

Complexity for 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 of degree at most d with real coefficients in a vector of variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Assume that f is non-negative on the basic semi-algebraic set S defined by polynomial inequalities $g_j(x) \geq 0$, for $j = 1, \dots, m$. Our previous work [arXiv:2205.04254 (2022)] has stated several representations of f based on the Fritz John conditions. In this paper, we provide some explicit degree bounds depending on n, m , and d for some of these representations. Accordingly, we obtain some explicit convergence rates of the sequences of values that are returned by semidefinite programs and that finitely converge to the optimal value for a given polynomial optimization problem.

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

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Proof of the main results	7
2.1	Preliminaries	7
2.2	Proof of the explicit degree bounds for the representations involving preorderings	8
3	Convergence rate for exact polynomial optimization	9
3.1	The case without denominators	10
3.2	The case with denominators	12
4	Explicit degree bounds for the representation based on the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions	14
4.1	The case of arbitrary multipliers	14
4.2	The case of nonnegative multipliers	16
5	Implicit degree bounds for the representations involving quadratic modules	17
5.1	The case without denominators	18
5.2	The case with denominators	19

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

1 Introduction

Hilbert’s 17th problem concerns whether a non-negative polynomial can be represented as a sum of squares of rational functions. Artin gave a positive answer for this problem in [1]. Later Krivine [8] and Stengle [28] separately stated a Nichtnegativstellensatz that a polynomial f non-negative on a basic semi-algebraic set S can be expressed as a linear combination of the polynomials g_j defining S with weights which are sums of squares of rational functions. Recently Lombardi, Perrucci, and Roy have provided in [11] a degree bound for Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz a tower of five exponentials depending only on the number of variables, the number of polynomials g_j defining S , and the degrees of f and g_j . Hence they obtain the best-known bound degrees for the numerators and denominators in Hilbert–Artin’s Nichtnegativstellensatz a tower of five exponentials.

Nowadays the study of representations of polynomials positive on a basic semi-algebraic set (also called Positivstellensatz) is of broad interest with influential applications in polynomial optimization. Let us revisit two representations commonly used in practice: Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz [25] says that a polynomial f positive on a compact basic semi-algebraic set S can be written as a linear combination of products of polynomials defining S with weights which are sums of squares of polynomials. Putinar presents in [21] a Positivstellensatz saying that a polynomial f positive on a compact basic semi-algebraic set S satisfying the so-called Archimedean condition (stated in [12]) can be decomposed as a linear combination of polynomials defining S with weights which are sums of squares of polynomials.

Schmüdgen’s and Putinar’s Positivstellensatz are both applicable to polynomial optimization. Indeed, to compute the minimal value f^* of a polynomial f on a basic semi-algebraic set S defined by polynomial inequalities $g_j(x) \geq 0$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, the idea is to reformulate the original problem as $f^* = \sup\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : f - \lambda > 0 \text{ on } S\}$ and then replace the constraint “ $f - \lambda > 0$ on S ” with a representation of $f - \lambda$ associated with g_j . More explicitly, using Putinar’s Positivstellensatz gives a sequence of real values $(\rho_k^{\text{Pu}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k^{\text{Pu}} &:= \sup_{\lambda, \sigma_j} \lambda \\ &\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma_j \text{ is sum of squares of polynomials,} \\ &f - \lambda = \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j, \deg(\sigma_j g_j) \leq 2k. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here $\deg(\cdot)$ stands for the degree of a polynomial. The sequence $(\rho_k^{\text{Pu}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to f^* under the Archimedean condition on S . Moreover, the program to compute each ρ_k^{Pu} is convex, namely, a semidefinite program (see [3]). The sequence of these programs is known as Lasserre’s hierarchy [9]. Similar process applies for Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz to obtain the corresponding sequence of real values $(\rho_k^{\text{Sch}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, which is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k^{\text{Sch}} &:= \sup_{\lambda, \sigma_j} \lambda \\ &\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma_j \text{ is sum of squares of polynomials,} \\ &f - \lambda = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m} \sigma_\alpha g_1^{\alpha_1} \dots g_m^{\alpha_m}, \deg(\sigma_\alpha g_\alpha) \leq 2k. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The convergence rates of the two sequences $(\rho_k^{\text{Sch}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\rho_k^{\text{Pu}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are first analyzed by Schweighofer [26] and Nie-Schweighofer [19], respectively. Despite of the polynomial time complexity $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-c})$ of the former one, the latter one has unexpected exponential time complexity $\mathcal{O}(\exp(\varepsilon^{-c}))$. Very recently Baldi and Mourrain have provided in [2] an improved polynomial time complexity for $(\rho_k^{\text{Pu}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, which relies on the degree bound for Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz on the unit hypercube stated by Laurent and Slot in [10]. Thanks to their bound, Laurent and Slot obtain the optimal convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1/2})$ for the minimization of a polynomial on the unit hypercube.

Note that Laurent and Slot utilize the polynomial kernel method introduced by Fang and Fawzi in [6], where they provide the optimal convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1/2})$ for the minimization of a polynomial on the unit sphere. Applying this method again, Slot achieves in [27] the optimal convergence rate for $(\rho_k^{\text{Sch}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ when S is the unit ball or the standard simplex.

The finite convergences of the two sequences $(\rho_k^{\text{Sch}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\rho_k^{\text{Pu}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are mainly studied by Scheiderer [22–24], Marshall [14, 15] and Nie [17]. In particular, Lasserre’s hierarchy has finite convergence under Archimedean condition and some standard optimality conditions. These conditions make the original polynomial optimization problem necessarily have finitely many global minimizers at which the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold for this problem. Recent efforts of Nie–Demmel–Sturmfels [18], Demmel–Nie–Powers [5], Nie [16] and our previous work [12] is to obtain the finite convergence of Lasserre’s hierarchy through the information of the Jacobian of the objective and constrained polynomials. However, the rate of finite convergence for these methods have not been tackled until now.

In this paper, we aim to provide some explicit degree bound for some of Nichtnegativstellensatz from our previous work [12] as well as the work of Demmel, Nie, and Powers [5]. To do this, we rely on the constructiveness of these representations and utilize the degree bounds for Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz by Lombardi, Perrucci, and Roy [11] as well as the upper bound on the number of connected components of a basic semi-algebraic set due to Coste [4]. Accordingly, we obtain the explicit convergence rate of each corresponding hierarchy of semidefinite relaxations for a polynomial optimization problem. The rates of these hierarchies depend on the number of variables, the number of constraints, and the degrees of the input polynomials. Although the convergence rates are extremely large, they do not depend on the coefficients of the input polynomials.

