

Exact polynomial optimization strengthened with Fritz John conditions

Ngoc Hoang Anh Mai*

June 28, 2022

Abstract

Let f, g_1, \dots, g_m be polynomials with real coefficients in a vector of variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Denote by $\text{diag}(g)$ the diagonal matrix with coefficients $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and denote by ∇g the Jacobian of g . Let C be the set of critical points defined by

$$C = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{rank}(\varphi(x)) < m\} \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi := \begin{bmatrix} \nabla g \\ \text{diag}(g) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Assume that the image of C under f , denoted by $f(C)$, is empty or finite. (Our assumption holds generically since C is empty in a Zariski open set in the space of the coefficients of g_1, \dots, g_m with given degrees.) We provide a sequence of values, returned by semidefinite programs, finitely converges to the minimal value attained by f over the basic semi-algebraic set S defined by

$$S := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_j(x) \geq 0, j = 1, \dots, m\}. \quad (2)$$

Consequently, we can compute exactly the minimal value of any polynomial with real coefficients in x over one of the following sets: the unit ball, the unit hypercube and the unit simplex. Under a slightly more general assumption, we extend this result to the minimization of any polynomial over a basic convex semi-algebraic set that has non-empty interior and is defined by the inequalities of concave polynomials.

Keywords: sum-of-squares; Nichtnegativstellensatz; gradient ideal; Fritz John conditions; polynomial optimization

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Proof of the main results	5
2.1	Preliminaries	5
2.2	Proof of the representations	8
2.3	Proof of the genericity of the assumption	10
3	Illustrated examples	10

*CNRS; LAAS; 7 avenue du Colonel Roche, F-31400 Toulouse; France.

4	Exact polynomial optimization	14
4.1	Moment-SOS relaxations	14
4.2	Numerical experiments	17
5	Variations	18
5.1	Representations	18
5.2	Proofs	19
5.3	Examples	21
5.4	Application to exact polynomial optimization	23
5.5	Numeical examples	25
6	Representations with denominators	25

1 Introduction

The study of non-negative polynomials is a major interest in real algebraic geometry with applications in polynomial optimization. The expression of non-negative polynomials as sums of squares of polynomials was studied in the seminal paper of Hilbert [5]. We call Positivstellensatz the representations of polynomials positive on a basic semi-algebraic set, which is defined by systems of polynomial inequalities. Putinar showed in [18] a Positivstellensatz saying that each polynomial positive on a compact basic semi-algebraic set satisfying the so-called Archimedean condition (stated below) can be decomposed as a linear combination of polynomials defining this basic semi-algebraic set with weights which are sums of squares of polynomials. Using Putinar’s Positivstellensatz, Lasserre introduced in [8] a sequence of values returned by semidefinite programs (also known as Lasserre’s hierarchy) to approximate from below as closely as desired the minimal value of a polynomial over a basic semi-algebraic set.

We refer to Nichtnegativstellensatz as the representations of polynomials that are non-negative on a basic semi-algebraic set. They allow us to obtain a sequence of values returned by relaxation programs being similar in spirit to Lasserre’s hierarchy that converges finitely to the optimal value for a given polynomial optimization problem. However, not all Nichtnegativstellensatz have clearly practical applications. For instance, the relaxation programs based on Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz [7] are not convex hence it is very difficult to obtain the values returned by such programs. It is due to the fact that Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz has non-prescribed denominators. In other words, the corresponding relaxation programs are convex, namely semidefinite programs when Nichtnegativstellensatz has no denominator or has prescribed denominator. We refer the readers to recent Nichtnegativstellensatz without denominators by Scheiderer [19, 20, 22] for some compact basic semi-algebraic sets of low dimension. His works involve the non-strict extension of Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz [23] originally stated that each polynomial positive on a compact basic semi-algebraic set can be written as a linear combination of products of polynomials defining this basic semi-algebraic set with weights which are sums of squares of polynomials.

In this paper we provide some Nichtnegativstellensatz without denominators which have the same forms with Putinar’s and Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz. To achieve this, we utilize slack variables and additional polynomial equations for a given basic semi-algebraic set. These polynomial equations, which are generated by the input polynomials and their gradients, involve the so-called Fritz John conditions stated below.

Let $\mathbb{R}[x]$ denote the ring of polynomials with real coefficients in the vector of

variables x . Given $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, consider polynomial optimization problem:

$$f^* := \inf_{x \in S(g)} f(x), \quad (3)$$

where $S(g)$ is the basic semi-algebraic set associated with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ defined by

$$S(g) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_j(x) \geq 0, j = 1, \dots, m\}. \quad (4)$$

Given $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, we denote by ∇p the gradient of p , i.e., $\nabla p = (\frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_n})$. We state the Fritz John conditions in the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. If u is a local minimizer for problem (3), then the Fritz John conditions hold for problem (3) at u , i.e., the following conditions hold:*

$$\begin{cases} \exists (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m) \in [0, \infty)^n : \\ \lambda_0 \nabla f(u) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j(u), \\ \lambda_j g_j(u) = 0, j = 1, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2 = 1 \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \exists (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} : \\ \lambda_0^2 \nabla f(u) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(u), \\ \lambda_j^2 g_j(u) = 0, j = 1, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2 = 1. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

If $\lambda_0 > 0$, these conditions are equivalent to the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions. Note that there are some cases of problem (3) (indicated below) for which the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold at any global minimizer.

Denote by $\Sigma^2[x]$ the cone of sum of squares of polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. Given $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, let $Q(g)[x]$ be the quadratic module associated with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ defined by

$$Q(g)[x] := \Sigma^2[x] + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j \Sigma^2[x]. \quad (6)$$

We say that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition if there exists $R > 0$ such that $R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 \in Q(g)[x]$. Under Archimedean condition and some standard optimality conditions that include the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions, Nie utilizes Marshall’s Nichtnegativstellensatz [10, 11] to guarantee in [15] finite convergence of Lasserre’s hierarchy. In this case, the polynomial optimization problem necessarily has finite global minimizers.

Given $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$, let Πg be the vector of products of g_1, \dots, g_m defined by

$$\Pi g := (g^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m \setminus \{0\}}, \quad (7)$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$ and $g^\alpha := g_1^{\alpha_1} \dots g_m^{\alpha_m}$. We call $Q(\Pi g)[x]$ the preordering generated by g , denoted by $P(g)[x]$. Obviously, if $m = 1$, it holds that $P(g)[x] = Q(g)[x]$.

Given $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, let $V(h)$ be the variety generated by $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$ defined by

$$V(h) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_j(x) = 0, j = 1, \dots, l\}. \quad (8)$$

and let $I(h)[x]$ be the ideal generated by h defined by

$$I(h)[x] := \sum_{j=1}^l h_j \mathbb{R}[x]. \quad (9)$$

The real radical of an ideal $I(h)[x]$, denoted by $\sqrt[\mathbb{R}]{I(h)}$, is defined as

$$\sqrt[\mathbb{R}]{I(h)[x]} = \{f \in \mathbb{R}[x] : \exists m \in \mathbb{N} : -f^{2m} \in \Sigma^2[x] + I(h)[x]\}. \quad (10)$$

Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz [7] imply that

$$\sqrt[\mathbb{R}]{I(h)[x]} = \{p \in \mathbb{R}[x] : p = 0 \text{ on } V(h)\}. \quad (11)$$

We say that $I(h)[x]$ is real radical if $I(h)[x] = \sqrt[\mathbb{R}]{I(h)[x]}$.

Demmel, Nie and Powers provide in [4] a Nichtnegativstellensatz saying that if f is non-negative on a subset of $S(g)$ at which the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold for problem (3), then there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \lambda]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{KKT}})$, where $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and

$$h_{\text{KKT}} := (\nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j, \lambda_1 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m g_m). \quad (12)$$

Here h_{KKT} includes polynomials in the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions. To apply this Nichtnegativstellensatz for exact polynomial optimization, they assume the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold at some global minimizer.

Our goal is to deal with the case of problem (3) for which the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold at any global minimizer or the set of global minimizers has positive dimension. Given $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, let $\varphi^g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times m}$ be a function associated with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ defined by

$$\varphi^g(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla g(x) \\ \text{diag}(g(x)) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla g_1(x) & \dots & \nabla g_m(x) \\ g_1(x) & \dots & 0 \\ \cdot & \dots & \cdot \\ 0 & \dots & g_m(x) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Given a real matrix A , we denote by $\text{rank}(A)$ the dimension of the vector space generated by the columns of A over \mathbb{R} . We say that a set Ω is finite if its cardinal number is a non-negative integer. Let $C(g)$ be the set of critical points associated with g defined by

$$C(g) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m\}.$$

It is easily seen that $C(g)$ is the set of points at which the Fritz John conditions stated in Lemma 1 hold for problem (3) in the case of $\lambda_0 = 0$. In other words, $C(g)$ is the set of all points at which the Fritz John conditions hold but the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not. Accordingly, the following lemma follows:

Lemma 2. *If $C(g) = \emptyset$, problem (3) has no local minimizer or only has local minimizers at which the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions for this problem hold.*

We state the first main result in the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(C(g))$ is finite. Then there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and*

$$h_{\text{FJ}} := (\lambda_0 \nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j, \lambda_1 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m g_m, 1 - \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2). \quad (14)$$

Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$.

Here h_{FJ} includes polynomials in the Fritz John conditions stated in Lemma 1. By (11), it is clear that in Theorem 1 if $I(h_{\text{FJ}})[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ is real radical, then $f - q \in I(h_{\text{FJ}})[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{R}[x]_d$ be the set of polynomials of degree at most d . We state the second main result in the following theorem:

Theorem 2. *Let d_1, \dots, d_m be positive integers. Then there exists a polynomial ψ , which is in the coefficients of polynomials $g_j \in \mathbb{R}[x]_{d_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$ such that if ψ does not vanish at the input data then $C(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ is empty.*

On one hand, Theorem 2 implies that $C(g)$ is empty and so is $f(C(g))$ on a Zariski open set in the space of the coefficients of g_1, \dots, g_m with given degrees. Thus in Theorem 1 our assumption that $f(C(g))$ is finite holds generically. However, there exists a case of $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ (indicated below) for which both $C(g)$ and $f(C(g))$ are infinite. To overcome this, we provide in Theorem 9 representations of f with denominator λ_0 but without assumption on $f(C(g))$. On the other hand, combining Theorem 2 and Lemma 2 gives the genericity of the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions.

The proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 (postponed to Sections 2.2 and 2.3) are inspired by techniques of Demmel–Nie–Power [4] and Nie [15], respectively. To prove Theorem 1, we claim that the polynomial f has a finite number of values on the variety $V(h_{FJ})$. We prove this by considering f on each connected component of $V(h_{FJ})$ not contained in the hyperplane $\lambda_0 = 0$ and then applying the mean value theorem. The remaining case is based on the assumption that $f(C(g))$ is finite. The proof of Theorem 2 relies on the existence of a discriminant for a system of polynomial equations generated by g_1, \dots, g_m under a simple transformation.

Bucero and Murrain present in [3, Section 3.3] a variety generated by the Fritz John conditions without giving any representation of polynomials non-negative on semi-algebraic sets in the case of $C(g) \neq \emptyset$. Note that the polynomial equation $1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 = 0$ does not exist in their variety to ensure the non-zero vector of multipliers similarly to our variety $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14).

