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#### Abstract

We present a global version of the Łojasiewicz inequality on comparing the rate of growth of two polynomial functions in the case the mapping defined by these functions is (Newton) non-degenerate at infinity. In addition, we show that the condition of non-degeneracy at infinity is generic in the sense that it holds in an open dense semi-algebraic set of the entire space of input data.


## 1. Introduction

Let $K$ be a compact semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ and let $g, h: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous semialgebraic functions such that the zero set of $g$ is contained in the zero set of $h$. Then the information concerning the rate of growth of $g$ and $h$ is given by the following Eojasiewicz inequality: there exist constants $c>0$ and $\alpha>0$ such that for any $x \in K$, we have

$$
|g(x)|^{\alpha} \geq c|h(x)| .
$$

Note that if $K$ is not compact, the Łojasiewicz inequality does not always hold (see Example 3.1 below). Recently, several versions of the Łojasiewicz inequality have been studied for a special case where $h$ is the distance function to the zero set of $g$, see [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 25, 26. However, the study of the Łojasiewicz inequality on comparing the rate of growth of two arbitrary semi-algebraic functions on non-compact semi-algebraic sets is barely developed (cf. [33]).

We would like to point out that the Łojasiewicz inequality and its variants play an important role in many branches of mathematics. For example, Łojasiewicz inequalities are very useful in the study of continuous regular functions, a branch of Algebraic Geometry, which has been actively developed recently, see [20, 30] for pioneering works and [31] for a survey. Also, Łojasiewicz inequalities, together with Nullstellensätz, are crucial tools for the study of the ring of (bounded) continuous semi-algebraic functions on a semi-algebraic set, see [17, 18, 19.

The purpose of this work is to show that for almost all pairs of polynomial functions, a variant of the Łojasiewicz inequality holds on the entire space. Namely, with the definitions given in Section 2, the following statements hold.

[^0]Theorem 1.1. Let $(g, h): \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2}$ be a polynomial mapping, which is non-degenerate at infinity. If $g$ is convenient and $g^{-1}(0) \subset h^{-1}(0)$, then there exist some constants $c>0, \alpha>0$, and $\beta>0$ such that

$$
|g(x)|^{\alpha}+|g(x)|^{\beta} \quad \geq c|h(x)| \quad \text { for all } \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}
$$

Theorem 1.2. In the space of polynomial mappings from $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{p}(n \geq p)$ with fixed Newton polyhedra, the set of polynomial mappings, which are non-degenerate at infinity, forms an open dense semi-algebraic subset.

Note that unlike the case where $h$ is the distance function to the zero set of $g$ (see [9, 11, 14, [15, [26]), estimating the exponents $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in Theorem 1.1 is still a delicate problem.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some preliminary results from Semialgebraic Geometry; the condition of non-degeneracy at infinity and the Ekeland variational principle will be also given there. Section 3 proves the existence of the global Łojasiewicz-type inequality for polynomial mappings which are non-degenerate at infinity. Finally, in Section 4 , it is shown that the property of being non-degenerate at infinity is generic.

## 2. Preliminaries

We begin by giving some necessary definitions and notational conventions. Let $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ denote the Euclidean space of dimension $n$ and $\mathbb{R}^{*}:=\mathbb{R} \backslash\{0\}$. The corresponding inner product (resp., norm) in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is defined by $\langle x, y\rangle$ for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ (resp., $\|x\|:=\sqrt{\langle x, x\rangle}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ ). The closure, the convex hull and the cardinality of a set $A$ is denoted by $\bar{A}, \operatorname{conv}(A)$ and $\# A$ respectively.
2.1. Semi-algebraic geometry. In this subsection, we recall some notions and results of semi-algebraic geometry, which can be found in [1, 2, 3, 5, 36].

Definition 2.1. (i) A subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is semi-algebraic if it is a finite union of sets of the form

$$
\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}: f_{i}(x)=0, i=1, \ldots, k ; f_{i}(x)>0, i=k+1, \ldots, p\right\}
$$

where all $f_{i}$ are polynomials.
(ii) A mapping $F: A \rightarrow B$ is semi-algebraic if its graph

$$
\{(x, y) \in A \times B: y=F(x)\}
$$

is a semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{p}$.
A major fact concerning the class of semi-algebraic sets is the following Tarski-Seidenberg Theorem.

Theorem 2.1. The image of a semi-algebraic set by a semi-algebraic mapping is semi-algebraic.
The following well-known lemmas will be of great importance for us.

Lemma 2.1 (Curve Selection Lemma). Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a semi-algebraic set and $x^{*} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a non-isolated point of $\bar{A}$. Then there exists a non-constant analytic semi-algebraic mapping $\varphi:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\varphi(0)=x^{*}$ and with $\varphi(t) \in A$ for $t \in(0, \epsilon)$.

Lemma 2.2 (Curve Selection Lemma at infinity). Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a semi-algebraic set, and let $f:=\left(f_{1}, \ldots, f_{p}\right): \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p}$ be a semi-algebraic mapping. Assume that there exists a sequence $\left\{x^{\ell}\right\}$ such that $x^{\ell} \in A, \lim _{l \rightarrow \infty}\left\|x^{\ell}\right\|=\infty$ and $\lim _{l \rightarrow \infty} f\left(x^{\ell}\right)=y \in(\overline{\mathbb{R}})^{p}$, where $\overline{\mathbb{R}}:=\mathbb{R} \cup\{ \pm \infty\}$. Then there exists an analytic semi-algebraic mapping $\varphi:(0, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that $\varphi(t) \in A$ for all $t \in(0, \epsilon), \lim _{t \rightarrow 0}\|\varphi(t)\|=\infty$, and $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0} f(\varphi(t))=y$.

Lemma 2.3 (Growth Dichotomy Lemma). Let $f:(0, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a semi-algebraic function with $f(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \in(0, \epsilon)$. Then there exist constants $c \neq 0$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $f(t)=c t^{q}+o\left(t^{q}\right)$ as $t \rightarrow 0^{+}$.
2.2. The (semi-algebraic) transversality theorem with parameters. Let $P, X$ and $Y$ be $C^{\infty}$ manifolds of finite dimension, $S$ be a $C^{\infty}$ sub-manifold of $Y$, and $F: X \rightarrow Y$ be a $C^{\infty}$ mapping. Denote by $d_{x} F: T_{x} X \rightarrow T_{F(x)} Y$, the differential of $F$ at $x$, where $T_{x} X$ and $T_{F(x)} Y$ are, respectively, the tangent space of $X$ at $x$ and the tangent space of $Y$ at $F(x)$.

Definition 2.2. The mapping $F$ is transverse to the sub-manifold $S$, abbreviated by $F \pitchfork S$, if either $F(X) \cap S=\emptyset$ or for each $x \in F^{-1}(S)$, we have

$$
d_{x} F\left(T_{x} X\right)+T_{F(x)} S=T_{F(x)} Y
$$

Remark 2.1. If $\operatorname{dim} X \geq \operatorname{dim} Y$ and $S=\{s\}$, then $F \pitchfork S$ if and only if either $F^{-1}(s)=\emptyset$ or $\operatorname{rank} d_{x} F=\operatorname{dim} Y$ for all $x \in F^{-1}(s)$. In the case $\operatorname{dim} X<\operatorname{dim} Y$, then $F \pitchfork S$ if and only if $F^{-1}(S)=\emptyset$.

The following result will be useful in the study of the genericity of the condition of nondegeneracy at infinity.

Theorem 2.2 (Transversality Theorem with parameters). Let $F: P \times X \rightarrow Y$ be a $C^{\infty}$ semialgebraic mapping. For each $p \in P$, consider the mapping $F_{p}: X \rightarrow Y$ defined by $F_{p}(x):=$ $F(p, x)$. If $F \pitchfork S$, then the set

$$
Q:=\left\{p \in P: F_{p} \pitchfork S\right\}
$$

contains an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $P$.
Proof. It is well-known that the set $Q$ is dense in $P$ (see, for example, [23, Theorem 1.3.6] or [24, The Transversality Theorem, page 68]). On the other hand, $Q$ is semi-algebraic (by Theorem 2.1). Since every dense semi-algebraic set in $P$ contains an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $P$, the desired statement follows.
2.3. Newton polyhedra and non-degeneracy conditions. Given a nonempty set $J \subset$ $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, we define

$$
\mathbb{R}^{J}:=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}: x_{j}=0, \text { for all } j \notin J\right\}
$$

We denote by $\mathbb{Z}_{+}$and $\mathbb{R}_{+}$, respectively, the set of non-negative integers and the set of nonnegative real numbers. If $\kappa=\left(\kappa_{1}, \ldots, \kappa_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{n}$, we denote by $x^{\kappa}$ the monomial $x_{1}^{\kappa_{1}} \cdots x_{n}^{\kappa_{n}}$. Denote by $\left\{e^{1}, \ldots, e^{n}\right\}$ the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$.
2.3.1. Newton polyhedra. A subset $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ is a Newton polyhedron if there exists a finite subset $S \subset \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{n}$ such that $\Gamma$ is the convex hull in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ of $S$. We say that $\Gamma$ is the Newton polyhedron determined by $S$ and write $\Gamma=\Gamma(S)$. A Newton polyhedron $\Gamma$ is convenient if it intersects each coordinate axis at a point different from the origin 0 in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, that is, if for any $j \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ there exists some $\kappa_{j}>0$ such that $\kappa_{j} e^{j} \in \Gamma$.

Given a Newton polyhedron $\Gamma$ and a vector $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
d(q, \Gamma) & :=\min \{\langle q, \kappa\rangle: \kappa \in \Gamma\} \\
\Delta(q, \Gamma) & :=\{\kappa \in \Gamma:\langle q, \kappa\rangle=d(q, \Gamma)\}
\end{aligned}
$$

By definition, for each nonzero vector $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, \Delta(q, \Gamma)$ is a closed face of $\Gamma$. Conversely, if $\Delta$ is a closed face of $\Gamma$, then there exists a nonzero vector $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that $\Delta=\Delta(q, \Gamma)$, where we can in fact assume that $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{n}$ since $\Gamma$ is an integer polyhedron. The dimension of a face $\Delta$ is the minimum of the dimensions of the affine subspaces containing $\Delta$. The faces of $\Gamma$ of dimension 0 are the vertices of $\Gamma$.

