

Smooth Points on Semi-algebraic Sets

Katherine Harris^a, Jonathan D. Hauenstein^b, Agnes Szanto^a

^a*Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University,
Campus Box 8205, Raleigh, North Carolina, 27695, USA.*

^b*Department of Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics, University of Notre Dame,
102G Crowley Hall, Notre Dame, Indiana, 46556, USA.*

Abstract

Many algorithms for determining properties of real algebraic or semi-algebraic sets rely upon the ability to compute smooth points. In this paper, we present a simple procedure based on computing the critical points of some well-chosen function that guarantees the computation of smooth points in each connected bounded component of a real atomic semi-algebraic set. Our technique is intuitive in principal, performs well on previously difficult examples, and is straightforward to implement using existing numerical algebraic geometry software. The practical efficiency of our approach is demonstrated by solving a conjecture on the number of equilibria of the Kuramoto model for the $n = 4$ case. We also apply our method to design an efficient algorithm to compute the real dimension of algebraic sets, the original motivation for this research. We compare the efficiency of our method to existing methods to compute the real dimension on a family of benchmark problems.

Keywords: computational real algebraic geometry, real smooth points, real dimension, polar varieties, numerical algebraic geometry, Kuramoto model

1. Introduction

Consider the atomic semi-algebraic set

$$S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_1(x) = \cdots = f_s(x) = 0, q_1(x) > 0, \dots, q_m(x) > 0\} \quad (1)$$

for some $f_1, \dots, f_s, q_1, \dots, q_m \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. When studying semi-algebraic sets, one often first studies the complex variety $V = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : f_1(x) = \cdots = f_s(x) = 0\}$ and deduces properties of S from the properties of V . In particular, if S contains a smooth point and V is irreducible, then S is Zariski dense in V , so all of the algebraic information of S is contained in V . Thus, deciding the existence of smooth points in real semi-algebraic sets and finding such points is a central problem in real algebraic geometry with many applications. For example, if $\varphi : S \rightarrow S'$ is a polynomial map of semi-algebraic sets, then smooth points in $\text{Im}(\varphi)$ are points where the Jacobian of φ has maximal rank within its connected component, called the *typical rank*. Finding

Email addresses: keharr14@ncsu.edu (Katherine Harris), hauenstein@nd.edu (Jonathan D. Hauenstein), aszanto@ncsu.edu (Agnes Szanto)

real smooth points in each connected component of a semi-algebraic set allows one to compute all typical ranks of real morphisms (see Sottile (2019) for applications of this property).

One of the main results of this paper is to give a new technique to compute smooth points on bounded connected components of atomic semi-algebraic sets. Our method is simple and suggests natural implementation using numerical homotopy methods and deformations. It complements other approaches that compute sample points on real semi-algebraic sets, such as computing the critical points of the distance function, in the sense that our method also guarantees the smoothness of the sample points. We demonstrate this advantage on “Thom’s lips” in which critical points of the distance function are often at the singularities (Wu and Reid, 2013, Ex. 2.3), while our method always computes smooth points. The main idea is very simple. Suppose V is irreducible. If a polynomial g vanishes on the singular points of V , but does not vanish on all of V , then the extreme points of g on S must contain nonsingular points in every bounded connected component of S , if such points exist. We extend this idea to the case when V is not equidimensional (i.e. reducible and the components may have different dimensions) by using *infinitesimal* deformations of V and limits. We show that this limiting approach is well-suited for numerical homotopy continuation methods after we translate an infinitesimal real deformation (that may only work for arbitrary small values) into a complex deformation that works along a real arc parameterized by the interval $(0, 1]$. Finally, we present a novel technique to compute such polynomials g using deflations, and compare its degree bounds to traditional symbolic approaches (see Proposition 4.8). In fact, Corollary 4.9 proves that our REAL SMOOTH POINT ALGORITHM performs well if the depth of the deflations (i.e. the number of iterations) s is small.

To demonstrate the practical efficiency of our new approach, we present the solution of a conjecture for the first time: counting the equilibria of the Kuramoto model in the $n = 4$ case given in Xin et al. (2016) (see Kuramoto (1975) for the original model and Coss et al. (2018) for a detailed historical overview and additional references).

We also apply our method to compute the dimension of real semi-algebraic sets. The difficulty of this problem, compared to its complex counterpart, is that in many cases the real part lies within the singular set of the complex variety containing it, and its real dimension is smaller than the complex one. In terms of worst case complexity bounds of the existing algorithms in the literature, it is an open problem if the real dimension can be computed within the same asymptotic complexity bounds as the complex dimension. The motivation for this research was to try to find an algorithm for the real dimension that has worst case complexity comparable to its complex counterpart. Even though this paper is presented using computational tools from *numerical algebraic geometry* (c.f. Sommese and Wampler (2005); Bates et al. (2013)), all procedures can be translated to symbolic methods for polynomials with rational coefficients. In fact, we did a worst case complexity estimate for a symbolic version, and found that unfortunately it does not improve the existing complexity bounds in the worst case (see Bannwarth and Safey El Din (2015) and the references therein). This is one of the reasons we wrote the paper in a numerical algebraic geometry setting, and gave evidence of the efficiency on benchmark problems. As mentioned above, in Proposition 4.8 and Corollary 4.9, we give bounds on the degrees of the polynomials appearing in our algorithms and the number of homotopy paths they follow, highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of our approach compared to other purely symbolic techniques.

1.1. Related Work

There are many approaches in the literature to compute at least one real point on every connected component of a semi-algebraic set. Methods using projections to obtain a cell decomposition based on sign conditions go back to Collins’ Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition (CAD)

algorithm described in Collins (1975). Improved symbolic methods using critical points or generalized critical points of functions along with infinitesimals and randomization can be found in Rouillier et al. (2000); Aubry et al. (2002); Safey El Din (2007); Faugère et al. (2008). The current state of the art deterministic symbolic algorithm is given in (Basu et al., 2006a, Alg. 13.3) which computes sample points on each connected component of all realizable sign conditions of a polynomial system and gives a complexity analysis. The most recent application of this technique is in Safey El Din et al. (2018, 2019) where the authors compute smooth points on real algebraic sets in order to compute the real radical of polynomial systems and analyze complexity. Alternatively, a homotopy-based approach computing the critical points of the distance function from a generic point or a line is presented in Hauenstein (2013); Wu and Reid (2013).

Another line of work has been developed in parallel which specifically focuses on computing critical points while utilizing the tool of *polar varieties*, introduced and developed in Bank et al. (1997); Safey El Din and Schost (2003); Bank et al. (2004, 2009, 2010, 2015); Safey El Din and Spaenlehauer (2016). It is important to note, however, that all of these methods only guarantee the finding of real points on every connected component of a semi-algebraic set, rather than real *smooth* points.

The real dimension problem has similarly been widely studied with the current state of the art deterministic algorithm is given by (Basu et al., 2006a, Alg. 14.10) computing all realizable sign conditions of a polynomial system. This approach improves on previous work in Vorobjov (1999) to obtain a complexity result with a better dependence on the number of polynomials in the input by utilizing a block elimination technique first proposed in Grigor'ev and Vorobjov (1988). Recent work has been presented giving probabilistic algorithms utilizing polar varieties which improve on complexity bounds even further in Safey El Din and Tsigaridas (2013); Bannwarth and Safey El Din (2015). We use a benchmark family from Bannwarth and Safey El Din (2015) to demonstrate the efficiency of our method.

One can also compute the real dimension by computing the real radical of a semi-algebraic set, first studied in Becker and Neuhaus (1993) with improvements and implementations in Neuhaus (1998); Zeng (1999); Spang (2008); Chen et al. (2013). The most recent implementation can be found in Safey El Din et al. (2018, 2019) as mentioned above. Their approach is shown to be efficient in the case when the polynomial system is smooth, but the iterative computation of singularities of singularities can increase the complexity significantly in the worst case. An alternative method using semidefinite programming techniques was proposed by Wang (2016); Ma et al. (2016).

2. Preliminaries

The following collects some basic notions used throughout including atomic semi-algebraic sets, semi-algebraic sets, and real algebraic sets.

A set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an *atomic semi-algebraic set* if it is of the form of (1). A set $T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a *semi-algebraic set* if it is a finite union of atomic semi-algebraic sets. A set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a *real algebraic set* if it is defined by polynomial equations only.

Smoothness on atomic semi-algebraic sets is described next.

Definition 2.1. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an atomic semi-algebraic set as in (1). A point $z \in S$ is smooth (or nonsingular) in S if z is smooth in the algebraic set

$$V(f_1, \dots, f_s) = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : f_1(x) = \dots = f_s(x) = 0\},$$

i.e., if there exists a unique irreducible component $V \subset V(f_1, \dots, f_s)$ containing z such that

$$\dim T_z(V) = \dim V$$

where $T_z(V)$ is the tangent space of V at z . We denote by $\text{Sing}(S)$ the set of singular (or non-smooth) points in S .