Nie provides in [14] a preordering-based representation of polynomial f non-negative on a basic semi-algebraic set $S(g)$ with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ by adding to this set a large number of polynomial equations generated by the Jacobian of f, g_1, \dots, g_m . To achieve this, he restricts the number of polynomials defining $S(g)$ and assumes that the Jacobian of each subset of g has full rank on their variety. For comparison purposes, to obtain our representations in Theorem 1, we utilize $n + m + 1$ additional polynomial equations (generated by g_j and $\nabla f, \nabla g_j$) for $S(g)$ and $m + 1$ slack variables $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m$ which are the multipliers in the Fritz John conditions stated in Lemma 1. We also make the assumption on the rank of the matrix φ^g (generated by g_j and ∇g_j) that $\varphi^g(x)$ does not need to have full rank for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ but it is required that the image of all real points at which φ^g is rank-deficient under f is finite. Under these conditions, we also provide a representation of f involving the quadratic module $Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ when $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is mostly to prove Theorems 1 and 2. We give in Section 3 some illustrated examples for Theorem 1. A relevant counterexample is indicated in this section. Section 4 is to present the application of our results in computing exactly the optimal value for a polynomial optimization problem. Section 5 is to show some variations of our main results under slightly more general assumptions. Section 6 is to state the general Nichtnegativstellensatz with prescribed denominators based on the Fritz John conditions.

2 Proof of the main results

2.1 Preliminaries

In this subsection we present some preliminaries from algebraic geometry needed for the proofs of our main results. We recall one of Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz [7] in the following lemma:

Lemma 3. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that $S(g) = \emptyset$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Then it holds that $-1 \in P(g)[x]$.*

We recall in the following lemma Putinar’s Positivstellensatz [18]:

Lemma 4. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that f is positive on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $S(g) \neq \emptyset$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. Then it holds that $f \in Q(g)[x]$.

Denote by $\deg(p)$ the degree of a given polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. The following lemma is a consequence of Lemmas 3 and 4:

Lemma 5. Let $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that $g_m := R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$ for some $R > 0$ and $S(g) = \emptyset$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Then it holds that $-1 \in Q(g)[x]$.

Proof. Since $S(g) = \emptyset$, Lemma 3 yields that there exists $\sigma_\alpha \in \Sigma^2[x]$ such that

$$-1 = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^n} \sigma_\alpha g^\alpha. \quad (15)$$

Given $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ with $u = \lceil \deg(p)/2 \rceil$, let $\bar{p} := x_0^{2u} p(x/x_0) \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{x}]$, where $\bar{x} := (x_0, x)$. For instance, $\bar{g}_m = Rx_0^2 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$. Let d be an integer number such that $2d \geq \deg(\sigma_\alpha g^\alpha)$. Let $d_j = \lceil \deg(g_j)/2 \rceil$. From (15), we get

$$-x_0^{2d} = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^n} \psi_\alpha \bar{g}^\alpha, \quad (16)$$

where $\psi_\alpha = x_0^{2(d-d_j)} \sigma_\alpha(x/x_0) \in \Sigma^2[\bar{x}]$ and $\bar{g} = (\bar{g}_1, \dots, \bar{g}_m)$. Denote by $w \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{x}]$ the polynomial on the right hand side of (16). Then w is non-negative on $S(\bar{g}, 1 - x_0^2)$. Since $0 \in S(\bar{g}, 1 - x_0^2)$, we get $S(\bar{g}, 1 - x_0^2) \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand $S(\bar{g}, 1 - x_0^2)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition since

$$(R+1) - x_0^2 - \dots - x_n^2 = (R+1)(1 - x_0^2) + \bar{g}_m \in Q(\bar{g}, 1 - x_0^2)[\bar{x}]. \quad (17)$$

Applying Lemma 4, we obtain

$$-x_0^{2d} + \frac{1}{2} = w + \frac{1}{2} \in Q(\bar{g}, 1 - x_0^2)[\bar{x}]. \quad (18)$$

Letting $x_0 = 1$ implies that $-\frac{1}{2} \in Q(g)[x]$, yielding the result. \square

In the following lemma, we obtain the same result with Lemma 5 under weaker condition:

Lemma 6. Let $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ such that $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition and $S(g) = \emptyset$. Then $-1 \in Q(g)[x]$.

Proof. Since $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_{m+1} := R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 \in Q(g)[x]$. It implies that $S(g) \subset S(g_{m+1})$ which gives $S(g, g_{m+1}) = S(g) = \emptyset$. By using Lemma 5, we get $-1 \in Q(g, g_{m+1})[x] \subset Q(g)[x]$, yielding the result. \square

Given $h_1, \dots, h_l \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$, let $V_{\mathbb{C}}(h)$ be the complex variety generated by $h = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$ defined by

$$V_{\mathbb{C}}(h) := \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : h_j(x) = 0, j = 1, \dots, l\}. \quad (19)$$

Denote by δ_{ij} the Kronecker delta function at $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. The following lemma is a direct consequence of [4, Lemma 2.4 and Remark 2.5]:

Lemma 7. Let U_1, \dots, U_r be pairwise disjoint complex varieties generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. Then there exist polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_r \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ such that $p_i(U_j) = \delta_{ij}$.

We generalize the definition of semi-algebraic set as follows: A semi-algebraic subset of \mathbb{R}^n is a subset of the form

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^t \bigcap_{j=1}^{r_i} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_{ij}(x) *_{ij} 0\}, \quad (20)$$

where $f_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ and $*_{ij}$ is either $>$ or $=$. Given two semi-algebraic sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, we say that a mapping $f : A \rightarrow B$ is semi-algebraic if its graph is a semi-algebraic set in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} . A semi-algebraic subset A is said to be semi-algebraically path connected if for every x, y in A , there exists a continuous semi-algebraic mapping $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow A$ such that $\phi(0) = x$ and $\phi(1) = y$.

Combining [1, Theorem 2.4.5 and Proposition 2.5.13], we obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 8. *Every semi-algebraic set has a finite number of components which are semi-algebraically path connected.*

The following result is a direct consequence of Lemma 8 since the difference of two real varieties is a semi-algebraic set according to the definition (20):

Lemma 9. *The difference of two real varieties has a finite number of components which are semi-algebraically path connected.*

We state in the following lemma a decomposition of the intersection of a given complex variety with the real space:

Lemma 10. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ and let W be a complex variety generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that $f(W \cap \mathbb{R}^n)$ is finite. Then there exist a finite sequence of subsets W_1, \dots, W_r such that the following conditions hold:*

1. W_1, \dots, W_r are pairwise disjoint complex varieties generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$;
2. for $j = 1, \dots, r$, $W_j \subset W$ and f is constant on W_j ;
3. $(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r) \cap \mathbb{R}^n = W \cap \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. By assumption, we get $f(W \cap \mathbb{R}^n) = \{t_1, \dots, t_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, where $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. For $j = 1, \dots, r$, let $W_j := W \cap V_{\mathbb{C}}(f - t_j)$. Then W_j is a complex variety generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. It is clear that $f(W_j) = \{t_j\}$. We claim that W_1, \dots, W_r are pairwise disjoint. Otherwise, let $x \in W_i \cap W_j$ with $i \neq j$. It implies that $t_i = f(x) = t_j$ which is impossible. Let $U = W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r$. We show that $W \cap \mathbb{R}^n = U \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $x \in W \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there is $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $f(x) = t_j$ which gives $x \in W_j \subset U$ so we get $x \in U \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus $W \cap \mathbb{R}^n \subset U \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ since x is arbitrary in $W \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Conversely, suppose that $x \in U \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. By the definition of U , there is $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $x \in W_j$. It implies that $x \in W$ by definition of W_j . Then $x \in W \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus $U \cap \mathbb{R}^n \subset W \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ since x is arbitrary in $U \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. \square

We use the technique from the proof of [4, Theorem 3.2] to obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 11. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let U_1, \dots, U_r be pairwise disjoint complex varieties generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. Set $U = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_r$. Assume that f is constant on each U_i . Then there exists $q \in P(g)[x]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $U \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take $q \in Q(g)[x]$.*

Proof. Let W_0 be the union of all U_j whose intersection with $S(g)$ is empty. Then W_0 is a complex variety generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. Let W_1, \dots, W_r be the remaining U_j . Thus f is constant on W_j , for $j = 1, \dots, r$. Further, since f is non-negative on the non-empty set $S(g) \cap W_j$, there exists $\alpha_j > 0$ such that $f = \alpha_j$ on W_j , $j = 1, \dots, r$. Set $q_j(x) = \alpha_j \in \Sigma^2[x]$ then we get $f = q_j$ on W_j . Observe that $U = W_0 \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r$, where W_0, \dots, W_r are pairwise disjoint. By Lemma 7, there exist polynomials $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_r \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ such that $p_i(W_j) = \delta_{ij}$. By assumption, it holds that $W_0 \cap S(g) = \emptyset$ and hence by Theorem 3, there exists $v_0 \in P(g)[x]$ such that $-1 = v_0$ on $W_0 \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. We have $f = s_1 - s_2$ for the SOS polynomials $s_1 = (f + \frac{1}{2})^2$ and $s_2 = f^2 + \frac{1}{4}$. It implies that $f = s_1 + v_0 s_2$ on $W_0 \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $q_0 = s_1 + v_0 s_2 \in P(g)[x]$. Now let $q = \sum_{i=0}^r q_i p_i^2$ then $q \in P(g)[x]$ and we obtain $f - q$ vanishes on $U \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Assume that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. According to Lemma 6, we now can take $v_0 \in Q(g)[x]$ which implies that $q_0 \in Q(g)[x]$ then so is q . \square

2.2 Proof of the representations

Recall the vector of variables $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$. For simplicity of notation, let

$$\{\lambda_0 = 0\} := \{(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} : \lambda_0 = 0\}. \quad (21)$$

Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the projection defined by

$$\pi(x, \bar{\lambda}) = x, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall \bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}. \quad (22)$$

We characterize the set of critical points in the following lemma:

Lemma 12. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let h_{FJ} be defined as in (14). Set $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Then it holds that $C(g) = \pi(V(h_{FJ}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\})$.*

Proof. The result follows thanks to the following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} & x \in C(g) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 = 1, \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = 0, \lambda_j g_j = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2 = 1, \lambda_0 = 0, \lambda_0 \nabla f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x), \lambda_j g_j = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\} \\ \Leftrightarrow & x \in \pi(V(h_{FJ}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

\square

The following lemma is based on [4, Lemma 3.3]:

Lemma 13. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that $f(C(g))$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ is finite. Let h_{FJ} be defined as in (14). Let W be a semi-algebraically path connected component of $V(h_{FJ})$. Then f is constant on W .*

Proof. Choose two arbitrary points $(x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$, $(x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ in W . We claim that $f(x^{(0)}) = f(x^{(1)})$.

It is sufficient to assume that both $(x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ are nonsingular points. If at least one of $(x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ is singular, we choose arbitrarily close nonsingular points to approximate $(x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ then we apply the continuity of f to obtain $f(x^{(0)}) = f(x^{(1)})$. It is due to the fact that the set of nonsingular points of W is dense and open in W .