Let $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial function. Suppose that $f$ is written as $f=\sum_{\kappa} c_{\kappa} x^{\kappa}$. The support of $f$, denoted by $\operatorname{supp}(f)$, is the set of $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{n}$ such that $c_{\kappa} \neq 0$. The Newton polyhedron (at infinity) of $f$, denoted by $\Gamma(f)$, is the convex hull in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ of the set $\operatorname{supp}(f)$, i.e., $\Gamma(f)=\Gamma(\operatorname{supp}(f))$. The polynomial $f$ is convenient if $\Gamma(f)$ is convenient. For each (closed) face $\Delta$ of $\Gamma(f)$, we will denote

$$
f_{\Delta}(x):=\sum_{\kappa \in \Delta} c_{\kappa} x^{\kappa} .
$$

Remark 2.2. The following statements follow immediately from definitions:
(i) We have $\Gamma(f) \cap \mathbb{R}^{J}=\Gamma\left(\left.f\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}\right)$ for all nonempty subset $J$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$.
(ii) Let $\Delta:=\Delta(q, \Gamma(f))$ for some nonzero vector $q:=\left(q_{1}, \ldots, q_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$. By definition, $f_{\Delta}(x)$ is a weighted homogeneous polynomial of type $(q, d:=d(q, \Gamma(f)))$, i.e., we have for all $t>0$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$,

$$
f_{\Delta}\left(t^{q_{1}} x_{1}, \ldots, t^{q_{n}} x_{n}\right)=t^{d} f_{\Delta}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) .
$$

This implies the Euler relation

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{j} x_{j} \frac{\partial f_{\Delta}}{\partial x_{j}}(x)=d \cdot f_{\Delta}(x)
$$

In particular, if $d \neq 0$ and $\nabla f_{\Delta}(x)=0$, then $f_{\Delta}(x)=0$.
2.3.2. Non-degeneracy conditions. In [28] (see also [29]), Khovanskii introduced a condition of non-degeneracy for complex analytic mappings $F:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{p}, 0\right)$ in terms of the Newton polyhedra of the component functions of $F$. This notion has been applied extensively to the study of isolated complete intersection singularities (see for instance [4, 8, 22, 35]). We will use this condition for real polynomial mappings. First we need to introduce some notation.

Definition 2.3. Let $F:=\left(f_{1}, \ldots, f_{p}\right): \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p}, 1 \leq p \leq n$, be a polynomial mapping.
(i) The mapping $F$ is Khovanskii non-degenerate at infinity if for any vector $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $d\left(q, \Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)\right)<0$ for $i=1, \ldots, p$, the system of gradient vectors $\nabla f_{i, \Delta_{i}}(x)$, for $i=1, \ldots, p$, is $\mathbb{R}$-linearly independent on the set

$$
\left\{x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}: f_{i, \Delta_{i}}(x)=0 \text { for } i=1, \ldots, p\right\}
$$

where $\Delta_{i}:=\Delta\left(q, \Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)\right)$.
(ii) The mapping $F$ is non-degenerate at infinity if for each $k$-tuple $\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{k}\right)$ of integers with $1 \leq i_{1}<\cdots<i_{k} \leq p$, the polynomial mapping

$$
\mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k}, x \mapsto\left(f_{i_{1}}(x), \ldots, f_{i_{k}}(x)\right)
$$

is Khovanskii non-degenerate at infinity.
Remark 2.3. By definition, the mapping $F$ is Khovanskii non-degenerate at infinity if and only if for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $d\left(q, \Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)\right)<0$ for $i=1, \ldots, p$ and for all $x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}$ with $f_{i, \Delta_{i}}(x)=0$ for $i=1, \ldots, p$ we have

$$
\operatorname{rank}\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
x_{1} \frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{1}}(x) & \cdots & x_{n} \frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{n}}(x) \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\
x_{1} \frac{\partial f_{p, \Delta_{p}}}{\partial x_{1}}(x) & \cdots & x_{n} \frac{\partial f_{p, \Delta_{p}}}{\partial x_{n}}(x)
\end{array}\right)=p
$$

The mapping $F$ is non-degenerate at infinity if and only if for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $d\left(q, \Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)\right)<0$ for $i=1, \ldots, p$, and for all $x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{rank}\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
x_{1} \frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{1}}(x) & \cdots & x_{n} \frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{n}}(x) & f_{1, \Delta_{1}}(x) & & \mathbf{0} \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \\
x_{1} \frac{\partial f_{p, \Delta_{p}}}{\partial x_{1}}(x) & \cdots & x_{n} \frac{\partial f_{p, \Delta_{p}}}{\partial x_{n}}(x) & \mathbf{0} & & f_{p, \Delta_{p}}(x)
\end{array}\right)=p
$$

2.4. Ekeland's variational principle. We recall the Ekeland variational principle which is important for our arguments in the following.

Theorem 2.3. [16, Ekeland's Variational Principle] Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a closed set, and $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, bounded from below. Let $\epsilon>0$ and $x^{0} \in X$ be such that

$$
\inf _{x \in X} f(x) \leq f\left(x^{0}\right) \leq \inf _{x \in X} f(x)+\epsilon
$$

Then for any $\lambda>0$, there exists some point $y^{0} \in X$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f\left(y^{0}\right) \leq f\left(x^{0}\right) \\
& \left\|y^{0}-x^{0}\right\| \leq \lambda \\
& f\left(y^{0}\right) \leq f(x)+\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}\left\|x-y^{0}\right\| \quad \text { for all } \quad x \in X
\end{aligned}
$$

## 3. ŁoJASIEWICZ INEQUALITIES

The main purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 1.1, which gives a global Łojasiewicz inequality on comparing the rate of growth of two polynomial functions. Note that we do not suppose the polynomial $h$ to be convenient. On the other hand, the assumption that the polynomial $g$ is convenient cannot be dropped. This is shown in the following example.

Example 3.1. Consider the polynomial mapping

$$
(g, h): \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2}, \quad\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \mapsto\left(\left(x_{1}^{2}-1\right)^{2}+\left(x_{1} x_{2}-1\right)^{2},\left(x_{1}^{2}-1\right)^{2}+\left(x_{2}^{2}-1\right)^{2}\right)
$$

Clearly, $(g, h)$ is non-degenerate at infinity, $g$ is not convenient (see Figure 1), and

$$
g^{-1}(0) \subset h^{-1}(0)
$$




Figure 1. The Newton polyhedra of $g$ and $h$ in Example 3.1.
Furthermore, we have

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} g\left(\frac{1}{k}, k\right)=1 \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} h\left(\frac{1}{k}, k\right)=+\infty
$$

and so there are no constants $c>0, \alpha>0$, and $\beta>0$ such that

$$
|g(x)|^{\alpha}+|g(x)|^{\beta} \geq c|h(x)| \quad \text { for all } \quad x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}
$$

The following simple example shows that the exponents $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in Theorem 1.1 are different in general.

Example 3.2. Consider the polynomial mapping

$$
(g, h): \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2}, \quad\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \mapsto\left(x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{4}, x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}\right)
$$

Clearly, $(g, h)$ is non-degenerate at infinity, $g$ is convenient, and $g^{-1}(0) \subset h^{-1}(0)$. Furthermore, it is not hard to see that there are no constants $c>0$ and $\alpha>0$ such that

$$
|g(x)|^{\alpha} \geq c|h(x)| \quad \text { for all } \quad x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}
$$

On the other hand, it holds that

$$
|g(x)|^{\frac{1}{2}}+|g(x)| \geq|h(x)| \quad \text { for all } \quad x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{2} .
$$

To prove Theorem [1.1, we first need the following definition.
Definition 3.1. Given a polynomial function $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a smooth semi-algebraic manifold $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ we let

$$
\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.f\right|_{X}\right):=\left\{t \in \mathbb{R}:\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\exists\left\{x^{k}\right\} \subset X, \text { s.t. }\left\|x^{k}\right\| \rightarrow+\infty, f\left(x^{k}\right) \rightarrow t, \\
\text { and }\left\|\nabla\left(\left.f\right|_{X}\right)\left(x^{k}\right)\right\| \rightarrow 0
\end{array}\right\} .\right.
$$

We also set

$$
K_{0}\left(\left.f\right|_{X}\right):=\left\{t \in \mathbb{R}: \exists x \in X \text { with } f(x)=t \text { and } \nabla\left(\left.f\right|_{X}\right)(x)=0\right\}
$$

which is the set of critical values of the restriction $\left.f\right|_{X}$. Note that, by the semi-algebraic Sard Theorem (see [27, Theorem 1.9] and [32]), $K_{0}\left(\left.f\right|_{X}\right)$ is a finite subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

If $X=\mathbb{R}^{n}$, we write $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}(f)$ and $K_{0}(f)$ instead of $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.f\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\right)$ and $K_{0}\left(\left.f\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\right)$, respectively.
Lemma 3.1. Let $g: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial function, which is non-degenerate at infinity and convenient, then $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}(g)=\emptyset$.

Proof. The result can be found in [11, Theorem 1]. For the sake of completeness, we include the proof below. By contradiction, suppose that there exist a sequence $\left\{x^{k}\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and a value $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|x^{k}\right\|=\infty, \quad \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} g\left(x^{k}\right)=y, \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\nabla g\left(x^{k}\right)\right\|=0
$$

By Lemma 2.2, there exists an analytic mapping $\varphi:(0, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}, t \mapsto\left(\varphi_{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi_{n}(t)\right)$, such that
(a1) $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0}\|\varphi(t)\|=\infty$;
(a2) $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0} g(\varphi(t))=y$; and
(a3) $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0}\|\nabla g(\varphi(t))\|=0$.
Let $J:=\left\{j: \varphi_{j} \not \equiv 0\right\}$. By Condition (a1), $J \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.3, for each $j \in J$, we expand the coordinate functions $\varphi_{j}$ as follows

$$
\varphi_{j}(t)=x_{j}^{0} t^{q_{j}}+o\left(t^{q_{j}}\right)
$$

where $x_{j}^{0} \neq 0$ and $q_{j} \in \mathbb{Q}$. From Condition (a1), we get $\min _{j \in J} q_{j}<0$.

