DATA LOCI IN ALGEBRAIC OPTIMIZATION
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Abstract. In this article we provide examples, methods and algorithms to determine conditions on the parameters of certain type of parametric optimization problems, such that among the resulting local minima and maxima there is at least one which satisfies given polynomial conditions (for example it is singular or symmetric).

1. Introduction

In many kinds of optimization problems (distance optimization, optimizing communication rate etc.) it is interesting to ask the question whether the solution is satisfying certain meaningful (polynomial) conditions. For example one can be interested if the solution will be singular, symmetric, etc. Equally interesting is to ask the same question not only about the minimizer or the maximizer of the optimization problem, but all the local minima and maxima as well, so for all the critical points of the problem. In other words, we are considering a generalization of the inverse problem of determining the parameter data that exhibits a certain type of critical point. We provide examples, methods and algorithms to test properties of a parametric optimization problem.

Our motivating example is the scaled distance function. A scaled distance function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is prescribed by parameter data $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a fixed scaling vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$d_w^u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (u_i - x_i)^2.$$ 

Our main problem is to solve

$$\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\text{minimize } & d_w^u(x) \\
\text{subject to } & x \in X_{\mathbb{R}},
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}$$

where $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ is an affine variety in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We want to provide the set of parameters $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which at least one of the critical points of Problem 1 satisfy prescribed (polynomial) conditions.

To use the algebraic techniques, we pose our problem over the algebraically closed field of complex numbers: For an objective function $d_w^u : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ given by $u \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $w \in \mathbb{C}^n$, determine the critical points of $d_w^u|_{X_{\mathbb{R}}}$ where $X$ denotes Zariski closure of $X_{\mathbb{R}}$. A practically meaningful (e.g. positive, real) critical point of $d_w^u|_{X_{\mathbb{R}}}$ will be among the set of complex critical points of $d_w^u|_{X_{\mathbb{R}}}$.

Our main theorem is the following.
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Theorem 1. Let $A$ be a subvariety of $X$, then the variety of parameters $u \in \mathbb{C}^n$ for which Problem [1] will have a critical point in $A$ is given by the closure of

$$\Gamma(\text{Con}(X) \cap \text{Con}(A)),$$

where $\text{Con}(X)$ and $\text{Con}(A)$ are the corresponding conormal varieties (see [5]) and

$$\Gamma(x, y) = \left( x_i - \frac{1}{w_i} y_i \right) _i.$$

Remark 2. The conormal varieties $\text{Con}(X)$ and $\text{Con}(A)$ are $n$-dimensional in $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$. So one would expect the intersection $\text{Con}(X) \cap \text{Con}(A)$ to be a finite set of points. But when $A \subset X$, the intersection is much more interesting and can be positive dimensional. For example if $A$ is a regular point in $X$, then the intersection $\text{Con}(X) \cap \text{Con}(A)$ is the normal space at the regular point.

In what follows, we provide a framework for generalizing the previous theorem to other optimizations problems besides the scaled distance function. In Sections 3 and 1 we discuss classical distance optimization concerning low rank and structured low rank approximations of matrices and tensors in Examples 10, 14, 15, 16; we discuss weighted distance optimization in Example 12; we discuss Maximum Likelihood (ML) Degree in Remark 8; and we show in Example 4 that optimizing communication rate also fits our problem setting.

2. Conormal map derived from the objective function

2.1. Pairing data with $\Gamma$. We are solving parametric optimization problems with polynomial constraints. More precisely we have the following parametric optimization problem: for any fixed vector of parameters $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ solve

$$\begin{cases} 
\text{minimize} & d_u(x), \\
\text{subject to} & x \in X, \\
\end{cases}$$

where $X$ is an affine variety in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is the common zero set of the polynomials $f_1(x), \ldots, f_c(x)$ and $d_u(x)$ is some parametric objective function. We will denote the collection of regular points by $X_{\text{reg}}$.

In order to find the minimizer algebraically we have to find all local minimizers and maximizers for [2], hence all the constrained critical points of $d_u$. The set of constrained critical points of $d_u$ is given by following:

$$\{ x \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \nabla d_u(x) \in N_x X, x \in X_{\text{reg}} \}.$$ 

Here $\nabla d_u(x)$ denotes the partial derivatives of $d_u$ with respect to $x$, and $N_x X$ is the normal space of $X$ at $x$.