An algebraic set $V \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is *equidimensional* of dimension d if every irreducible component of V has dimension d . The following defines the real dimension of semi-algebraic sets from (Basu et al., 2006a, §5.3).

Definition 2.2. For a semi-algebraic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, its real dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} S$ is the largest k such that there exists an injective semi-algebraic map from $(0, 1)^k$ to S . Here, a map $\varphi : (0, 1)^k \rightarrow S$ is semi-algebraic if the graph of φ in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} is semi-algebraic. By convention, the dimension (real or complex) of the empty set is -1 .

The main ingredient in our results is the following theorem that was proved in (Marshall, 2008, Theorem 12.6.1):

Theorem 2.3. *Let $V \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be an irreducible algebraic set and let $V_{\mathbb{R}} := V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{R}} V_{\mathbb{R}} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V$$

if and only if there exists $z \in V_{\mathbb{R}}$ that is smooth.

2.1. Semi-algebraic to Algebraic

In this section, we show that our problem on atomic semi-algebraic sets can be reformulated as a problem on real algebraic sets. This will allow us to use homotopy continuation methods that solve polynomial equations, but not inequalities.

The following shows that smooth points on each connected component of an atomic semi-algebraic set S can be obtained as projections of smooth points of some real algebraic set.

Proposition 2.4. *Let S be an atomic semi-algebraic set as in (1) and*

$$W := \{(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m : f_1(x) = \dots = f_n(x) = 0, z_1^2 q_1(x) - 1 = \dots = z_m^2 q_m(x) - 1 = 0\}.$$

If $y \in W$ is smooth, then $\pi_x(y) \in S$ is also smooth. Conversely, if $x \in S$ is smooth, then (x, z) is smooth in W for all $z = (z_1, \dots, z_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $(x, z) \in W$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that f_1, \dots, f_s generate a prime ideal. The Jacobian matrix of the polynomial system defining W has the block structure

$$J(x, z) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline Jf(x) & 0 \\ \hline * & \text{diag}(2z_i q_i(x)) \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Since for $(x, z) \in W$ we have $z_i q_i(x) \neq 0$, the Jacobian matrix $Jf(x)$ has full column rank if and only if $J(x, z)$ has full column rank, which proves the claim. \square

Therefore, for the rest of the paper, we assume that we are given a *real algebraic set* and the goal is to compute smooth points on each connected component.

2.2. Boundedness

The next reduction is to replace an arbitrary real algebraic set with a compact one.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $f_1, \dots, f_{s-1} \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ and consider $q = (q_1, \dots, q_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, introduce a new variable x_n , and consider*

$$f_s := (x_1 - q_1)^2 + \dots + (x_{n-1} - q_{n-1})^2 + x_n^2 - \delta$$

Then, $V(f_1, \dots, f_s) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ is bounded and

$$\pi_{n-1}(V(f_1, \dots, f_s) \cap \mathbb{R}^n) = V(f_1, \dots, f_{s-1}) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : \|z - q\|^2 \leq \delta\}$$

where $\pi_{n-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$.

Remark 2.6. The definition of f_s above is based on a standard trick used in real algebraic geometry to make an arbitrary real algebraic set bounded (e.g., see Basu et al. (2006b)). In general, $V \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is embedded into a sphere in \mathbb{R}^n around the origin of radius $1/\zeta$ where ζ is infinitesimal. In this paper, we are only interested in computing points with bounded coordinates, so it is sufficient to embed its intersection with a closed ball around q of radius $\sqrt{\delta}$ for some fixed $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In particular, we will not use infinitesimal variables.

Later in the paper, when we assume that $V(f_1, \dots, f_s) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact, we assume that we applied Proposition 2.5.

2.3. Genericity Assumptions

The algorithms described in this paper make assumptions that certain points, matrices, or linear polynomials are generically chosen from a vector space (over \mathbb{Q} , \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C}). In all these cases, there exists a proper Zariski closed subset of the corresponding vector space such that all choices outside this set yield correct answers. Therefore, a generic choice means it is outside of this proper Zariski closed subset. For algorithms which depend on generic choices, the algorithms compute the correct answer with *algebraic probability one* (Sommese and Wampler, 2005, Chap. 4). Effective probability bounds can be obtained from bounds on the degrees of the proper Zariski closed sets containing the “bad” choices. See (Krick et al., 2001, Prop. 4.5) and Elliott and Schost (2019) for such bounds for linear changes of variables for Noetherian position and transversality, respectively.

3. Computation of Real Smooth Points

This section contains the main algorithms of this paper with the subsequent section providing the necessary subroutines.

3.1. Equidimensional case

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and assume that $V := V(f_1, \dots, f_s) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is equidimensional of dimension $n - s$. Suppose that $g \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ satisfies the following conditions:*

1. $\text{Sing}(V) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \subset V(g)$;
2. $\dim(V \cap V(g)) < n - s$.

Then the set of points where g restricted to $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ attains its extreme values intersects each bounded connected component of $(V \setminus \text{Sing}(V)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$.

The proof of this theorem is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let V be as in Theorem 3.1. Let $g \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that $\dim(V \cap V(g)) < n - s$. Then, either $(V \setminus V(g)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n = \emptyset$ or g restricted to $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ attains a non-zero extreme value on each bounded connected component of $(V \setminus V(g)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. Assume that $(V \setminus V(g)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \neq \emptyset$ and let C be a bounded connected component of the set $(V \setminus V(g)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Since $C \not\subset V(g)$, there exists $x \in C$ with $g(x) \neq 0$. Let \overline{C} be the Euclidean closure of C so that $\overline{C} \subset V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ is closed and bounded, and g vanishes identically on $\overline{C} \setminus C$. By the extreme value theorem, g attains both a minimum and a maximum on \overline{C} . Since g is not identically zero on \overline{C} , either the minimum or the maximum value of g on \overline{C} must be nonzero, so g attains a non-zero extreme value on C . \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Assume that $(V \setminus \text{Sing}(V)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \neq \emptyset$. By Theorem 2.3, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} V \cap \mathbb{R}^n = n - s$. By (2), $(V \setminus V(g)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \neq \emptyset$. By (1), $(V \setminus V(g)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \subset (V \setminus \text{Sing}(V)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$, so the bounded connected components of $(V \setminus \text{Sing}(V)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ are subsets of the bounded connected components of $(V \setminus V(g)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. By Lemma 3.2, g restricted to $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ attains a non-zero extreme value on each bounded connected component of $(V \setminus V(g)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ yielding a point in every bounded connected component of $(V \setminus \text{Sing}(V)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. \square

ALGORITHM 1 in Section 3.3 computes real smooth points when $V(f_1, \dots, f_s)$ is not equidimensional by using deformations and limits. However, the same algorithm can be used in the equidimensional case with input f_1, \dots, f_s and $\mathbf{a} = 0 \in \mathbb{Q}^s$, i.e., without deformation.

Example 3.3. An example of a real curve with two singular cusps is often referred to as ‘‘Thom’s lips,’’ e.g., $f = y^2 - (x(1 - x))^3$ as shown in Figure 1. An obvious choice of g which satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.1 is $g = x(1 - x)$. Using Lagrange multipliers to optimize with respect to g results in two points $(0.5, \pm 0.125)$ plotted as red diamonds. Alternatively, the polynomial g can be constructed algorithmically (see Section 4.2) yielding, e.g., $g = 3(2x - 1)(x(1 - x))^2 + 2y$ which produces two points plotted as black circles, approximately $(0.5987, 0.1178)$ and $(0.4013, -0.1178)$. Both yield a real smooth point on each of the two connected components of $(V \setminus \text{Sing}(V)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. We note that the first choice of g demonstrates that when $\text{Sing}(V)$ is 0-dimensional, defining g as a product of a coordinate of these points will satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.1. The second choice of g demonstrates the general method described in Section 4.2 which works in every dimension.




Figure 1: ‘‘Thom’s lips’’

3.2. Application to Kuramoto model

The Kuramoto model from Kuramoto (1975) is a dynamical system used to model synchronization amongst n coupled oscillators. The maximum number of equilibria (i.e. real solutions to steady-state equations) for $n \geq 4$ remains an open problem with details discussed in Coss et al. (2018). The following confirms the conjecture in Xin et al. (2016) for $n = 4$.