Let $q:=\left(q_{1}, \ldots, q_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, where $q_{j}:=M$ for $j \notin J$ with $M$ being sufficiently large and satisfying

$$
M>\max \left\{\sum_{j \in J} q_{j} \kappa_{j}: \kappa \in \Gamma(g)\right\}
$$

Let $d$ be the minimal value of the linear function $\sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{j} \kappa_{j}$ on $\Gamma(g)$ and let $\Delta$ be the maximal face of $\Gamma(g)$ (maximal with respect to the inclusion of faces) where the linear function takes this value, i.e.,

$$
d:=d(q, \Gamma(g)) \quad \text { and } \quad \Delta:=\Delta(q, \Gamma(g)) .
$$

Recall that $\mathbb{R}^{J}:=\left\{x:=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}: x_{j}=0\right.$ for $\left.j \notin J\right\}$. Since $g$ is convenient, the restriction $\left.g\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}$ is not constant, $\Gamma(g) \cap \mathbb{R}^{J}=\Gamma\left(\left.g\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}\right)$ is nonempty and different from $\{0\}$. Furthermore, by definition of the vector $q$, one has

$$
d=d\left(q, \Gamma\left(\left.g\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}\right)\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \Delta=\Delta\left(q, \Gamma\left(\left.g\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}\right)\right) \subset \mathbb{R}^{J}
$$

A direct calculation shows that

$$
g(\varphi(t))=g_{\Delta}\left(x^{0}\right) t^{d}+o\left(t^{d}\right)
$$

where $x^{0}:=\left(x_{1}^{0}, \ldots, x_{n}^{0}\right)$ with $x_{j}^{0}:=1$ for $j \notin J$ (note that, for $j \notin J$, as $g_{\Delta}$ does not depend on the variable $x_{j}$, we can choose $x_{j}^{0}$ arbitrarily). Since $g$ is convenient, for each $j=1, \ldots, n$, there exists a natural number $m_{j} \geq 1$ such that $m_{j} e^{j} \in \Gamma(g)$. Let $j_{*} \in J$ be such that $q_{j_{*}}:=\min _{j \in J} q_{j}$. As $q_{j_{*}}<0$, it is clear that

$$
d \leq q_{j_{*}} m_{j_{*}} \leq q_{j_{*}}<0
$$

Now, by Condition (a2), we have $g_{\Delta}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$.
On the other hand, for $j \in J$, we have

$$
\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_{j}}(\varphi(t))=\frac{\partial g_{\Delta}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right) t^{d-q_{j}}+o\left(t^{d-q_{j}}\right)
$$

Since $d \leq \min _{j \in J} q_{j}$, it follows from (a3) that $\frac{\partial g_{\Delta}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$ for all $j \in J$. So this, together with $g_{\Delta}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$, implies that $g$ is not Khovanskii non-degenerate at infinity, which contradicts our assumption.

Lemma 3.2. Let $(g, h): \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2}$ be a polynomial mapping, which is non-degenerate at infinity. If $g$ is convenient, then $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h=r\}}\right)=\emptyset$ for $0<|r| \ll 1$ and for $|r| \gg 1$.

Proof. For simplicity of notation, we write $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ instead of $g$ and $h$, respectively. We will show that $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.f_{1}\right|_{\left\{f_{2}=r\right\}}\right)=\emptyset$ for $0<|r| \ll 1$ and for $|r| \gg 1$.

For $0<|r| \ll 1$ or $|r| \gg 1$, in view of the semi-algebraic Sard Theorem, we can make the following assumptions without loss of generality:
(i) $r \notin K_{0}\left(f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\right)$ for any face $\Delta_{2}$ of $\Gamma\left(f_{2}\right)$;
(ii) If the set $X:=\left\{x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}: f_{1, \Delta_{1}}(x)=0, \nabla f_{1, \Delta_{1}}(x) \neq 0\right\}$ is not empty for some face $\Delta_{1}$ of $\Gamma\left(f_{1}\right)$, then $r \notin K_{0}\left(\left.f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\right|_{X}\right)$ for any face $\Delta_{2}$ of $\Gamma\left(f_{2}\right)$. (Clearly, if $X$ is not empty, then it a semi-algebraic smooth hypersurface.)
By contradiction, suppose that $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.f_{1}\right|_{\left\{f_{2}=r\right\}}\right) \neq \emptyset$ for some $0<|r| \ll 1$ or $|r| \gg 1$, i.e., there exist a sequence $\left\{x^{k}\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and a value $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|x^{k}\right\|=\infty, \quad \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} f_{1}\left(x^{k}\right)=y, \quad f_{2}\left(x^{k}\right)=r, \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\nabla\left(\left.f_{1}\right|_{\left\{f_{2}=r\right\}}\right)\left(x^{k}\right)\right\|=0
$$

By definition, there exists a sequence $\lambda^{k} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $k \geq 1$, we have

$$
\nabla\left(\left.f_{1}\right|_{\left\{f_{2}=r\right\}}\right)\left(x^{k}\right)=\nabla f_{1}\left(x^{k}\right)-\lambda^{k} \nabla f_{2}\left(x^{k}\right)
$$

By Lemma 2.2, there exist an analytic mapping $\varphi(t):=\left(\varphi_{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi_{n}(t)\right)$ and an analytic function $\lambda(t)$ with $0<t \ll 1$ such that
(b1) $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0}\|\varphi(t)\|=\infty$;
(b2) $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0} f_{1}(\varphi(t))=y$;
(b3) $f_{2}(\varphi(t))=r$; and
(b4) $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0}\left\|\nabla f_{1}(\varphi(t))-\lambda(t) \nabla f_{2}(\varphi(t))\right\|=0$.
Let $J:=\left\{j: \varphi_{j} \not \equiv 0\right\} \neq \emptyset$ and for each $j \in J$, expand $\varphi_{j}$ as follows

$$
\varphi_{j}(t)=x_{j}^{0} t^{q_{j}}+o\left(t^{q_{j}}\right)
$$

where $x_{j}^{0} \neq 0$ and $q_{j} \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let $q:=\left(q_{1}, \ldots, q_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, where $q_{j}:=M$ for $j \notin J$ with $M$ being sufficiently large and satisfying

$$
M>\max _{i=1,2}\left\{\sum_{j \in J} q_{j} \kappa_{j}: \kappa \in \Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)\right\} .
$$

For each $i=1,2$, let $d_{i}$ be the minimal value of the linear function $\sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{j} \kappa_{j}$ on $\Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)$ and let $\Delta_{i}$ be the maximal face of $\Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)$ (maximal with respect to the inclusion of faces) where the linear function takes this value, i.e.,

$$
d_{i}:=d\left(q, \Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \Delta_{i}:=\Delta\left(q, \Gamma\left(f_{i}\right)\right) .
$$

Since $f_{1}$ is convenient, the restriction $\left.f_{1}\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}$ is not constant. Furthermore, the restriction $\left.f_{2}\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}$ is not constant. If this is not the case, then it follows from (b4) that

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x_{j}}(\varphi(t))=0 \quad \text { for all } \quad j \in J
$$

Replacing $f_{1}$ by the restriction $\left.f_{1}\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}$ and repeating the previous arguments, we see that $f_{1}$ is not Khovanskii non-degenerate at infinity. Then, the polynomial mapping $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ is not non-degenerate at infinity, which contradicts our assumption.

Therefore, the restriction of $f_{i}, i=1,2$, on $\mathbb{R}^{J}$ is not constant, and so $\Gamma\left(f_{i}\right) \cap \mathbb{R}^{J}=\Gamma\left(\left.f_{i}\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}\right)$ is nonempty and different from $\{0\}$. Furthermore, by definition of the vector $q$, one has

$$
d_{i}=d\left(q, \Gamma\left(\left.f_{i}\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}\right)\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \Delta_{i}=\Delta\left(q, \Gamma\left(\left.f_{i}\right|_{\mathbb{R}^{J}}\right)\right) \subset \mathbb{R}^{J}
$$

Similarly to what was done in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we obtain $d_{1} \leq q_{j_{*}}:=\min _{j \in J} q_{j}<0$ and $f_{1, \Delta_{1}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$, where $x^{0}:=\left(x_{1}^{0}, \ldots, x_{n}^{0}\right)$ with $x_{j}^{0}:=1$ for $j \notin J$. As $f_{1, \Delta_{1}}$ and $f_{2, \Delta_{2}}$ do not depend on the variable $x_{j}$ for all $j \notin J$, we have

$$
\frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)=\frac{\partial f_{2, \Delta_{2}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0 \text { for } j \notin J
$$

Note that $\lambda(t) \not \equiv 0$, since otherwise $y \in \widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(f_{1}\right)=\emptyset$, a contradiction. Hence, we can expand the coordinate $\lambda(t)$ in terms of $t$ as

$$
\lambda(t)=\lambda^{0} t^{\theta}+o\left(t^{\theta}\right)
$$

where $\lambda^{0} \neq 0$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}$. There are three cases to be considered.
Case 1: $d_{1}<d_{2}+\theta$. For each $j \in J$, we have

$$
\frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x_{j}}(\varphi(t))-\lambda(t) \frac{\partial f_{2}}{\partial x_{j}}(\varphi(t))=\frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right) t^{d_{1}-q_{j}}+o\left(t^{d_{1}-q_{j}}\right) .
$$

Since $d_{1} \leq q_{j_{*}}$, in view of (b4), we have $\frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$ for all $j \in J$. As $f_{1, \Delta_{1}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$, it implies that $f_{1}$ is not Khovanskii non-degenerate at infinity, which contradicts our assumption.

Case 2: $d_{1}>d_{2}+\theta$. For each $j \in J$, we have

$$
\frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x_{j}}(\varphi(t))-\lambda(t) \frac{\partial f_{2}}{\partial x_{j}}(\varphi(t))=-\lambda^{0} \frac{\partial f_{2, \Delta_{2}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right) t^{d_{2}+\theta-q_{j}}+o\left(t^{d_{2}+\theta-q_{j}}\right)
$$

From $d_{2}+\theta<d_{1} \leq q_{j_{*}}$ and (b4), we get $\frac{\partial f_{2} \Delta_{2}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$ for all $j \in J$. On the other hand, a simple calculation shows that

$$
f_{2}(\varphi(t))=f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\left(x^{0}\right) t^{d_{2}}+o\left(t^{d_{2}}\right)
$$

If $d_{2}<0$, then it follows from (b3) that $f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$ and so $f_{2}$ is not Khovanskii nondegenerate at infinity, which contradicts our assumption. If $d_{2}=0$, we have $f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\left(x^{0}\right)=r$ and so $r \in K_{0}\left(f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\right)$, a contradiction. Finally, if $d_{2}>0$, then $r=0$, which contradicts the assumption $|r|>0$.

