} \cdots \int_{z_1}^{z_2} V_{n-1}(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (y_i - z_j)^{a_j} dy_1 \cdots dy_{n-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In order to prove this, notice that each of the integrands on the left-hand side, and the integrand on the right-hand side, are *anti-symmetric* in their arguments. Hence, for any given permutation of the integration variables, the effect is to multiple it by the sign of that permutation. Calling the common integrand $f(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$ and denoting $A_n(i) = \text{Per}(1, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, n)$, we claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} \sum_{\pi \in A_n(i)} \text{sgn}(\pi) \int_0^{z_{\pi(n)}} \cdots \int_0^{z_{\pi(i+1)}} \int_0^{z_{\pi(i-1)}} \cdots \int_0^{z_{\pi(1)}} f(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) dy_1 \cdots dy_{n-1} \\ & = \sum_{\pi \in A_n(1)} \text{sgn}(\pi) \int_{z_1}^{z_{\pi(n)}} \cdots \int_{z_1}^{z_{\pi(2)}} f(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) dy_1 \cdots dy_{n-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Since both sides of Eq. (6) are $(n-1)!$ times the respective sides of Eq. (5), if we can prove (6), then (5) would follow.

But **surprise!**, Eq. (6) is valid for *any* integrand! It is just a relation between *regions* in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} that is equivalent to an easy symmetric function identity, that we also leave as a pleasant exercise to the reader. Now make the change of variables $(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \rightarrow (y_1 - z_1, \dots, y_{n-1} - z_1)$, thereby making it a case of $\mathbf{A}(n-1, b)$ with $b = a_1$; and a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} replaced by a_2, \dots, a_n , respectively; and z_1, \dots, z_{n-1} replaced by $z_2 - z_1, \dots, z_n - z_1$, respectively. Plugging it in and simplifying, completes the induction. \square

Remark: Readers that prefer not do the ‘exercises’ can convince themselves of all the claims, empirically, by playing with the Maple package `CritVal.txt` available from the front of this paper

<https://sites.math.rutgers.edu/~zeilberg/mamarim/mamarimhtml/crit.html>

6 Appendix: proof of the "exercises"

Proof of Equation (3):

Let $\mathbf{e}_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ be the i -th unit vector. So, the recurrence (3) reads as

$$X(\mathbf{a}; b+1) = \sum_{i=1}^n X(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{e}_i; b) \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \frac{z_j}{z_j - z_i} + X(\mathbf{a}; b) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n z_i.$$

The integrand on the left-hand side of (1) satisfies this recurrence because it reduces to (check!)

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i}{z_i} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{x_i - z_i}{z_i} \right) \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \frac{x_j - z_i}{z_j - z_i}. \quad (7)$$

Induct on n . The case $n = 1$ is obvious. Let $w = x_1$ and treat (7) as a *linear* equation in w :

$$\frac{w}{z_1} \cdot \prod_{i=2}^n \frac{x_i}{z_i} = 1 + \frac{w - z_1}{z_1} \prod_{j=2}^n \frac{x_j - z_1}{z_j - z_1} + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{x_i - z_i}{z_i} \cdot \frac{w - z_i}{z_1 - z_i} \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n \frac{x_j - z_i}{z_j - z_i}.$$

If $w = z_1$, equality holds by the induction assumption. Putting $w = 0$, turns the task into

$$\prod_{i=2}^n \frac{x_i - z_1}{z_i - z_1} = 1 + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{x_i - z_i}{z_i - z_1} \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n \frac{x_j - z_i}{z_j - z_i}$$

which is *again* the inductive step with $x_i \rightarrow x_i - z_1$ and $z_i \rightarrow z_i - z_1$. So, the first claim holds. Now, we focus on the right-hand side of (1) and show it, too, fulfils (3). This tantamount

$$\frac{1+b}{n+b+1 + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{\delta_i} \frac{1+a_i}{n+b+1 + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i} \cdot (-1)^{i-1}$$

where $\delta_i = 1$ if i is odd; $\delta_i = 0$, otherwise. The justification is immediate. \square

Proof of Equation (4):

After computing the derivatives and cancelling out the term $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, the claim boils down to

$$\begin{aligned} \left(n + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right) V_n(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i V_{n-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n (1+a_j) \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^n (x_i - z_k) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n (1+a_j) \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i V_{n-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i) \cdot \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^n (x_i - z_k). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

If we consider the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i V_{n-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i) \cdot x_i^m$, it is recognized as the determinant of the Vandermonde matrix \mathbf{M} where the last row is replaced by the vector (x_1^m, \dots, x_n^m) . This, however, is well-known to be $V_n(\mathbf{x}) \cdot s_{m-n+1}$ where s_μ is the *Schur polynomial*. Notice that $\prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^n (x_i - z_k)$ is a polynomial of degree $n-1$, in x_i . But, $s_{m-n+1} = 1$ if $m = n-1$; and $s_{m-n+1} = 0$ for $m < n-1$. Thus, equation (8) becomes trivial $(n + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i) V_n(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^n (1+a_j) V_n(\mathbf{x})$. \square

Proof of Equation (5):

Eq. (5) has been elucidated, neatly, using a symmetrizing process as depicted by Eq. (6). Here, we offer yet another verification. To this end, start with the right-hand side of Eq. (5) by replacing each integral with $\int_{z_1}^{z_i} = \int_0^{z_i} - \int_0^{z_1}$ and expand the product $(\int_0^{z_n} - \int_0^{z_1}) \cdots (\int_0^{z_2} - \int_0^{z_1})$. Based on the fact that the integrand is an anti-symmetric, any multi-integral involving repeated evaluation $\int_0^{z_1} \int_0^{z_1}$ vanishes while out-of-order pairs, such as $\int_0^{z_3} \int_0^{z_1} \int_0^{z_2}$, changes sign where *reordered*, that is, $-\int_0^{z_3} \int_0^{z_2} \int_0^{z_1}$. On account of this, we find the $(n-1)$ -tuple multi-integrals

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{z_1}^{z_n} \cdots \int_{z_1}^{z_2} &= \left(\int_0^{z_n} - \int_0^{z_1} \right) \cdots \left(\int_0^{z_2} - \int_0^{z_1} \right) \\ &= \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_1} - \sum_{i=2}^n \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_{i-1}} \int_0^{z_1} \int_0^{z_{i+1}} \cdots \int_0^{z_2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} \int_0^{z_n} \cdots \int_0^{z_{i-1}} \int_0^{z_{i+1}} \cdots \int_0^{z_1}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows. \square

References

- [1] A. F. Beardon, T. K. Carne, T. W. Ng, The critical values of a polynomial *Constr. Approx.*, **18** #3 343-354 (2002).
- [2] M. Dougherty, J. M. McCammond, Critical points, critical values, and a determinant identity for complex polynomials, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **148** 5722-5280 (2020).

Author information

Tewodros Amdeberhan, Department of Mathematics, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, 70118, USA.
E-mail: tamdeber@tulane.edu

Doron Zeilberger, Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University (New Brunswick), Hill Center - Busch Campus, 110 Frelinghuysen Rd., Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019, USA.
E-mail: DoronZeil@gmail.com

Received: January 15, 2022.

Accepted: February 4, 2022