A classical approach to such problems is to use Lagrange multipliers when $X$ is of dimension $n - c$, see [2] Section 5.5.3]. Indeed in this case [3] is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} 
\nabla d_u(x) + \sum_{i=1}^c \lambda_i \nabla f_i(x) = 0 \\
f_1(x) = f_2(x) = \ldots = f_c(x) = 0. \\
\end{cases}$$

So in any case a point $x \in X_{\text{reg}}$ is a solution to [3] if and only if $\nabla d_u(x) = y$, for some $y \in N_x X$. 

Furthermore, to be able to use algebraic geometry techniques, we will need some assumptions on $d_u$.

**Condition 2.1.** We suppose that for almost all choices of $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$ (outside a hypersurface $H$) there is a unique $u \in \mathbb{C}^n$, such that

$$\nabla d_u(x) = y.$$ 

Now let us denote by $\Gamma(x, y) := u$ the unique solution $u$ to $\nabla d_u(x) = y$, for any fixed $x$ and $y$. Furthermore we must require that $\Gamma$ is a rational function.

In this setting, a point $x \in X_{\text{reg}}$ is a solution to (3) if and only if there exists $y \in N_x X$, such that

$$\Gamma(x, y) = u.$$ 

A couple of examples for $\Gamma$ from classical optimization problems will follow.

**Example 3** (Weighted distance optimization). Suppose that we want to solve for any parameter vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and fixed weight vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the following weighted distance minimization problem

$$\begin{cases} \text{minimize } \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i(u_i - x_i)^2, \\ \text{subject to } x \in X_{\text{reg}}, \end{cases}$$

with $X$ an affine variety in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then based on the discussion above we get that all the critical points of the system (local minimizers and maximizers) satisfy that

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i(u_i - x_i)^2 \in N_x X, \\ x \in X_{\text{reg}}. \end{cases}$$

That is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} (w_1(x_1 - u_1), \ldots, w_n(x_n - u_n)) \in N_x X, \\ x \in X_{\text{reg}}. \end{cases}$$

So we get that $x \in X_{\text{reg}}$ is a critical point of the system if and only if there exists $y \in N_x X$ such that $(w_1(x_1 - u_1), \ldots, w_n(x_n - u_n)) = y$. We see that in this case Condition 2.1 is satisfied, so for fixed $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$ there is a unique $u$ such that the above condition is satisfied, namely

$$u = \Gamma(x, y) = \left(x_1 + \frac{1}{w_1} y_1, \ldots, x_n + \frac{1}{w_n} y_n\right).$$

Observe that when we choose the weight function to be all ones then we get back to classical distance optimization on algebraic varieties, namely to Euclidean Distance Degree theory, which is discussed in article [3] in detail. Furthermore, see [9] for a topological viewpoint involving Euler characteristics.

**Example 4** (Information theory-Water filling). We consider the following parametrized optimization problem in convex optimization (see [2, Chapter 5, Example 5.2]). For
any parameter vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u_i > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
\text{minimize} & \sum_{i=1}^{n} - \log(u_i + x_i), \\
\text{subject to} & x_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = 1.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

This problem arises in information theory, in allocating power to a set of $n$ communication channels. The variable $x_i$ represents the transmitter power allocated to the $i$-th channel, and $\log(u_i + x_i)$ gives the capacity or communication rate of the channel, so the problem is to allocate a total power of one to the channels, in order to maximize the total communication rate. A relaxed version over the complex numbers of this problem can be tackled by the methods presented in this article. So we consider the following optimization problem. For any parameter vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
\text{minimize} & \sum_{i=1}^{n} - \log(u_i + x_i), \\
\text{subject to} & x \in \mathcal{L},
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is a suitable linear space and $\log$ is some fixed branch of the complex logarithm. We get that all the critical points of the system (local minimizers and maximizers) satisfy that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \sum_{i=1}^{n} - \log(u_i + x_i) & \in \mathcal{N}_x \mathcal{L}, \\
x & \in \mathcal{L}.
\end{aligned}$$

That is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
\left( \frac{1}{u_1 + x_1}, \ldots, \frac{1}{u_n + x_n} \right) & \in \mathcal{N}_x \mathcal{L}, \\
x & \in \mathcal{L}.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

We see that in this case Condition (2.1) is satisfied, so for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by $y_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot y_n = 0$, there is a unique $u$, such that the above condition is satisfied, namely

$$u = \Gamma(x, y) = \left( \frac{1}{y_1} - x_1, \ldots, \frac{1}{y_n} - x_n \right).$$

In the next section we introduce the conormal variety and construct the graph of $\Gamma$ over it.