Let $\mathbb{R}[x]$ denote the ring of polynomials with real coefficients in the vector of variables x . Given $r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{R}_r[x]$ denote the linear space of polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree at most r . 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 $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$, i.e.,

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

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 say that the Fritz John conditions hold for problem (3) at $u \in S(g)$ if

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

We say that the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold for problem (3) at $u \in S(g)$ if

$$\begin{cases} \exists(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) \in [0, \infty)^m : \\ \nabla f(u) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j(u), \\ \lambda_j g_j(u) = 0, j = 1, \dots, m. \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \exists(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \\ \nabla f(u) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j(u), \\ \lambda_j^2 g_j(u) = 0, j = 1, \dots, m. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

If u is a local minimizer for problem (3), then the Fritz John conditions hold for problem (3) at u . In contrast, there exist cases where the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold for problem (3) at any local minimizer of this problem. We denote by $W(f, g)$ the set of all points at which the Fritz John conditions hold but the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold for problem (3).

Denote by $\Sigma^2[x]$ (resp. $\Sigma_r^2[x]$) the cone of sum of squares of polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x]$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}_r[x]$). Given $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, let $Q_r(g)[x]$ be the truncated quadratic module of order $r \in \mathbb{N}$ associated with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$, i.e.,

$$Q_r(g)[x] := \left\{ \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j \sigma_j : \sigma_j \in \Sigma^2[x], \deg(\sigma_0) \leq 2r, \deg(g_j \sigma_j) \leq 2r \right\}. \quad (7)$$

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

$$\Pi g := (g^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m \setminus \{0\}}, \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$ and $g^\alpha := g_1^{\alpha_1} \dots g_m^{\alpha_m}$. We call $Q_r(\Pi g)[x]$ the truncated preordering of order $r \in \mathbb{N}$ generated by g , denoted by $P_r(g)[x]$. Obviously, if $m = 1$, it holds that $P_r(g)[x] = Q_r(g)[x]$.

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

$$V(h) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_j(x) = 0, j = 1, \dots, l\}. \quad (9)$$

and let $I_r(h)[x]$ be the truncated ideal of order r generated by h , i.e.,

$$I_r(h)[x] := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^l h_j \psi_j : \psi_j \in \mathbb{R}[x], \deg(h_j \psi_j) \leq 2r \right\}. \quad (10)$$

We denote by $\text{bit}(d)$ the number of bits of $d \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e.,

$$\text{bit}(d) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d = 0, \\ k & \text{if } d \neq 0 \text{ and } 2^{k-1} \leq d < 2^k. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Given $n, d, s \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} b(n, d, s) &:= 2^{2 \left(2^{\max\{2, d\} 4^n} + s^{2^n \max\{2, d\} 16^n \text{bit}(d)} \right)}, \\ c(n, d, s) &:= d(2d - 1)^{n+s-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The two parameters $b(n, d, s)$ and $c(n, d, s)$, given in [11] and [4], involve the degree bound for Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz and the upper bound on the number of connected components of a basic semi-algebraic set, respectively.

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

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

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

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

We state the first main result in the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 1$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(C(g))$ is finite. Set*

$$w := \frac{1}{2} \times b(n + m + 1, d + 1, 2m + n + 3) + d \times c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + m + 1). \quad (14)$$

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

$$h_{FJ} := (\lambda_0 \nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j, \lambda_1 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m g_m, 1 - \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2). \quad (15)$$

Here h_{FJ} includes polynomials on the left-hand side of the Fritz John conditions (5). The proof of Theorem 1 is postponed to Section 2. In Theorem 1, if we assume further that the ideal generated by h_{FJ} is real radical (see in [12]), then $f - q \in I_r(h_{FJ})$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. However, this further assumption does not play any role in this paper when we apply the representation in Theorem 1 for polynomial optimization by using Nie's technique in [17].

Our second main result is as follows:

Theorem 2. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 1$. 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. Set*

$$w := d \times (c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + 2m + 1) - 1). \quad (16)$$

Then there exists $q \in \Sigma_w^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ 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 (15).

The proof of Theorem 2 can be found in Section 2.

To prove Theorem 1 (resp. Theorem 2), the ideal is to decompose the variety $V(h_{FJ})$ (resp. the intersection $S(g) \cap V(h_{FJ})$) into finitely many connected components whose number is upper bounded by a value depending on the number of polynomials defining $V(h_{FJ})$ (resp. $S(g) \cap V(h_{FJ})$) and the degrees of these polynomials (see in [4]). To prove that f is constant on each connected component, we rely on the Fritz John conditions generating $V(h_{FJ})$ and the assumption that the image of the set of critical points $C(g)$ (resp. $C(g) \cap S(g)$) under f is finite. It turns out that f has finitely many values on $V(h_{FJ})$ (resp. $S(g) \cap V(h_{FJ})$). To obtain the representation of f with explicit degree bound, we construct an explicit ‘‘variety version’’ of Lagrangian interpolation and utilize Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz with degree bound given in [11].

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 third main result in the following theorem:

Theorem 3. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(C^+(g))$ is finite. Set*

$$w := \frac{1}{2} \times b(n + m + 1, d + 2, 2m + n + 3) + d \times c(n + m + 1, d + 2, n + m + 1). \quad (17)$$

Then there exists $q \in P_w(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ}^+)$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and

$$h_{FJ}^+ := (\lambda_0^2 \nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j, \lambda_1^2 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m^2 g_m, 1 - \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2). \quad (18)$$

Here h_{FJ}^+ includes polynomials in the right hand side of the Fritz John conditions (5). The fourth main result is stated as follows:

Theorem 4. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \in \mathbb{N}$. 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. Set*

$$w := d \times (c(n + m + 1, d + 2, n + 2m + 1) - 1). \quad (19)$$

Then there exists $q \in \Sigma_w[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ 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 (18).

To prove Theorem 3 (resp. Theorem 4), we do similarly to the proof of Theorem 1 (resp. Theorem 2) by replacing $C(g)$ and h_{FJ} with $C^+(g)$ and h_{FJ}^+ , respectively. Note that each entry of h_{FJ}^+ has degree at most $d + 2$.