Case 3: $d_{1}=d_{2}+\theta$. For each $j \in J$, we have

$$
\frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x_{j}}(\varphi(t))-\lambda(t) \frac{\partial f_{2}}{\partial x_{j}}(\varphi(t))=\left(\frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)-\lambda^{0} \frac{\partial f_{2, \Delta_{2}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)\right) t^{d_{1}-q_{j}}+o\left(t^{d_{1}-q_{j}}\right) .
$$

Since $d_{1} \leq \min _{j \in J} q_{j}<0$, it follows from (b4) that

$$
\frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)-\lambda^{0} \frac{\partial f_{2, \Delta_{2}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0 \quad \text { for all } \quad j \in J .
$$

Observe that $\frac{\partial f_{1, \Delta_{1}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}\right) \neq 0$ for some $j \in J$ since otherwise, we get a contradiction by repeating the arguments in Case 1. Hence the set

$$
X:=\left\{x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}: f_{1, \Delta_{1}}(x)=0, \nabla f_{1, \Delta_{1}}(x) \neq 0\right\}
$$

is a nonempty semi-algebraic smooth manifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Moreover, $x^{0}$ is a critical point of $\left.f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\right|_{X}$. Finally, by a similar argument as Case 2, we can see that either $d_{2}<0$ and $f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\left(x^{0}\right)=0$ which contradicts the assumption that the polynomial mapping $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ is Khovanskii non-degenerate at infinity, or $d_{2}=0$ and $f_{2, \Delta_{2}}\left(x^{0}\right)=r$ which contradicts the assumption $r \notin K_{0}\left(f_{2, \Delta_{2}} \mid X\right)$, or $d_{2}>0$ and $r=0$, which contradicts the assumption $|r|>0$.

The following definition is inspired by [10, Definition 3.1].
Definition 3.2. Let $g, h: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be polynomial functions. A sequence $\left\{x^{k}\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\left\|x^{k}\right\| \rightarrow+\infty$ is said to be
(i) a sequence of the first type if $g\left(x^{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$ and $\left|h\left(x^{k}\right)\right| \geq \delta$ for some $\delta>0$;
(ii) a sequence of the second type if the sequence $\left\{g\left(x^{k}\right)\right\}$ is bounded and $\left|h\left(x^{k}\right)\right| \rightarrow+\infty$.

Lemma 3.3. Let $g, h: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be polynomial functions such that $g^{-1}(0) \subset h^{-1}(0)$ and $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}(g)=$ $\emptyset$. Then following two statements hold:
(i) If $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h=r\}}\right)=\emptyset$ for all $|r|>0$ sufficiently small, then there are no sequences of the first type.
(ii) If $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h=r\}}\right)=\emptyset$ for all $|r|$ sufficiently large, then there are no sequences of the second type.

Proof. (i) By contradiction, assume that there exist a real number $\delta>0$ and a sequence $x^{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, with $\left\|x^{k}\right\| \rightarrow+\infty$, such that

$$
g\left(x^{k}\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { and } \quad\left|h\left(x^{k}\right)\right| \geq \delta
$$

Then $\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right|>0$ since $g^{-1}(0) \subset h^{-1}(0)$. By the semi-algebraic Sard Theorem, the set of critical values of $h$ is a finite subset of $\mathbb{R}$. So we can choose $\delta>0$ sufficiently small so that each of the level sets $h^{-1}( \pm \delta)$ is either empty or a smooth hypersurface. Furthermore, by assumption, we can suppose that $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h= \pm \delta\}}\right)=\emptyset$.

Let $X:=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:|h(x)| \geq \delta\right\}$. We have

$$
0=\inf _{x \in X}|g(x)|<\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right| \quad \text { for all } \quad k
$$

Applying the Ekeland variational principle (Theorem (2.3) to the function

$$
X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto|g(x)|
$$

with data $\epsilon:=\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right|>0$ and $\lambda:=\frac{\left\|x^{k}\right\|}{2}>0$, there is a point $y^{k}$ in $X$ such that the following inequalities hold

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|g\left(y^{k}\right)\right| \leq\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right| \\
& \left\|y^{k}-x^{k}\right\| \leq \lambda \\
& \left|g\left(y^{k}\right)\right| \leq|g(x)|+\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}\left\|x-y^{k}\right\| \quad \text { for all } \quad x \in X
\end{aligned}
$$

We deduce easily that $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|y^{k}\right\|=+\infty$ and $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} g\left(y^{k}\right)=0$. Furthermore, since $g^{-1}(0) \subset$ $h^{-1}(0)$ and $\left|h\left(y^{k}\right)\right| \geq \delta>0$, we have $g\left(y^{k}\right) \neq 0$ for all $k$. Passing to a subsequence and replacing
$g$ (resp., $h$ ) by $-g$ (resp., $-h$ ) if necessary, we may assume that to all $k$ the following conditions hold: $g\left(y^{k}\right)>0$ and either $h\left(y^{k}\right)>\delta$ or $h\left(y^{k}\right)=\delta$. By continuity, $g$ and $h$ are positive in some open neighborhood of $y^{k}$. In particular, we have for all $x$ near $y^{k}$,

$$
|g(x)|=g(x) \quad \text { and } \quad|h(x)|=h(x)
$$

Hence $y^{k}$ is a local minimizer of the function

$$
\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}: h(x) \geq \delta\right\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto g(x)+\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}\left\|x-y^{k}\right\|
$$

Observe that $h^{-1}(\delta)$ is a smooth hypersurface, the function $g$ is smooth and the function $x \mapsto\left\|x-y^{k}\right\|$ is locally Lipschitz. Therefore, by Lagrange's multipliers theorem (see [7, Theorem 6.1.1]), there exists $\mu_{k} \leq 0$ with $\mu_{k}\left(h\left(y^{k}\right)-\delta\right)=0$ such that

$$
0 \in \partial\left(g(\cdot)+\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}\left(\left\|\cdot-y^{k}\right\|\right)\right)\left(y^{k}\right)+\mu_{k} \nabla h\left(y^{k}\right)
$$

where for a locally Lipschitz function $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the notation $\partial f(x)$ denotes the Clarke derivative of $f$ at $x$. Using the properties of the Clarke derivative (see [7, Chapter 2]) we derive

$$
\nabla g\left(y^{k}\right)+\mu_{k} \nabla h\left(y^{k}\right) \in \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda} \mathbb{B}^{n}
$$

where $\mathbb{B}^{n}$ stands for the unit closed ball in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Consequently, we get

$$
\left\|\nabla g\left(y^{k}\right)+\mu_{k} \nabla h\left(y^{k}\right)\right\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}=\frac{2\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right|}{\left\|x^{k}\right\|}
$$

By letting $k$ tend to infinity, we obtain

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|y^{k}\right\|=+\infty, \quad \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} g\left(y^{k}\right)=0, \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\nabla g\left(y^{k}\right)+\mu_{k} \nabla h\left(y^{k}\right)\right\|=0
$$

By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that either $h\left(y^{k}\right)>\delta$ for all $k$ or $h\left(y^{k}\right)=\delta$ for all $k$. For the former case, $\mu_{k}=0$ for all $k$ and hence $0 \in \widetilde{K}_{\infty}(g)$; for the latter case, $\left\|\nabla\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h=\delta\}}\right)\left(y^{k}\right)\right\| \rightarrow 0$ and thus $0 \in \widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h=\delta\}}\right)$. In both cases we get a contradiction to our assumption.
(ii) Suppose on the contrary that there exists a sequence $x^{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, with $\left\|x^{k}\right\| \rightarrow+\infty$ such that the sequence $\left\{g\left(x^{k}\right)\right\}$ is bounded and $\left|h\left(x^{k}\right)\right| \rightarrow+\infty$. Then $\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right|>0$ from our assumption $g^{-1}(0) \subset h^{-1}(0)$. By the semi-algebraic Sard Theorem, the set of critical values of $h$ is a finite subset of $\mathbb{R}$. So we can choose $M>0$ sufficiently large so that each of the level sets $h^{-1}( \pm M)$ is either empty or a smooth hypersurface. Furthermore, by assumption, we can suppose that $\widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h= \pm M\}}\right)=\emptyset$.

Let $X:=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:|h(x)| \geq M\right\}$. We have for all $k$ sufficiently large,

$$
\inf _{x \in X}|g(x)| \leq\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right|
$$

By applying the Ekeland variational principle (Theorem (2.3) to the function $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto|g(x)|$, with data $\epsilon:=\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right|>0$ and $\lambda:=\frac{\left\|x^{k}\right\|}{2}>0$, we get a point $y^{k}$ in $X$ satisfying the following
inequalities

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|g\left(y^{k}\right)\right| \leq\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right| \\
& \left\|y^{k}-x^{k}\right\| \leq \lambda \\
& \left|g\left(y^{k}\right)\right| \leq|g(x)|+\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}\left\|x-y^{k}\right\| \quad \text { for all } \quad x \in X .
\end{aligned}
$$

We deduce easily that

$$
\frac{\left\|x^{k}\right\|}{2} \leq\left\|y^{k}\right\| \leq \frac{3\left\|x^{k}\right\|}{2}
$$

which yields $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|y^{k}\right\|=+\infty$.
Similarly to (i), for $k$ large enough, we can assume that $h\left(y^{k}\right) \geq M>0$ and $g\left(y^{k}\right)>0$ since $g^{-1}(0) \subset h^{-1}(0)$. Hence, repeating arguments similar to (i), we have

$$
\left\|\nabla g\left(y^{k}\right)+\mu_{k} \nabla h\left(y^{k}\right)\right\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}=\frac{2\left|g\left(x^{k}\right)\right|}{\left\|x^{k}\right\|}
$$

for some $\mu_{k} \leq 0$ with $\mu_{k}\left(h\left(y^{k}\right)-M\right)=0$. Hence,

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\nabla g\left(y^{k}\right)+\mu_{k} \nabla h\left(y^{k}\right)\right\|=0
$$

On the other hand, since the sequence $\left\{g\left(x^{k}\right)\right\}$ is bounded, so is the sequence $\left\{g\left(y^{k}\right)\right\}$. Hence, by passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume the existence of the limit $t:=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} g\left(y^{k}\right)$. Furthermore, we can assume that either $h\left(y^{k}\right)>M$ for all $k$ or $h\left(y^{k}\right)=M$ for all $k$. For the former case, $\mu_{k}=0$ for all $k$ and hence $t \in \widetilde{K}_{\infty}(g)$; for the latter case, $\left\|\nabla\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h=M\}}\right)\left(y^{k}\right)\right\| \rightarrow 0$ and thus $t \in \widetilde{K}_{\infty}\left(\left.g\right|_{\{h=M\}}\right)$. In both cases we get a contradiction to our assumption.