If a manifold is path-connected, the set of its nonsingular points is a manifold that is also path-connected. By assumption, there exists a continuous piecewise-differentiable path $\phi(\tau) = (x(\tau), \bar{\lambda}(\tau))$, for $\tau \in [0, 1]$, lying inside W such that $\phi(0) = (x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$ and $\phi(1) = (x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ (see, e.g., [17, Theorem 1.8.1]).

Since $\tau \mapsto \lambda_0(\tau)$ is continuous on $[0, 1]$, the set $\lambda_0^{-1}(0) \subset [0, 1]$ is closed. Then there exists a sequence of intervals $[a_j, b_j] \subset [0, 1]$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$ such that

- $0 \leq a_1 \leq b_1 < a_2 \leq b_2 < \dots < a_r \leq b_r \leq 1$;
- $\forall \tau \in [0, 1], \lambda_0(\tau) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \tau \in \cup_{j=1}^r [a_j, b_j]$.

We claim that $\tau \mapsto f(x(\tau))$ is constant on $[a_j, b_j]$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$. Let $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ be fixed. Assume by contradiction that there are $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [a_j, b_j]$ such that $\tau_1 < \tau_2$ and $f(x(\tau_1)) \neq f(x(\tau_2))$. Since $\tau \mapsto f(x(\tau))$ is continuous on $[a_j, b_j]$, the set $f(x([\tau_1, \tau_2]))$ is infinite. This contradicts the assumption $f(C(g)) = f(\pi(V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}))$ (according to Lemma 12) is finite since $f(\pi(V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\})) \supset f(x([\tau_1, \tau_2]))$ which is due to the fact that

$$\pi(V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \supset \pi(W \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \supset x([\tau_1, \tau_2]). \quad (24)$$

On the other hand $\tau \mapsto \lambda_0(\tau)$ has no zero value on each of the following open intervals:

$$(0, a_1), (b_1, a_2), \dots, (b_{r-1}, a_r), (b_r, 1) \quad (25)$$

We claim that $\tau \mapsto f(x(\tau))$ is constant on each of open intervals in (25). Let us prove this for the interval $(0, a_1)$. The proof for the other intervals is similar. Let τ_1, τ_2 be arbitrary in $(0, a_1)$. The Lagrangian function

$$L(x, \bar{\lambda}) = f(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_0} g_j(x). \quad (26)$$

is equal to $f(x)$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$, which contains $\phi([\tau_1, \tau_2])$. Let $\mu_j(\tau)$ be the principal square root of $\lambda_j(\tau)$ for $\tau \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. Note that $\tau \mapsto L(x(\tau), \bar{\lambda}(\tau))$ has zero gradient on the path $\phi(\tau)$, $\tau \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$. By the mean value theorem, it follows that $f(x(\tau_1)) = f(x(\tau_2))$.

By its continuity, $\tau \mapsto f(x(\tau))$ is constant on the following closed intervals:

$$[0, a_1], [b_1, a_2], \dots, [b_{r-1}, a_r], [b_r, 1] \quad (27)$$

It implies that $\tau \mapsto f(x(\tau))$ is constant on $[0, 1]$ since it is constant on each $[a_j, b_j]$. We now obtain $f(x^{(0)}) = f(x^{(1)})$ and hence f is constant on W . \square

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Using Lemma 8, we decompose $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s . Lemma 13 shows that f is constant on Z_i . Thus $f(V(h_{\text{FJ}}))$ is finite. Observe that $V(h_{\text{FJ}}) = V_{\mathbb{C}}(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$. By using Lemma 10, we obtain a finite sequence of subsets W_1, \dots, W_r such that the following conditions hold:

- W_1, \dots, W_r are pairwise disjoint complex varieties generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x, \bar{\lambda}]$;
- for $j = 1, \dots, r$, $W_j \subset V_{\mathbb{C}}(h_{\text{FJ}})$ and f is constant on W_j ;
- $(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} = V_{\mathbb{C}}(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$.

Let D be the union of W_1, \dots, W_r . Let $b = 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2$. From this, Lemma 11 yields that there exists $p \in P(g, b)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - p$ vanishes on $D \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} = V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. We write

$$p = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m} \sigma_{\alpha} g^{\alpha} + b \sum_{\beta \in \{0,1\}^m} \psi_{\beta} g^{\beta}, \quad (28)$$

for some $\sigma_{\alpha}, \psi_{\beta} \in \Sigma^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Let $q = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m} \sigma_{\alpha} g^{\alpha} \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Since $b = 0$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$, it holds that $f = p = q$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$.

Assume that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. Then there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_{m+1} = R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 \in Q(g)[x]$. It implies that $S(g, b)$ with $b = 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. This is due to the fact that

$$(R + 1) - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2 = b + g_{m+1} \in Q(g, b)[x, \bar{\lambda}]. \quad (29)$$

From this, Lemma 11 shows that there exists $p \in Q(g, b)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - p$ vanishes on $D \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} = V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. We write

$$p = \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j + b\sigma_{m+1}, \quad (30)$$

for some $\sigma_j \in \Sigma^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Let $q = \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Since $b = 0$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$, $f = p = q$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. This completes the proof. \square

2.3 Proof of the genericity of the assumption

Given $p = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ with $p_1, \dots, p_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, we denote the Jacobian of p by $\nabla p = [\nabla p_1 \dots \nabla p_m]$. Given a complex matrix A , we denote by $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{C}}(A)$ the dimension of the vector space generated by the columns of A over \mathbb{C} . Note that $\text{rank}(A)$ is the dimension of the vector space generated by the columns of A over \mathbb{R} .

In the following lemma, we recall Nie's result in [13] involving discriminants:

Lemma 14. *Let $p_1, \dots, p_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ be of degrees d_1, \dots, d_m , respectively, and $m \leq n$. Suppose at least one $d_i > 1$. Then there exists a polynomial ψ in the coefficients of p_1, \dots, p_m having the property that with $p := (p_1, \dots, p_m)$, $\psi(p) = 0$ if and only if there exists $u \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying*

$$p_1(u) = \dots = p_m(u) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rank}_{\mathbb{C}}(\nabla p(u)) < m. \quad (31)$$

Polynomial ψ in Lemma 14 is called a discriminant of p , denoted by $\Delta(p)$.

Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Let $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$. Let $p_j(x, y) = g_j(x) - y_j^2 \in \mathbb{R}[x, y]$. Then $\deg(p_j) > 1$. Then with $p = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$, we get

$$\nabla p(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla g_1(x) & \dots & \nabla g_m(x) \\ -2y_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & -2y_m \end{bmatrix}. \quad (32)$$

Let $\psi(g) := \Delta(p)$. Then ψ is a polynomial in the coefficients of g_1, \dots, g_m . We make the following implications:

$$\begin{aligned} & C(g) \neq \emptyset \\ \Rightarrow & \exists x \in C(g) \\ \Rightarrow & \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m \\ \Rightarrow & \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = 0, \lambda_j g_j = 0 \\ \Rightarrow & \exists x \in \mathbb{C}^n : \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^m \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = 0, \lambda_j g_j = 0 \\ \Rightarrow & \exists (x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+m} : g_j(x) = y_j^2, \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^m \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = 0, -2\lambda_j y_j = 0 \\ \Rightarrow & \exists (x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+m} : p_j(x, y) = 0, \text{rank}_{\mathbb{C}}(\nabla p(x, y)) < m \\ \Rightarrow & \Delta(p) = 0 \quad (\text{according to Lemma 14}) \\ \Rightarrow & \psi(g) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Thus it holds that if $\psi(g) \neq 0$ then $C(g) = \emptyset$, yielding the result. \square

3 Illustrated examples

In this section, we illustrate our Nichtnegativstellensatz stated in Theorem 1 with several explicit examples that belong to the following cases of problem (3):

- unconstrained case (see Example 1) and constrained case (see Examples 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10);
- the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold at any global minimizer (see Examples 2, 3, 4, 5);
- the basic semi-algebraic set $S(g)$ is non-compact (see Example 1, 3, 4, 5) and the set of global minimizers is infinite (see Example 5);
- both the set of critical points $C(g)$ and its image under f are empty (see Examples 6, 7, 8, 9);
- both the set of critical points $C(g)$ and its image under f are finite (see Examples 2, 3);
- neither the set of critical points $C(g)$ nor its image under f is finite (see Example 4);
- the set of critical points $C(g)$ is infinite but its image under f is finite (see Example 5);
- the minimal value f^* is not attained (see Example 9);
- the set $f(C)$ is infinite and there does not exist $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14) (see Example 10);
- the set $f(C)$ is infinite but there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ (see Example 5).

We begin with the following example in the case where the basic semi-algebraic set is the whole space:

Example 1. *Consider the unconstrained case of problem (3). We can assume that $f^* = 0$, $m = 1$ and $g = (g_1) = (1)$. It is obvious that $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) = 1 = m$ which implies $C(g)$ is empty. Thus $f(C(g))$ is non-empty. Using Theorem 1, we get $q \in \Sigma^2[x, \lambda_0, \lambda_1]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14), namely*

$$h_{FJ} := (\lambda_0 \nabla f, \lambda_1, 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2). \quad (34)$$

With $\lambda_0 = 1$ and $\lambda_1 = 0$, $q(x, 1, 0) \in \Sigma^2[x, \lambda_0]$ and $f - q(x, 1, 0)$ vanishes on $V(\nabla f)$. It is exactly the same as the result of Nie, Demmel and Surmfels in [16].

In the next four examples, $f^* = 0$ is attained but the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold at any global minimizer for problem (3):

Example 2. *Consider the problem (3) with $n = m = 1$, $f = x$ and $g = (g_1) = (-x^2)$. Then 0 is the unique global minimizer for this problem. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as*

$$\exists \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} : \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) = -2\lambda_1 x = 0, \lambda_1 g_1(x) = -\lambda_1 x^2 = 0. \quad (35)$$

It is equivalent to $x = 0$. Thus $C(g) = \{0\}$ is singleton then so is $f(C(g))$. Since $1 - x^2 = 1 + g_1 \in Q(g)[x]$, $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. From this, Theorem 1 yields that there exists $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14), namely $h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 + 2\lambda_1 x, -\lambda_1 x^2, 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2)$. It is easy to check that $V(h_{FJ}) = \{(0, 0, \pm 1)\}$. It implies the selection $q = 0$ in this case.

The following example involves the case where the basic semi-algebraic set is non-compact:

Example 3. *Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 1$, $f = (x_1 + 1)^2 + x_2^2 - 1$ and $g = (g_1) = (x_1^3 - x_2^2)$. Then $(0, 0)$ is the unique global minimizer for this problem. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as*

$$\exists \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} : \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 3x_1^2 \\ -2x_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \lambda_1 g_1(x) = \lambda_1 (x_1^3 - x_2^2) = 0. \quad (36)$$

It is equivalent to $x = (x_1, x_2) = 0$. Thus $C(g) = \{0\}$ is singleton then so is $f(C(g))$. From this, Theorem 1 shows that there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14), namely

$$h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 \begin{bmatrix} 2(x_1 + 1) \\ 2x_2 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 3x_1^2 \\ -2x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \lambda_1(x_1^3 - x_2^2), 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2). \quad (37)$$

Let $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ})$. We get $2(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1)x_2 = 0$, so either $x_2 = 0$ or $\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 = 0$ then we obtain $\lambda_0 = -\lambda_1 \in \{\pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\}$ and $2(x_1 + 1) + 3x_1^2 = 0$ which has no real solution and hence this is impossible. Consequently $x_2 = 0$ from which we obtain $\lambda_1 x_1^3 = 0$ which gives $\lambda_1 = 0$ or $x_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_1 = 0$, we obtain $\lambda_0 \in \{\pm 1\}$ which implies $x_1 = -1$. If $x_1 = 0$, we get $\lambda_0 = 0$ which implies $\lambda_1 \in \{\pm 1\}$. These give $V(h_{FJ}) = \{(-1, 0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, \pm 1)\}$. It is not hard to check that $q = g_1$ satisfies $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ and $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$.