Theorem 3.4. *The maximum number of equilibria for the Kuramoto model with $n = 4$ oscillators is 10.*

The steady-state equations for the $n = 4$ Kuramoto model are

$$f_i(\theta; \omega) = \omega_i - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^4 \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j) = 0, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, 4$$

parameterized by the natural frequencies $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Since only the angle differences matter, one can assume $\theta_4 = 0$ and observe a necessary condition for equilibria is

$$0 = f_1 + f_2 + f_3 + f_4 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 + \omega_4,$$

i.e., assume $\omega_4 = -(\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3)$. Substituting $s_i = \sin(\theta_i)$ and $c_i = \cos(\theta_i)$ yields

$$F(s, c; \omega) = \left\{ \omega_i - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^4 (s_i c_j - s_j c_i), s_i^2 + c_i^2 - 1, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3 \right\}$$

which is a polynomial system with variables $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$ and $c = (c_1, c_2, c_3)$, parameters $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$, and constants $s_4 = 0$ and $c_4 = 1$.

The goal is to compute the maximum number of isolated real solutions of $F = 0$ as ω varies over \mathbb{R}^3 . Let $D(\omega)$ be the discriminant polynomial of the system F , a polynomial in ω of degree 48. The number of real solutions of F is constant in each connected component of $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus V(D)$. Since it is easy to see that there can be no real solutions if $|\omega_i| \geq \frac{n-1}{n} = 0.75$, we need to compute at least one interior point in each of the bounded connected components of $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus V(D)$. Applying Lemma 3.2 with $f = 0$ and $g = D$, i.e., by computing the real solutions of $\nabla D = 0$ and $D \neq 0$, accomplishes this task. Exploiting symmetry and utilizing Bertini (Bates et al.), alphaCertified (Hauenstein and Sottile (2012)), and Macaulay2 (Grayson and Stillman) all solutions have been found and certified. In fact, this computation showed that all real critical points of D arose, up to symmetry, along two slices shown in Figure 2. A similar computation then counted the number of real solutions to $F = 0$ showing that the maximum number of equilibria is 10. All code used in these computations is available at dx.doi.org/10.7274/r0-5c1t-jw53.

3.3. Non-equidimensional case

We now consider the case when $V(f_1, \dots, f_s)$ is not equidimensional, i.e., it has some components of dimension greater than $n - s$. To handle this case, we perturb the polynomials by constants and take limits. We present an algorithm that computes real smooth points on this limit. This is applied to compute the real dimension of real algebraic sets in Section 3.4.

We need the following from (Faugère et al., 2008, Lemma 1).

Lemma 3.5. *Let $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and fix $l \leq s$ and $\{i_1, \dots, i_l\} \subset \{1, \dots, s\}$. Then there exists a Zariski closed subset $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{C}^s \times \mathbb{C}$ such that for all $(a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{R}^s \setminus \mathcal{A}$ and $e \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{E}$, the ideal generated by the polynomials $f_{i_1} - ea_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_l} - ea_{i_l}$ is a radical equidimensional ideal and $V(f_{i_1} - ea_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_l} - ea_{i_l})$ is either empty or smooth of dimension $n - l$.*




Figure 2: Compact connected regions and critical points for the Kuramoto model with $n = 4$

Definition 3.6. Consider polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and point $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{Q}^s$. We say that f_1, \dots, f_s and \mathbf{a} satisfy Assumption (A) if

- (A): There exists $e_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < e \leq e_0$, the polynomials $f_1 - ea_1, \dots, f_s - ea_s$ generate a radical equidimensional ideal and $V_e^{\mathbf{a}} := V(f_1 - ea_1, \dots, f_s - ea_s)$ is smooth and has dimension $n - s$.

We extend the results of Theorem 3.1 to the non-equidimensional case using deformations and limits in ALGORITHM 1 and Theorem 3.7. In ALGORITHM 1, the direction of the perturbation $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^s$ is part of the input because that is how we use it in the NUMERICAL REAL DIMENSION ALGORITHM 2. However, by Lemma 3.5, for a *generic* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^s$, f_1, \dots, f_s and \mathbf{a} satisfies Assumption (A). The subroutines of ALGORITHM 1 are explained in Sections 4.1 and 4.2.

Algorithm 1 REAL SMOOTH POINT

Input: $n \geq 2$, $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^s$ satisfying Assumption (A). Let $V_e^{\mathbf{a}} := V(f_1 - ea_1, \dots, f_s - ea_s)$ and $V := \lim_{e \rightarrow 0^+} V_e^{\mathbf{a}}$.

Output: A finite set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ containing smooth points in each bounded connected component of $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ that has dimension $n - s$.

(1) Call the COMPUTATION OF g ALGORITHM 5 with input f_1, \dots, f_s and \mathbf{a} to obtain $\{(g_j, (G_j, L, W_j)) : j = 1, \dots, r\}$ such that g_j is in $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and (G_j, L, W_j) is a deflated witness set for some $V_j \subset V$ that is a union of irreducible components of V . For each $j = 1, \dots, r$:

(2) Set up the polynomial system

$$L_e^{(j)} := \left\{ \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x_i} + \sum_{t=1}^s \lambda_t \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial x_i} : i = 1, \dots, n \right\} \cup \{f_1 - ea_1, f_2 - ea_2, \dots, f_s - ea_s\} \quad (2)$$

in the variables $x_1, \dots, x_n, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ and parameter e . For the projection $\pi_x : \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, compute the finite set $U_j := \lim_{e \rightarrow 0} \pi_x(V(L_e^{(j)})) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ using the WITNESS POINTS IN LIMITS ALGORITHM 3. Define $T_j := U_j \setminus V(g_j) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$.

(3) For each $p \in T_j$, use the Membership Test of (Bates et al., 2013, Sec. 8.4) with input p and (G_j, L, W_j) to find $S_j := T_j \cap V_j$.

(4) Return $S := \bigcup_{j=1}^r S_j$.

Theorem 3.7. *Assume that $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and point $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^s$ satisfies Assumption (A). Then ALGORITHM 1 is correct. Furthermore, if $S = \emptyset$, then $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ has no bounded connected components of dimension $n - s$. If $S \neq \emptyset$, then $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ has some connected components (possibly unbounded) of dimension $n - s$.*

Proof. By Assumption (A), $V_e^{\mathbf{a}}$ is smooth and equidimensional of dimension $n - s$ for all sufficiently small $e > 0$. We can apply (Basu et al., 2006b, Prop. 12.38) to show that the set $V = \lim_{e \rightarrow 0} V_e^{\mathbf{a}} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is a Zariski closed set that is either equidimensional of dimension $n - s$ or empty. Assume that $\{(g_j, (G_j, L, W_j)) : j = 1, \dots, r\}$ satisfies output specifications (i)-(vi) of ALGORITHM 5. Fix $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and let $V_j \subset V$ be the union of irreducible components of V with witness set (G_j, L, W_j) . We note that since $V_e^{\mathbf{a}}$ is smooth and equidimensional for all sufficiently small $e > 0$, $V(L_e^{(j)}) \subset \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^{n-d}$ is zero dimensional, and so $U_j = \lim_{e \rightarrow 0} \pi_x(V(L_e^{(j)}))$ is finite.

Suppose $(V_j \setminus V(g_j)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \neq \emptyset$. Let $C_1, \dots, C_t \subset V_j \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ be the bounded connected components of $V_j \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ where g_j is not identically zero. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. Since $C_i \subset V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact, (Safey El Din and Tsigaridas, 2013, Prop. 5) shows that there exist connected components $C_{i,1}^{(e)}, \dots, C_{i,s_i}^{(e)}$ of $V_e^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ for all sufficiently small $e > 0$ such that $C_i = \bigcup_{l=1}^{s_i} \lim_{e \rightarrow 0^+} C_{i,l}^{(e)}$, each $C_{i,l}^{(e)}$ is bounded, and

$$\bigcup_{l=1}^{s_i} C_{i,l}^{(e)} \cap \bigcup_{l=1}^{s_j} C_{j,l}^{(e)} = \emptyset$$

for all $j \neq i$. For each $l = 1, \dots, s_i$, let $S_{i,l}^{(e)} := \pi_x(V(L_e^{(j)})) \cap C_{i,l}^{(e)}$. By Lemma 3.2, $S_{i,l}^{(e)} \neq \emptyset$ and it

contains all points in $C_{i,l}^{(e)}$ where g_j takes its extreme values. Let $\mathcal{S}_i := \bigcup_{l=1}^{s_i} \lim_{e \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{S}_{i,l}^{(e)}$. Since $\mathcal{S}_{i,l}^{(e)}$ is bounded for all sufficiently small e , none of the limit points escape to infinity. Suppose that for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_i$ we have $g_j(z) = 0$. Since g_j is not identically zero on C_i , there exists $z^* \in C_i$ such that $|g_j(z^*)| > 0$. Let $z_e^* \in C_{i,l}^{(e)}$ for some $l = 1, \dots, s_i$ such that $\lim_{e \rightarrow 0} z_e^* = z^*$. Then for any $z \in \mathcal{S}_i$, if $z_e \in \mathcal{S}_i^{(e)}$ such that $\lim_{e \rightarrow 0} z_e = z$, then for sufficiently small e we have that $|g_j(z_e^*)| > |g_j(z_e)|$. Since \mathcal{S}_i is finite, we can choose a common e_0 value for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_i$ so that if $0 < e < e_0$ then $|g_j(z_e^*)| > |g_j(z_e)|$ for all $z_e \in \mathcal{S}_i^{(e)}$. Thus, $\mathcal{S}_i^{(e)}$ could not contain all points of $C_{i,l}^{(e)}$ for $l = 1, \dots, s_i$ where g_j takes its extreme values, a contradiction. So this proves $\lim_{e \rightarrow 0} \pi_x(V(L_e^{(j)})) \cap C_i = U_j \cap C_i$ contains a point $z \in C_i$ such that $g_j(z) \neq 0$.