Recall that the two sets of critical points $C(g)$ and $C^+(g)$ include the set of points $W(f, g)$ at which the Fritz John conditions hold but the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions do not hold for problem (3). The assumptions that the images of $C(g)$ and $C^+(g)$ under f are finite allow us to obtain the representations of f in the case of $W(f, g) \neq \emptyset$.

We state the fifth main result in the following theorem, which does not require any assumption on the set of critical points:

Theorem 5. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 1$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Set*

$$w := \frac{1}{2} \times b(n + m + 1, d + 1, 2m + n + 3) + 2d \times c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + m + 1). \quad (20)$$

Then there exists $q \in P_w(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $\lambda_0(f - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and h_{FJ} is defined as in (15).

The proof of Theorem 2 is postponed to Section 2.

Note that we provide the degree bound for the representations involving preorderings in Theorems 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Our bounds are extremely large because of the exponential bounds for Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz and the number of connected components of a basic semi-algebraic set. Fortunately, our bounds only depend on the number of variables, the number of polynomials defining the basic semi-algebraic set, and the degrees of the input polynomials.

In contrast, our degree bound for the representations involving quadratic modules in Theorems 15 and 17 stated below is implicit and depends on all information (including the coefficients) of the input polynomials. To achieve it, we apply the polynomial degree bound for Putinar’s Positivstellensatz in the case where the image of the set of critical points $C(g)$ under f is finite.

To obtain the convergence rate of the corresponding hierarchies of semidefinite relaxations for a polynomial optimization problem in Theorems 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, we utilize the degree bounds in Theorems 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. We also analyze the complexity for the technique of Nie in [17] by using the degree bound of Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is mostly to prove Theorems 1, 2, and 5. Section 3 is to present the application of Theorems 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 in analyzing the complexity of the corresponding hierarchies of the exact semidefinite relaxations for a polynomial optimization problem. Section 4 is to provide the explicit degree bounds for the representation based on the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions by Demmel, Nie, and Powers in [5]. Section 5 is to state the implicit degree bound for the representation involving quadratic modules.

2 Proof of the main results

2.1 Preliminaries

In this subsection, we present some preliminaries from algebraic geometry needed for the proof of our main results. We recall the degree bound for Krivine–Stengle’s Nichtnegativstellensatz by Lombardi, Perrucci, and Roy [11] in the following two lemmas:

Lemma 1. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Assume that $S(g) \cap V(h) = \emptyset$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $h := (h_1, \dots, h_l)$. Set $r = b(n, d, m + l + 1)/2$. Then it holds that $-1 \in P_r(g)[x] + I_r(h)[x]$.*

Lemma 2. *Let $p, g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Assume that p vanishes on $S(g) \cap V(h)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $h := (h_1, \dots, h_l)$. Set $r := b(n, d, m + l + 1)/2$ and $s := 2\lceil r/d \rceil$. Then it holds that $-p^s \in P_r(g)[x] + I_r(h)[x]$.*

Denote by δ_{ij} the Kronecker delta function at $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. We generalize the definition of semi-algebraic set as follows: A semi-algebraic subset of \mathbb{R}^n is a subset of the form

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^t \bigcap_{j=1}^{r_i} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_{ij}(x) *_{ij} 0\}, \quad (21)$$

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 $A \times f(A)$ is a semi-algebraic set in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} .

A semi-algebraic subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ 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 $\phi(1) = y$. Note that ϕ is piecewise-differentiable in this case (see, e.g., [20, Theorem 1.8.1]).

The upper bound on the number of connected components of a basic semi-algebraic set is stated by Coste [4, Proposition 4.13] as follows:

Lemma 3. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 2$. The number of (semi-algebraically path) connected components of $S(g) \cap V(h)$ is not greater than $c(n, d, m + l)$.*

Denote by $|\cdot|$ the cardinal number of a set. We state the following two lemmas which will be used in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2:

Lemma 4. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ and $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(V(h))$ is finite with $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$. Set $r := |f(V(h))|$ and $u := b(n, d + 1, m + l + 2)/2$. Then there exist $q \in P_u(g)[x, \lambda]$ with $w = dr + u$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h)$.*

Proof. By assumption, we get $f(V(h)) = \{t_1, \dots, t_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, where $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. For $j = 1, \dots, r$, let $W_j := V(h, f - t_j)$. Then W_j is a real variety generated by $l + 1$ polynomials in $\mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. It is clear that $f(W_j) = \{t_j\}$.

Define the following polynomials:

$$p_j(x) = \prod_{i \neq j} \frac{f(x) - t_i}{t_j - t_i}, \quad j = 1, \dots, r. \quad (22)$$

It is easy to check that $p_j(W_i) = \{\delta_{ji}\}$ and $\deg(p_j) \leq d(r - 1)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that there is $s \in \{0, 1, \dots, r - 1\}$ such that $W_j \cap S(g) = \emptyset$, for $j = 1, \dots, s$, and $W_i \cap S(g) \neq \emptyset$, for $i = s + 1, \dots, r$.

Let $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Since $W_j \cap S(g) = \emptyset$, Theorem 1 says that $-1 \in P_u(g)[x] + I_u(h, f - t_j)[x]$. It implies that there exists $v_j \in P_u(g)[x]$ such that $-1 = v_j$ on W_j .

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 $f = s_1 + v_j s_2$ on W_j . Let $q_j = s_1 + v_j s_2 \in P_{u+d}(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$.

Since $f \geq 0$ on $S(g)$, it holds that $f = t_i \geq 0$ on W_i , for $i = s+1, \dots, r$. Now letting

$$q = \sum_{j=1}^s q_j p_j^2 + \sum_{i=s+1}^r t_i p_i^2, \quad (23)$$

we obtain $q \in P_w(g)[x]$ since $\deg(t_i p_i^2) \leq 2 \deg(p_i) \leq 2d(r-1) \leq 2w$ and

$$\deg(q_j p_j^2) \leq \deg(q_j) + 2 \deg(p_j) \leq 2(d+u+d(r-1)) = 2w, \quad (24)$$

Hence $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h) = W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r$. \square

We use the technique in Lemma 4 to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 5. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ and $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(V(h) \setminus A)$ is finite with $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Set $r := |f(V(h) \setminus A)|$ and $u := b(n, d+1, m+l+2)/2$. Then there exist $q \in P_w(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $w = dr + u$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h) \setminus A$.*

Proof. By assumption, we get $f(V(h) \setminus A) = \{t_1, \dots, t_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, where $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. We now handle in much the same way as the proof of Lemma 4 to get $q \in P_w(g)[x]$ in (23). Hence $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h) \setminus A \subset W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r$. \square