In the last two examples, the sets of critical points are finite. We indicate in the following two examples the case where the sets of critical points is infinite:

Example 4. Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 1$, $f = x_1 + x_2^2$ and $g = (g_1) = (-x_1^2)$. Then $(0, 0)$ is the unique global minimizer. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\exists \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} : \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -2x_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \lambda_1 g_1(x) = -\lambda_1 x_1^2 = 0. \quad (38)$$

It is equivalent to $x_1 = 0$. Thus $C(g) = \{(0, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is infinite which implies that $f(C(g)) = \{t^2 : t \in \mathbb{R}\} = [0, \infty)$ is infinite. Let h_{FJ} be as in (14). Then we obtain

$$h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2x_1 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -2x_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, -\lambda_1 x_1^2, 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2). \quad (39)$$

Let $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ})$. We get $-\lambda_1 x_1^2 = 0$, so either $\lambda_1 = 0$ or $x_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_1 = 0$, we get $\lambda_0 \in \{\pm 1\}$ (since $1 = \lambda_0^2 + \lambda_1^2$) and $\lambda_0 = 0$ and hence this is impossible. Consequently $x_1 = 0$ from which we obtain $\lambda_0 = 0$ which gives $\lambda_1 \in \{\pm 1\}$. It implies that $V(h_{FJ}) = \{(0, t, 0, \pm 1) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Since $f(C(g))$ is infinite, the assumption of Theorem 1 does not hold in this case. However, it is not hard to check that $q = x_2^2$ satisfies $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ and $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. It is interesting to know clearly the extension of Theorem 1 to the case where $f(C(g))$ is infinite.

In the last three examples, the sets of global minimizers are finite. The following example shows the case where the set of global minimizers is infinite:

Example 5. Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 1$, $f = x_1 - x_2$ and $g = (g_1) = -(x_1 - x_2)^2$. Then the set of global minimizers $\{(t, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is infinite. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\exists \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} : \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -2(x_1 - x_2) \\ -2(x_2 - x_1) \end{bmatrix} = 0, \lambda_1 g_1(x) = -\lambda_1 (x_1 - x_2)^2 = 0. \quad (40)$$

It is equivalent to $x_2 = x_1$. Thus $C(g) = \{(t, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is infinite. However, $f(C(g)) = \{0\}$ is singleton. Thus Theorem 1 yields that there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14), namely

$$h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -2(x_1 - x_2) \\ -2(x_2 - x_1) \end{bmatrix}, -\lambda_1 (x_1 - x_2)^2, 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2). \quad (41)$$

It is easy to check that $V(h_{FJ}) = \{(t, t, 0, \pm 1) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. It yields the selection $q = 0$ in this case.

We show in the next three examples of problem (3) that the set of critical points $C(g)$ is empty and so is its image under f :

Example 6. Consider the problem (3) with $m = 1$ and $g = (1 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2)$. Then $S(g)$ is the unit ball. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\exists \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} : \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) = -2\lambda_1 x = 0, \lambda_1 g_1(x) = \lambda_1(1 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2) = 0. \quad (42)$$

It is equivalent to $x = 0$ and $1 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 = 0$ and hence it is impossible. Thus we get $C(g) = \emptyset$ which implies $f(C(g)) = \emptyset$. Note that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition in this case. From this, Theorem 1 shows that if f is non-negative on $S(g)$, there exists $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14), namely

$$h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 \nabla f - 2\lambda_1 x, \lambda_1(1 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2), 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2). \quad (43)$$

Let e_1, \dots, e_n be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^n .

Example 7. Consider the problem (3) with $m = n$, $g = (1 - x_1^2, \dots, 1 - x_n^2)$. Then $S(g)$ is the unit hypercube. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = -2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j e_j = 0, \lambda_j g_j(x) = \lambda_j(1 - x_j^2) = 0. \quad (44)$$

It implies that $\lambda_j = \lambda_j(1 - x_j^2) - \frac{1}{2}x_j(-2\lambda_j x_j) = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, m$ which contradicts $\lambda \neq 0$. Thus we get $C(g) = \emptyset$ which implies $f(C(g)) = \emptyset$. Note that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean in this case. From this, Theorem 1 yields that if f is non-negative on $S(g)$, there exists $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14), namely

$$h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 \nabla f - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j e_j, \lambda_1(1 - x_1^2), \dots, \lambda_n(1 - x_n^2), 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_n^2). \quad (45)$$

Example 8. Consider the problem (3) with $m = n + 1$, $g = (x_1, \dots, x_n, 1 - x_1 - \dots - x_n)$. Then $S(g)$ is the unit simplex. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\} : \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) + \lambda_{n+1} \nabla g_{n+1}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda_j - \lambda_{n+1}) e_j = 0, \\ \lambda_j g_j(x) = \lambda_j x_j = 0, j = 1, \dots, n, \\ \lambda_{n+1} g_{n+1}(x) = \lambda_{n+1}(1 - x_1 - \dots - x_n) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

It implies that $\lambda_j = \lambda_{n+1}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, and $\lambda_{n+1} = \lambda_{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j = 0$. Thus we get $\lambda = 0$ which contradicts $\lambda \neq 0$. Thus we obtain $C(g) = \emptyset$ which implies $f(C(g)) = \emptyset$. Note that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean in this case, as shown in [6]. From this, Theorem 1 shows that if f is non-negative on $S(g)$, there exists $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14), namely

$$h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 \nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda_j - \lambda_{n+1}) e_j, \lambda_1 x_1, \dots, \lambda_n x_n, \lambda_{n+1}(1 - \sum_{j=1}^n x_j), 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \lambda_j^2). \quad (47)$$

Next we consider an example of problem (3) whose optimal value f^* is not attained:

Example 9. Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 1$, $f = x_1$ and $g = (g_1) = (x_1 x_2^2 - 1)$. It is not hard to prove that $f^* = 0$. Note that problem (3) does not have any global minimizer. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\exists \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} : \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} x_2^2 \\ 2x_1 x_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \lambda_1 g_1(x) = \lambda_1(x_1 x_2^2 - 1) = 0. \quad (48)$$

It implies that $\lambda_1 x_2^2 = 0$ which gives $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1 x_1 x_2^2 = 0$. This contradicts $\lambda_1 \neq 0$. Thus we get $C(g) = \emptyset$, in consequence, $f(C(g)) = \emptyset$. From this, Theorem 1 yields that there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$ with h_{FJ} defined as in (14), namely

$$h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} x_2^2 \\ 2x_1 x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \lambda_1(x_1 x_2^2 - 1), 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2). \quad (49)$$

Let $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ})$. We get $\lambda_1 x_1 x_2 = 0$ which gives $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1 x_1 x_2^2 = 0$. It follows that $\lambda_0 = 0$ which is impossible since $1 = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = 0$. Thus $V(h_{FJ}) = \emptyset$ yields the selection $q = 0$.

We indicate the following counterexample and consequently the assumption that $f(C(g))$ is finite in Theorem 1 cannot be removed:

Example 10. Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 2$, $f = x_1 + x_2$ and $g = (-x_1^2, -x_2^2)$. Then we get $f^* = 0$ and $(0, 0)$ is the unique global minimizer for this problem. It is not hard to prove the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold for this problem at any global minimizer. The condition $\text{rank}(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} : \begin{cases} \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) + \lambda_2 \nabla g_2(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -2x_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -2x_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \\ \lambda_j g_j(x) = -\lambda_j x_j^2 = 0, \quad j = 1, 2. \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

Since $\lambda \neq 0$, either λ_1 or λ_2 is non-zero. If $\lambda_1 \neq 0$, we get $x_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_2 \neq 0$, we get $x_2 = 0$. It implies that $x_1 = 0$ or $x_2 = 0$. Thus we get $C(g) = \{(t, 0), (0, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ which gives that $f(C(g)) = \mathbb{R}$ is infinite. Let h_{FJ} be as in (14). Then we obtain

$$h_{FJ} = (\lambda_0 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -2x_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -2x_2 \end{bmatrix}, -\lambda_1 x_1^2, -\lambda_2 x_2^2, 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2 - \lambda_2^2). \quad (51)$$

Let $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ})$. We get $\lambda_1 x_1 = \lambda_2 x_2 = 0$ which gives $\lambda_0 = 0$. Since $\lambda_1 x_1 = 0$, either $\lambda_1 = 0$ or $x_1 = 0$ holds. If $\lambda_1 = 0$, we get $\lambda_2 \in \{\pm 1\}$ which gives $x_2 = 0$. If $x_1 = 0$, we consider $\lambda_2 x_2 = 0$ which gives $\lambda_2 = 0$ or $x_2 = 0$. If $x_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 = 0$, it implies that $\lambda_1 \in \{\pm 1\}$. If $x_1 = 0$ and $x_2 = 0$, it follows that $\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = 1$. Thus we see that

$$V(h_{FJ}) = \{(t, 0, 0, 0, \pm 1), (0, t, 0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, \cos t, \sin t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (52)$$

Since $f(C(g))$ is infinite, the assumption of Theorem 1 does not hold in this case. Assume that there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. We write $q = \sigma_0 + \sigma_1 g_1 + \sigma_2 g_2 + \sigma_3 g_1 g_2$ for some $\sigma_j \in \Sigma^2[x]$. For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, since $(t, 0, 0, 0, 1) \in V(h_{FJ})$, we have $f(t, 0) = q(t, 0, 0, 0, 1)$. Setting $\psi_j = \sigma_j(t, 0, 0, 0, 1) \in \Sigma^2[t]$, we obtain $t = \psi_0 - \psi_1 t^2$. It implies that $\psi_0 = t(1 + t\psi_1)$ which leads to $\psi_0 = t^2 \xi$ for some $\xi \in \Sigma^2[t]$ since $\psi_0 \in \Sigma^2[t]$. We now get $t = t^2(\xi - \psi_1)$ which is impossible. Hence there does not exist $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$.

4 Exact polynomial optimization

4.1 Moment-SOS relaxations

In this subsection we recall some preliminaries of the Moment-SOS relaxations originally developed by Lasserre in [8]. Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{N}_d^n := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq d\}$. Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by v_d the vector of monomials in x of degree at most d , i.e., $v_d = (x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n}$ with $x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n}$. For each $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]_d$, we write $p =$

$c(p)^\top v_d = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n} p_\alpha x^\alpha$, where $c(p)$ is denoted by the vector of coefficient of p , i.e., $c(p) = (p_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n}$ with $p_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Given $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ being symmetric, we say that A is positive semidefinite, denoted by $A \succeq 0$, if every eigenvalue of A is non-negative.