Next, let $S_j = U_j \setminus V(g_j) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \cap V_j$ and $S = \bigcup_{j=1}^r S_j$ as in Steps (3) and (4). Since S_j contains points in $V_j \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ where g_j is not zero, by (iii)-(vi) in ALGORITHM 5 these points are smooth in $V_j \cap \mathbb{R}^n$, and also smooth in $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus if $S \neq \emptyset$, by Theorem 2.3, $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ must have dimension $n - s$ connected components. Conversely, if $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ has a bounded connected component of dimension $n - s$, then there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $V_j \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ has a bounded connected component of dimension $n - s$. By Theorem 2.3, this component has real smooth points. In fact, these real smooth points form a semi-algebraic set that has also dimension $n - s$. However, since $\dim(V_j \cap V(g_j)) < n - s$, g_j does not vanish on all real smooth points of this component, but it vanishes on the singular points. By the above argument $U_j \cap \mathbb{R}^n \cap V_j$ must contain points where g_j is not zero, thus S_j and S are not empty. \square

Example 3.8. Consider $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ where

$$f_1 = (x^2 + 1)(x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 1) \text{ and } f_2 = (x^2 + 1)(x + y + z - 1).$$

Clearly, $V(f_1, f_2)$ is not equidimensional, but $V(f_1, f_2) \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ is compact of dimension 1. With $\mathbf{a} = (1, 1)$, we utilize ALGORITHM 1 to compute a smooth point on this real curve. The limit variety V is a curve with two irreducible components: $V_1 = V(x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 1, x + y + z - 1)$ and $V_2 = V(x^2 + 1, x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - x - y - z)$. Using $g_1 = x - y$ and $g_2 = x(2y - 1)$, respectively, one obtains $S_1 = \{(1 \pm \sqrt{3}, 1 \mp \sqrt{3}, 1)/3\}$ consisting of two smooth points on $V_1 \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ and $S_2 = \emptyset$.

3.4. Application to Real Dimension

This section applies the REAL SMOOTH POINT ALGORITHM 1 to compute the real dimension of real algebraic sets with the main idea as follows. Using Theorem 2.3, if we find a real smooth point, we find the real dimension to be the same as the complex one. If there are no real smooth points, we conclude that the real dimension is smaller than the complex dimension. In that case, we need to lower the complex dimension in a way that we do not lose any real points inside the variety. One approach is to replace the variety by its singular set which, for hypersurfaces, one simply adds all partial derivatives. However, recursively adding minors of the Jacobian matrix for higher codimension varieties can cause a drastic increase in the degree of the polynomials utilized. Here we apply an alternative technique using a sequence of *polar varieties*. The following uses the notation in Safey El Din and Tsigaridas (2013).

Definition 3.9. Let $f \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be square-free and $V = V(f) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Consider the projections $\pi_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1, \dots, x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. The *polar variety associated to π_i* of V is defined as

$$\text{crit}(V, \pi_i) := V\left(f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}\right) \subset \mathbb{C}^n \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Remark 3.10. There is extensive literature about different notions of polar varieties (e.g., see Bank et al. (2010) for a survey). Here we use the simplest version following Safey El Din and Tsingaridas (2013) and we reduce to the hypersurface case by taking a sum of squares. In practice, other notions of polar varieties may work better. We chose this presentation for conciseness. In particular, using more general forms of polar varieties would involve reproving (Safey El Din and Tsingaridas, 2013, Propositions 2 and 3) (see the proof of Theorem 3.12 below).

We use the following notation.

Definition 3.11. Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $V = V(f) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, and $A \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$. Then, we denote $f^A(\mathbf{x}) := f(A\mathbf{x})$, i.e. $V(f^A)$ is the image of V via the map $\mathbf{x} \mapsto A^{-1}\mathbf{x}$.

Our real dimension algorithm is as follows.

Algorithm 2 NUMERICAL REAL DIMENSION

Input: $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that $V(f_1, \dots, f_s) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact where $n \geq 2$.

Output: The real dimension of $V(f_1, \dots, f_s) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$.

(1) Choose a generic $A \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ and define

$$f(x) := \sum_{i=1}^s f_i^A(x)^2 \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n].$$

Assume that for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $(f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$ and $\mathbf{a} := \mathbf{e}_1$ satisfy Assumption (A). Let $i := n$.

(2) Using the REAL SMOOTH POINT ALGORITHM 1 with input $(f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$ and $\mathbf{a} := \mathbf{e}_1$, compute $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ that contains smooth points in $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$, where $V := \lim_{e \rightarrow 0} \text{crit}(V(f - e), \pi_i)$.

(3) If $S \neq \emptyset$ then return $i - 1$.

(4) Set $i := i - 1$. If $i = 0$ then return -1 . If $i > 0$ go to Step 2.

Theorem 3.12. Let $n \geq 2$, $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that $V(f_1, \dots, f_s) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact. Then, ALGORITHM 2 is correct.

Proof. Note that $\dim(V(f_1, \dots, f_s) \cap \mathbb{R}^n) = \dim(V(f) \cap \mathbb{R}^n)$. We cannot test if Assumption (A) is satisfied in Step (1). However, for a generic choice of $A \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ in Step (1), $(f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$ and $\mathbf{a} := \mathbf{e}_1$ satisfy Assumption (A) with probability one by (Safey El Din and Tsingaridas, 2013, Prop. 2), so the input specification of ALGORITHM 1 is also satisfied with probability one. We prove by induction on $n - i < n$ that we have the following loop invariant in Step (2): $\dim(V(f) \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \leq i - 1$. This is true when $n - i = 0$. Assume it is true for $n - i < n$, and we are in Step (2) with $i > 0$. By (Safey El Din and Tsingaridas, 2013, Prop. 3), $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n = V(f) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ for $V := \lim_{e \rightarrow 0} \text{crit}(V(f - e), \pi_i)$ since $\dim(V(f) \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \leq i - 1$ by the inductive hypothesis. In Step (3) if $S \neq \emptyset$, V has a real smooth point by Theorem 3.7, so by Theorem 2.3 we have $\dim(V \cap \mathbb{R}^n) = \dim V = i - 1$ and we return this value. If $S = \emptyset$, the compactness of $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ and Theorem 3.7 implies that there are no real smooth points on V , so $\dim(V \cap \mathbb{R}^n) < \dim V = i - 1$. In this case we proceed to Step (4): if $i - 1 = 0$ then we return -1 concluding that $V(f) \cap \mathbb{R}^n = \emptyset$, or we return to Step (2) with $i - 1 > 0$ maintaining the loop invariant. \square

3.5. Benchmark Family for Real Dimension

A benchmark family from Bannwarth and Safey El Din (2015) are hypersurfaces $V(f_n) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ for $n \geq 3$ such that

$$f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 \right)^2 - 4 \sum_{j=1}^n (x_j x_{j+1})^2 \quad (3)$$

where $x_{n+1} = x_1$. Since f_n is homogeneous, one knows $\dim V(f_n) \cap \mathbb{R}^n = \dim(V(f_n, s_n) \cap \mathbb{R}^n) + 1$ where $s_n = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 - 1$ in which $V(f_n, s_n) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact. The cases $3 \leq n \leq 6$ were solved in Bannwarth and Safey El Din (2015) with the following considering $3 \leq n \leq 8$. All code used in these computations is available at dx.doi.org/10.7274/r0-5c1t-jw53 with the timings reported using Bertini (Bates et al.) on an AMD Opteron 6378 2.4 GHz processor using one (serial) or 64 (parallel) cores.