Lemma 6. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ and $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(S(g) \cap V(h))$ is finite with $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$. Set $r := |f(S(g) \cap V(h))|$. Then there exist $q \in P_w(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $w = d(r-1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $S(g) \cap V(h)$.*

Proof. By assumption, we get $f(S(g) \cap V(h)) = \{t_1, \dots, t_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, where $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. For $j = 1, \dots, r$, let $W_j := V(h, f - t_j)$. Then W_j is a real variety generated by $l+1$ polynomials in $\mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. It is clear that $f(W_j) = \{t_j\}$. Define polynomials p_j , for $j = 1, \dots, r$, as in (22). It is easy to check that $W_i \cap S(g) \neq \emptyset$, $p_j(W_i) = \{\delta_{ji}\}$ and $\deg(p_j) \leq d(r-1)$. Since $f \geq 0$ on $S(g)$, it holds that $f = t_i \geq 0$ on W_i for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Now letting $q = \sum_{i=1}^r t_i p_i^2$, we obtain $q \in \Sigma_w^2[x]$ with $w = d(r-1)$, and hence $f - q$ vanishes on $W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r \supset S(g) \cap V(h)$. \square

2.2 Proof of the explicit degree bounds for the representations involving preorderings

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

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Using Lemma 3, we decompose $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s with

$$s \leq c(n+m+1, d+1, n+m+1), \quad (25)$$

since each entry of h_{FJ} has degree at most $d+1 \geq 2$. Accordingly [12, Lemma 13] shows that f is constant on each Z_i . Thus $f(V(h_{\text{FJ}}))$ is finite. Set $r = |f(V(h_{\text{FJ}}))|$. From (25), we get

$$r \leq s \leq c(n+m+1, d+1, n+m+1). \quad (26)$$

Set

$$u := b(n+m+1, d+1, 2m+n+3)/2. \quad (27)$$

By using Lemma 4, there exist $q \in P_\xi(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\xi = dr + u$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. By (26) and (14), we obtain $\xi \leq w$, and hence $q \in P_w(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Using Lemma 3, 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 with

$$s \leq c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + 2m + 1), \quad (28)$$

since each entry of h_{FJ} (resp. g) has degree at most $d+1 \geq 2$ (resp. d). Accordingly [12, Lemma 19] shows that f is constant on Z_i . Thus the set $f((S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}}))$ has r elements and we get

$$r \leq s \leq c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + 2m + 1). \quad (29)$$

By using Lemma 6, there exist $q \in \Sigma_\xi^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\xi = d(r-1)$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. By (29) and (16), we obtain $\xi \leq w$, and hence $q \in \Sigma_w^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. \square

Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. Using Lemma 3, we decompose $V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s with

$$s \leq 2 \times c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + m + 1). \quad (30)$$

It is due to the fact that each entry of h_{FJ} has degree at most $d + 1 \geq 2$ and

$$V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\} = (V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 > 0\}) \cup (V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \cap \{\lambda_0 < 0\}). \quad (31)$$

Accordingly [12, Lemma 24] shows that f is constant on each Z_i . Thus $f(V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\})$ is finite. Set $r = |f(V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\})|$. From (25), we get

$$r \leq s \leq 2 \times c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + m + 1). \quad (32)$$

Set

$$u := b(n + m + 1, d + 1, 2m + n + 3)/2. \quad (33)$$

By using Lemma 5, there exist $q \in P_\xi(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\xi = dr + u$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{FJ}}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$. It implies that $\lambda_0(f - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{FJ}})$. By (32) and (20), we obtain $\xi \leq w$, and hence $q \in P_w(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. \square

3 Convergence rate for exact polynomial optimization

We recall some preliminaries of the Moment-SOS relaxations originally developed by Lasserre in [9]. 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 $p \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$, 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

$$Q_d(g)[x] = \left\{ \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j g_j : \sigma_j \in \Sigma^2[x], \deg(\sigma_0) \leq 2d, \deg(\sigma_j g_j) \leq 2d \right\}. \quad (34)$$

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

$$I_d(h)[x] = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^l \psi_j h_j : \psi_j \in \mathbb{R}[x], \deg(\psi_j h_j) \leq 2d \right\}. \quad (35)$$

Consider polynomial optimization problem:

$$\bar{f}^* := \inf_{x \in S(g) \cap V(h)} f(x). \quad (36)$$

3.1 The case without denominators

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

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_k(f, g, h) &:= \inf_y L_y(f) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &M_k(y) \succeq 0, \quad M_{k-d_j}(g_j y) \succeq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \\ &M_{k-r_t}(h_t y) = 0, \quad t = 1, \dots, l, \quad y_0 = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k(f, g, h) &:= \sup_{\xi, G_j, u_t} \xi \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &G_j \succeq 0, \\ &f - \xi = v_k^\top G_0 v_k + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j v_{k-d_j}^\top G_j v_{k-d_j} \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=1}^l h_t u_t^\top v_{2r_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where $d_j = \lceil \deg(g_j)/2 \rceil$ and $r_t = \lceil \deg(h_t)/2 \rceil$. Using [12, Lemma 15], we obtain

$$\rho_k(f, g, h) := \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \xi : f - \xi \in Q_k(g)[x] + I_k(h)[x] \}. \quad (39)$$

Primal-dual semidefinite programs (37)-(38) is known as the Moment-SOS relaxations of order k for the following problem (36).

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

Lemma 7. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$, $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ and $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. Let \bar{f}^* be as in (36) 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 (37) 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 (38) of order k .*
6. *If there exists $q \in Q_w(g)[x]$ with $2w \geq d + 1$ such that $f - \bar{f}^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h)$, then $\rho_r(f, g, h) = \bar{f}^*$ with $r = b(n, 2w, l + 1)/2$.*
7. *If there exists $q \in \Sigma_w^2[x]$ with $2w \geq d + 1$ such that $f - \bar{f}^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h) \cap S(g)$, then $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h) = \bar{f}^*$ with $r = b(n, 2w, m + l + 1)/2$.*

Proof. The proofs of the first five statements can be found in [12].

