

# On the exactness for polynomial optimization strengthened with Fritz John conditions

Ngoc Hoang Anh Mai\*

May 18, 2022

## Abstract

We utilize the same technique as in [arXiv:2205.04254 (2022)] to provide some representations of polynomials non-negative on a basic semi-algebraic set, defined by polynomial inequalities, under more general conditions. Based on each representation, we obtain semidefinite programs which return a sequence of values that finitely converges to the optimal value of a given polynomial optimization problem under generic assumption. Consequently, we can compute exactly the minimal value of any polynomial over a basic convex semi-algebraic set which is defined by the inequalities of concave polynomials.

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

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Proof</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Illustrated examples</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Exact polynomial optimization</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1	Moment-SOS relaxations . . . . .	7
4.2	Numerical examples . . . . .	10

## 1 Introduction

The study of representations of a polynomial  $f$  non-negative on a basic semi-algebraic set  $S$  (also called Nichtnegativstellensatz) is a central interest in real algebraic geometry with influential applications in polynomial optimization. We refer the readers to [4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18–20, 22, 23] for extensive discussions of various aspects of this subject. Accordingly, it is important, difficult and challenging to provide Nichtnegativstellensatz, which have the same forms as Putinar’s and Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz, in cases where: (i) polynomial  $f$  is non-negative with infinitely many zeros on basic semi-algebraic sets  $S$  or (ii) the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold for  $\min_x \{f(x) : x \in S\}$  at any zero of  $f$  on  $S$ . Initially developed by Demmel,

---

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

Nie and Powers in their celebrated work [4], the techniques in [9] enable us to deal with above cases, and hence obtain exact semidefinite programs for a polynomial optimization problem in these cases. Roughly speaking, we utilize a variety  $V$ , generated by polynomials in the Fritz John conditions for  $\min_x \{f(x) : x \in S\}$ , whose intersection with  $S$  contains the zeros of  $f$ . It turns out that  $f$  has finitely many values on  $V$ , so has nice representations without denominator involving quadratic module and preordering associated with  $S \cap V$  under a generic condition. Following the same research line as in [9] our main results in this paper based on this approach state some Nichtnegativstellensatz under more general conditions. In particular,  $f$  still has the representation involving preordering when  $f$  has finitely many values on the intersection  $V \cap S$  (instead of only  $V$  as above) under the more general condition.

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:

$$f^* := \inf_{x \in S(g)} f(x), \quad (1)$$

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

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

Given  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ , we denote by  $\nabla p$  the gradient of  $p$ , i.e.,  $\nabla p = (\frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_n})$ . We state in the following lemma the Fritz John conditions, which are equivalent to but different from the ones in [9, Lemma 1]:

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ . If  $u$  is a local minimizer for problem (1), then the Fritz John conditions hold for problem (1) at  $u$ , i.e., there exists a real vector  $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0^2 \nabla f(u) &= \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(u), \\ \lambda_j^2 g_j(u) &= 0, j = 1, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

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

$$Q(g)[x] := \Sigma^2[x] + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j \Sigma^2[x]. \quad (4)$$

We say that  $S(g)$  satisfies the Archimedean condition if there exists  $R > 0$  such that  $R - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 \in Q(g)[x]$ .

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

$$\Pi g := (g^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m \setminus \{0\}}, \quad (5)$$

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  $h_1, \dots, h_l$ , let  $V(h)$  be the variety generated by  $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$  defined by

$$V(h) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_j(x) = 0, j = 1, \dots, l\}. \quad (6)$$

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

$$I(h)[x] := \sum_{j=1}^l h_j \mathbb{R}[x]. \quad (7)$$

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

$$\varphi^g(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla g_1(x) & \dots & \nabla g_m(x) \\ g_1(x) & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & g_m(x) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Given a real matrix  $A$ , we denote by  $\text{rank}(A)$  the largest number of columns of  $A$  which are not linearly dependent over  $\mathbb{R}$ . We say that a set  $\Omega$  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

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

In the following theorem, we recall the main representation in [9, Theorem 1] :

**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  $q \in P(g)[x, \lambda]$  such that  $f - q$  vanishes on  $V(h_{FJ})$ , where  $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$  and*

$$h_{FJ} := (\lambda_0 \nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j, \lambda_1 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m g_m, 1 - \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2). \quad (9)$$

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

We state the first main result in the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.** *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 (9). Moreover, if  $S(g)$  satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take  $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ .*

The proof of Theorem 2 is postponed to Section 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 zeros. 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 main result in the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.** *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*

$$h_{FJ}^+ := (\lambda_0^2 \nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j, \lambda_1^2 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m^2 g_m, 1 - \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2). \quad (10)$$