2.2. Conormal Variety and $\Gamma$ correspondence. We have seen so far that pairs of points $(x, y)$ such that $x \in X_{\text{reg}}$ and $y \in \mathcal{N}_x X$ play a crucial role in our analysis. The closure of the collection of all such pairs with $x \in X_{\text{reg}}$ is called the conormal variety and we denote it by $\text{Con}(X)$. Formally we have

$$(5) \quad \text{Con}(X) = \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^n_x \times \mathbb{C}^n_y, \ x \in X_{\text{reg}}, \ y \in \mathcal{N}_x X \}.$$ 

We use the notation $\mathbb{C}^n_x \times \mathbb{C}^n_y$ instead of just simply $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$ to keep track that the first $n$ tuple of coordinates represents a point $x$ and the second $n$ tuple of coordinates represents a point $y$.

There is a natural pair of projections $\pi_1 : \text{Con}(X) \to \mathbb{C}^n_x$ to the first $n$-tuple of coordinates and $\pi_2 : \text{Con}(X) \to \mathbb{C}^n_y$ to the second $n$-tuple of coordinates. The
image of the first projection is the variety \( X \) itself and the closure of the image of 
the second projection \( Y := \pi_2(\text{Con}(X)) \), in the case of affine cones (or projective 
varieties), is called the dual variety of \( X \), see for instance [11, Section 5.4.2].

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Con}(X) \\
\pi_1 \\
X \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n_x \\
\pi_2 \\
Y \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n_y \\
\end{array}
\]

We remind the reader that (see [3, Theorem 4.1]) the conormal variety is an irreducible 
variety of dimension \( n \) inside \( \mathbb{C}^n_x \times \mathbb{C}^n_y \). Moreover the first projection 
\( \pi_1 : \text{Con}(X) \to X \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n_x \) is an affine vector bundle of rank \( c \) over \( X_{\text{reg}} \) (where \( c \) is the codimension of \( X \)). Over generic \( y_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n_y \), the second projection \( \pi_2 : \text{Con}(X) \to \mathbb{C}^n_y \) 
has finite fibers \( \pi_2^{-1}(y_0) \) of cardinality equal to the Euclidean Distance Degree 
[3] of \( X \).

So we have that \( x \in X_{\text{reg}} \) is a solution to (3) if and only if there exists a point 
\((x,y)\) in \( \text{Con}(X) \setminus \mathcal{H} \) such that \( u = \Gamma(x,y) \), equivalently such that 
\((x,y,u)\) is a point on the closure of the graph of \( \Gamma \) over the conormal variety \( \text{Con}(X) \setminus \mathcal{H} \). Let us remember that \( \Gamma : \text{Con}(X) \setminus \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n_x \times \mathbb{C}^n_y \to \mathbb{C}^n_u \). We call the closure of the 
graph of \( \Gamma \) over \( \text{Con}(X) \setminus \mathcal{H} \) the \( \Gamma \)-correspondence. More formally \( \text{Graph}(\Gamma) \) is the 
closure of all triples 
\[ \{(x,y,u) \text{ such that, } (x,y) \in \text{Con}(X) \setminus \mathcal{H} \text{ and } u = \Gamma(x,y)\}. \]

**Remark 5.** In the case of classical distance optimization on varieties, like in 
Example 3, we have that \( \Gamma(x,y) = x + y \) and the \( \Gamma \)-correspondence is called the the ED (Euclidean Distance)-correspondence, see [3, Section 4].

We have the following diagram of projections from the \( \Gamma \)-correspondence.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Graph}(\Gamma) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n_x \times \mathbb{C}^n_y \times \mathbb{C}^n_u \\
\pi_1 \bigtriangleup \pi_2 \bigtriangleup \pi_3 \\
\text{Con}(X) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n_x \times \mathbb{C}^n_y \\
\pi_1 \bigtriangleup \pi_2 \\
X \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n_x \\
\pi_3 \\
Y \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n_y \\
\end{array}
\]

Because \( \text{Con}(X) \) is an \( n \)-dimensional variety, \( \text{Graph}(\Gamma) \) is an \( n \)-dimensional variety 
as well inside \( \mathbb{C}^n_x \times \mathbb{C}^n_y \times \mathbb{C}^n_u \). By Condition 2.1 we have that \( \pi_3 \) is a generically 
finite map.