Lemma 3.4. Let $g, h: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be polynomial functions such that $g^{-1}(0) \subset h^{-1}(0)$. The following two conditions are equivalent:
(i) there are no sequences of the first and second types.
(ii) there exist some constants $c>0, \alpha>0$, and $\beta>0$ such that

$$
|g(x)|^{\alpha}+|g(x)|^{\beta} \geq c|h(x)| \quad \text { for all } \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}
$$

Proof. (Cf. [27, Theorem 3.4].)
(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): The implication is straightforward.
(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): We assume that $h \not \equiv 0$, otherwise the implication is trivial. We only consider the case where $g^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$; the case $g^{-1}(0)=\emptyset$ follows similarly. Then for each $t \geq 0$, the set $\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:|g(x)|=t\right\}$ is non-empty. This, together with condition (i), implies that the (semi-algebraic) function $\mu:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$
\mu(t):=\sup _{|g(x)|=t}|h(x)|
$$

is well-defined. Furthermore, $\mu(0)=0, \mu(t)>0$ for all $t>0$ small enough and $\mu(t) \rightarrow+\infty$ as $t \rightarrow+\infty$. By Lemma 2.3, we can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu(t)=a t^{\alpha}+o\left(t^{\alpha}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad t \rightarrow 0^{+} \\
& \mu(t)=b t^{\beta}+o\left(t^{\beta}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad t \rightarrow+\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constants $a \neq 0, b \neq 0, \alpha \geq 0$ and $\beta>0$. Therefore, we can find constants $c_{1}>0, c_{2}>$ $0, \delta>0$ and $r>0$ with $\delta \ll 1 \ll r$ such that the following inequalities hold

$$
\begin{aligned}
& |g(x)|^{\alpha} \geq c_{1}|h(x)| \quad \text { for } \quad 0<|g(x)| \leq \delta, \\
& |g(x)|^{\beta} \geq c_{2}|h(x)| \quad \text { for } \quad|g(x)| \geq r .
\end{aligned}
$$

By assumption, we may assume that $\alpha>0$ so that the first inequality holds for $|g(x)| \leq \delta$. Furthermore, we also may assume $\alpha \leq 1 \leq \beta$ because $\delta$ is sufficiently small and $r$ is sufficiently large.

On the other hand, it follows easily from condition (i) that there exists a constant $M>0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\delta \leq|g(x)| \leq R$ we have $|h(x)| \leq M$ and hence

$$
|g(x)|^{\alpha}+|g(x)|^{\beta} \geq \delta^{\alpha}+\delta^{\beta}=\frac{\delta^{\alpha}+\delta^{\beta}}{M} M \geq \frac{\delta^{\alpha}+\delta^{\beta}}{M}|h(x)| .
$$

Letting $c:=\min \left\{c_{1}, c_{2}, \frac{\delta^{\alpha}+\delta^{\beta}}{M}\right\}$, we get the desired conclusion.
We now are in position to finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.
Proof of Theorem 1.1. This is a direct consequence of Lemmas 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.
The following corollary is inspired by Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 in [18].
Corollary 3.1. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, there exist a positive integer $N$ and $a$ continuous semi-algebraic function $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $h^{N}=g f$.

Proof. Clearly, if $\inf _{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}}|g(x)|>0$ then the integer $N:=1$ and the function $f:=\frac{h}{g}$ have the desired property. So assume that $\inf _{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}}|g(x)|=0$. By observing the proof of Lemma 3.4, we can find positive constants $\alpha$ and $\delta$ with $\alpha \leq 1$ such that

$$
|g(x)|^{\alpha} \geq c|h(x)| \quad \text { for } \quad|g(x)| \leq \delta
$$

Let $\ell:=\left[\frac{1}{\alpha}\right]+1>\frac{1}{\alpha} \geq 1$. The following function $f_{0}: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
f_{0}(x):= \begin{cases}\frac{h^{2 \ell}(x)}{g^{2}(x)} & \text { if } g(x) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

is continuous and semi-algebraic. Since $f_{0} g^{2}=h^{2 \ell}$, we deduce that the integer $N:=2 \ell$ and the function $f:=f_{0} g$ have the desired property.

## 4. Genericity of non-degenerate at infinity polynomial mappings

In this section we show the genericity of the condition of non-degeneracy at infinity for real polynomial mappings (Theorem [1.2); actually, we will prove a stronger result (see Theorem 4.1 below). Note that the genericity of the condition of non-degeneracy for complex polynomial mappings has been given in [29] (the case $p=1$ ) and in [28, Theorem (Resolution of Singularities)] and [35, Corollary 3.2.1] (the case $p \geq 1$ ).

For simplicity, we introduce some notation here for this section. Let $\Gamma:=\left(\Gamma_{1}, \ldots, \Gamma_{p}\right)$ with $1 \leq p \leq n$ and each $\Gamma_{i}$ being a Newton polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$. Let

$$
\mathcal{F}:=\left\{\Delta:=\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{p}\right): \exists q \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \text { s.t. } \Delta_{i}=\Delta\left(q, \Gamma_{i}\right) \text { for all } i\right\} .
$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{F}$ is a finite set as the number of faces of a polyhedron is finite.
For each $i=1, \ldots, p$, let $\mathcal{Z}_{i}:=\Gamma_{i} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}$ and $m_{i}:=\# \mathcal{Z}_{i}$-the number of points in the set $\mathcal{Z}_{i}$. For each polynomial mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{p}$ such that the Newton polyhedra of its components are given by $\Gamma$, we can index the coefficients of the $i$ th component over the integer points of $\Gamma_{i}$. So let $c_{i}=\left(c_{i, \kappa}\right)_{\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}}$,

$$
f_{i}\left(x, c_{i}\right):=\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}} c_{i, \kappa} x^{\kappa} \in \mathbb{R}[x] \text { and } F(x, c):=\left(f_{1}\left(x, c_{1}\right), \ldots, f_{p}\left(x, c_{p}\right)\right) .
$$

Denote by $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$ the product space $\mathbb{R}^{m_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{p}}$. For any $c:=\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$, set

$$
\mathcal{G}(c):=\left(\Gamma\left(f_{1}\left(x, c_{1}\right)\right), \ldots, \Gamma\left(f_{p}\left(x, c_{p}\right)\right)\right) .
$$

For each nonempty set $I:=\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{s}\right\} \subset\{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $\Delta:=\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{p}\right) \in \mathcal{F}$, we let

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{I, \Delta}(x, c) & :=\left(f_{i_{1}, \Delta_{i_{1}}}\left(x, c_{i_{1}}\right), \ldots, f_{i_{s}, \Delta_{i_{s}}}\left(x, c_{i_{s}}\right)\right) \\
x D F_{I, \Delta}(x, c) & :=\left(x_{j} \frac{\partial f_{i, \Delta_{i}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x, c_{i}\right)\right)_{i \in I, j=1, \ldots, n}, \\
\mathcal{V}(I, \Delta, c) & :=\left\{x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}: F_{I, \Delta}(x, c)=0\right\}, \\
\mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{reg}}(I, \Delta, c) & :=\left\{x \in \mathcal{V}(I, \Delta, c): \operatorname{rank}\left(x D F_{I, \Delta}(x, c)\right)=\# I\right\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{I}(\Delta) & :=\left\{c \in \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}: \mathcal{G}(c)=\Gamma, \mathcal{V}(I, \Delta, c)=\mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{reg}}(I, \Delta, c)\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

With the notation above, Theorem 1.2 is a direct consequence of the following.
Theorem 4.1. The set $\cap_{I, \Delta} \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Delta)$ is an open dense semi-algebraic set in $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$, where the intersection is taken over all nonempty sets $I \subset\{1, \ldots, p\}$ and all $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Observe that the number of subsets of $\{1, \ldots, p\}$ is finite, $\mathcal{F}$ is a finite set, and a finite intersection of open dense semi-algebraic sets is open dense semi-algebraic. Now the desired conclusion follows immediately from Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 below.

Proposition 4.1. For each nonempty set $I \subset\{1, \ldots, p\}$, the set $\cap_{\Delta \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Delta)$ is open and semi-algebraic.

Proof. (Cf. [34, Appendix]; see also [6, Proposition 3.1].) Let $I$ be a nonempty subset of $\{1, \ldots, p\}$. By renumbering, we may assume that $I=\{1, \ldots, s\}$ for some $s \leq p$. By definition, for any $\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{p}\right) \in \mathcal{F}$ we have

$$
\mathcal{D}_{I}\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{p}\right)=\mathcal{D}_{I}\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{s}\right) \times X
$$

where

$$
X:=\left\{\left(c_{s+1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right): \Gamma\left(f_{i}\left(x, c_{i}\right)\right)=\Gamma_{i} \text { for } i=s+1, \ldots, p\right\}
$$

Observe that $X$ is an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{m_{s+1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{p}}$ and that $X$ does not depend on the polyhedra $\Gamma_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, s$. Hence, it suffices to show that

$$
\cap_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{s}\right)} \mathcal{D}_{I}\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{s}\right)
$$

is an open semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{m_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{s}}$. In other words, we can assume that $s=p$, i.e., $I=\{1, \ldots, p\}$.

Consider the projection

$$
\pi: \mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{\Pi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}, \quad(x, c) \mapsto c
$$

and the union $V^{*}:=\cup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{F}} V(\Delta)$ where

$$
V(\Delta):=\left\{(x, c) \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}: \mathcal{G}(c)=\Gamma, x \in \mathcal{V}(I, \Delta, c) \backslash \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{reg}}(I, \Delta, c)\right\}
$$

By definition, $W:=\pi\left(V^{*}\right)$ is the complement of $\cap_{\Delta \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Delta)$ in the set $\left\{c \in \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}: \mathcal{G}(c)=\Gamma\right\}$. Observe that the latter set is an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$. In light of Theorem 2.1, $W$ is a semi-algebraic set, and so is $\cap_{\Delta \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Delta)$.