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

*Proof.* To prove Theorem 3, we do similarly to the proof of [9, Theorem 1] by replacing  $C(g)$  and  $h_{FJ}$  in [9, 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:

$$\begin{aligned} & x \in C^+(g) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{rank}^+(\varphi^g(x)) < m \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 = 1, \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(x) = 0, \lambda_j^2 g_j = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2 = 1, \lambda_0 = 0, \lambda_0^2 \nabla f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(x), \lambda_j^2 g_j = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \exists \bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}^+) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\} \\ \Leftrightarrow & x \in \pi(V(h_{FJ}^+) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

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 main result in the following theorem:

**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  $S(g) \cap V(h_{FJ}^+)$ , where  $\lambda := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$  and  $h_{FJ}^+$  is defined as in (10). 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 2 by replacing  $C(g)$  and  $h_{FJ}$  in [9, Section 2.2] with  $C^+(g)$  and  $h_{FJ}^+$ , respectively.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** *Since  $C(g) \cap S(g)$ ,  $C^+(g)$  and  $C^+(g) \cap S(g)$  are subsets of  $C(g)$ , the assumptions of Theorems 2, 3 and 4 that  $f(C(g) \cap S(g))$ ,  $f(C^+(g))$  and  $f(C^+(g) \cap S(g))$  are finite hold generically thanks to [9, Theorem 2], respectively.*

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is mostly to prove Theorem 2. We give in Section 3 some illustrated examples for Theorems 2 and 3. Section 4 is to present the application of our results in computing exactly the optimal value for a polynomial optimization problem.

## 2 Proof

We use the same notation as in [9] throughout this section. We generalize [9, Lemma 10] in the following lemma:

**Lemma 2.** *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 2 is similar to the one of [9, Lemma 10] since we only need to replace  $\mathbb{R}^n$  in the proof of [9, Lemma 10] with  $A$ .

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

**Lemma 3.** *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 (9). Let  $W$  be a semi-algebraically path connected component of  $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{FJ})$ . Then  $f$  is constant on  $W$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the one of [9, Lemma 13]. When proving that  $\tau \mapsto f(x(\tau))$  is constant on  $[a_j, b_j]$ , we note that

$$f(S(g) \cap C(g)) = f(S(g) \cap \pi(V(h_{FJ}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\})) \quad (12)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} S(g) \cap \pi(V(h_{FJ}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) &= \pi((S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{FJ}) \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \\ &\supset \pi(W \cap \{\lambda_0 = 0\}) \supset x([\tau_1, \tau_2]). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$\square$

## Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* Using [9, 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 3 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 2, 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, [9, 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

$$p = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m} \sigma_{\alpha} g^{\alpha} + b \sum_{\beta \in \{0,1\}^m} \psi_{\beta} g^{\beta}, \quad (14)$$

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. This is due to the fact that

$$(R + 1) - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 - \lambda_0^2 - \dots - \lambda_m^2 = b + g_{m+1} \in Q(g, b)[x, \bar{\lambda}]. \quad (15)$$

From this, [9, 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

$$p = \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j + b \sigma_{m+1}, \quad (16)$$

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.  $\square$

## 3 Illustrated examples

In this section, we illustrate our Nichtnegativstellensatz stated in Theorems 2, 4 and 3 with several explicit examples. The following lemma shows a case where  $S(g)$  is convex and  $C^+(g)$  is empty:

**Lemma 4.** *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 nonempty 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  $x \in C^+(g) \cap S(g)$ . Since  $x \in C^+(g)$ , by (11), there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(x) = 0$  and  $\lambda_j^2 g_j = 0$ . 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,  $\nabla G(x) = 0$  yields that  $G(x) = 0$  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 4 and Theorem 3:

**Lemma 5.** Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ . Assume that  $f$  is non-negative on  $S(g)$  with  $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ , each  $g_j$  is concave and  $S(g)$  has nonempty 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  $\lambda := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$  and  $h_{F,J}^+$  is defined as in (10). Moreover, if  $S(g)$  satisfies the Archimedean condition, we can take  $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ .

To illustrate the representations in Lemma 5, see [9, 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 5, the following example shows the representation of any polynomial non-negative on a non-convex semi-algebraic set  $S(g)$ :

**Example 1.** Consider the problem (1) 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

$$\begin{cases} \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -2x_2 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_3 \begin{bmatrix} 2(x_1 - 1) \\ -2x_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \\ \lambda_1 g_1(x) = \lambda_1(x_1 + 1) = 0, \lambda_2 g_2(x) = \lambda_2(1 - x_2^2) = 0, \\ \lambda_3 g_3(x) = \lambda_3(1 - (x_1 - 1)^2 - x_2^2) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

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 3, 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 [9, Example 10] which the previous result (Theorem 1) is inapplicable to but the the new one (Theorem 2) is applicable to:

**Example 2.** Consider the problem (1) 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 (9). Then

$$V(h_{FJ}) = \{(t, 0, 0, 0, \pm 1), (0, t, 0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, \cos t, \sin t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (18)$$

By Theorem 2, there exists  $q \in P(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$  such that  $f - q$  vanishes on

$$(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{FJ}) = \{(0, 0, 0, \cos t, \sin t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (19)$$

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

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

**Example 3.** Consider the problem (1) 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 (1) at this point. The condition  $\text{rank}^+(\varphi^g(x)) < m$  can be expressed as

$$\begin{cases} \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \{0\} : \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_3 \begin{bmatrix} 3(x_1-1)^2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \\ \lambda_1 g_1(x) = \lambda_1 x_1 = 0, \lambda_2 g_2(x) = \lambda_2 x_2 = 0, \lambda_3 g_3(x) = \lambda_3((x_1-1)^3 - x_2) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

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 3 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 (10), namely

$$\begin{aligned} h_{FJ}^+ &= (\lambda_0^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_1^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_2^2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_3^2 \begin{bmatrix} 3(x_1-1)^2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}), \\ &\lambda_1^2 x_1, \lambda_2^2 x_2, \lambda_3^2((x_1-1)^3 - x_2), 1 - \sum_{j=0}^3 \lambda_j^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

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

$$V(h_{FJ}^+) = \{(0, t, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r_1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r_2, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r_1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r_2) : r_j = \pm 1, t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (22)$$

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 2.** From Lemma 4 and Examples 1, 3, 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 2, 4 and 3 are inapplicable to [9, Example 4]:

**Example 4.** Consider the problem (1) 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

$$\exists \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\} : \lambda_1 \nabla g_1(x) = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -2x_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \lambda_1 g_1(x) = -\lambda_1 x_1^2 = 0. \quad (23)$$

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

$$f(C(g)) = f(C^+(g)) = f(C(g) \cap S(g)) = f(C^+(g) \cap S(g)) = \{t^2 : t \in \mathbb{R}\} = [0, \infty) \quad (24)$$

is infinite.

## 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  $\mathbb{N}_d^n := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq d\}$

$d\}$ . 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.

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

$$Q_d(g)[x] = \left\{ \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j : \sigma_j \in \Sigma^2[x], \deg(\sigma_0) \leq 2d, \deg(\sigma_j g_j) \leq 2d \right\}. \quad (25)$$

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

$$I_d(h)[x] = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^l \psi_j h_j : \psi_j \in \mathbb{R}[x], \deg(\psi_j h_j) \leq 2d \right\}. \quad (26)$$

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  $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_k(f, g, h) &:= \inf_y L_y(f) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &M_k(y) \succeq 0, M_{k-d_j}(g_j y) \succeq 0, j = 1, \dots, m, \\ &M_{k-r_t}(h_t y) = 0, t = 1, \dots, l, y_0 = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k(f, g, h) &:= \sup_{\xi, G_j, u_t} \xi \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &G_j \succeq 0, \\ &f - \xi = v_k^\top G_0 v_k + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j v_{k-d_j}^\top G_j v_{k-d_j} \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=1}^l h_t u_t^\top v_{2r_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where  $d_j = \lceil \deg(g_j)/2 \rceil$  and  $r_t = \lceil \deg(h_t)/2 \rceil$ . Using [9, Lemma 15], we obtain

$$\rho_k(f, g, h) := \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \xi : f - \xi \in Q_k(g)[x] + I_k(h)[x] \}. \quad (29)$$

Primal-dual semidefinite programs (27)-(28) is known as the Moment-SOS relaxations of order  $k$  for problem

$$\bar{f}^* := \inf_{x \in S(g) \cap V(h)} f(x). \quad (30)$$

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

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ . Let  $\bar{f}^*$  be as in (30) 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 (27) 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 (28) 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  $\rho_k(f, g, h) = \bar{f}^*$ .
7. If 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 of the first six statements can be found in [9, Lemma 16]. The final statement is proved similarly to the fifth statement. 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  $u^{2r} + w \in I(h)$ . Let  $c = \frac{1}{2r}$ . Then it holds that  $1 + t + ct^{2r} \in \Sigma^2[t]$ . Thus for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon = q + \varepsilon \left(1 + \frac{u}{\varepsilon} + c \left(\frac{u}{\varepsilon}\right)^{2r}\right) - c\varepsilon^{1-2r}(u^{2r} + w) + c\varepsilon^{1-2r}\sigma \in P(g)[x] + I(h)[x]. \quad (31)$$