Let us prove the sixth statement. Let $u = f - \bar{f}^* - q$. By assumption, we get $u \in \mathbb{R}_{2w}[x]$ and $u = 0$ on $V(h)$. Set $s = 2\lceil r/(2w) \rceil$. From this, Lemma 2 says that there exist $\sigma \in \Sigma_r^2[x]$ such that $u^{2s} + \sigma \in I_r(h)[x]$. Let $c = \frac{1}{2s}$. Then it holds that $1 + t + ct^{2s} \in \Sigma_s^2[t]$. Thus for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon = q + \varepsilon \left(1 + \frac{u}{\varepsilon} + c \left(\frac{u}{\varepsilon} \right)^{2s} \right) - c\varepsilon^{1-2s}(u^{2s} + \sigma) + c\varepsilon^{1-2s}\sigma \in Q_r(g)[x] + I_r(h)[x]. \quad (40)$$

Then we for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{f}^* - \varepsilon$ is a feasible solution of (39) of the value $\rho_r(f, g, h)$. It gives $\rho_r(f, g, h) \geq \bar{f}^* - \varepsilon$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, and, in consequence, we get $\rho_r(f, g, h) \geq \bar{f}^*$. Using the second statement, we obtain that $\rho_r(f, g, h) = \bar{f}^*$, yielding the sixth statement.

We prove the final statement. Let $u = f - \bar{f}^* - q$. By assumption, we get $u = 0$ on $S(g) \cap V(h)$. Set $s = 2\lceil r/(2w) \rceil$. From this, Lemma 2 says that there exist $\eta \in P_r(g)[x]$ such that $u^{2s} + \eta \in I_r(h)[x]$. Let $c = \frac{1}{2s}$. Then it holds that $1 + t + ct^{2s} \in \Sigma_s^2[t]$. Thus for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon = q + \varepsilon \left(1 + \frac{u}{\varepsilon} + c \left(\frac{u}{\varepsilon} \right)^{2s} \right) - c\varepsilon^{1-2s}(u^{2s} + \eta) + c\varepsilon^{1-2s}\eta \in P_r(g)[x] + I_r(h)[x]. \quad (41)$$

Analysis similar to that in the proof of the third statement shows $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h) = \bar{f}^*$, yielding the final statement. \square

Remark 1. *It is easily seen that the sequence $(\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$) converges to f^* faster than the sequence $(\rho_k(f, g, 0))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(\rho_k(f, \Pi g, 0))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$). It is due to the fact that*

$$\rho_k(f, g, 0) \leq \rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}) \leq f^* \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k(f, \Pi g, 0) \leq \rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) \leq f^*. \quad (42)$$

Thus we can obtain the convergence rate for $(\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$) thanks to the available convergence rate of $(\rho_k(f, g, 0))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(\rho_k(f, \Pi g, 0))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$) in [2, 6, 10, 27]. However, these rates do not give the finite convergence for the two sequences $(\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$). Moreover, the computational complexity for the semidefinite relaxation of each value $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ})$ (resp. $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ})$) grows more quickly than the one of the value $\rho_k(f, g, 0)$ (resp. $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, 0)$) as k increases. It is due to the fact that to obtain the relaxation of the value $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ})$ (resp. $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ})$), we utilize $m + 1$ additional variables and $n + m + 1$ additional equality constraints to the original polynomial optimization problem.

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

Theorem 6. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Assume that problem (3) has a global minimizer and $f(C(g))$ is finite. Let h_{FJ} be as in (15) and let w be as in (20). Set*

$$r = b(n + m + 1, 2w, m + n + 2)/2. \quad (43)$$

Then $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) = f^$, where Πg is defined as in (8).*

Proof. Since $S(g) = S(\Pi g)$, [12, Lemma 17] implies that

$$f^* := \min_{x, \bar{\lambda}} f(x) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \in S(\Pi g), (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}), \quad (44)$$

By assumption, Theorem 1 yields that there exists $q \in P_w(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}] = Q_w(\Pi g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - f^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. Applying the sixth statement of Lemma 7 (by replacing g with Πg), we obtain the conclusion. \square

Theorem 7. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Assume that problem (3) has a global minimizer and $f(C(g) \cap S(g))$ is finite. Let h_{FJ} be as in (15) and let w be as in (16). Set r as in (43). Then $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$, where Πg is defined as in (8).

Proof. Note that [12, Lemma 17] implies that

$$\begin{aligned} f^* &:= \min_{x, \bar{\lambda}} f(x) \\ \text{s.t. } &x \in S(g), (x, \bar{\lambda}) \in V(h_{FJ}), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

By assumption, Theorem 2 yields that there exists $q \in \Sigma_w^2[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - f^* - q$ vanishes on $(S(g) \cap \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \times V(h_{FJ})$. Applying the final statement of Lemma 7, we obtain the conclusion. \square

Theorem 8. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Assume that problem (3) has a global minimizer and $f(C^+(g))$ is finite. Let h_{FJ}^+ be as in (15) and let w be as in (17). Set r as in (43). Then $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$, where Πg is defined as in (8).

The proof of Theorem 8, which is based on Theorem 3, is similar to the one of Theorem 6.

Theorem 9. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Assume that problem (3) has a global minimizer and $f(C^+(g) \cap S(g))$ is finite. Let h_{FJ}^+ be as in (15) and let w be as in (19). Set r as in (43). Then $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$, where Πg is defined as in (8).

The proof of Theorem 9, which is based on Theorem 4, is similar to the one of Theorem 7.

It is worth to pointing out in Theorems 6, 7, 8 and 9 that the order $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}) = f^*$ depends on n (the number of variables), m (the number of inequality constraints g_j) and d (the upper bound on the degrees of f, g_j) but does not depend on the coefficients of f, g_j .

3.2 The case with denominators

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f, g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_l, \theta \in \mathbb{R}[x] \setminus \{0\}$, consider the following primal-dual semidefinite programs associated with $f, g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_k(f, g, h, \theta) &:= \inf_y L_y(\theta^{\eta(k, f, \theta)} f) \\ \text{s.t. } &M_k(y) \succeq 0, M_{k-d_j}(g_j y) \succeq 0, j = 1, \dots, m, \\ &M_{k-r_t}(h_t y) = 0, t = 1, \dots, l, L_y(\theta^{\eta(k, f, \theta)}) = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) &:= \sup_{\xi, G_j, u_t} \xi \\ \text{s.t. } &G_j \succeq 0, \\ &\theta^{\eta(k, f, \theta)}(f - \xi) = v_k^\top G_0 v_k + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j v_{k-d_j}^\top G_j v_{k-d_j} \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=1}^l h_t u_t^\top v_{2r_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $d_j = \lceil \deg(g_j)/2 \rceil$, $r_t = \lceil \deg(h_t)/2 \rceil$, and

$$\eta(k, f, \theta) := 2 \lfloor \frac{2k - \deg(f)}{2 \deg(\theta)} \rfloor. \quad (48)$$

Using [12, Lemma 15], we obtain

$$\rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) := \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \xi : \theta^{\eta(k, f, \theta)}(f - \xi) \in Q_k(g)[x] + I_k(h)[x] \}. \quad (49)$$

Primal-dual semidefinite programs (37)-(38) is known as the Moment-SOS relaxations of order k for the following problem (36).