For $n = 3$ with $g = \partial f_3 / \partial x_1$, one obtains smooth points on $V(f_3) \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ thereby showing $\dim V(f_3) \cap \mathbb{R}^3 = 2$ in about a second in serial.

For $n = 4$, $V(f_4)$ has multiplicity 2 with respect to f_4 since

$$f_4(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (x_1^2 - x_2^2 + x_3^2 - x_4^2)^2.$$

Trivially, a deflated witness system for $V(f_4)$ is $G = x_1^2 - x_2^2 + x_3^2 - x_4^2$. For $g = x_1 x_2$, one obtains smooth points on $V(f_4) \cap \mathbb{R}^4$ showing $\dim V(f_4) \cap \mathbb{R}^4 = 3$ in about a second in serial.

For $n = 5, \dots, 8$, with $g = \partial f_n / \partial x_1$, one does not obtain smooth points on $V(f_n) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ showing $\dim V(f_n) \cap \mathbb{R}^n < n - 1$. Therefore, one can move down the dimensions searching for real smooth points using perturbed polar varieties, similarly to Step (2) of Algorithm 2. Nonsingular real points are first found at dimension 2, i.e., $\dim V(f_n) \cap \mathbb{R}^n = 2$. In fact, at dimension 2, the polar variety contains various irreducible components of degree 2 and testing one is enough to confirm the existence of a smooth real point. Table 1 lists the total computation time using parallel processing.

n	$\dim V(f_n) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$	Time (min)
5	2	3.63
6	2	5.73
7	2	34.81
8	2	159.81

Table 1: Summary of benchmark problem (3) for $5 \leq n \leq 8$

4. Subroutines

This section describes the subroutines used in REAL SMOOTH POINT ALGORITHM 1.

4.1. Witness sets and isosingular deflation

This subsection collects the numerical algebraic geometric tools needed for ALGORITHM 1 and uses the notation and results from Bates et al. (2013); Sommese and Wampler (2005); Hauenstein and Wampler (2013). The key is the notion of witness sets, which is a numerical algebraic geometry data structure for representing algebraic sets.

Definition 4.1. If $V \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is equidimensional with $\dim V = k$, a *witness set* for V is the triple (F, L, W) such that

- $F \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a *witness system* for V in that each irreducible component of V is an irreducible component of $V(F)$,
- $L \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a *linear system* where $V(L)$ is a linear space of codimension k that intersects V transversely,
- $W \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is a *witness point set* which is equal to $V \cap V(L)$.

If, in addition, each irreducible component of V has multiplicity one with respect to F , then F is called a *deflated witness system* and (F, L, W) is a *deflated witness set*.

The first computation in our algorithms is to compute witness point sets of the limit $V = \lim_{e \rightarrow 0^+} V(f_1 - a_1 e, \dots, f_s - a_s e)$ where f_1, \dots, f_s and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s)$ satisfy Assumption (A). The difficulty is that $V(f_1 - a_1 e, \dots, f_s - a_s e)$ is only smooth and equidimensional for $0 < e \leq e_0$ where e_0 is unknown and can be arbitrarily small. Instead, the next result shows that we can replace e with $t\xi$ where $t \in (0, 1]$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$ generic with $|\xi| = 1$.

In the next proposition we use Puiseux series in an infinitesimal variable ε . Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} and denote by $\mathbb{K}\langle\varepsilon\rangle$ the field of Puiseux series over \mathbb{K} , i.e.

$$\mathbb{K}\langle\varepsilon\rangle := \left\{ \sum_{i \geq i_0} a_i \varepsilon^{i/q} : i_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, a_i \in \mathbb{K} \right\}.$$

A Puiseux series $z = \sum_{i \geq i_0} a_i \varepsilon^{i/q} \in \mathbb{K}\langle\varepsilon\rangle$ is called bounded if $i_0 \geq 0$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{Q}^s$ and let ε be infinitesimal. Assume that $V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}} := V(f_1 - \varepsilon a_1, \dots, f_s - \varepsilon a_s) \subset \mathbb{C}\langle\varepsilon\rangle^n$ is smooth and equidimensional of dimension $n - s$. Then for all but finitely many $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\xi| = 1$ and for all $t \in (0, 1]$ $V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}} := V(f_1 - t\xi a_1, \dots, f_s - t\xi a_s) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is smooth and equidimensional of dimension $n - s$ and in that case we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}}.$$

Proof. First, we show that for all but a finite number of choices of $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$, $V_\xi^{\mathbf{a}} = V(f_1 - \xi a_1, \dots, f_s - \xi a_s)$ is smooth. Note that from our assumptions on $V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}}$ we get that f_1, \dots, f_s and \mathbf{a} satisfies Assumption (A) for some $e_0 > 0$. Consider the ideal using new variables x_0, z and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$:

$$I := \langle f_1^{(h)} - a_1 z x_0^{\deg(f_1)}, \dots, f_s^{(h)} - a_s z x_0^{\deg(f_s)} \rangle \\ + \langle (\lambda_1 \nabla(f_1) + \dots + \lambda_s \nabla(f_s))^{(h)} \rangle.$$

Here $g^{(h)}$ denotes the homogenization of $g \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ by the variable x_0 and ∇ is the differential operator in the variables x_1, \dots, x_n . Thus I is bi-homogeneous in the variables $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$ and (x_0, \dots, x_n) . Then the projection of $X(I) \subset \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^s \times \mathbb{C}$ onto \mathbb{C} is a Zariski closed subset of \mathbb{C} , and since e_0 is not in the projection, the projection is not \mathbb{C} , thus a finite set Z . Clearly, for $\xi \in \mathbb{C} \setminus Z$ and for all $p \in V_\xi^{\mathbf{a}}$, the Jacobian of $f_1 - \xi a_1, \dots, f_s - \xi a_s$ at p has rank s , thus $V_\xi^{\mathbf{a}}$ is smooth and equidimensional of dimension $n - s$. This also implies that for all but finitely many $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\xi| = 1$ and for all $t \in (0, 1]$ we have that $V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}} = V(f_1 - t\xi a_1, \dots, f_s - t\xi a_s)$ is smooth and equidimensional.

Fix $\xi \in \mathbb{C} \setminus Z$ with $|\xi| = 1$ so $V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}}$ is smooth and equidimensional. To prove the second claim, let $L_1, \dots, L_{n-s} \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be linear polynomials such that $\mathcal{L} = V(L_1, \dots, L_{n-s})$ is a generic

linear space of codimension $n - s$ which intersects both $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}}$ transversely. By our assumptions, both $V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L}$ and $V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L}$ are finite. One can show that it is sufficient to prove that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L} \right) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left(V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L} \right)$$

to achieve the desired result.

Let $H \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n, \varepsilon]$ be the system

$$H := H(x, \varepsilon) = [f_1 - \varepsilon a_1, \dots, f_s - \varepsilon a_s, L_1, \dots, L_{n-s}].$$

Let $S \subset \mathbb{C}\langle \varepsilon \rangle^n$ be the finite set of bounded solutions of $H = 0$, where bounded is as defined for Puiseux series above. Then for all $x(\varepsilon) \in S$, let $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} x(\varepsilon) = x_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Furthermore, by the definition of H , $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} S = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L} \right)$.

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is a real infinitesimal, each $x(\varepsilon)$ has an interval of convergence $(0, \varepsilon_x) \subset \mathbb{R}$ for some $\varepsilon_x > 0$. Choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\varepsilon_0 < \min_{x \in S} \varepsilon_x$. Then, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| \leq \varepsilon_0$, $x(z) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ for $x \in S$.

We consider the branch points of $x(z)$ for all $x \in S$. In particular, the critical points C associated to these branch points are all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that there exists an $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ where $H(x, z) = 0$ and $\det JH(x, z) = 0$, where JH is the Jacobian matrix of H with respect to x . Then, since $|S| < \infty$, we know $|C| < \infty$,

Now let $z \in C$. Then there exists some $\xi_z \in S_1$ such that for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the path $\xi_z t$ passes through z , so that $x(t\xi_z) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ has some branching point. Let $Z = \{\xi_z : z \in C\} \subset S_1$, since $|C| < \infty$, $|Z| < \infty$. Then, for $\xi \in S_1 \setminus Z$, $x(t\xi) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ for $t \in (0, 1]$ does not pass through branching points. Since $S_1 \setminus Z$ is Zariski dense in S_1 , the same holds for generic $\xi \in S_1$.