Next we show that $W$ is closed, or equivalently, $W=\bar{W}$. To see this, take a point $c^{0}:=$ $\left(c_{1}^{0}, \ldots, c_{p}^{0}\right) \in \bar{W}$. We show $c \in W$. Indeed, if $c^{0}$ is an isolated point of $\bar{W}$, then $c^{0} \in W$ and we are done. So assume that $c^{0}$ is not isolated in $\bar{W}$. By definition, $c^{0} \in \overline{\pi(V(\Delta))}$ for some $\Delta:=\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{p}\right) \in \mathcal{F}$. In view of Lemma 2.1, there exists a non-constant real analytic mapping $t \mapsto(\varphi(t), c(t)) \in V(\Delta)$ defined on a small enough interval $(0, \epsilon)$ such that $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0} c(t)=c^{0}$. Let us expand $\varphi_{j}(t), j=1, \ldots, n$, and $c_{i}(t), i=1, \ldots, p$, in terms of the parameter, say

$$
\varphi_{j}(t)=x_{j}^{0} t^{q_{j}}+o\left(t^{q_{j}}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad c_{i}(t)=c_{i}^{0}+o(1),
$$

where $x_{j}^{0} \neq 0$ and $q_{j} \in \mathbb{Q}$ (note that for all $t$ we have $\varphi(t) \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}$ and so $\left.\varphi_{j}(t) \neq 0\right)$. Let $q:=\left(q_{1}, \ldots, q_{n}\right)$ and

$$
\widetilde{\Delta}_{i}:=\Delta\left(q, \Delta_{i}\right) \quad \text { for all } \quad i=1, \ldots, p
$$

We prove that $\widetilde{\Delta}:=\left(\widetilde{\Delta}_{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{\Delta}_{p}\right)$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$. In fact, if $q=0$, then $\widetilde{\Delta}=\Delta \in \mathcal{F}$ and there is nothing to prove. So, assume that $q \neq 0$. By definition, we can find a vector $q^{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that $\Delta_{i}=\Delta\left(q^{0}, \Gamma_{i}\right)$ for all $i$. If $\Delta_{i}=\Gamma_{i}$ for all $i$, then it is clear that $\widetilde{\Delta} \in \mathcal{F}$. Otherwise, we have $q^{0} \neq 0$ and $I^{\prime}:=\left\{i \in\{1, \ldots, p\}: \Delta_{i} \neq \Gamma_{i}\right\} \neq \emptyset$. Then for each $i \in I^{\prime}$, there exists $\epsilon_{i}>0$ such that for any $\widetilde{q}$ with $\left\|\widetilde{q}-q^{0}\right\| \leq \epsilon_{i}$, we get that

$$
\Delta\left(\widetilde{q}, \Gamma_{i}\right) \subset \Delta\left(q^{0}, \Gamma_{i}\right)=\Delta_{i} .
$$

Set $\epsilon:=\min _{i \in I^{\prime}} \epsilon_{i}>0$ and $\widetilde{q}:=q^{0}+\epsilon \frac{q}{\|q\|}$. Clearly $\Delta\left(\widetilde{q}, \Gamma_{i}\right) \subset \Delta_{i}$. Hence $\Delta\left(\widetilde{q}, \Gamma_{i}\right)=\Delta\left(\widetilde{q}, \Delta_{i}\right)$. Moreover, for any $\kappa \in \Delta_{i}$, we have

$$
\langle\widetilde{q}, \kappa\rangle=\left\langle q^{0}, \kappa\right\rangle+\frac{\epsilon}{\|q\|}\langle q, \kappa\rangle \geq d_{i}+\frac{\epsilon}{\|q\|} \widetilde{d}_{i},
$$

where $d_{i}:=\min _{\kappa^{\prime} \in \Gamma_{i}}\left\langle q^{0}, \kappa^{\prime}\right\rangle$ and $\widetilde{d}_{i}:=\min _{\kappa^{\prime} \in \Delta_{i}}\left\langle q, \kappa^{\prime}\right\rangle$. Observe that the equality happens if and only if $\kappa \in \widetilde{\Delta}_{i}$, which yields $\widetilde{\Delta}_{i}=\Delta\left(\widetilde{q}, \Delta_{i}\right)$. Therefore $\widetilde{\Delta}_{i}=\Delta\left(\widetilde{q}, \Gamma_{i}\right)$ and so $\widetilde{\Delta} \in \mathcal{F}$.

On the other hand, a simple calculation shows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{i, \Delta_{i}}\left(\varphi(t), c_{i}(t)\right) & =f_{i, \widetilde{\Delta}_{i}}\left(x^{0}, c_{i}^{0}\right) t^{d_{i}}+o\left(t^{d_{i}}\right), \\
\varphi_{j}(t) \frac{\partial f_{i, \Delta_{i}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(\varphi(t), c_{i}(t)\right) & =x_{j}^{0} \frac{\partial f_{i, \widetilde{\Delta}_{i}}}{\partial x_{j}}\left(x^{0}, c_{i}^{0}\right) t^{d_{i}}+o\left(t^{d_{i}}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $x^{0}:=\left(x_{1}^{0}, \ldots, x_{n}^{0}\right) \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}$. As $(\varphi(t), c(t)) \in V(\Delta)$ for all $t \in(0, \epsilon)$, we get easily that $\left(x^{0}, c^{0}\right) \in V(\widetilde{\Delta}) \subset V^{*}$. Thus $c^{0} \in W$, as required.

Proposition 4.2. For each nonempty set $I \subset\{1, \ldots, p\}$ and each $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Delta)$ contains an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$.

Before proving Proposition 4.2, we need the following auxiliary lemma.
Lemma 4.1. Let $d$ and $n$ be integers such that $0 \leqslant d \leqslant n$. Let $q^{1}, \ldots, q^{n-d}$ be linearly independent vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^{n}$ and $S \subset \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{n}$. Assume that $\left\langle q^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle \geqslant 0$ for all $\kappa \in S$ and $j=1, \ldots, n-d$. Then the following statements hold:
(i) There are $q^{n-d+1}, \ldots, q^{n} \subset\left\{e^{1}, \ldots, e^{n}\right\}$ such that the system $\left\{q^{1}, \ldots, q^{n}\right\}$ is linearly independent.
(ii) There exist vectors $\widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$ such that
(ii1) $\operatorname{span}\left\{\widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}\right\}=\operatorname{span}\left\{q^{1}, \ldots, q^{k}\right\}$ for $k=1, \ldots, n$;
(ii2) $\left\langle\widetilde{q}^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle \geqslant 0$ for all $\kappa \in S$ and $j=1, \ldots, n$;
(ii3) $\operatorname{conv}\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{n}\right\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}=\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{n}\right\}$; and
(ii4) $\left|\operatorname{det}\left(\widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{n}\right)\right|=1$.
Here for a set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$, the notation span $X$ denotes the smallest linear subspace containing
$X$ and the notation $\operatorname{conv}(X)$ denotes the convex hull of $X$.
Proof. As (i) is clear, it remains to prove (ii). Clearly $\left\langle q^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle \geqslant 0$ for all $\kappa \in S$ and $j=$ $n-d+1, \ldots, n$. The proof is done by induction as follows.

Set $\widetilde{q}^{1}:=\frac{q^{1}}{N}$ where $N \geqslant 1$ is the integer such that $\frac{q^{1}}{N} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$ and $\left[0, \frac{q^{1}}{N}\right] \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}=\left\{0, \frac{q^{1}}{N}\right\}$. For $1 \leqslant k<n$, assume that we have constructed a linearly independent system $\left\{\widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}\right\}$ such that

- $\operatorname{span}\left\{\widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}\right\}=\operatorname{span}\left\{q^{1}, \ldots, q^{k}\right\} ;$
- $\left\langle\widetilde{q}^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle \geqslant 0$ for all $\kappa \in S$ and $j=1, \ldots, k$; and
- $\operatorname{conv}\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}\right\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}=\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}\right\}$.

If conv $\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, q^{k+1}\right\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}=\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, q^{k+1}\right\}$, then we are done by setting $\widetilde{q}^{k+1}=q^{k+1}$. Otherwise, set

$$
N_{1}:=\#\left(\left(\operatorname{conv}\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, q^{k+1}\right\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}\right) \backslash\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, q^{k+1}\right\}\right)>0
$$

Let $a^{1} \in\left(\operatorname{conv}\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, q^{k+1}\right\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}\right) \backslash\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, q^{k+1}\right\}$. Then

$$
a^{1}=\sum_{l=1}^{k} t_{l} \widetilde{q}^{l}+t_{k+1} q^{k+1} \text { with } 0 \leqslant t_{1}, \ldots, t_{k+1}<1
$$

Observe that $t_{k+1}>0$ since otherwise $a^{1} \in\left(\operatorname{conv}\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}\right\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}\right) \backslash\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}\right\}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore the system $\left\{\widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, a^{1}\right\}$ is linearly independent and

$$
\operatorname{span}\left\{\widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, a^{1}\right\}=\operatorname{span}\left\{q^{1}, \ldots, q^{k}, q^{k+1}\right\}
$$

In addition, for all $\kappa \in S$, we have

$$
\left\langle a^{1}, \kappa\right\rangle=\left\langle\sum_{l=1}^{k} t_{l} \widetilde{q}^{l}+t_{k+1} q^{k+1}, \kappa\right\rangle=\sum_{l=1}^{k} t_{l}\left\langle\widetilde{q}^{l}, \kappa\right\rangle+t_{k+1}\left\langle q^{k+1}, \kappa\right\rangle \geqslant 0 .
$$

Let

$$
N_{2}:=\#\left(\left(\operatorname{conv}\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, a^{1}\right\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}\right) \backslash\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k}, a^{1}\right\}\right)
$$

Clearly $N_{2}<N_{1}$. If $N_{2}=0$, set $\widetilde{q}^{k+1}=a^{1}$ and we are done. Otherwise, since $N_{2}$ is finite, by repeating the procedure finitely many times, we must get the vector $\widetilde{q}^{k+1}$ such that

- $\operatorname{span}\left\{\widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k+1}\right\}=\operatorname{span}\left\{q^{1}, \ldots, q^{k+1}\right\} ;$
- $\left\langle\widetilde{q}^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle \geqslant 0$ for all $\kappa \in S$ and $j=1, \ldots, k+1$; and
- $\operatorname{conv}\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k+1}\right\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n}=\left\{0, \widetilde{q}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{q}^{k+1}\right\}$.