Moreover, the degree of the right hand side has an upper bound independent from  $\varepsilon$ . 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 (29) 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 3.** In Lemma 6, 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 7.** Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ . Let  $f^*$  be as in problem (1) with  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ . Let  $h_{FJ}^+$  be as in (10). If problem (1) has a global minimizer, then it holds that

$$f^* := \min_{\substack{x, \bar{\lambda} \\ \text{s.t. } x \in S(g), (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}^+)}} f(x) \quad (32)$$

We present in the following two theorems the main application of Theorems 1, 2, 3 and 4 to polynomial optimization:

**Theorem 5.** Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ . Let  $f^*$  be as in problem (1) with  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ . Let  $h_{FJ}$  be as in (9) and  $h_{FJ}^+$  be as in (10). Assume that problem (1) has at least one global minimizer. Let  $\Pi g$  be as in (5). 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 4.** Since  $C^+(g) \cap S(g) \subset C^+(g)$ , the second statement of Theorem 5 holds if  $f(C^+(g))$  is finite.

The proof of Theorem 5, which relies on Theorems 2, 4 and the final statement of Lemma 6, is similar to the one of [9, Theorem 3].

**Theorem 6.** Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ . Let  $f^*$  be as in problem (1) with  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ . Let  $h_{FJ}$  be as in (9) and  $h_{FJ}^+$  be as in (10). Assume that problem (1) has at least one global minimizer and  $S(g)$  satisfies the Archimedean condition. Then the following statements hold:

1. If  $f(C(g))$  is finite, there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$ .
2. 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 (28) of order  $k$  with  $h = h_{FJ}$  or  $h = h_{FJ}^+$ .

The proof of Theorem 6, which relies on Theorems 1 and 3 together with the fifth and sixth statements of Lemma 6, is similar to the one of [9, Theorem 3].

Combining Lemma 5 and the sixth statement of Lemma 6, we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ . Let  $f^*$  be as in problem (1) with  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ . Let  $h_{FJ}^+$  be as in (10). Assume that problem (1) has at least one global minimizer, each  $g_j$  is concave and  $S(g)$  has nonempty interior. Then  $S(g)$  is convex and there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}^+) = f^*$  with  $\Pi g$  being defined as in (5). Moreover, if  $S(g)$  satisfies the Archimedean condition, there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}^+) = f^*$ .*

## 4.2 Numerical examples

In this subsection we report numerical results obtained by solving the SOS relaxations of the values  $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$  and  $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ})$  for problem (1), where  $h_{FJ}$  is defined as in (9). 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.

The experiments are performed in Julia 1.3.1 with the softwares TSSOS [24] and Mosek 9.1 [13]. 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  $n = 2$ ,  $m = 3$ ,  $f = x_1 - 1$  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 (1). Moreover, the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold at this minimizer. By using [16, Proposition 3.4], we get  $\rho_k(f, g, 0) < f^*$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . As shown in Example 3, there exists  $q \in Q(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$  and  $f - q$  vanishes on  $V(h_{FJ}^+)$ . From this, the sixth statement of Theorem 6 yields that  $\rho_d(f, g, h_{FJ}^+) = f^*$  for some  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus we obtain  $\rho_k(f, g, 0) < f^* = \rho_d(f, g, h_{FJ}^+)$ , for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $h_{FJ}^+$  has sign symmetry at  $\bar{\lambda}$ , we use TSSOS to exploit this structure when computing  $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}^+)$ .

We display the numerical results in Table 1. It shows that the numerical value  $-0.00822$  of  $\rho_5(f, g, h_{FJ}^+)$  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  $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}^+)$  grows faster than the ones of the values  $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$  and  $\rho_k(f, (g, b), 0)$  when  $k$  increases and even when the sparsity is exploited.

**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.

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

$\rho_k(f, g, h_{\mathbb{F},1}^+)$			
$k$	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)

- [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 Formquadraten. *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. Exact polynomial optimization strengthened with fritz john conditions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.04254*, 2022.
- [10] 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.
- [11] 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.
- [12] M. Marshall. Representations of non-negative polynomials, degree bounds and applications to optimization. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 61(1):205–221, 2009.
- [13] A. Mosek. The mosek optimization software. *Online at <http://www.mosek.com>*, 54(2-1):5, 2010.
- [14] J. Nie. Discriminants and nonnegative polynomials. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 47(2):167–191, 2012.
- [15] J. Nie. An exact Jacobian SDP relaxation for polynomial optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 137(1):225–255, 2013.

- [16] J. Nie. Optimality conditions and finite convergence of Lasserre’s hierarchy. *Mathematical programming*, 146(1-2):97–121, 2014.
- [17] J. Nie, J. Demmel, and B. Sturmfels. Minimizing polynomials via sum of squares over the gradient ideal. *Mathematical programming*, 106(3):587–606, 2006.
- [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.