The following lemma shows the connection between sum of squares and semidefinite programming (see, e.g., [2]):

Lemma 15. *Let $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2d \geq \deg(\sigma)$. Then $\sigma \in \Sigma^2[x]$ iff there exists $G \succeq 0$ such that $\sigma = v_d^\top G v_d$.*

Given $y = (y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \subset \mathbb{R}$, let $L_y : \mathbb{R}[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Riesz linear functional defined by $L_y(p) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} p_\alpha y_\alpha$ for every $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ and $y = (y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \subset \mathbb{R}$, let $M_d(y)$ be the moment matrix of order d defined by $(y_{\alpha+\beta})_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_d^n}$ and let $M_d(py)$ be the localizing matrix of order d associated with p defined by $(\sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^n} p_\gamma y_{\alpha+\beta+\gamma})_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_d^n}$.

Given $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, let $Q_d(g)[x]$ be the truncated quadratic module of order d associated with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ defined by

$$Q_d(g)[x] = \left\{ \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j : \sigma_j \in \Sigma^2[x], \deg(\sigma_0) \leq 2d, \deg(\sigma_j g_j) \leq 2d \right\}. \quad (53)$$

Given $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, let $I_d(h)$ be the truncated ideal of order d associated with $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$ defined by

$$I_d(h)[x] = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^l \psi_j h_j : \psi_j \in \mathbb{R}[x], \deg(\psi_j h_j) \leq 2d \right\}. \quad (54)$$

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f, g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, consider the following primal-dual semidefinite programs associated with $f, g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_k(f, g, h) &:= \inf_y L_y(f) \\ \text{s.t. } & M_k(y) \succeq 0, M_{k-d_j}(g_j y) \succeq 0, j = 1, \dots, m, \\ & M_{k-r_t}(h_t y) = 0, t = 1, \dots, l, y_0 = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k(f, g, h) &:= \sup_{\xi, G_j, u_t} \xi \\ \text{s.t. } & G_j \succeq 0, \\ & f - \xi = v_k^\top G_0 v_k + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j v_{k-d_j}^\top G_j v_{k-d_j} \\ & \quad + \sum_{t=1}^l h_t u_t^\top v_{2r_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where $d_j = \lceil \deg(g_j)/2 \rceil$ and $r_t = \lceil \deg(h_t)/2 \rceil$. Using Lemma 15, we obtain

$$\rho_k(f, g, h) := \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \xi : f - \xi \in Q_k(g)[x] + I_k(h)[x] \}. \quad (57)$$

Primal-dual semidefinite programs (55)-(56) is known as the Moment-SOS relaxations of order k for problem

$$\bar{f}^* := \inf_{x \in S(g) \cap V(h)} f(x). \quad (58)$$

We state in the following lemma some recent results involving the Moment-SOS relaxations:

Lemma 16. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let \bar{f}^* be as in (58) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$. Then the following statements hold:*

1. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau_k(f, g, h) \leq \tau_{k+1}(f, g, h)$ and $\rho_k(f, g, h) \leq \rho_{k+1}(f, g, h)$.
2. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho_k(f, g, h) \leq \tau_k(f, g, h) \leq \bar{f}^*$.

3. If $S(g) \cap V(h)$ has non-empty interior, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficient large, the Slater condition holds for the Moment relaxation (55) of order k .
4. If $S(g) \cap V(h)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, $\rho_k(f, g, h) \rightarrow \bar{f}^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.
5. If there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_m + h_l = R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficient large, the Slater condition holds for the SOS relaxation (56) of order k .
6. If there exists $q \in Q(g)[x]$ such that $f - \bar{f}^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h)$, then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, g, h) = \bar{f}^*$.

Proof. The first four statements are shown by Lasserre in [8]. The proof of the fifth statement can be found in [9]. The final statement is based on Nie's technique in [15] which is sketched as follows: Let $u = f - \bar{f}^* - q$. By assumption, we get $u = 0$ on $V(h)$. From this, Krivine–Stengle's Nichtnegativstellensatz [7] say that there exist a positive integer r and $\sigma \in \Sigma^2[x]$ such that $u^{2r} + \sigma \in I(h)[x]$. Let $c = \frac{1}{2r}$. Then it holds that $1 + t + ct^{2r} \in \Sigma^2[t]$. Thus for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon = q + \varepsilon \left(1 + \frac{u}{\varepsilon} + c \left(\frac{u}{\varepsilon}\right)^{2r}\right) - c\varepsilon^{1-2r}(u^{2r} + \sigma) + c\varepsilon^{1-2r}\sigma \in Q(g)[x] + I(h)[x]. \quad (59)$$

Moreover, the degree of the right hand side has an upper bound independent from ε . This implies that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon \in Q_k(g)[x] + I_k(h)[x]$. Then we for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{f}^* - \varepsilon$ is a feasible solution of (57) of the value $\rho_k(f, g, h)$. It gives $\rho_k(f, g, h) \geq \bar{f}^* - \varepsilon$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, and, in consequence, we get $\rho_k(f, g, h) \geq \bar{f}^*$. Using the third statement, we obtain that $\rho_k(f, g, h) = \bar{f}^*$, yielding the final statement. \square

Remark 1. In the final statement of Lemma 16, if we assume further that $I(h)$ is real radical, $\rho_k(f, g, h)$ is attained. However, there is a case where $\rho_k(f, g, h)$ is not attained, although $\rho_k(f, g, h) = \bar{f}^*$. Example 2 is an instance for this (see in the end of [15, Section 3]). Fortunately, if there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_m + h_l = R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficient large, the fifth statement of Theorem 16 shows that the Slater condition holds for the SOS relaxation (56) of order k hence the Moment relaxation (55) has at least one global minimizer.

As a consequence of Lemma 1, the following lemma is obtained:

Lemma 17. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let h_{FJ} be as in (14). If problem (3) has a global minimizer, then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} f^* &:= \min_{x, \bar{\lambda}} f(x) \\ \text{s.t. } &x \in S(g), (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

We present in the following theorem the main application of Theorem 1 to polynomial optimization:

Theorem 3. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let h_{FJ} be as in (14). Assume that problem (3) has at least one global minimizer and $f(C(g))$ is finite. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$, where Πg is defined as in (7). Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$. Furthermore, if there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_m = R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficient large, the Slater condition holds for the SOS relaxation (56) of order k with $h = h_{FJ}$.

Proof. We first prove $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $S(g) = S(\Pi g)$, Lemma 17 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} f^* &:= \min_{x, \bar{\lambda}} f(x) \\ \text{s.t. } &x \in S(\Pi g), (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

By assumption, Theorem 1 yields that there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}] = Q(\Pi g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - f^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. Applying the final statement of Lemma 16 (by replacing g with Πg), we obtain the first statement. Assume that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. The proof of the equality $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is similar. Now assume that there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_m = R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$. Let us prove the final statement. By definition of h_{FJ} , the final entry of h_{FJ} is $b = 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2$ which implies that

$$g_m + b = (R + 1) - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2. \quad (62)$$

From this, the fifth statement of Lemma 16 shows that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficient large, the Slater condition holds for the SOS relaxation (56) of order k with $h = h_{FJ}$, yielding the final statement. \square

Combining Theorem 3, Examples 6, 7 and 8, we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 1. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let h_{FJ} be as in (14). Assume that problem (3) has at least one global minimizer and one of the following conditions holds:*

1. $g = (1 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2)$;
2. $g = (1 - x_n^2, \dots, 1 - x_1^2)$;
3. $g = (x_1, \dots, x_n, 1 - x_1 - \dots - x_n)$.

Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}) = f^$.*

The following two examples are given in [15, Example 3.3]:

Example 11. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the problem (3) with $n = 3$, $m = 1$, $f = x_1^4 x_2^2 + x_1^2 x_2^4 + x_3^6 - 3x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3^2 + \varepsilon(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2)$ and $g = (1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 - x_3^2)$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, Lasserre's hierarchy for this problem does not have finite convergence, as shown by Marshall [10, Example 2.4]. However, Corollary 1 shows there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$.*

Example 12. *Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 3$, $f = x_1 x_2 + x_1^3 + x_2^3$ and $g = (x_1, x_2, 1 - x_1 - x_2)$. As shown by Scheiderer [21, Remark 3.9], Lasserre's hierarchy for this problem does not have finite convergence. However, Corollary 1 yields there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$.*

The following two examples are given in [14, Example 5.6]:

Example 13. *Consider the problem (3) with $n = m = 3$, $f = x_1^4 x_2^2 + x_2^4 x_3^2 + x_3^4 x_1^2 - 3x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3^2$ and $g = (1 - x_1^2, 1 - x_2^2, 1 - x_3^2)$. As shown by Nie [14, Example 5.6], Lasserre's hierarchy for this problem does not have finite convergence. However, Corollary 1 yields there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$.*

4.2 Numerical experiments

In this subsection we report numerical results obtained by solving the SOS relaxations of the values $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$ and $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ})$ for problem (3), where h_{FJ} is defined as in (14). The first one is the standard semidefinite program in [8] while the second one is the semidefinite program modeled by our method in this paper. We indicate the data of each semidefinite program, namely "value", "time" and "size" correspond to the numerical value of the optimal value of the semidefinite program, the running time in seconds to obtain this numerical value, and the size of the semidefinite program, respectively. Here the size of the semidefinite program includes the largest matrix size, the number of affine constraints, the number of scalar variables, and the number of matrix variables.

Table 1: Lower bounds on $f^* = 0$

$\rho_k(f, g, h_{\text{FJ}})$			
k	value	time	size
2	-0.99984	0.03	(15,70,34,1)
3	-0.48463	0.08	(35,210,271,2)
4	-0.00920	0.33	(70,495,1501,2)
5	-0.00860	1.63	(126,1001,6231,2)
6	-0.00831	7.64	(210,1820,20973,2)
$\rho_k(f, g, 0)$			
k	value	time	size
16	-0.04760	2.34	(153,561,1,2)
17	-0.04672	3.30	(171,630,1,2)
18	-0.04528	5.26	(190,703,1,2)
19	-0.04476	6.73	(210,780,1,2)
20	-0.04337	11.4	(231,861,1,2)
$\rho_k(f, (g, b), 0)$			
k	value	time	size
16	-0.02370	5.31	(153,561,1,3)
17	-0.02306	6.97	(171,630,1,3)
18	-0.02284	7.91	(190,703,1,3)
19	-0.02198	11.9	(210,780,1,3)
20	-0.02148	24.1	(231,861,1,3)

The experiments are performed in Julia 1.3.1 with the softwares TSSOS [24] and Mosek 9.1 [12]. We use a desktop computer with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-8665U CPU @ 1.9GHz \times 8 and 31.2 GB of RAM.

Our test problem is taken from Example 3, namely $n = 2$, $m = 1$, $f = (x_1 + 1)^2 + x_2^2 - 1$ and $g = (g_1) = (x_1^3 - x_2^2)$. It is clear that $f^* = 0$ which is attained at the unique global minimizer $(0, 0)$ for problem (3). Moreover, the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold at this minimizer. By using [15, Proposition 3.4], we get $\rho_k(f, g, 0) < f^*$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As shown in Example 3, $f(C(g))$ is singleton. From this, Theorem 3 yields that $\rho_d(f, g, h_{\text{FJ}}) = f^*$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus we obtain $\rho_k(f, g, 0) < f^* = \rho_d(f, g, h_{\text{FJ}})$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We display the numerical results in Table 1. It shows that the numerical value -0.00831 of $\rho_6(f, g, h_{\text{FJ}})$ is the best lower bound on f^* . It takes around 7 seconds to obtain this numerical value. It is worth pointing out that the standard SOS relaxations of the values $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$ and $\rho_k(f, (g, b), 0)$ cannot reach the bound -0.00831 in less than 10 seconds in spite of using the additional ball constraint $b = 1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2$. Another observation is that the size of the SOS relaxations of the value $\rho_k(f, g, h_{\text{FJ}})$ grows faster than the ones of the values $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$ and $\rho_k(f, (g, b), 0)$ when k increases.