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

Lemma 8. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$, $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$, and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{2u}[x] \setminus \{0\}$. Let \bar{f}^* be as in (36) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$. Then the following statements hold:*

1. *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau_k(f, g, h, \theta) \leq \tau_{k+1}(f, g, h, \theta)$, $\rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) \leq \rho_{k+1}(f, g, h, \theta)$, and $\rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) \leq \tau_k(f, g, h, \theta)$.*
2. *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 (37) of order k .*
3. *If one of the following two conditions holds:*

- (a) *problem (36) has an optimal solution x^* such that $\theta(x^*) > 0$;*
- (b) *there exists a sequence of feasible solutions $(x^{(t)})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ for problem (36) such that $(f(x^{(t)}))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to \bar{f}^* and $\theta(x^{(t)}) > 0$,*

then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) \leq \bar{f}^$.*

4. *If $\rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) \leq \bar{f}^*$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and there exists $q \in Q_w(g)[x]$ with $2(w+u) \geq d+1$ such that $\theta(f - \bar{f}^* - q)$ vanishes on $V(h)$, then $\rho_r(f, g, h, \theta) = \bar{f}^*$ with $r = b(n, 2(w+u), l+1)/2$.*

Proof. The proofs of the first two statements are similar to the ones of Lemma 7 (see also in [13]). Let us prove the third statement. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By (49), we get

$$\theta^{\eta(k, f, \theta)}(f - \rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) + \varepsilon) \in Q_k(g)[x] + I_k(h)[x]. \quad (50)$$

Consider the following two cases:

- Assume that the condition (a) holds. By (50), it implies that $\theta(x^*)^{\eta(k, f, \theta)}(\bar{f}^* - \rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) + \varepsilon) \geq 0$. Since $\theta(x^*) > 0$, $\bar{f}^* \geq \rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) - \varepsilon$. The result follows since ε is arbitrary.
- Assume that the condition (b) holds. By (50), it implies that $\theta(x^{(t)})^{\eta(k, f, \theta)}(f(x^{(t)}) - \rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) + \varepsilon) \geq 0$. Since $\theta(x^{(t)}) > 0$, $f(x^{(t)}) \geq \rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) - \varepsilon$. As t goes to infinity, $\bar{f}^* \geq \rho_k(f, g, h, \theta) - \varepsilon$. The result follows since ε is arbitrary.

Let us prove the fourth statement. Let $p = f - \bar{f}^* - q$. By assumption, we get $\theta p \in \mathbb{R}_{2(w+u)}[x]$ and $\theta p = 0$ on $V(h)$. Set $s = 2\lfloor r/(2w) \rfloor$. From this, Lemma 2 says that there exist $\sigma \in \Sigma_r^2[x]$ such that $(\theta p)^{2s} + \sigma \in I_r(h)[x]$. Let $c = \frac{1}{2s}$. Then it holds that $1 + t + ct^{2s} \in \Sigma_s^2[t]$. Thus for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\theta(f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon) = \theta q + \varepsilon \theta \left(1 + \frac{p}{\varepsilon} + c \left(\frac{p}{\varepsilon}\right)^{2s}\right) - c(\varepsilon \theta)^{1-2s}((\theta p)^{2s} + \sigma) + c(\varepsilon \theta)^{1-2s} \sigma. \quad (51)$$

It implies that $\theta^{2s}(f - \bar{f}^* + \varepsilon) \in Q_r(g)[x] + I_r(h)[x]$. Then we for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{f}^* - \varepsilon$ is a feasible solution of (39) of the value $\rho_r(f, g, h, \theta)$. It gives $\rho_r(f, g, h, \theta) \geq \bar{f}^* - \varepsilon$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, and, in consequence, we get $\rho_r(f, g, h, \theta) \geq \bar{f}^*$. By assumption, we obtain that $\rho_r(f, g, h, \theta) = \bar{f}^*$, yielding the final statement. \square

We present in the following four theorems the main application of Theorem 5 to polynomial optimization:

Theorem 10. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Let h_{FJ} be as in (15) and let w be as in (20). Assume that problem (3) has global minimizer and one of the following two conditions holds:*

1. *the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold for problem (3) at x^* ;*

2. there exists a sequence of points $(x^{(t)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(t)})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{FJ})$ such that $(f(x^{(t)}))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to \bar{f}^* and $\lambda_0^{(t)} > 0$,

Set

$$r = b(n + m + 1, 2(w + 1), m + n + 2)/2. \quad (52)$$

Then $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}, \lambda_0) = \bar{f}^*$, where Πg is defined as in (8).

Proof. Since $S(g) = S(\Pi g)$, [12, Lemma 17] implies (44). Note that the first condition implies that the Fritz John conditions hold for problem (3) at x^* with multipliers $\bar{\lambda}^*$ such that $\lambda_0^* > 0$, so that $(x^*, \bar{\lambda}^*)$ is a global minimizer for problem (44) with $\lambda_0^* > 0$. The second condition implies that each $(x^{(t)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(t)})$ is a feasible solution for problem (44) such that $(f(x^{(t)}))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to \bar{f}^* and $\lambda_0^{(t)} > 0$. The third statement of Lemma 8 says that $\rho_k(f, \Pi g, h_{FJ}, \lambda_0) \leq \bar{f}^*$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition, Theorem 5 yields that there exists $q \in P_w(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}] = Q_w(\Pi g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $\lambda_0(f - \bar{f}^* - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. Applying the final statement of Lemma 8 (by replacing g, h, θ with $\Pi g, h_{FJ}, \lambda_0$), we obtain the conclusion. \square

Remark 2. As shown by Freund in [7], the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold for problem (3) at its global minimizers if one of the following conditions holds:

1. g can be decomposed as $g = (g^{(1)}, g^{(2)}, -g^{(2)})$, $S(g^{(1)})$ has non-empty interior, and g_j , $j = 1, \dots, m$, are concave;
2. g_j , $j = 1, \dots, m$, are linear;
3. f is a pseudoconvex and g_j , $j = 1, \dots, m$, are quasiconcave (see the definitions of pseudoconvexity and quasiconcavity in [7]).