So let $\xi \in S_1$ be generic and $H_\xi \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be the homotopy defined by the system

$$H_\xi := H_\xi(x, t) = [f_1 - t\xi a_1, \dots, f_s - t\xi a_s, L_1, \dots, L_{n-s}].$$

The limit points of the solutions of H_ξ are $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left(V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L} \right)$. Let $T \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be the roots of $H_\xi(x, 1)$. Then $|T| = |V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L}| < \infty$. Furthermore, by the above argument the homotopy paths for H_ξ are exactly described by the points in $V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{C}\langle \varepsilon \rangle^n$ by replacing ε with $t\xi$. Hence,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(V_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L} \right) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left(V_{t\xi}^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{L} \right).$$

□

This immediately yields ALGORITHM 3 which computes a witness point set of a limit with algebraic probability one.

Although the witness point set provides some information, a witness system is needed to perform additional computations on the limit such as testing membership. One difficulty is that the limit could lie inside some irreducible component of $V(f_1, \dots, f_s)$ of dimension higher than $n - s$. Another difficulty is that the limit points may be singular, arising from multiple paths converging to the same limit point. These are demonstrated in the following.

Example 4.3. For $f_1 = x_1 x_2$, $f_2 = x_1 x_2 - x_1^2$, and $\mathbf{a} = (1, 1/2)$, there are two paths that both limit to $(0, 0) \subset V(f_1, f_2) = V(x_1)$.

Algorithm 3 WITNESS POINTS IN LIMITS

Input: $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{Q}^s$ satisfying Assumption (A) and $L = \{L_1, \dots, L_{n-s}\} \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ generic linear polynomials.

Output: $W = V(L) \cap V$ where $V := \lim_{e \rightarrow 0^+} V(f_1 - a_1 e, \dots, f_s - a_s e)$.

(1) Choose generic $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\xi| = 1$ and set up the homotopy

$$H_\xi(x, t) = [f_1 - t\xi a_1, \dots, f_s - t\xi a_s, L_1, \dots, L_{n-s}].$$

(2) Follow the finitely many homotopy paths $V(H_\xi(x, t))$ starting for $t = 1$ to compute the set W consisting of the finite limit points of $V(H_\xi(x, t))$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Isosingular deflation (Hauenstein and Wampler (2013)) can overcome these difficulties.

Definition 4.4. Let $F_0 \subset \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ and $q \in V(F_0) \subset \mathbb{C}^m$. The *isosingular deflation operator* \mathcal{D} is defined via

$$(F_1, q) := \mathcal{D}(F_0, q)$$

where $F_1 \subset \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ consists of F_0 and all $(r+1) \times (r+1)$ minors of the Jacobian matrix JF_0 for F_0 where $r = \text{rank } JF_0(q)$. Thus, $q \in V(F_1)$, meaning that we can iterate this operator to construct a sequence of systems $F_j \subset \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ with $(F_j, q) = \mathcal{D}(F_{j-1}, q) = \mathcal{D}^j(F_0, q)$ for $j \geq 1$.

We say that $F \subset \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ is the *isosingular deflation* of F_0 at q if there exists a minimal $j \geq 0$ such that $(F, q) = \mathcal{D}^j(F_0, q)$ and $\dim \text{NullSpace}(JF(q)) = \dim_F(q)$, where $\dim_F(q)$ is the maximal dimension of the irreducible components of $V(F)$ containing q (called the local dimension of q with respect to F).

ALGORITHM 4 computes a deflated witness system for irreducible components of a variety defined as a limit.

Algorithm 4 DEFLATED WITNESS SYSTEM

Input: $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{Q}^s$ satisfying Assumption (A) and $p \in V := \lim_{e \rightarrow 0^+} V(f_1 - a_1 e, \dots, f_s - a_s e)$, a generic point on a unique irreducible component V_p of V .

Output: A deflated witness system $G \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for V_p .

(1) For $F_0(x, t) := (f_1 - a_1 t, \dots, f_s - a_s t)$ and $q = (p, 0)$, apply (Hauenstein and Wampler, 2013, Alg. 6.3) to compute the isosingular deflation F of F_0 at q .

(2) Set $G_0(x) = F(x, 0)$ and apply (Hauenstein and Wampler, 2013, Alg. 6.3) to compute the isosingular deflation G of G_0 at p .

Theorem 4.5. Let f_1, \dots, f_s , \mathbf{a} , and p as in the input of ALGORITHM 4. Then G , computed by ALGORITHM 4, satisfies the output specifications.

Proof. Since V_p is an irreducible component of V , there exists an irreducible component $Z \subset V(F_0(x, t)) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ such that $V_p \times \{0\}$ is an irreducible component of $Z \cap V(t)$ which is an intersection. Hence, one can apply the isosingular deflation approach applied to intersections in (Hauenstein and Wampler, 2017, Thm. 6.2). Although (Hauenstein and Wampler, 2017, Thm. 6.2)

would deflate $H_0(x, t, t') := (F_0(x, t), t')$ at $q' := (p, 0, 0)$, the simplicity of the intersection together with t' contained in H_0 easily shows that one obtains an equivalent deflation as deflating $F_0(x, t)$ at $q = (p, 0)$, say $F(x, t)$. Therefore, V_p must be an irreducible component of $V(F(x, 0))$ so $G_0(x) := F(x, 0)$ is a witness system for V_p . Since G_0 need not be a deflated witness system for V_p , one deflates G_0 at p to yield a deflated witness system G for V_p . \square

4.2. Computation of g

One key aspect of ALGORITHM 1 is a polynomial g that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.1, i.e., $\text{Sing}(V) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \subset V(g)$ and $\dim(V \cap V(g)) < \dim(V)$. There exist symbolic methods to compute such a g for an irreducible variety V . For example, (Safey El Din et al., 2018, Lemma 4.3) computes the defining equation w of a generic projection $\pi(V)$ that is a hypersurface. Then, g can be taken to be one of the partial derivatives of w . This idea could be extended to the case when V is not equidimensional using infinitesimal deformations and limits (c.f., Safey El Din and Tsigaridas (2018)). ALGORITHM 5 provides a new approach based on isosingular deflation, discussed and utilized in Section 4.1, which computes several g 's depending on the isosingular deflation sequence of the irreducible components.

Algorithm 5 COMPUTATION OF g

Input: $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{Q}^s$ satisfying Assumption (A). Let $V_e^{\mathbf{a}} := V(f_1 - a_1 e, \dots, f_s - a_s e)$ and $V := \lim_{e \rightarrow 0^+} V_e^{\mathbf{a}}$.

Output: $r \geq 1$, and

$$\{(g_j, (G_j, L, W_j)) : j = 1, \dots, r\}$$

such that for all $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$

- (i) $g_j \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $G_j, L \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and $W_j \subset V$.
- (ii) (G_j, L, W_j) is a deflated witness set of some $V_j \subset V$, where V_j is a union of irreducible components of V ;
- (iii) $V = \bigcup_{j=1}^r V_j$
- (iv) $\text{Sing}(V_j) \subseteq V(g_j)$
- (v) $\dim(V_j) \cap V(g_j) < n - s$
- (vi) $\dim(V_i \cap V_j) < n - s$ and $V_i \cap V_j \subseteq V(g_j)$.

(1) Let $L \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a generic system of $n - s$ linear polynomials. Compute $W = V \cap V(L)$ using WITNESS POINTS IN LIMITS ALGORITHM 3. Let $j := 1$.

(2) Fix $p \in W$ and define $W_j := \{p\}$. Update $W := W \setminus \{p\}$.

(3) Using the DEFLATED WITNESS SYSTEM ALGORITHM 4 with input $f_1, \dots, f_s, \mathbf{a}$ and p , compute $G_j \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

(4) For $p' \in W$, if $G_j(p') = 0$ and $\text{rank } JG_j(p') = s$, then update $W_j = W_j \cup \{p'\}$ and $W = W \setminus \{p'\}$.

(5) Let $g_j(x) := \det(M(x))$ where M is a generic rational linear combination of all $s \times s$ submatrices of $JG_j(x)$.

(6) If $W \neq \emptyset$, increment $j = j + 1$ and go to Step (2). Otherwise, set $r = j$ and return.

Theorem 4.6. Let f_1, \dots, f_s , \mathbf{a} , $V_e^{\mathbf{a}}$, and V be as in the input specification of ALGORITHM 5. Then, ALGORITHM 5 is correct.

In the proof we need the following definitions following Hauenstein and Wampler (2013).