We conjecture that the smallest integer k satisfying $\rho_k(f, g, h_{\text{FJ}}) = f^*$ can be bounded from above by a polynomial in the size (coefficients and degrees) of the input f, g_j .

5 Variations

5.1 Representations

We state in the following theorem the first variation of Theorem 1, where we assume that the image of the intersection of a semi-algebraic set with the set of its singularities is finite:

Theorem 4. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(C(g) \cap S(g))$ is finite. Then there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{FJ})$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and h_{FJ} is defined as in (14). Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$.*

The proof of Theorem 4 is postponed to Section 5.2.

Given a real matrix A , we denote by $\text{rank}^+(A)$ the largest number of columns of A whose convex hull over \mathbb{R} has no zero. Let $C^+(g)$ be the set of critical points associated with g defined by

$$C^+(g) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{rank}^+(\varphi^g(x)) < m\}.$$

We state the second variation of Theorem 1 in the following theorem:

Theorem 5. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(C^+(g))$ is finite. Then there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ}^+)$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and*

$$h_{FJ}^+ := (\lambda_0^2 \nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j, \lambda_1^2 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m^2 g_m, 1 - \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2). \quad (63)$$

Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$.

Proof. To prove Theorem 5, we do similarly to the proof of Theorem 1 by replacing $C(g)$ and h_{FJ} in Section 2.2 with $C^+(g)$ and h_{FJ}^+ , respectively. Note that the equality $C^+(g) = \pi(V(h_{FJ}^+) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\})$ follows thanks to the following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} & x \in C^+(g) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{rank}^+(\varphi^g(x)) < m \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 = 1, \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(x) = 0, \lambda_j^2 g_j(x) = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2 = 1, \lambda_0 = 0, \lambda_0^2 \nabla f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(x), \lambda_j^2 g_j(x) = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}^+) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\} \\ \Leftrightarrow & x \in \pi(V(h_{FJ}^+) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Moreover, the Lagrangian function becomes $L(x, \bar{\lambda}) = f(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_0}\right)^2 g_j(x)$. \square

We state the third variation of Theorem 1 in the following theorem:

Theorem 6. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(C^+(g) \cap S(g))$ is finite. Then there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $S(g) \cap V(h_{FJ}^+)$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and h_{FJ}^+ is defined as in (63). Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$.*

Proof. The proof is processed similarly to the one of Theorem 1 by replacing $C(g)$ and h_{FJ} in Section 2.2 with $C^+(g)$ and h_{FJ}^+ , respectively. \square

Remark 2. *Since $C(g) \cap S(g)$, $C^+(g)$ and $C^+(g) \cap S(g)$ are subsets of $C(g)$, the assumptions of Theorems 4, 5 and 6 that $f(C(g) \cap S(g))$, $f(C^+(g))$ and $f(C^+(g) \cap S(g))$ are finite hold generically thanks to Theorem 2, respectively.*

5.2 Proofs

We use the same notation as in Section 2. We generalize Lemma 10 in the following lemma:

Lemma 18. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, let W be a complex variety generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$, and let A be a semi-algebraic subset of \mathbb{R}^n . Assume that $f(A \cap W)$ is finite. Then there exist a finite sequence of subsets W_1, \dots, W_r such that the following conditions hold:*

1. W_1, \dots, W_r are pairwise disjoint complex varieties generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$;
2. for $j = 1, \dots, r$, $W_j \subset W$ and f is constant on W_j ;
3. $(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r) \cap A = W \cap A$.

The proof of Lemma 18 is similar to the one of Lemma 10 since we only need to replace \mathbb{R}^n in the proof of Lemma 10 with A .

The following lemma is based on [4, Lemma 3.3]:

Lemma 19. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that $f(C(g))$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ is finite. Let h_{FJ} be defined as in (14). Let W be a semi-algebraically path connected component of $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. Then f is constant on W .*

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 13. When proving that $\tau \mapsto f(x(\tau))$ is constant on $[a_j, b_j]$, we note that

$$f(S(g) \cap C(g)) = f(S(g) \cap \pi(V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\})) \quad (65)$$

is finite since $f(S(g) \cap \pi(V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\})) \supset f(x([\tau_1, \tau_2]))$, which is due to the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} S(g) \cap \pi(V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) &= \pi((S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \\ &\supset \pi(W \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \supset x([\tau_1, \tau_2]). \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Using Lemma 8, we decompose $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}})$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s . Lemma 19 shows that f is constant on Z_i . Thus $f((S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}}))$ is finite. Observe that $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}}) = (S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V_{\mathbb{C}}(h_{\text{FJ}})$. By using Lemma 18, we obtain a finite sequence of subsets W_1, \dots, W_r such that the following conditions hold:

- W_1, \dots, W_r are pairwise disjoint complex varieties generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x, \bar{\lambda}]$;
- for $j = 1, \dots, r$, $W_j \subset V_{\mathbb{C}}(h_{\text{FJ}})$ and f is constant on W_j ;
- $(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r) \cap (S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) = V_{\mathbb{C}}(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap (S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) = (S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}})$.

Let D be the union of W_1, \dots, W_r . Let $b = 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2$. From this, Lemma 11 yields that there exists $p \in P(g, b)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - p$ vanishes on $D \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} \supset (S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. We write p as in (28) for some $\sigma_\alpha, \psi_\beta \in \Sigma^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Let $q = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m} \sigma_\alpha g^\alpha \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Since $b = 0$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$, it holds that $f = p = q$ on $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}})$.

Assume that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. Then there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_{m+1} = R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 \in Q(g)[x]$. It implies that $S(g, b)$ with $b = 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2$ satisfies the Archimedean condition due to (29). From this, Lemma 11 shows that there exists $p \in Q(g, b)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - p$ vanishes on $D \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} \supset (S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. We write p as in (30) for some $\sigma_j \in \Sigma^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Let $q = \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Since $b = 0$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$, $f = p = q$ on $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. This completes the proof. □

5.3 Examples

In this section, we illustrate our Nichtnegativstellensatz stated in Theorems 4, 5, and 6 with several explicit examples. The following lemma shows a case where $S(g)$ is convex and $C^+(g)$ is empty:

Lemma 20. *Let $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ with $g_j \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that each g_j is concave and $S(g)$ has non-empty interior. Then $S(g)$ is convex and $C^+(g) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. It is a simple matter to prove that $S(g)$ is convex. Assume by contradiction that there is $y \in C^+(g)$. Then by (64), there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(y) = 0$ and $\lambda_j^2 g_j(y) = 0$. Set $G(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 g_j(x)$. Then G is concave since all g_j is concave. In addition, $\nabla G(y) = 0$ yields that $G(y) = 0$ is the maximal value of G . Let a be in the interior of $S(g)$. Then $0 \geq G(a) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 g_j(a)$ implies that $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_m = 0$ since all $g_j(a)$ are positive. This contradicts $\lambda \neq 0$, and hence it holds that $C^+(g) = \emptyset$. \square

The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 20 and Theorem 5:

Lemma 21. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$, each g_j is concave and $S(g)$ has non-empty interior. Then $S(g)$ is convex and there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{F,J}^+)$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and $h_{F,J}^+$ is defined as in (63). Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$.*

To illustrate the representations in Lemma 21, see Examples 6, 7 and 8. Note that if $C(g) = \emptyset$, then so is $C^+(g)$ since $C^+(g) \subset C(g)$.

Contrary to Lemma 21, the following example shows the representation of any polynomial non-negative on a non-convex semi-algebraic set $S(g)$:

Example 14. *Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 3$ and $g = (g_1, g_2, g_3) = (x_1 + 1, 1 - x_2^2, 1 - (x_1 - 1)^2 - x_2^2)$. Then $S(g)$ is non-convex since it contains all points in the hypercube $[-1, 1]^2$ but not in the open ball of center $(1, 0)$ with unit radius. The condition $\text{rank}^+(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as*

$$\begin{cases} \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -2x_2 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_3 \begin{bmatrix} 2(x_1 - 1) \\ -2x_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \\ \lambda_1 g_1(x) = \lambda_1(x_1 + 1) = 0, \lambda_2 g_2(x) = \lambda_2(1 - x_2^2) = 0, \\ \lambda_3 g_3(x) = \lambda_3(1 - (x_1 - 1)^2 - x_2^2) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (67)$$

It implies that $\lambda_1 = 0$ or $x_1 = -1$. If $\lambda_1 = 0$, $2\lambda_3(x_1 - 1) = 0$ which gives $\lambda_3 = 0$ or $x_1 = 1$. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = 0$, $\lambda_2 \neq 0$ which implies $-2x_2 = 0$ and $1 - x_2^2 = 0$, hence this is impossible. If $\lambda_1 = 0$ and $x_1 = 1$, then $-2(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)x_2 = 0$ and $\lambda_2(1 - x_2^2) = \lambda_3(1 - x_2^2) = 0$. If $\lambda_1 = 0$, $x_1 = 1$ and $x_2 = 0$, then $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$ which contradicts $\lambda \neq 0$. If $\lambda_1 = 0$, $x_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$, then $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$ (since $\lambda_j \geq 0$) which also contradicts $\lambda \neq 0$. Thus we get $x_1 = -1$. Then $\lambda_1 - 4\lambda_3 = 0$, $-2(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)x_2 = 0$, $\lambda_2(1 - x_2^2) = 0$ and $\lambda_3(-3 - x_2^2) = 0$. It implies $\lambda_3 = 0$, so $\lambda_1 = 0$, $\lambda_2 x_2 = 0$ and $\lambda_2(1 - x_2^2) = 0$. Since $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = 0$, we obtain $\lambda_2 > 0$ which gives $x_2 = 0 = 1 - x_2^2$. This is impossible, hence $C^+(g) = \emptyset$ which implies that $f(C^+(g)) = \emptyset$. By Theorem 5, if f is non-negative on $S(g)$, there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ and $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{F,J}^+)$.

In the following example, we reconsider Example 10 which Theorem 1 is inapplicable to but Theorem 4 is applicable to:

Example 15. *Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 2$, $f = x_1 + x_2$ and $g = (-x_1^2, -x_2^2)$. Then we get $f^* = 0$, $S(g) = \{(0, 0)\}$ and $(0, 0)$ is the unique global minimizer for this problem. We get $C(g) = \{(t, 0), (0, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ which gives that*

$f(C(g)) = \mathbb{R}$ is infinite. However $C(g) \cap S(g) = \{(0, 0)\}$ implies $f(C(g) \cap S(g)) = \{0\}$ is finite. Let h_{FJ} be as in (14). Then

$$V(h_{FJ}) = \{(t, 0, 0, 0, \pm 1), (0, t, 0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, \cos t, \sin t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (68)$$

By Theorem 1, there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on

$$(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{FJ}) = \{(0, 0, 0, \cos t, \sin t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (69)$$

It is not hard to take $q = 0$.