Thanks to Theorem 10 (as well as Theorems 12, 14, and 18 stated below), we can compute exactly the optimal value f^* for problem (3) by using semidefinite programming under one of the above three conditions.

4 Explicit degree bounds for the representation based on the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions

4.1 The case of arbitrary multipliers

The following lemma is similar to [5, Lemma 3.3] but is proved by using the tools from real algebraic geometry (instead of the ones from complex algebraic geometry):

Lemma 9. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Set

$$h_{KKT} := (\nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j, \lambda_1 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m g_m). \quad (53)$$

Let W be a semi-algebraically path connected component of $V(h_{KKT})$. Then f is constant on W .

Proof. Recall $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$. Choose two arbitrary points $(x^{(0)}, \lambda^{(0)})$, $(x^{(1)}, \lambda^{(1)})$ in W . We claim that $f(x^{(0)}) = f(x^{(1)})$.

It is sufficient to assume that both $(x^{(0)}, \lambda^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \lambda^{(1)})$ are non-singular points. If at least one of $(x^{(0)}, \lambda^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \lambda^{(1)})$ is singular, we choose arbitrarily close non-singular points to approximate $(x^{(0)}, \lambda^{(0)})$ and $(x^{(1)}, \lambda^{(1)})$ 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 non-singular points of W is dense and open in W .

If a manifold is path-connected, the set of its non-singular points is a manifold that is also path-connected. By assumption, there exists a continuous piecewise-differentiable path $\phi(\tau) = (x(\tau), \lambda(\tau))$, for $\tau \in [0, 1]$, lying inside W such that

$\phi(0) = (x^{(0)}, \lambda^{(0)})$ and $\phi(1) = (x^{(1)}, \lambda^{(1)})$. We claim that $\tau \mapsto f(x(\tau))$ is constant on $[0, 1]$. The Lagrangian function

$$L(x, \lambda) = f(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j g_j(x). \quad (54)$$

is equal to $f(x)$ on $V(h_{\text{KKT}})$, which contains $\phi([0, 1])$. Let $\mu_j(\tau)$ be the principal square root of $\lambda_j(\tau)$ for $\tau \in [0, 1]$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. By the mean value theorem, it follows that $f(x(0)) = f(x(1))$. We now obtain $f(x^{(0)}) = f(x^{(1)})$ and hence f is constant on W . \square

We state in the following theorem the explicit degree bound for the representation based on the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions:

Theorem 11. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 1$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Set*

$$w := \frac{1}{2} \times b(n+m, d+1, 2m+n+1) + d \times c(n+m, d+1, n+m). \quad (55)$$

Then there exists $q \in P_w(g)[x, \lambda]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{KKT}})$, where $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and h_{KKT} is defined as in (53).

Proof. Using Lemma 3, we decompose $V(h_{\text{KKT}})$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s with

$$s \leq c(n+m, d+1, n+m), \quad (56)$$

since each entry of h_{KKT} has degree at most $d+1 \geq 2$. Accordingly Lemma 9 shows that f is constant on each Z_i . Thus $f(V(h_{\text{KKT}}))$ is finite. Set $r = |f(V(h_{\text{KKT}}))|$. From (56), we get

$$r \leq s \leq c(n+m, d+1, n+m). \quad (57)$$

Set

$$u := b(n+m, d+1, 2m+n+1)/2. \quad (58)$$

By using Lemma 4, there exists $q \in P_\xi(g)[x, \lambda]$ with $\xi = dr + u$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{KKT}})$. By (57) and (55), $\xi \leq w$, and hence $q \in P_w(g)[x, \lambda]$. \square

We apply Theorem 11 for polynomial optimization as follows:

Theorem 12. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Assume that problem (3) has a global minimizer at which the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold for this problem. Let h_{KKT} be as in (53) and let w be as in (55). Set*

$$r = b(n+m+1, 2w, m+n+2)/2. \quad (59)$$

Then $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h_{\text{KKT}}) = f^$, where Πg is defined as in (8).*

Proof. By assumption, there exists $(x^*, \lambda^*) \in V(h_{\text{KKT}})$ such that x^* is a global minimizer of (3). Since $S(g) = S(\Pi g)$, it implies that

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

By assumption, Theorem 11 yields that there exists $q \in P_w(g)[x, \lambda] = Q_w(\Pi g)[x, \lambda]$ such that $f - f^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{KKT}})$. Applying the sixth statement of Lemma 7 (by replacing g with Πg), we obtain the conclusion. \square

4.2 The case of nonnegative multipliers

The same proof as the one of Lemma 9 works for the following lemma:

Lemma 10. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Set*

$$h_{\text{KKT}}^+ := (\nabla f - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^2 \nabla g_j, \lambda_1^2 g_1, \dots, \lambda_m^2 g_m). \quad (61)$$

Let W be a semi-algebraically path connected component of $V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+)$. Then f is constant on W .

We state in the following theorem the explicit degree bound for the representation based on the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions:

Theorem 13. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Set*

$$w := \frac{1}{2} \times b(n+m, d+1, 2m+n+1) + d \times c(n+m, d+2, n+m). \quad (62)$$

Then there exists $q \in P_w(g)[x, \lambda]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+)$, where $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and h_{KKT} is defined as in (61).