### 3. Data loci

In this article we want to determine the set of all parameters \( u \in \mathbb{C}^n_u \), such that 
the optimization problem [2] has at least one critical solution in a given subvariety 
of \( X \). Let \( A \subseteq X \) be a subvariety of \( X \). We define the data-locus of \( A \) to be 
the closure of projection \( \pi_3 \) (that is into the space \( \mathbb{C}^n_u \) of parameters \( u \)) of 
triples \((x,y,u)\in\text{Graph}(\Gamma)\), such that \( x \in A \). We denote the data locus by \( DL_A \) and 
formally we have that 
\[ DL_A := \overline{\pi_3 \left( \text{Graph}(\Gamma) \cap (A \times \mathbb{C}^n_y \times \mathbb{C}^n_u) \right)} \].
Our main theorem is as follows.

**Theorem 6 (Structure theorem).** Let $A \subseteq X$ be a subvariety, then we have that
\[
DL_A = \overline{\Gamma(Con(X) \cap Con(A))} \setminus \mathcal{H}.
\]

A special case of this theorem, when $\Gamma(x, y) = (x_i + \frac{1}{w_i} y_i)$, is presented in the introduction as Theorem [I]

**Proof.** The graph of $\Gamma$ over $Con(X) \setminus \mathcal{H}$ is
\[
\{(x, y, u) \in \mathbb{C}_x^n \times \mathbb{C}_y^n \times \mathbb{C}_u^n, \text{ s.t. } (x, y) \in Con(X) \setminus \mathcal{H} \text{ and } u = \Gamma(x, y)\}.
\]
So we have that $\text{Graph}(\Gamma) \cap (A \times \mathbb{C}_y^n \times \mathbb{C}_u^n)$ equals to
\[
\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}_x^n \times \mathbb{C}_y^n \setminus \mathcal{H}, \text{ s.t. } x \in A, (x, y) \in Con(X) \setminus \mathcal{H} \text{ and } u = \Gamma(x, y)\}.
\]
But we have that the set of pairs
\[
\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}_x^n \times \mathbb{C}_y^n, \text{ s.t. } x \in A \text{ and } (x, y) \in Con(X) \setminus \mathcal{H}\}
\]
is equal to
\[
\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}_x^n \times \mathbb{C}_y^n \setminus \mathcal{H}, \text{ s.t. } x \in A \text{ and } y \in N_x A\} \bigcap \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}_x^n \times \mathbb{C}_y^n \setminus \mathcal{H}, \text{ s.t. } x \in X \text{ and } y \in N_x X\} = Con(X) \cap Con(A) \setminus \mathcal{H},
\]
because $A \subseteq X$ is a subvariety and $N_x X \subseteq N_x A$. So we get that
\[
\text{Graph}(\Gamma) \cap (A \times \mathbb{C}_y^n \times \mathbb{C}_u^n)
\]
is equal to the graph of $\Gamma$ over $Con(X) \cap Con(A) \setminus \mathcal{H}$.

Now that we know the structure of the data locus we can bound it as a set to be able to extract further properties of it.

**Corollary 7 (Bounding the data locus).** Let $A \subseteq X$ be a subvariety, then we have that
\[
\overline{\Gamma((A \times \{0\}) \setminus \mathcal{H})} \subseteq DL_A \subseteq \overline{\Gamma((A \times Y_A \cap Y) \setminus \mathcal{H})},
\]
where $Y_A$ is the dual variety of $A$, that is the closure of $\pi_2(Con(A))$ and $Y$ is the dual variety of $X$, that is the closure of $\pi_2(Con(X))$. Moreover, if $A$ is contained in a hyperplane defined by $h_0 + h_1 x_1 + \cdots + h_n x_n = 0$, then
\[
\overline{\Gamma(A \times \{(h_1, \ldots, h_n)\}) \setminus \mathcal{H}} \subseteq DL_A.
\]