The following lemma shows a case where $C^+(g)$ is a singleton:

Example 16. Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 3$, $f = x_1 - 1$ and $g = (g_1, g_2, g_3) = (x_1, x_2, (x_1 - 1)^3 - x_2)$. It is easy to check that $S(g)$ is non-convex and $f^* = 0$. Moreover, the point $(1, 0)$ is the unique global minimizer for this problem and Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold for (3) at this point. The condition $\text{rank}^+(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{cases} \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_3 \begin{bmatrix} 3(x_1 - 1)^2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \\ \lambda_1 g_1(x) = \lambda_1 x_1 = 0, \lambda_2 g_2(x) = \lambda_2 x_2 = 0, \lambda_3 g_3(x) = \lambda_3 ((x_1 - 1)^3 - x_2) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

It implies that $\lambda_3 = \lambda_2$ so $\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2(x_1 - 1)^2 = 0$. It follows that $\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2(x_1 - 1) = 0$. If $\lambda_2 = 0$, then $\lambda = 0$, hence this is impossible. Thus we get $\lambda_2 > 0$ which gives $x_1 = 1$ and $x_2 = 0$. Thus $C^+(g) = \{(1, 0)\}$ is a singleton then so is $f(C^+(g))$. From this, Theorem 5 shows that there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ}^+)$ with h_{FJ}^+ defined as in (63), namely

$$\begin{aligned} h_{FJ}^+ &= (\lambda_0^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_1^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_2^2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_3^2 \begin{bmatrix} 3(x_1 - 1)^2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}), \\ &\lambda_1^2 x_1, \lambda_2^2 x_2, \lambda_3^2 ((x_1 - 1)^3 - x_2), 1 - \sum_{j=0}^3 \lambda_j^2. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Let $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}^+)$. We get $\lambda_3^2 = \lambda_2^2$, so $\lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2 - 3\lambda_2^2(x_1 - 1)^2 = 0$ and $\lambda_1^2 x_1 = \lambda_2^2 x_2 = \lambda_3^2 ((x_1 - 1)^3 - x_2) = 0$. If $\lambda_2 = 0$, then $\lambda_0^2 = \lambda_1^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $x_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_2 \neq 0$, then $x_2 = 0$, $x_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_0 = 0$ which gives $\lambda_2^2 = \lambda_3^2 = \frac{1}{2}$. Thus we obtain

$$V(h_{FJ}^+) = \{(0, t, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r_1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r_2, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r_1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r_2) : r_j = \pm 1, t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (72)$$

It is not hard to check that $q = (x_1 - 1)^3 = g_2 + g_3 \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}] \subset P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ and $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ}^+)$.

Remark 3. From Lemma 20 and Examples 4, 16, if $C^+(g)$ is finite, then there are cases where $S(g)$ is convex, and there are cases where $S(g)$ is non-convex. This implies that the finiteness of $C^+(g)$ does not depend on the convexity of $S(g)$. Thus it is still open to find all explicit cases of g where $C^+(g)$ is finite.

Next we show in the following example that Theorems 4, 5 and 6 are inapplicable to Example 4:

Example 17. Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 1$, $f = x_1 + x_2^2$ and $g = (g_1) = (-x_1^2)$. Then the point $(0, 0)$ is the unique global minimizer. The condition $\text{rank}^+(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\exists \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\} : \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -2x_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \lambda_1 g_1(x) = -\lambda_1 x_1^2 = 0. \quad (73)$$

It is equivalent to $x_1 = 0$. Thus $C(g) = C^+(g) = S(g) = \{(0, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is infinite which implies that

$$f(C(g)) = f(C^+(g)) = f(C(g) \cap S(g)) = f(C^+(g) \cap S(g)) = \{t^2 : t \in \mathbb{R}\} = [0, \infty) \quad (74)$$

is infinite.

We prove in the following example that the finiteness assumptions of $f(C^+(g))$ and $f(S(g) \cap C^+(g))$ in Theorems 5 and 6 cannot be removed, respectively:

Example 18. Consider the problem (3) with $n = 2$, $m = 3$, $f = x_1 + x_2$ and $g = (g_1, g_2, g_3) = (x_1^3, x_2^3, -x_1x_2)$. It is easy to check that $S(g) = \{(0, t), (t, 0) : t \geq 0\}$ and $f^* = 0$. Moreover, the point $(0, 0)$ is the unique global minimizer for this problem and Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold for (3) at this point. The condition $\text{rank}^+(\varphi^g(x)) < m$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{cases} \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 2x_1^2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2x_2^2 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_3 \begin{bmatrix} -x_2 \\ -x_1 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \\ \lambda_1 g_1(x) = \lambda_1 x_1^3 = 0, \lambda_2 g_2(x) = \lambda_2 x_2^3 = 0, \lambda_3 g_3(x) = -\lambda_3 x_1 x_2 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

It implies that $\lambda_3 x_1 = \lambda_3 x_2 = \lambda_1 x_1 = \lambda_2 x_2 = 0$. If $\lambda_3 \neq 0$, then $x = 0$. If $\lambda_3 = 0$, we have either $x_1 = 0$ or $\lambda_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = 0$, then $\lambda_2 = \pm 1$ so $x_2 = 0$. Thus $C^+(g) = S(g)$ is infinite then so are $f(C^+(g))$ and $f(S(g) \cap C^+(g))$. Let h_{FJ}^+ be as in (63). Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} h_{FJ}^+ = & (\lambda_0^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_1^2 \begin{bmatrix} 2x_1^2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_2^2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2x_2^2 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_3^2 \begin{bmatrix} -x_2 \\ -x_1 \end{bmatrix}), \\ & \lambda_1^2 x_1^3, \lambda_2^2 x_2^3, -\lambda_3^2 x_1 x_2, 1 - \sum_{j=0}^3 \lambda_j^2). \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Let $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}^+)$. Then we have $\lambda_1 x_1 = \lambda_2 x_2 = \lambda_0^2 + \lambda_3^2 x_2 = \lambda_0^2 + \lambda_3^2 x_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_3 = 0$, then $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1 x_1 = \lambda_2 x_2 = 0$, which implies $\lambda_1 = 0$ or $x_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_3 = \lambda_0 = \lambda_1 = 0$, then $\lambda_2 = \pm 1$, which yields $x_2 = 0$. If $\lambda_3 = \lambda_0 = x_1 = 0$, then $\lambda_2 = 0$ or $x_2 = 0$. If $\lambda_3 \neq 0$, then $x_1 = x_2 = -\lambda_0^2/\lambda_3^2$ and $\lambda_0 \lambda_1 = \lambda_0 \lambda_2 = 0$. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V(h_{FJ}^+) = & \{(t_1, 0, 0, 0, \pm 1, 0), (0, t_2, 0, 0, \pm 1, 0), \\ & (0, 0, 0, \cos t_3, \sin t_3, 0), (-\frac{\mu_0^2}{\mu_3^2}, -\frac{\mu_0^2}{\mu_3^2}, \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) : \\ & t_j \in \mathbb{R}, \mu_j \in \mathbb{R}, \mu_3 \neq 0, \sum_{i=0}^3 \mu_i^2 = 1, \mu_0 \mu_1 = \mu_0 \mu_2 = 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Let us prove that there does not exist $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ}^+)$. Assume by contradiction that there is $\sigma_\alpha \in \Sigma^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^3} \sigma_\alpha g^\alpha$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ}^+)$. Since $(t, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0) \in V(h_{FJ}^+)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we get

$$t - \sigma_{(0,0,0)}(t, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0) - \sigma_{(1,0,0)}(t, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)t^3 = 0. \quad (78)$$

Set $\psi_0(t) = \sigma_{(0,0,0)}(t, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0) \in \Sigma^2[t]$ and $\psi_1(t) = \sigma_{(1,0,0)}(t, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0) \in \Sigma^2[t]$. Then it implies that $\psi_0 = t(1 - t^2\psi_1)$, yielding $\psi_0 = t^2\hat{\psi}_0$ for some $\hat{\psi}_0 \in \Sigma^2[t]$ (since $\psi_0 \in \Sigma^2[t]$). Thus, $t = \psi_0 + t^3\psi_1 = t^2(\hat{\psi}_0 + t\psi_1)$, and hence this is impossible.

5.4 Application to exact polynomial optimization

In this subsection we apply the representations stated in Section 5.1 for computing exactly the optimal value of a polynomial optimization problem by using semidefinite programming.

We state in the following lemma an extension of the sixth statement of Lemma 16:

Lemma 22. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let \bar{f}^* be as in (58) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$. Assume that there exists $q \in P(g)[x]$ such that $f - \bar{f}^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h) \cap S(g)$. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h) = \bar{f}^*$.*

Proof. The proof is proved similarly to the sixth statement of Lemma 16. It is sketched as follows: Let $u = f - \bar{f}^* - q$. By assumption, we get $u = 0$ on $S(g) \cap V(h)$. From this, Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz [7] say that there exist a positive integer r and $w \in P(g)[x]$ such that $u^{2r} + w \in I(h)[x]$. Let $c = \frac{1}{2r}$. Then it holds that $1 + t + ct^{2r} \in \Sigma^2[t]$. Thus for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon = q + \varepsilon \left(1 + \frac{u}{\varepsilon} + c \left(\frac{u}{\varepsilon}\right)^{2r}\right) - c\varepsilon^{1-2r}(u^{2r} + w) + c\varepsilon^{1-2r}w \in P(g)[x] + I(h)[x]. \quad (79)$$

Moreover, the degree of the right hand side has an upper bound independent from ε . This implies that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon \in P_k(g)[x] + I_k(h)[x]$. Then we for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{f}^* - \varepsilon$ is a feasible solution of (57) of the value $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h)$. It gives $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h) \geq \bar{f}^* - \varepsilon$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, and, in consequence, we get $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h) \geq \bar{f}^*$. Using the third statement, we obtain that $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h) = \bar{f}^*$, yielding the final statement. \square

Remark 4. *In Lemma 16, if $m \geq 2$ and there exists $q \in Q(g)[x]$ such that $f - \bar{f}^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h) \cap S(g)$, we are not sure that $\rho_k(f, g, h) = \bar{f}^*$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

As a consequence of Lemma 1, the following lemma is obtained:

Lemma 23. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let h_{FJ}^+ be as in (63). If problem (3) has a global minimizer, then it holds that*

$$f^* := \min_{x, \bar{\lambda}} f(x) \quad (80)$$

s.t. $x \in S(g), (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}^+)$.

We present in the following two theorems the main application of Theorems 5 and 6 to polynomial optimization:

Theorem 7. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let h_{FJ} be as in (14) and h_{FJ}^+ be as in (63). Assume that problem (3) has at least one global minimizer. Let Πg be as in (7). Then the following statements hold:*

1. *If $f(C(g) \cap S(g))$ is finite, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$.*
2. *If $f(C^+(g) \cap S(g))$ is finite, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}^+) = f^*$.*

Remark 5. *Since $C^+(g) \cap S(g) \subset C^+(g)$, the second statement of Theorem 7 holds if $f(C^+(g))$ is finite.*

The proof of Theorem 7, which relies on Theorems 4, 6 and Lemma 22, is similar to the one of Theorem 3.