Definition 4.7. Let $F_0 \subset \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ and $q \in V(F_0) \subset \mathbb{C}^m$. Let \mathcal{D} be the isosingular deflation operator defined in Definition 4.4. We define

- The *deflation sequence* of F_0 at q is $\{d_k(F_0, q)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ where $d_k(F_0, q) = \text{dnull}(F_k, q) := \dim \text{NullSpace} JF_k(q)$ with JF_k the Jacobian matrix of F_k with $(F_k, q) = \mathcal{D}^k(F_0, q)$.
- Let $V \subset V(F_0)$ be a non-empty irreducible algebraic set. Then V is an *isosingular set* of F_0 if there exists a sequence $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that V is an irreducible component of

$$\overline{\{p \in V(F_0) : d_k(F_0, p) = c_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}}.$$

- Let $V \subset V(F_0)$ be a non-empty irreducible algebraic set. Then $\text{Iso}_{F_0}(V)$ is the unique isosingular set with respect to F_0 containing V such that $\text{Iso}_{F_0}(V)$ and V have the same deflation sequence with respect to F_0 .
- Let V be an isosingular set for F_0 . The set of *singular points* of V with respect to F_0 is

$$\text{Sing}_{F_0}(V) = \{p \in V : \{d_k(F_0, p)\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \neq \{d_k(F_0, V)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}\}.$$

Here, $d_k(F_0, V)$ is meant for a generic point in V .

Proof. By our assumption on the genericity of L , each point $p \in W$ is a generic point of a unique irreducible component V_p of V containing p . Then, $G_j \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ computed in Step (3) deflates all generic points of V_p . Step (4) adds all other points from W which are deflated by G_j . In particular, every other point on V_p contained in W will be added to W_j . Hence, (G_j, L, W_j) is a deflated witness set for a union of irreducible components of V , denoted by V_j , proving (ii). Since $\bigcup_j W_j = W$, we also get $\bigcup_j V_j = V$, which proves (iii). If $y \in \text{Sing}(V_j)$, then $\text{rank}(JG_j(y)) < s$ so all $s \times s$ minors of $JG_j(y)$ vanish. Hence, $g_j(y) = \det(M(y)) = 0$ proving (iv). Conversely, for any $p' \in W_j$, some $s \times s$ minor of $JG_j(p')$ does not vanish at p' . Since g_j is a generic choice of combinations of all such minors, $g_j(p') \neq 0$ for all $p' \in W_j$. By Assumption (A), $V = \lim_{e \rightarrow 0} V_e^{\mathbf{a}}$ is equidimensional of dimension $n - s$, so for all $p' \in W$, $\dim V_{p'} = n - s$. Since g_j does not vanish identically on $V_{p'}$ for any $p' \in W_j$, we get $\dim(V_j) \cap V(g_j) < n - s$, proving (v). To prove the first claim in (vi), note that each V_i is a union of $(n - s)$ -dimensional irreducible components of V and sample points from the irreducible components of V are uniquely assigned to one W_j . Then for $i \neq j$, V_i and V_j cannot share an irreducible component, so their intersection is lower dimensional.

To prove the second claim in (vi) we use (Hauenstein and Wampler, 2013, Theorem 5.9) as follows. Let $y \in V_i \cap V_j$. Suppose that X is an irreducible component of V_i and Y is an irreducible component of V_j such that $y \in X \cap Y$. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$ be generic with $|\xi| = 1$, t a complex variable, and denote $f_{\xi}^{\mathbf{a}} = f_{\xi}^{\mathbf{a}}(x, t) := (f_1 - a_1 t \xi, \dots, f_s - a_s t \xi)$. Then, $X \times \{0\}$ and $Y \times \{0\}$ are irreducible varieties of \mathbb{C}^{n+1} and both are subsets of $V(f_{\xi}^{\mathbf{a}}) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Therefore, each is contained in a unique isosingular set of $f_{\xi}^{\mathbf{a}}$ denoted by $\text{Iso}_{f_{\xi}^{\mathbf{a}}}(X \times \{0\})$ and $\text{Iso}_{f_{\xi}^{\mathbf{a}}}(Y \times \{0\})$, respectively. Let $F_i(x, t)$ and $F_j(x, t)$ be their corresponding deflated witness systems, respectively. If $F_i = F_j$, then $\text{Iso}_{F_j(x,0)}(X) \neq \text{Iso}_{F_j(x,0)}(Y)$ (otherwise $X = Y$) so $y \in \text{Sing}_{F_j(x,0)}(Y)$. Note that by the DEFLATED

WITNESS SYSTEM ALGORITHM 4, $G_j(x)$ is the deflation of $F_j(x, 0)$ at a generic point of V_j . This implies by (Hauenstein and Wampler, 2013, Theorem 5.9) that $y \in \text{Sing}_{G_j}(Y)$ and $g_j(y) = 0$.

If $F_i \neq F_j$, then $(y, 0)$ is in the intersection of two different isosingular sets so $(y, 0)$ has a different deflation sequence than $Y \times \{0\}$, i.e., $(y, 0) \in \text{Sing}_{f_\xi^a}(Y \times \{0\})$. By (Hauenstein and Wampler, 2013, Theorem 5.9), we have that $(y, 0) \in \text{Sing}_{F_j}(Y \times \{0\})$. Denoting the Jacobian by $J := JF_j(x, t)$, we have that $\text{rank}J(y) < s$ with $\text{rank}J(y') = s$ for all generic $y' \in Y$. Consider $J' := JF_j(x, 0)$. (i.e. column of J corresponding to ∂t removed). If $\text{rank}J'(y') = s$ for generic $y' \in Y$, then $G_j = F_j(x, 0)$, $y \in \text{Sing}_{G_j}(Y)$, and $g_j(y) = 0$. If $\text{rank}J'(y') < s$ for generic $y' \in Y$, we claim that $\text{rank}J'(y) < \text{rank}J'(y')$ for generic $y' \in Y$. First note that both $\text{rank}Jf(y) \leq s - 1$ and $\text{rank}Jf(y') \leq s - 1$ for $f = (f_1, \dots, f_s)$, so without loss of generality, we assume that $\nabla f_1(y) = \nabla f_1(y') = 0$. Note that the ∂t column of $J = JF_j(x, t)$ has the only possibly non-zero constant entries in the rows corresponding to $f_1 - a_1 t \xi, \dots, f_s - a_s t \xi$. Denote by J'' the submatrix of J' with the row corresponding to f_1 removed. Then for a generic $y' \in Y$ we have $\text{rank}J'(y') = s - 1$, since among all $s \times s$ minors of $J(y')$ some has to be non-zero, and the only possible non-zeros are the ones that are a_1 times the $(s-1) \times (s-1)$ minors of $J''(y')$, thus $a_1 \neq 0$ and $\text{rank}J'(y') = s - 1$. On the other hand, the $s \times s$ minors of $J(y)$ contain all $(s-1) \times (s-1)$ minors of $J''(y)$ times a_1 , so all these minors of $J''(y)$ must be zero. This implies that $\text{rank}J'(y) < s - 1$. Thus, $\text{rank}J'(y) < \text{rank}J'(y')$. In particular, $y \in \text{Sing}_{F_j(x, 0)}(Y)$ and by (Hauenstein and Wampler, 2013, Theorem 5.9), $y \in \text{Sing}_{G_j}(Y)$ which implies that $g_j(y) = 0$. \square

One advantage of the approach using isosingular deflation is that, in many problems, the number of iterations in the deflation process is a small constant (zero or one). In this case, the degrees of the polynomials in the output of ALGORITHMS 4 and 5 are comparable to the maximal degree of the input polynomials f_1, \dots, f_s . On the other hand, the degree of the polynomial w computed in the symbolic approach in (Safey El Din et al., 2018, Lemma 4.3) mentioned above is the degree of V bounded by the product of the degrees of the input polynomials. Nonetheless, the disadvantage of our approach is that in the worst case, we need as many iterations in the deflation as the multiplicity of the points and this may result polynomials that are higher degree than w . We have the following bound on the degree of g as a function on the number of iterations in the deflation:

Proposition 4.8. *Let $f = (f_1, \dots, f_s)$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{Q}^s$ such that $V_e^{\mathbf{a}} := V(f_1 - a_1 e, \dots, f_s - a_s e)$ satisfies Assumption (A). Let $D := \max_{i=1}^s \{\deg(f_i)\}$ and fix $p \in V := \lim_{e \rightarrow 0} V_e^{\mathbf{a}}$. If ALGORITHM 4 takes k iterations of the isosingular deflation to output $G \subset \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, the degrees of the polynomials in G are bounded by $s^k D$. Furthermore, if $g(x) := \det(M(x)) \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ where $M(x)$ is a $s \times s$ submatrix of $JG(x)$, then $\deg(g) \leq s^{k+1} D$.*

Proof. The first claim follows from the fact that each iteration of the deflation algorithm adds the minors of the Jacobian of the polynomials in the previous iteration, and these minors have size less than s . Thus, the degrees of polynomials added to the system in each iteration are at most s times the degrees of the polynomials in the previous iteration. The second claim follows from the first. \square

Using Proposition 4.8, we can bound the number of homotopy paths followed in Step (2) in the REAL SMOOTH POINT ALGORITHM 1, which is the bottleneck of our method. Note that the number of iterations r is at most $\deg(V) \leq D^n$ and the Membership Test of (Bates et al., 2013, Sec. 8.4) utilized in Step (3) follows at most $|W_j| = \deg(V_j) \leq \deg(V) \leq D^n$ homotopy paths.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $f = (f_1, \dots, f_s)$ and \mathbf{a} be as above. Consider the zero-dimensional polynomial system $L_e^{(j)}$ for some fixed $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ as in Step (2) of ALGORITHM 1. Then, the number of complex roots of $L_e^{(j)}$ is bounded by $\deg(g_j)^n D^s \leq s^{(k_j+1)n} D^{n+s}$, where D is as above when we assume that $\deg(g_j) \geq D$ and k_j is the number of iterations of the isosingular deflation needed to compute G_j using ALGORITHM 4.*

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Mohab Safey El Din and Elias Tsigaridas for many discussions regarding real algebraic geometry. This research was partly supported by NSF grants CCF-1812746 (Hauenstein) and CCF-1813340 (Szanto and Harris).