**Proof.** The first inequality follows from the fact that $0 \in N_x X$ for any $x \in X$, hence for any $a \in A$ we have that $(a, 0) \in Con(X) \cap Con(A)$, so by Theorem [6] we get that $\overline{\Gamma((A \times \{0\}) \setminus \mathcal{H})} \subseteq DL_A$. For the second inequality observe that
\[
\pi_1(Con(X) \cap Con(A)) = \pi_1(Con(X)) \cap \pi_1(Con(A)) = X \cap A,
\]
and
\[
\pi_2(Con(X) \cap Con(A)) = \pi_2(Con(X)) \cap \pi_2(Con(A)) = Y_A \cap Y.
\]
We also have that $Con(X) \cap Con(A)$ is a subset of
\[
\pi_1(Con(X) \cap Con(A)) \times \pi_2(Con(X) \cap Con(A)).
\]
So we get that
\[
Con(X) \cap Con(A) \subseteq A \times (Y_A \cap Y).
\]
Hence
\[
DL_A = \overline{\Gamma(Con(X) \cap Con(A) \setminus \mathcal{H})} \subseteq \overline{\Gamma((A \times Y_A \cap Y) \setminus \mathcal{H})}.
\]
The moreover part follows from the fact that \((h_1, \ldots, h_n) \in \mathcal{N}_a X\) and hence \((h_1, \ldots, h_n) \in \mathcal{N}_a A\) for any \(a \in A\). By this we get that \((a, (h_1, \ldots, h_n))\) is an element of \(\text{Con}(X) \cap \text{Con}(A)\), so by Theorem 6 we get that

\[
\Gamma(A \times \{(h_1, \ldots, h_n)\} \setminus \mathcal{H}) \subseteq \text{DL}_A.
\]

\(\square\)

**Remark 8.** A specialized version of Corollary 7 for \(\Gamma(x, y) = x + y\) (that is the Euclidean distance case) and for \(A = \text{Sing}X\) can be read as

\[
\text{Sing}X \subseteq \text{DL}_{\text{Sing}X} \subseteq \text{Sing}X + Y \cap \text{Y}_{\text{Sing}X},
\]

where \(Y\) is the dual variety of \(X\) and \(\text{Y}_{\text{Sing}X}\) is the dual variety of \(\text{Sing}X\). This is a stronger version of a similar inequality found in [7, Theorem 1].

**Remark 9.** If \(X\) is an affine cone that is an algebraic statistical model in \(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\), then \(X\) is always a subset of the hyperplane controlling the sum of coordinates, that is \(x_1 + \cdots + x_n - x_{n+1} = 0\) with \(x_{n+1} = 1\). The algebraic approach to do maximum likelihood estimation on this model is by determining every critical point of the likelihood function on the the model’s closure. For this parametric optimization problem the corresponding choice of \(\Gamma\) is \(\Gamma(x, y) = (x_1y_1, \ldots, x_ny_n, x_{n+1}y_{n+1})\) with domain \(\mathbb{C}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{H}\), where \(\mathcal{H}\) is defined by \(x_1 \cdots x_n \cdot x_{n+1} = 0\). Let \(A\) be the singular locus of \(X\). The corresponding data locus is called the **ML Data Singular Locus** (see [3, Example 2]). Observe that \(\text{Sing}X\) (as the whole model) is always a subset of the hyperplane controlling the sum of coordinates, so in this case (the moreover part of ) Corollary 7 reads as

\[
(\text{Sing}X \setminus \mathcal{H}) \ast (1, 1, \ldots, 1, -1) \subseteq \text{DL}_{\text{Sing}X} \subseteq (\text{Sing}X \setminus \mathcal{H}) \ast (Y \cap \text{Y}_{\text{Sing}X}),
\]

where \(Y\) is the dual variety of \(X\), \(\text{Y}_{\text{Sing}X}\) is the dual variety of \(\text{Sing}X\) and \(\ast\) denotes the Hadamard product. A weaker version of this result appears in [8, Theorem 1].