Theorem 8. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let h_{FJ}^+ be as in (63). Assume that problem (3) has at least one global minimizer and $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. If $f(C^+(g))$ is finite, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}^+) = f^*$. Furthermore, if there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_m = R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficient large, the Slater condition holds for the SOS relaxation (56) of order k with $h = h_{FJ}$ or $h = h_{FJ}^+$.*

The proof of Theorem 8, which relies on Theorem 5 together with the fifth and sixth statements of Lemma 16, is similar to the one of Theorem 3.

Combining Lemmas 21 and 22, we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 2. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let h_{FJ}^+ be as in (63). Assume that problem (3) has at least one global minimizer, each g_j is concave and $S(g)$ has non-empty interior. Then $S(g)$ is convex and there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}^+) = f^*$ with Πg being defined as in (7). Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}^+) = f^*$.*

Table 2: Lower bounds on $f^* = 0$

$\rho_k(f, g, h_{F,J}^+)$			
k	value	time	size
3	-0.38154	0.09	(21,186,216,19)
4	-0.01199	0.38	(42,476,1056,54)
5	-0.00822	2.07	(84,1110,4393,100)
$\rho_k(f, g, 0)$			
k	value	time	size
13	-0.02419	1.27	(105,378,1,4)
14	-0.02254	2.08	(120,435,1,4)
15	-0.02254	3.13	(136,496,1,4)
$\rho_k(f, (g, b), 0)$			
k	value	time	size
13	-0.01490	1.68	(105,378,1,5)
14	-0.01305	2.43	(120,435,1,5)
15	-0.01267	3.03	(136,496,1,5)

5.5 Numerical examples

In this subsection we report numerical results obtained by solving the SOS relaxations of the values $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$ and $\rho_k(f, g, h_{F,J}^+)$ for problem (3), where $h_{F,J}^+$ is defined as in (63). We use the same notation as in Section 4.2.

Our test problem is taken from Example 16, namely $n = 2$, $m = 3$, $f = x_1 - 1$ and $g = (g_1, g_2, g_3) = (x_1, x_2, (x_1 - 1)^3 - x_2)$. It is clear that $f^* = 0$ which is attained at the unique global minimizer $(1, 0)$ for problem (3). Moreover, the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold at this minimizer. By using [15, Proposition 3.4], we get $\rho_k(f, g, 0) < f^*$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As shown in Example 16, there exists $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ and $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{F,J}^+)$. From this, the sixth statement of Theorem 16 yields that $\rho_d(f, g, h_{F,J}^+) = f^*$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus we obtain $\rho_k(f, g, 0) < f^* = \rho_d(f, g, h_{F,J}^+)$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $h_{F,J}^+$ has sign symmetry at $\bar{\lambda}$, we use TSSOS [24] to exploit this structure when computing $\rho_k(f, g, h_{F,J}^+)$.

We display the numerical results in Table 2. It shows that the numerical value -0.00822 of $\rho_5(f, g, h_{F,J}^+)$ is the best lower bound on f^* . It takes around 2 seconds to obtain this numerical value. It is worth pointing out that the standard SOS relaxations of the values $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$ and $\rho_k(f, (g, b), 0)$ cannot reach the bound -0.00822 in less than 3 seconds in spite of using the additional ball constraint $b = 2 - x_1^2 - x_2^2$. Another observation is that the size of the SOS relaxations of the value $\rho_k(f, g, h_{F,J}^+)$ grows faster than the ones of the values $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$ and $\rho_k(f, (g, b), 0)$ when k increases.

6 Representations with denominators

We close the paper with the following Nichtnegativstellensatz:

Theorem 9. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ such that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Then there exists $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $\lambda_0(f - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{F,J})$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and $h_{F,J}$ is defined as in (14). Moreover, if $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$.*

The proof of Theorem 9, which has the same idea as Theorem 1, is postponed to below. Although the representations in Theorem 9 have prescribed-denominator, we are not required to make any assumption on the image of the set of critical points under f .

The following example is to illustrate the representations stated in Theorem 9:

Example 19. Consider Example 4 where $V(h_{FJ}) = \{(0, t, 0, \pm 1) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ which gives $\lambda_0(f - 0) = 0$ on $V(h_{FJ})$ since $\lambda_0 = 0$ on $V(h_{FJ})$. Similar consideration applies to Example 10.

The following lemma is utilized to prove Theorem 9:

Lemma 24. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ such that $f(C(g))$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ is finite. Let h_{FJ} be defined as in (14). Let W be a semi-algebraically path connected component of $V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$. Then f is constant on W .

Proof. Choose two arbitrary points $(x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$, $(x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ in W . We claim that $f(x^{(0)}) = f(x^{(1)})$.

It is sufficient to assume that both $(x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ are nonsingular points. If at least one of $(x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ is singular, we choose arbitrarily close nonsingular points to approximate $(x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ then apply the continuity of f to obtain $f(x^{(0)}) = f(x^{(1)})$. It is due to the fact that the set of nonsingular points of W is dense and open in W .

If a manifold is path-connected, the set of its nonsingular points is a manifold that is also path-connected. By assumption, there exists a continuous piecewise-differentiable path $\phi(\tau) = (x(\tau), \bar{\lambda}(\tau))$, for $\tau \in [0, 1]$, lying inside W such that $\phi(0) = (x^{(0)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(0)})$ and $\phi(1) = (x^{(1)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(1)})$ (see, e.g., [17, Theorem 1.8.1]). The Lagrangian function $L(x, \bar{\lambda})$ defined in (26) is equal to $f(x)$ on $V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$, which contains $\phi([0, 1])$. Let $\mu_j(\tau)$ be the principal square root of $\lambda_j(\tau)$ for $\tau \in [0, 1]$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. Note that $\tau \mapsto L(x(\tau), \bar{\lambda}(\tau))$ has zero gradient on the path $\phi(\tau)$, $\tau \in [0, 1]$. By the mean value theorem, we get $f(x(0)) = f(x(1))$. We now obtain $f(x^{(0)}) = f(x^{(1)})$ and hence that f is constant on W . \square

Proof of Theorem 9

Proof. Using Lemma 9, we decompose $V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s . from this, Lemma 13 shows that f is constant on Z_i which implies that $f(V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\})$. We write

$$f(V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) = \{t_1, \dots, t_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}, \quad (81)$$

where $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. For $j = 1, \dots, r$, set $W_j := V_{\mathbb{C}}(h_{FJ}, f - t_j)$. Then W_j is a complex variety generated by finitely many polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. We claim that W_1, \dots, W_r are pairwise disjoint. Otherwise, let $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in W_i \cap W_j$ with $i \neq j$. It implies that $t_i = f(x) = t_j$ which is impossible. Let $U = W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r$. We now prove that

$$V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\} = (U \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}. \quad (82)$$

Let $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. By (81), there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $f(x) = t_j$. It implies that $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in W_j \subset U$ and so we get $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in U \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$. Thus $V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\} \subset (U \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$ since $(x, \bar{\lambda})$ is arbitrary. Conversely, suppose that $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in (U \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$. Then there is $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $x \in W_j$. It implies that $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ})$ by the definition of W_j . Then $(x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$. Thus $(U \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} \subset V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$ since $(x, \bar{\lambda})$ is arbitrary.

Let $b = 1 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2$. By the definition of U , Lemma 11 shows that there exists $p \in P(g, b)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - p$ vanishes on $U \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$. We write p as in (28) for some $\sigma_\alpha, \psi_\beta \in \Sigma^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Let $q = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^m} \sigma_\alpha g^\alpha \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Since $b = 0$ on $V(h_{FJ})$, $f = p = q$ on $V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$ thanks to (82). Thus $\lambda_0(f - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$.

Assume that $S(g)$ satisfies the Archimedean condition. Then there exists $R > 0$ such that $g_{m+1} = R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 \in Q(g)[x]$. It implies that $S(g, b)$ with $b = 1 - \lambda_0^2 + \dots - \lambda_m^2$ satisfies the Archimedean condition due to (29). By the definition of U Lemma

11 yields that there exists $p \in Q(g, b)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - p$ vanishes on $U \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$. We write p as in (30) for some $\sigma_j \in \Sigma^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Let $q = \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. Since $b = 0$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$, $f = p = q$ on $V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$ thanks to (82). Thus $\lambda_0(f - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. \square

Acknowledgements. The author was supported by the MESRI funding from ED-MITT.

References

- [1] J. Bochnak, M. Coste, and M.-F. Roy. *Real algebraic geometry*, volume 36. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [2] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [3] M. A. Bucero and B. Mourrain. Exact relaxation for polynomial optimization on semi-algebraic sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.6426*, 2013.
- [4] J. Demmel, J. Nie, and V. Powers. Representations of positive polynomials on noncompact semialgebraic sets via KKT ideals. *Journal of pure and applied algebra*, 209(1):189–200, 2007.
- [5] D. Hilbert. Über die Darstellung Definiten Formen als Summe von Formenquadraten. *Mathematische Annalen*, 32(3):342–350, 1888.
- [6] T. Jacobi and A. Prestel. Distinguished representations of strictly positive polynomials. *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik*, 2001.
- [7] J.-L. Krivine. Anneaux préordonnés. *Journal d’analyse mathématique*, 12(1):307–326, 1964.
- [8] J. B. Lasserre. Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. *SIAM Journal on optimization*, 11(3):796–817, 2001.
- [9] N. H. A. Mai, J.-B. Lasserre, V. Magron, and J. Wang. Exploiting constant trace property in large-scale polynomial optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.08873*, 2020.
- [10] M. Marshall. Representations of non-negative polynomials having finitely many zeros. In *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques*, volume 15, pages 599–609, 2006.
- [11] M. Marshall. Representations of non-negative polynomials, degree bounds and applications to optimization. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 61(1):205–221, 2009.
- [12] A. Mosek. The mosek optimization software. *Online at <http://www.mosek.com>*, 54(2-1):5, 2010.
- [13] J. Nie. Discriminants and nonnegative polynomials. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 47(2):167–191, 2012.
- [14] J. Nie. An exact Jacobian SDP relaxation for polynomial optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 137(1):225–255, 2013.
- [15] J. Nie. Optimality conditions and finite convergence of Lasserre’s hierarchy. *Mathematical programming*, 146(1-2):97–121, 2014.
- [16] J. Nie, J. Demmel, and B. Sturmfels. Minimizing polynomials via sum of squares over the gradient ideal. *Mathematical programming*, 106(3):587–606, 2006.
- [17] T. S. Pham and H. H. Vui. *Genericity in polynomial optimization*, volume 3. World Scientific, 2016.

- [18] M. Putinar. Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42(3):969–984, 1993.
- [19] C. Scheiderer. Sums of squares of regular functions on real algebraic varieties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 352(3):1039–1069, 2000.
- [20] C. Scheiderer. Sums of squares on real algebraic curves. *Mathematische zeitschrift*, 245(4):725–760, 2003.
- [21] C. Scheiderer. Distinguished representations of non-negative polynomials. *Journal of Algebra*, 289(2):558–573, 2005.
- [22] C. Scheiderer. Sums of squares on real algebraic surfaces. *manuscripta mathematica*, 119(4):395–410, 2006.
- [23] K. Schmüdgen. The K-moment problem for compact semi-algebraic sets. *Mathematische Annalen*, 289(1):203–206, 1991.
- [24] J. Wang, V. Magron, and J.-B. Lasserre. TSSOS: A Moment-SOS hierarchy that exploits term sparsity. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(1):30–58, 2021.