References

- Aubry, P., Rouillier, F., Safey El Din, M., 2002. Real solving for positive dimensional systems. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 34, 543–560.
- Bank, B., Giusti, M., Heintz, J., Lecerf, G., Matera, G., Solern, P., 2015. Degeneracy loci and polynomial equation solving. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 15, 159184.
- Bank, B., Giusti, M., Heintz, J., Mandel, R., Mbakop, G.M., 1997. Polar varieties and efficient real equation solving: the hypersurface case, in: *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Approximation and Optimization in the Caribbean (Puebla, 1995)*, Benemérita Univ. Autón. Puebla, Puebla. p. 13.
- Bank, B., Giusti, M., Heintz, J., Pardo, L.M., 2004. Generalized polar varieties and an efficient real elimination procedure. *Kybernetika (Prague)* 40, 519–550.
- Bank, B., Giusti, M., Heintz, J., Pardo, L.M., 2009. On the intrinsic complexity of point finding in real singular hypersurfaces. *Inform. Process. Lett.* 109, 1141–1144.
- Bank, B., Giusti, M., Heintz, J., Safey El Din, M., Schost, E., 2010. On the geometry of polar varieties. *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing* 21, 33–83.
- Bannwarth, I., Safey El Din, M., 2015. Probabilistic algorithm for computing the dimension of real algebraic sets, in: *ISSAC’15—Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*. ACM, New York, pp. 37–44.
- Basu, S., Pollack, R., Roy, M.F., 2006a. Algorithms in real algebraic geometry. volume 10 of *Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*. Second ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Basu, S., Pollack, R., Roy, M.F., 2006b. Computing the dimension of a semi-algebraic set. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences* 134, 2346–2353.
- Bates, D.J., Hauenstein, J.D., Sommese, A.J., Wampler, C.W., . Bertini: Software for numerical algebraic geometry. Available at bertini.nd.edu.
- Bates, D.J., Hauenstein, J.D., Sommese, A.J., Wampler, C.W., 2013. Numerically solving polynomial systems with Bertini. volume 25 of *Software, Environments, and Tools*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA.
- Becker, E., Neuhaus, R., 1993. Computation of real radicals of polynomial ideals, in: *Computational algebraic geometry (Nice, 1992)*. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA. volume 109 of *Progr. Math.*, pp. 1–20.
- Chen, C., Davenport, J.H., May, J.P., Moreno Maza, M., Xia, B., Xiao, R., 2013. Triangular decomposition of semi-algebraic systems. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 49, 3–26.
- Collins, G.E., 1975. Quantifier elimination for real closed fields by cylindrical algebraic decomposition, in: Brakhage, H. (Ed.), *Automata Theory and Formal Languages*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg. pp. 134–183.
- Coss, O., Hauenstein, J.D., Hong, H., Molzahn, D.K., 2018. Locating and counting equilibria of the Kuramoto model with rank-one coupling. *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.* 2, 45–71.
- Elliott, J., Schost, É., 2019. Bit complexity for critical point computation in smooth and compact real hypersurfaces. *ACM Communications in Computer Algebra* 53, 114–117.
- Faugère, J.C., Moroz, G., Rouillier, F., Safey El Din, M., 2008. Classification of the perspective-three-point problem, discriminant variety and real solving polynomial systems of inequalities, in: *ISSAC’08 – Proceedings of the 2008 ACM International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ACM, New York, NY, USA. pp. 79–86.
- Grayson, D.R., Stillman, M.E., . Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.

- Grigor'ev, D.Y., Vorobjov, Jr., N.N., 1988. Solving systems of polynomial inequalities in subexponential time. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 5, 37–64.
- Hauenstein, J.D., 2013. Numerically computing real points on algebraic sets. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae* 125, 105–119.
- Hauenstein, J.D., Sottile, F., 2012. Algorithm 921: alphaCertified: certifying solutions to polynomial systems. *ACM Trans. Math. Software* 38, Art. 28, 20.
- Hauenstein, J.D., Wampler, C.W., 2013. Isosingular sets and deflation. *Found. Comput. Math.* 13, 371–403.
- Hauenstein, J.D., Wampler, C.W., 2017. Unification and extension of intersection algorithms in numerical algebraic geometry. *Appl. Math. Comput.* 293, 226–243.
- Krick, T., Pardo, L.M., Sombra, M., 2001. Sharp estimates for the arithmetic Nullstellensatz. *Duke Math. J.* 109, 521–598.
- Kuramoto, Y., 1975. Self-entrainment of a population of coupled non-linear oscillators. *Lect. Notes Phys.* 39, 420–422.
- Ma, Y., Wang, C., Zhi, L., 2016. A certificate for semidefinite relaxations in computing positive-dimensional real radical ideals. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 72, 1–20.
- Marshall, M., 2008. Positive polynomials and sums of squares. volume 146 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
- Neuhaus, R., 1998. Computation of real radicals of polynomial ideals. II. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 124, 261–280.
- Rouillier, F., Roy, M.F., Safey El Din, M., 2000. Finding at least one point in each connected component of a real algebraic set defined by a single equation. *Journal of Complexity* 16, 716 – 750.
- Safey El Din, M., 2007. Testing sign conditions on a multivariate polynomial and applications. *Math. Comput. Sci.* 1, 177–207.
- Safey El Din, M., Schost, E., 2003. Polar varieties and computation of one point in each connected component of a smooth algebraic set, in: *Proceedings of the 2003 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ACM, New York. pp. 224–231.
- Safey El Din, M., Spaenlehauer, P.J., 2016. Critical point computations on smooth varieties: degree and complexity bounds, in: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ACM, New York. pp. 183–190.
- Safey El Din, M., Tsigaridas, E., 2013. A probabilistic algorithm to compute the real dimension of a semi-algebraic set. CoRR abs/1304.1928. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.1928>, arXiv:1304.1928.
- Safey El Din, M., Tsigaridas, E., 2018. Personal communication. ICERM - Nonlinear Algebra Program.
- Safey El Din, M., Yang, Z.H., Zhi, L., 2018. On the complexity of computing real radicals of polynomial systems, in: *ISSAC'18—Proceedings of the 2018 ACM International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*. ACM, New York, pp. 351–358.
- Safey El Din, M., Yang, Z.H., Zhi, L., 2019. Computing real radicals and S-radicals of polynomial systems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* .
- Sommese, A.J., Wampler, II, C.W., 2005. *The numerical solution of systems of polynomials*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ. Arising in engineering and science.
- Sottile, F., 2019. Real algebraic geometry for geometric constraints, in: *Handbook of geometric constraint systems principles*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. *Discrete Math. Appl. (Boca Raton)*, pp. 273–285.
- Spang, S.J., 2008. A zero-dimensional approach to compute real radicals. *Comput. Sci. J. Moldova* 16, 64–92.
- Vorobjov, N., 1999. Complexity of computing the local dimension of a semialgebraic set. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 27, 565–579.
- Wang, F., 2016. *Computation of Real Radical Ideals by Semidefinite Programming and Iterative Methods*. Ph.D. thesis. University of Western Ontario.
- Wu, W., Reid, G., 2013. Finding points on real solution components and applications to differential polynomial systems, in: *ISSAC 2013—Proceedings of the 38th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ACM, New York. pp. 339–346.
- Xin, X., Kikkawa, T., Liu, Y., 2016. Analytical solutions of equilibrium points of the standard Kuramoto model: 3 and 4 oscillators, in: *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 2447–2452.
- Zeng, G., 1999. Computation of generalized real radicals of polynomial ideals. *Sci. China Ser. A* 42, 272–280.