By induction, (ii1), (ii2) and (ii3) follow. By applying [21, Exercises of page 48], (ii4) follows from (ii3). The lemma is proved.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. As in the proof of Proposition4.1, we may assume that $I=\{1, \ldots, p\}$. Furthermore, observe that for any $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right) \in \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Delta)$, all coefficients $c_{i, \kappa}$, with $\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i} \backslash \Delta_{i}$ and $i=1, \ldots, p$, can be replaced by any nonzero real numbers and the resulting $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right)$ still belong to $\mathcal{D}_{I}(\Delta)$. Consequently, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\Delta_{i}=\Gamma_{i}$ for all $i$. In other words, we need to show that the set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{D}_{I}(\Gamma)=\left\{c \in \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}: \mathcal{G}(c)=\Gamma, \mathcal{V}(I, \Gamma, c)=\mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{reg}}(I, \Gamma, c)\right\} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

contains an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$.
It is clear that if there exists an index $i_{0}$ such that $m_{i_{0}}=1$ (i.e., $f_{i_{0}}\left(x, c_{i_{0}}\right)$ is a monomial), then $\left\{f_{i_{0}}\left(x, c_{i_{0}}\right)=0\right\} \subset\left\{x_{1} \cdots x_{n}=0\right\}$ for $c_{i_{0}} \neq 0$; hence $\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{m_{1}} \times \cdots \times\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{m_{p}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Gamma)$ and the problem is trivial. So in what follows we will assume that $m_{i}>1$ for every $i=1, \ldots, p$. Let $\Gamma_{1}+\cdots+\Gamma_{p}$ be the Minkowski sum and set $d:=\operatorname{dim}\left(\Gamma_{1}+\cdots+\Gamma_{p}\right)$. There are two cases to consider:

Case 1: $d=n$. For each $i=1, \ldots, p$, let $v^{i 1}, \ldots, v^{i r_{i}}$ be the vertices of $\Gamma_{i}$. Note that $r_{i}>1$ for every $i$ by the assumption $m_{i}>1$. Let

$$
w^{i j}:=v^{i j}-v^{i r_{i}} \quad \text { for } \quad j=1, \ldots, r_{i}-1 .
$$

It is not hard to see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{rank}\left\{w^{11}, \ldots, w^{1\left(r_{1}-1\right)}, \ldots, w^{p 1}, \ldots, w^{p\left(r_{p}-1\right)}\right\}=\operatorname{dim}\left(\Gamma_{1}+\cdots+\Gamma_{p}\right)=n \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we proceed by induction on $p$, the number of polynomials. In what follows, $c_{i, j}$ stands for the coefficient of the monomial $x^{v^{i j}}$ in $f_{i}\left(x, c_{i}\right)$.

Firstly, let $p=1$ and consider the semi-algebraic mapping

$$
\Phi:\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \quad\left(x, c_{1}\right) \mapsto\left(x_{1} \frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x_{1}}\left(x, c_{1}\right), \ldots, x_{n} \frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x_{n}}\left(x, c_{1}\right), f_{1}\left(x, c_{1}\right)\right)
$$

The Jacobian matrix $D \Phi$ of $\Phi$ contains the following matrix

$$
\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial\left(c_{1,1}, \ldots, c_{1, r_{1}}\right)}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
x^{v^{11}} v^{11} & \cdots & x^{v^{1\left(r_{1}-1\right)}} v^{1\left(r_{1}-1\right)} & x^{v^{1 r_{1}}} v^{1 r_{1}} \\
x^{v^{11}} & \cdots & x^{v^{1\left(r_{1}-1\right)}} & x^{1^{r_{1}}}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $v^{1 j}\left(j=1, \ldots, r_{1}\right)$ are written as column vectors. The rank of $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial\left(c_{1,1}, \ldots, c_{1, r_{1}}\right)}$ is equal to the rank of the following matrix

$$
M_{1}:=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
v^{11} & \cdots & v^{1\left(r_{1}-1\right)} & v^{1 r_{1}} \\
1 & \cdots & 1 & 1
\end{array}\right) .
$$

The following matrix has the same rank as $M_{1}$

$$
M_{2}:=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
v^{11}-v^{1 r_{1}} & \cdots & v^{1\left(r_{1}-1\right)}-v^{1 r_{1}} & v^{1 r_{1}} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
w^{11} & \cdots & w^{1\left(r_{1}-1\right)} & v^{1 r_{1}} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right) .
$$

In light of (2), $\operatorname{rank} M_{2}=n+1$, and so $\operatorname{rank}(D \Phi)=n+1$. Consequently $\Phi \pitchfork\{0\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. By Theorem 2.2, the set

$$
P_{1}:=\left\{c_{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_{1}}: \Phi\left(\cdot, c_{1}\right) \pitchfork\{0\}\right\}
$$

contains an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{m_{1}}$. Observe that the mapping $\Phi\left(\cdot, c_{1}\right):\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n} \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is transversal to $\{0\}$ if and only if $\operatorname{Im} \Phi\left(\cdot, c_{1}\right) \cap\{0\}=\emptyset$. Hence, we have $\left\{\Phi\left(\cdot, c_{1}\right)=0\right\}=\emptyset$ for $c_{1} \in P_{1}$. Consequently, $P_{1} \subset \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Gamma)$, which completes the proof for the case $p=1$.

Now assume that $p>1$. Recall that $I=\{1, \ldots, p\}$. By induction, for each $l=1, \ldots, p$, the set $\mathcal{D}_{I \backslash\{l\}}(\Gamma)$ contains an open dense semi-algebraic set $\widetilde{U}_{l}$ in

$$
\widehat{\mathbb{R}}_{l}^{\Pi}:=\mathbb{R}^{m_{1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{l-1}} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{l+1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{p}}
$$

Let $U_{l} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$ be the set obtained from $\widetilde{U}_{l} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{l}}$ by the following permutation of coordinates

$$
\widehat{\mathbb{R}}_{l}^{\Pi} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{l}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}, \quad\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{l-1}, c_{l+1}, \ldots, c_{p}, c_{l}\right) \mapsto\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right)
$$

Consider the semi-algebraic mapping

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi:\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n} \times\left(U_{1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{p}\right) \times\left(\mathbb{R}^{p}-\{0\}\right) & \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{p}, \\
\left(x, c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}, \lambda\right) & \mapsto\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_{i} x \nabla f_{i}\left(x, c_{i}\right), f_{1}\left(x, c_{1}\right), \ldots, f_{p}\left(x, c_{p}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where, for simplicity of notation, we let

$$
x \nabla f_{i}\left(x, c_{i}\right):=\left(x_{1} \frac{\partial f_{i}}{\partial x_{1}}\left(x, c_{i}\right), \ldots, x_{n} \frac{\partial f_{i}}{\partial x_{n}}\left(x, c_{i}\right)\right) .
$$

Note that if $(x, c, \lambda) \in \Psi^{-1}(0)$, then $\lambda_{1} \cdots \lambda_{p} \neq 0$, since if $\lambda_{l}=0$ for some $l$, then

$$
\sum_{i \neq l} \lambda_{i} x \nabla f_{i}\left(x, c_{i}\right)=0
$$

which implies that $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{l-1}, c_{l+1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right) \notin \widetilde{U}_{l}$. Hence $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right) \notin U_{l}$ which is a contradiction. The Jacobian matrix $D \Psi$ of $\Psi$ contains the matrix

$$
M_{3}:=\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial\left[\left(c_{1,1}, \ldots, c_{1, r_{1}}\right), \ldots,\left(c_{p, 1}, \ldots, c_{p, r_{p}}\right)\right]}=\left(B_{1}\left|B_{2}\right| \ldots \mid B_{p}\right)
$$

where

$$
B_{i}:=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
\lambda_{i} x^{v^{i 1}} v^{i 1} & \cdots & \lambda_{i} x^{v^{i\left(r_{i}-1\right)}} v^{i\left(r_{i}-1\right)} & \lambda_{i} x^{v^{i r_{i}}} v^{i r_{i}} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
x^{v^{i 1}} & \cdots & x^{v^{i\left(r_{i}-1\right)}} & x^{v^{i r_{i}}} \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right) \leftarrow(n+i) \text { th row }
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, p$. Here, $v^{i j}$ are written as column vectors.
If $(x, c, \lambda) \in \Psi^{-1}(0)$, we know that $\lambda_{i} x^{v^{i j}} \neq 0$ for $i=1, \ldots, p$, and $j=1, \ldots, r_{i}$. Hence, for $i=1, \ldots, p, B_{i}$ has the same rank as the matrix

$$
C_{i}:=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
v^{i 1} & \cdots & v^{i\left(r_{i}-1\right)} & v^{i r_{i}} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right) \leftarrow(n+i) \text { th row }
$$

By subtracting the last column from the first $r_{i}-1$ columns of $C_{i}$, we get the following matrix having the same rank as $C_{i}$ :

$$
D_{i}:=\left(\begin{array}{clcc}
w^{i 1} & \cdots & w^{i\left(r_{i}-1\right)} & v^{i r_{i}} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right) \leftarrow(n+i) \text { th row }
$$

It is clear that $M_{3}$ has the same rank as

$$
M_{4}:=\left(D_{1}\left|D_{2}\right| \cdots \mid D_{p}\right)
$$

Rearranging the columns of $M_{4}$ by moving the last column of each $D_{i}$ to the right of $M_{4}$, we get

$$
M_{5}:=\left(\begin{array}{cccccc|ccc}
w^{11} & \cdots & w^{1\left(r_{1}-1\right)} & \cdots & w^{p 1} & \cdots & w^{p\left(r_{p}-1\right)} & v^{1 r_{1}} & \cdots \\
\hline & & & & & & v^{p r_{p}} \\
& & & 0 & & & & & \\
& & & & & & \mathbf{0} \\
& & & & & & & \\
& & & & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

In view of (2), $\operatorname{rank} M_{5}=n+p$ on $\Psi^{-1}(0)$. Thus $D \Psi$ is of maximal rank on $\Psi^{-1}(0)$, namely $\Psi \pitchfork\{0\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+p}$. Note that $U_{1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{p}$ is an open dense semi-algebraic set in $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$. This, together with Theorem [2.2, implies that the set

$$
P_{2}:=\left\{c \in U_{1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{p}: \Psi(\cdot, c, \cdot) \pitchfork\{0\}\right\}
$$

contains an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$. Since $\Psi(\cdot, c, \cdot):\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n} \times\left(\mathbb{R}^{p}-\{0\}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{p}$ is a mapping between two manifolds of same dimension, the transversality condition implies that $\Psi(\cdot, c, \cdot)$ is a local diffeomorphism on $(\Psi(\cdot, c, \cdot))^{-1}(0)$ for each $c \in P_{2}$.

Let $c \in P_{2}$. If $(\Psi(\cdot, c, \cdot))^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$, there exists $(x, \lambda) \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n} \times\left(\mathbb{R}^{p}-\{0\}\right)$ such that $\Psi(x, c, \lambda)=0$. Note that, for every $t \in \mathbb{R} \backslash\{0\}, \Psi(x, c, t \lambda)=0$. So $\Psi(\cdot, c, \cdot)$ is not a local diffeomorphism at $(x, \lambda)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $(\Psi(\cdot, c, \cdot))^{-1}(0)=\emptyset$. Consequently, $c \in \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Gamma)$. Therefore, $P_{2} \subset \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Gamma)$, which ends the proof in Case 1.