**Example 10 (Rank \(r\) approximations).** An illustrating example of our main theorem, is the following. Let \(M_{n}^{\leq r}\) be the variety of \(n \times n\) matrices of rank at most \(r\). Let \(q < r\) and let \(A\) be the variety of \(n \times n\) matrices of rank at most \(q\). Now if we take \(\Gamma(x, y) = x + y\), which is exactly the case of Euclidean distance optimization (see [3, Example 2.3]), then \(\text{DL}_{M_{n}^{\leq q}}\) corresponds the set of all matrices that have at least one critical rank \(r\) approximation that is in fact of rank at most \(q\). For \(q = r - 1\), by [7, Proposition 9], we know that this set is equal to \(M_{n}^{\leq n-1}\). Now for a general \(q\) our structure theorem says that

\[
\text{DL}_{M_{n}^{\leq q}} = \overline{\Gamma(\text{Con}(M_{n}^{\leq r}) \cap \text{Con}(M_{n}^{\leq q}))}.
\]

Now by [5, Chapter 1, Prop. 4.11 and Lemma 4.12] (and by [11, Example 5.15] for the symmetric case) we know that the conormal variety of \(M_{n}^{\leq r}\) is the closure of the set of pairs

\[
\{(A, B) \in M_{n} \times M_{n}, \text{ s.t. } A \in M_{n}^{\leq r} \text{ and } B \in M_{n}^{\leq n-r}\},
\]

and the conormal variety of \(M_{n}^{\leq q}\) is the closure of the set of pairs

\[
\{(A, B) \in M_{n} \times M_{n}, \text{ s.t. } A \in M_{n}^{\leq q} \text{ and } B \in M_{n}^{\leq n-q}\}.
\]

So we get that \(\text{Con}(M_{n}^{\leq r}) \cap \text{Con}(M_{n}^{\leq q})\) equals to the closure of

\[
\{(A, B) \in M_{n} \times M_{n}, \text{ s.t. } A \in M_{n}^{\leq q} \text{ and } B \in M_{n}^{\leq n-r}\}.
\]
Hence $DL_A$ is equal to the closure of 
\[ \Gamma(\text{Con}(M_n^{\leq r}) \cap \text{Con}(M_n^{\leq q})) = \Gamma(M_n^{\leq q}, M_n^{\leq n-r}) = M_n^{\leq n-r+q}. \]

In other words, we have that any matrix of rank at most $n - r + q$ will have at least one matrix of rank at most $q$ among its critical rank $r$ approximations. Choosing $q = r - 1$ we get that any matrix with zero determinant will have at least one matrix of rank at most $r - 1$ among its critical rank $r$ approximations.

**Remark 11.** Another consequence of Theorem 6 is a method on how to find points on $DL_A$ computationally. First pick a point $a \in A$ and pick a set of generators $f_1, \ldots, f_c$ of the ideal of $X$. Then compute the Jacobian of $X$ at $a,$ that is 
\[ \text{Jac}_X|_a = \left( \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} \bigg|_a \right)_{i,j}. \]

Now any vector $v$ in the row span of $\text{Jac}_X|_a$ will be an element of $N_aX \cap N_aA$, hence the pair $(a, v)$ is an element of $\text{Con}(X) \cap \text{Con}(A)$. Finally by Theorem 6 we get that $\Gamma(a, v)$ is an element of $DL_A$.

4. **Computational examples**

Usually obtaining any knowledge on the conormal variety is very hard. When this is the case determining the data locus computationally helps a lot. Sometimes simply checking if the data locus is or is not the entire space proves certain general statements (see Example 15). In what follows we will see a set of examples on how to compute these data loci. The wide range of examples shows the importance as well.

**Example 12** (Rational normal surface). Let us consider the rational normal surface in $\mathbb{C}^4$ (the twisted cubic surface). It is the image of the monomial map defined by 
\[ (t_1, t_2) \mapsto (t_1^3, t_1^2 t_2, t_1 t_2^2, t_2^3). \]

The closure of the image is not a complete intersection, but it is defined by the vanishing of the following three polynomials 
\[ x_3^2 - x_2 x_4, \quad x_2 x_3 - x_1 x_4, \quad x_2^2 - x_1 x_3. \]

The origin is the only singular point of this variety and its intersection with any affine hyperplane is the moment curve. We optimize a weighted distance function 
\[ \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} w_i(u_i - x_i)^2, \]

and we are interested in those points in $\mathbb{C}^4$ for which among the critical points of the weighted distance function to the rational normal surface there is at least one point on the moment curve cut out by $x_4 = 1$. So we have that $X$ is the rational normal surface and the subvariety $A$ is its cut by the hyperplane $x_4 = 1.$ For this problem there are two natural weights to be considered for the distance function (see [3, Example 2.7]). One is the unit weight $w_i = 1$, corresponding to the classical Euclidean distance and the other one is the weight $w_i = \binom{3}{i}$, corresponding to the natural metric on the space of symmetric tensors. We will choose the weight $w_i = \binom{3}{i-1}$ and we get that $\Gamma(x, y) = (x_i + \frac{1}{w_i} y_i).$ After running the computations (see Example 13) we get that the data locus is an irreducible hypersurface of degree 7. The real part of an affine slice can be seen in Figure 1.
Example 13. Below is the Macaulay2 [6] code for computing the data locus of the moment curve from Example [12].

```
n=4;
kk=QQ[x_1..x_n,u_1..u_n];
------------------------------------------------------------
--defining polynomials of X
(f1,f2,f3) = (x_3^2-x_2*x_4, x_2*x_3-x_1*x_4, x_2^2-x_1*x_3)
X = ideal(f1,f2,f3);
c = codim X;
Jac = jacobian gens X;
SingX = X+minors(c,Jac);
------------------------------------------------------------
g = x_1-1;--additional defining polynomial of the subvariety A
A = X+ideal(g);
------------------------------------------------------------
Y = matrix{{x_1-u_1,3*(x_2-u_2),3*(x_3-u_3),x_4-u_4}};
--Gamma is incorporated here, by setting y_i=w_i(x_i-u_i)
S = submatrix(Jac,{0..n-1},{0..numgens(X)-1});
Jbar = S|transpose(Y);
projGammaCorr = X + minors(c+1,Jbar);
```
-- the (x, u) projection of the Gamma Correspondence
projGammaCorrRegular = saturate(projGammaCorr, SingX);

PreimDL = projGammaCorrRegular + A; -- preimage of the data locus
DLA = eliminate(toList(x_1..x_n), PreimDL); -- data locus of A

Here in the construction of the Γ-correspondence we use that for \( x \in X_{\text{reg}}, (w_i(x_i - u_i))_i \in \mathcal{N}_x X \) is equivalent to the matrix

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
(w_i(x_i - u_i))_i \\
\nabla f_1 \\
\vdots \\
\nabla f_c
\end{pmatrix}
\]

having rank less than or equal to the codimension of \( X \) (see [3, Section 2]).

**Example 14** (Formation control [1]). Formation control, for a set of \( n \) points (called “agents”) in some given dimension \( d \), is concerned with defining control laws which ensure that the points will move so that certain inter-agent distances approximate prescribed values as closely as possible. One of the challenging questions in this area is the following: given the dimension and the number of agents, what is the number of critical formations? This problem can be formulated as a distance optimization problem, see [3, Example 3.7]. Here the authors proved a formula for the number of critical formations on a line (\( d = 1 \)) for any number of agents. Using the notation from the above mentioned article let \( X \) denote the variety in \( \mathbb{C}^{p_2} \) with parametric representation

\[
d_{ij} = (z_i - z_j)^2 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq p.
\]

Thus, the points in \( X \) record the squared distances among \( p \) interacting agents with coordinates \( z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_p \in \mathbb{C}^d \). Then \( X \) is defined by the \((d + 1) \times (d + 1)\)-minors of the Cayley-Menger matrix

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
2d_{1p} & d_{1p} + d_{2p} - d_{12} & d_{1p} + d_{3p} - d_{13} & \cdots & d_{1p} + d_{p-1,p} - d_{1,p-1} \\
d_{1p} + d_{2p} - d_{12} & 2d_{2p} & d_{2p} + d_{3p} - d_{23} & \cdots & d_{2p} + d_{p-1,p} - d_{2,p-1} \\
d_{1p} + d_{3p} - d_{13} & d_{2p} + d_{3p} - d_{23} & 2d_{3p} & \cdots & d_{3p} + d_{p-1,p} - d_{3,p-1} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
d_{1p} + d_{p-1,p} - d_{1,p-1} & d_{2p} + d_{p-1,p} - d_{2,p-1} & d_{3p} + d_{p-1,p} - d_{3,p-1} & \cdots & 2d_{p-1,p}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Now we are interested in those tuples of prescribed inter-agent distances for which a special critical formation occurs. Finding these data is equivalent to determining a certain data locus. The first interesting case is for four agents in the plane, i.e. \( p = 4 \) and \( d = 2 \). We would like to find those data (or prescribed inter-agent distance tuples) for which there is a critical formation that is a square. Hence \( A \) is the subvariety satisfying the additional constrains

\[
d_{12} - d_{23} = d_{23} - d_{34} = d_{34} - d_{14} = 0,
\]

and we are interested in \( \text{DL}_{\text{A}} \). After running the computations we get that the locus of these data forms a degree 13, codimension 3 variety generated minimally by 26 polynomials. The Macaulay2 code and the resulting polynomials of the computations can be found at [13].
Example 15 (Structured low rank approximations [10]). Structured low-rank approximation is the problem of minimizing a weighted Frobenius distance to a given matrix among all matrices of fixed rank in a linear space of matrices. Here we optimize a weighted distance function

\[ \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} w_{ij} (u_{ij} - x_{ij})^2. \]