Case 2: $d<n$. It is clear that there exist linearly independent vectors $q^{1}, \ldots, q^{n-d} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$ and numbers $d_{1}, \ldots, d_{n-d} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the set $\Gamma_{1}+\cdots+\Gamma_{p}$ is contained in the affine space

$$
L:=\left\{\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:\left\langle q^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle=d_{j}, j=1, \ldots, n-d\right\}
$$

Consequently, we deduce the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. For each $i \in\{1, \ldots, p\}$ there exist real numbers $d_{i j}, j=1, \ldots, n-d$, such that $\Gamma_{i} \subset L_{i}$, where

$$
L_{i}:=\left\{\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:\left\langle q^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle=d_{i j}, j=1, \ldots, n-d\right\}
$$

i.e., $\Gamma_{i}$ is contained in an affine space parallel to $L$.

For each $j=1, \ldots, n-d$, let us write $q^{j}:=\left(q_{j 1}, \ldots, q_{j n}\right)$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $q_{11}>0$. For $j=2, \ldots, n-d$, by replacing $q^{j}$ by $q^{j}+N q^{1}$ for $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$large enough, we can assume that $q_{j 1}>0$. Recall that $I=\{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{I}(\Gamma)$ is defined by (11). For any $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$, set

$$
\Gamma_{N}:=\left(\Gamma_{1}+N e^{1}, \ldots, \Gamma_{p}+N e^{1}\right),
$$

i.e., $\Gamma_{N}$ is the translation of $\Gamma$ by the vector $N e^{1}$. Then $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma_{N}$ have the same number of integer points. Furthermore,

$$
\mathcal{D}_{I}(\Gamma)=\mathcal{D}_{I}\left(\Gamma_{N}\right)
$$

Indeed, for all $c \in \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$, it is not hard to check that the set

$$
\left\{x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}: F(x, c)=0 \text { and } \operatorname{rank}(x D F(x, c))=p\right\}
$$

is equal to the set

$$
\left\{x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}: x_{1}^{N} F(x, c)=0 \text { and } \operatorname{rank}\left(D\left(x_{1}^{N} F\right)(x, c)\right)=p\right\}
$$

So the equality holds. Observe that

$$
\Gamma_{i}+N e^{1} \subset\left\{\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:\left\langle q^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle=d_{i j}+N q_{j 1}, j=1, \ldots, n-d\right\}
$$

Hence, by replacing $\Gamma$ by $\Gamma_{N}$ for $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$large enough, we can suppose that

$$
d_{i j} \geqslant 0 \text { for } i=1, \ldots, p \text { and } j=1, \ldots, n-d
$$

In view of Lemma 4.1, and for simplicity of notation, we can assume that there are vectors $q^{n-d+1}, \ldots, q^{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$ such that $\left|\operatorname{det}\left(q^{1}, \ldots, q^{n}\right)\right|=1$ and for $i=1, \ldots, p$ and $j=n-d+1, \ldots, n$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle q^{j}, \kappa\right\rangle \geqslant 0 \text { for all } \kappa \in \Gamma_{i} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Set $A:=\left(q_{j k}\right)_{j, k=1, \ldots, n}$. Consider the following change of coordinates

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{ccc}
x_{1} & = & u_{1}^{q_{11}} \ldots u_{n-d}^{q_{(n-d) 1}} \ldots u_{n}^{q_{n 1}}  \tag{4}\\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
x_{n} & = & u_{1}^{q_{1 n}} \ldots u_{n-d}^{q_{(n-d) n}} \ldots u_{n}^{q_{n n}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

It follows from Lemma 4.2 that for each $\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}$, we have $A \kappa=\left(d_{i 1}, \ldots, d_{i(n-d)}, \gamma_{\kappa}\right)$, for some $\gamma_{\kappa} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{d}$. So in the system of coordinates $u_{1}, \ldots, u_{n}$, the polynomial $f_{i}\left(x, c_{i}\right)$ has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{1}^{d_{i 1}} \ldots u_{n-d}^{d_{i(n-d)}} \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}} c_{i, \kappa} u^{\prime \gamma_{\kappa}} \in \mathbb{R}[u] \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $u^{\prime}=\left(u_{n-d+1}, \ldots, u_{n}\right)$. Set

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{i}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{i}\right):=\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}} c_{i, \kappa} u^{\prime \gamma_{\kappa}} \in \mathbb{R}\left[u^{\prime}\right] . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $A$ is an integer matrix and $|\operatorname{det}(A)|=1$, the monomial mapping (4) admits a unique monomial inverse mapping, given by $A^{-1}$. Hence the system $f_{1}\left(x, c_{1}\right)=\cdots=f_{p}\left(x, c_{p}\right)=0$ has solutions in $\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}$ if and only if the system $g_{1}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{1}\right)=\cdots=g_{p}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{p}\right)=0$ has solutions in $\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{d}$. There are two cases to be considered (recall that $n>d$ and $n \geq p$ ).

Case 2.1: $d<p$. Consider the semi-algebraic mapping

$$
G:\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{d} \times \mathbb{R}^{\Pi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p}, \quad\left(u^{\prime}, c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right) \mapsto\left(g_{1}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{1}\right), \ldots, g_{p}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{p}\right)\right)
$$

For $i=1, \ldots, p$, let $\kappa^{i} \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}$. The Jacobian matrix $D G$ of $G$ contains the following diagonal matrix

$$
\frac{\partial G}{\partial\left(c_{1, \kappa^{1}}, \ldots, c_{p, \kappa^{p}}\right)}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
u^{\prime \gamma_{\kappa^{1}}} & & \mathbf{0} \\
& \ddots & \\
\mathbf{0} & & u^{\prime \gamma_{\kappa} p}
\end{array}\right)
$$

which has rank $p$ since $u^{\prime} \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{d}$. Hence $D G$ is of rank $p$, which yields $G \pitchfork\{0\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{p}$. By Theorem 2.2, the set

$$
P_{3}:=\left\{c:=\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}: G(\cdot, c) \pitchfork\{0\}\right\}
$$

contains an open dense semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$. Since $d<p$, the mapping $G(\cdot, c):\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{d} \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{R}^{p}$ is transverse to $\{0\}$ if and only if $\operatorname{Im} G(\cdot, c) \cap\{0\}=\emptyset$. We deduce, for each $c \in P_{3}$, that $\{G(\cdot, c)=0\} \cap\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{d}=\emptyset$, and hence $\{F(\cdot, c)=0\} \cap\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}=\emptyset$. This implies that $P_{3} \subset \mathcal{D}_{I}(\Gamma)$.

Case 2.2: $d \geqslant p$. We show that this case can be reduced to the case $n=d$. To see this, fix $c:=\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{p}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$. Under the change of coordinates (4), the polynomials $f_{i}\left(x, c_{i}\right) \in$ $\mathbb{R}[x]$ and $g_{i}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{i}\right) \in \mathbb{R}\left[u^{\prime}\right]$ have the forms (5) and (6), respectively. Recall that $F(x, c)=$ $\left(f_{1}\left(x, c_{1}\right), \ldots, f_{p}\left(x, c_{p}\right)\right)$ and $G\left(u^{\prime}, c\right)=\left(g_{1}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{1}\right), \ldots, g_{p}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{p}\right)\right)$. We have seen that $F(x, c)=0$ has solutions in $\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}$ if and only if $G\left(u^{\prime}, c\right)=0$ has solutions in $\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{d}$.

For any $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$, let $\kappa=\left(\kappa_{1}, \ldots, \kappa_{n}\right)$. By a direct calculation, in the system of coordinates $u_{1}, \ldots, u_{n}$, the matrix $x D F(x, c)$ has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(u_{1}^{d_{i 1}} \ldots u_{n-d}^{d_{i(n-d)}} \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}} \kappa_{l} c_{i, \kappa} u^{\prime \gamma_{\kappa}}\right)_{i=1, \ldots, p, l=1, \ldots, n} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, let $u^{\prime} D G\left(u^{\prime}, c\right)$ denote the matrix

$$
\left(u_{j}^{\prime} \frac{\partial g_{i}}{\partial u_{j}^{\prime}}\left(u^{\prime}, c_{i}\right)\right)_{i=1, \ldots, p, j=n-d+1, \ldots, n}
$$

then we can see that

$$
u^{\prime} D G\left(u^{\prime}, c\right)=\left(\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{n} q_{j, l} \kappa_{l}\right) c_{i, \kappa} u^{\prime \gamma_{\kappa}}\right)_{i=1, \ldots, p, j=n-d+1, \ldots, n}
$$

Observe that the columns of $u^{\prime} D G\left(u^{\prime}, c\right)$ are linear combinations of the columns of the matrix

$$
\left(\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{Z}_{i}} \kappa_{l} c_{i, \kappa} u^{\gamma_{\kappa}}\right)_{i=1, \ldots, p, l=1, \ldots, n}
$$

which has the same rank as the matrix in (7) for any $u \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}$. The monomial mapping (4) admits a unique monomial inverse mapping. Consequently, we have

$$
\left\{x \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{n}: F(x, c)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{rank}(x D F(x, c))<p\right\} \neq \emptyset
$$

if and only if

$$
\left\{u^{\prime} \in\left(\mathbb{R}^{*}\right)^{d}: G\left(u^{\prime}, c\right)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{rank}\left(u^{\prime} D G\left(u^{\prime}, c\right)\right)<p\right\} \neq \emptyset
$$

We note, in addition, the following facts:

- For each $c_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_{i}}, g_{i}\left(\cdot, c_{i}\right)$ is a polynomial function in $d$ variables.
- Let $\pi: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d}$ be the projection on the last $d$ coordinates, and for $i=1, \ldots, n$, we write $A\left(\Gamma_{i}\right)$ for the set $\left\{A \kappa: \kappa \in \Gamma_{i}\right\}$. In light of (3) , $\pi\left(A\left(\Gamma_{i}\right)\right)$ is a Newton polyhedron and is equal to the Newton polyhedron of $g_{i}$. As the matrix $A$ is nonsingular, $\gamma_{\kappa}$ in (5) are distinct for different $\kappa$, and so $\pi\left(A\left(\Gamma_{i}\right)\right)$ has the same number of integer points as $\Gamma_{i}$. Moreover, we have

$$
\operatorname{dim}\left(\pi\left(A\left(\Gamma_{1}\right)\right)+\cdots+\pi\left(A\left(\Gamma_{p}\right)\right)\right)=\operatorname{dim}\left(\Gamma_{1}+\cdots+\Gamma_{p}\right)=d
$$

Therefore, the problem is reduced to the case $n=d$. This ends the proof of the proposition.
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