In this case we have again that \( \Gamma(x, y) = (x_{ij} - \frac{1}{w_{ij}} y_{ij})_{i,j} \). The Hankel matrix \( H_n \) of format \( n \times n \) has the entry \( x_{i+j-1} \) in row \( i \) and column \( j \). For example

\[ H_5 = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\ x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \\ x_3 & x_4 & x_5 \end{bmatrix}. \]

Any element of the the space of symmetric \( 2 \times 2 \times \cdots \times 2 \)-tensors corresponds to a binary form

\[ F(s, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{n-1}{i-1} \cdot x_i \cdot s^{n-i} \cdot t^{i-1}. \]

For such a binary form the corresponding Hankel matrix \( H_n \) has rank 1 if and only if \( F(s, t) \) is the \((n-1)\)-st power of a linear form. More generally, if \( F(s, t) \) is the sum of \( r \) powers of linear forms, then \( H_n \) has rank \( \leq r \). This locus corresponds to the \( r \)-th secant variety of the rational normal curve (see Example 12). For low rank approximations of Hankel matrices there are certain weights to be considered (see more [10, Section 4]). We choose to work with the unit weight vector \( w_{ij} = 1 \), because of computational reasons. Based on the fact that the best rank 1 approximation to real symmetric tensors can be chosen symmetric (see [4]), we are interested in the following problem. What is the set of those \( 3 \times 3 \) Hankel matrices, which have a Hankel matrix among their critical rank 1 approximations? Can the best rank 1 approximation be chosen to be Hankel? For some structured low rank approximations the answer to the analogous question is true. For example a symmetric matrix always has a symmetric matrix among its rank 1 critical approximations (so for \( 2 \times 2 \) Hankel matrices this is true). An analogy is not true for Hankel matrices of dimension \( n \geq 3 \). Choosing the variety \( X \) to be \( 3 \times 3 \) matrices of rank one and letting the subvariety \( A \) to be the rank one Hankel matrices, the data locus \( DL_A \) consists of all matrices that admit at least one critical Hankel rank one approximation. After running the computations we get that there is an irreducible hypersurface of degree 3 of \( 3 \times 3 \) matrices which have a critical rank 1 Hankel approximation and this hypersurface has a codimension 5, degree 9 subvariety of Hankel matrices. The Macaulay2 code and the resulting polynomials of the computations can be found at [13].

Example 16 (Low rank approximation of tensors). When does it happen that among the critical rank 2 approximations of an \( n_1 \times n_2 \times \cdots \times n_p \) tensor there is a tensor that is of rank 1? The smallest interesting case would be for \( 2 \times 2 \times 3 \) tensors. Let \( Rk_2 \) be the variety of border rank at most 2 tensors, defined by all the \( 3 \times 3 \) minors of all the flattenings. Let \( Rk_1 \) be the subvariety of rank at most one tensors, defined by all the \( 2 \times 2 \) minors of all the flattenings. The singular locus of \( Rk_2 \) is defined by all the \( 2 \times 2 \) minors of all but one flattening. The missing minors come from a \( 2 \times 6 \) flattening of the tensor. So we have that \( Rk_1 \subset \text{Sing}_{Rk_2} \). After running the computations we get the following. The data locus of the singular locus is \( Rk_2 \).
itself. So $DL_{R_k^2} = R_k^2$. This means that all tensors (and only them) of rank at most 2 have a singular critical rank 2 approximation. Moreover the data locus of rank one tensors is a subvariety of the previous data locus, that is

$$DL_{R_k^1} \subset DL_{\text{Sing} R_k^2} = R_k^2.$$ 

Also $DL_{R_k^1}$ has codimension 3, degree 40 and is defined by 10 polynomials. The Macaulay2 code and the resulting polynomials of the computations can be found at [13].
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