Proof. Using Lemma 3, we decompose $V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+)$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s with

$$s \leq c(n+m, d+2, n+m), \quad (63)$$

since each entry of h_{KKT}^+ has degree at most $d+2 \geq 2$. Accordingly Lemma 10 shows that f is constant on each Z_i . Thus $f(V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+))$ is finite. Set $r = |f(V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+))|$. From (56), we get

$$r \leq s \leq c(n+m, d+2, n+m). \quad (64)$$

Set

$$u := b(n+m, d+1, 2m+n+1)/2. \quad (65)$$

By using Lemma 4, there exists $q \in P_\xi(g)[x, \lambda]$ with $\xi = dr + u$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+)$. By (64) and (62), $\xi \leq w$, and hence $q \in P_w(g)[x, \lambda]$. \square

We apply Theorem 13 for polynomial optimization as follows:

Theorem 14. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Assume that problem (3) has a global minimizer at which the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold for this problem. Let h_{KKT}^+ be as in (61) and let w be as in (62). Set*

$$r = b(n+m+1, 2w, m+n+2)/2. \quad (66)$$

Then $\rho_r(f, \Pi g, h_{\text{KKT}}^+) = f^$, where Πg is defined as in (8).*

Proof. By assumption, there exists $(x^*, \lambda^*) \in V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+)$ such that x^* is a global minimizer of (3). Since $S(g) = S(\Pi g)$, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} f^* &:= \min_{x, \lambda} f(x) \\ \text{s.t. } & x \in S(\Pi g), (x, \lambda) \in V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+), \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

By assumption, Theorem 13 yields that there exists $q \in P_w(g)[x, \lambda] = Q_w(\Pi g)[x, \lambda]$ such that $f - f^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{\text{KKT}}^+)$. Applying the sixth statement of Lemma 7 (by replacing g with Πg), we obtain the conclusion. \square

5 Implicit degree bounds for the representations involving quadratic modules

Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the max norm of a polynomial on $[-1, 1]^n$. We recall in the following lemma the degree bound for Putinar's Positivstellensatz by Baldi and Mourain in [2]:

Lemma 11. *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 the following conditions:*

1. $1 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 \in Q_d(g)[x]$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$;
2. $\|g_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Let f^* be as in (3). Then there exist positive reals $\gamma(n, g)$ and $L(n, g)$ depending only on n and g such that $f \in Q_r(g)[x]$ if

$$r \geq \gamma(n, g) \deg(f)^{3.5nL(n, g)} \left(\frac{\|f\|}{f^*} \right)^{2.5nL(n, g)}. \quad (68)$$

We denote by $v(n, f, g)$ the ceiling of the right hand side of (68). Given $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ with $\xi = \lceil \deg(p)/2 \rceil$, let $\tilde{p} := x_0^{2\xi} p(\frac{x}{x_0\sqrt{2}}) \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{x}]$, where $\bar{x} := (x_0, x)$. The following lemma is a consequence of Lemmas 1 and 11:

Lemma 12. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

1. $\|\tilde{g}_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $g_m := \frac{1}{2} - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$;
2. $S(g) = \emptyset$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$.

Then there exists a positive real u depending on n and g such that $-1 \in Q_u(g)[x]$.

Denote by $u(n, d, g)$ the parameter u in Lemma 12.

Proof. Set $\eta = b(n, d, m + 1)/2$. Since $S(g) = \emptyset$, Lemma 1 yields that there exists $\sigma_\alpha \in \Sigma^2[x]$ such that $\deg(\sigma_\alpha g^\alpha) \leq 2\eta$ and

$$-1 = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^n} \sigma_\alpha g^\alpha. \quad (69)$$

We have $\tilde{g}_m = \frac{1}{2}x_0^2 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$. Let $\eta_j = \lceil \deg(g_j)/2 \rceil$. From (69), we get

$$-x_0^{2\eta} = \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^n} \psi_\alpha \tilde{g}^\alpha, \quad (70)$$

where $\psi_\alpha = x_0^{2(\eta - \eta_j)} \sigma_\alpha(\frac{x}{x_0\sqrt{2}}) \in \Sigma^2[\bar{x}]$ and $\tilde{g} = (\tilde{g}_1, \dots, \tilde{g}_m)$. Denote by $w \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{x}]$ the polynomial on the right hand side of (70). Then w is non-negative on $S(\tilde{g}, \frac{1}{2} - x_0^2)$. Since $0 \in S(\tilde{g}, \frac{1}{2} - x_0^2)$, we get $S(\tilde{g}, \frac{1}{2} - x_0^2) \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand we have

$$1 - x_0^2 - \dots - x_n^2 = (\frac{1}{2} - x_0^2) + \tilde{g}_m \in Q(\tilde{g}, \frac{1}{2} - x_0^2)[\bar{x}]. \quad (71)$$

Applying Lemma 11, we obtain $u = v(n, w + \frac{1}{2\eta+1}, (\tilde{g}, \frac{1}{2} - x_0^2))$ such that

$$-x_0^{2\eta} + \frac{1}{2\eta+1} = w + \frac{1}{2\eta+1} \in Q_u(\tilde{g}, \frac{1}{2} - x_0^2)[\bar{x}]. \quad (72)$$

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

The following lemma is a direct consequence of Lemma 12:

Lemma 13. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ and $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

1. $\|\tilde{g}_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $g_m := \frac{1}{2} - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$;
2. $S(g) \cap V(h) = \emptyset$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $h := (h_1, \dots, h_l)$.

Set $h_{\max} := \max_{j=1, \dots, l} \|\tilde{h}_j\|$. Then there exists a positive real

$$w = u(n, d + 1, (g, \frac{h}{2h_{\max}}, -\frac{h}{2h_{\max}})) \quad (73)$$

depending on n and g such that $-1 \in Q_w(g)[x]$.

Denote by $w(n, d, g, h)$ the parameter w in Lemma 13.

5.1 The case without denominators

Lemma 14. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ and $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

1. $\|\tilde{g}_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $g_m := \frac{1}{2} - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$;
2. f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$;
3. $f(V(h))$ is finite with $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$.

Set $r := |f(V(h))|$ and

$$u := \max_{t \in f(V(h))} w(n, d, g, (h, f - t)). \quad (74)$$

Then there exist $q \in Q_t(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $t = dr + u$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h)$.

Denote by $t(n, d, r, f, g, h)$ the parameter t in Lemma 14. Note that it holds that

$$t(n, d, r, f, g, h) \leq t(n, d, r', f, g, h) \text{ if } r \leq r'. \quad (75)$$

Proof. By assumption, we get $f(V(h)) = \{t_1, \dots, t_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, where $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. For $j = 1, \dots, r$, let $W_j := V(h, f - t_j)$. Then W_j is a real variety generated by $l + 1$ polynomials in $\mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. It is clear that $f(W_j) = \{t_j\}$.

Let $p_j \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, as in (22). It is easy to check that $p_j(W_i) = \{\delta_{ji}\}$ and $\deg(p_j) \leq d(r - 1)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that there is $s \in \{0, 1, \dots, r - 1\}$ such that $W_j \cap S(g) = \emptyset$, for $j = 1, \dots, s$, and $W_i \cap S(g) \neq \emptyset$, for $i = s + 1, \dots, r$.

Let $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Since $W_j \cap S(g) = \emptyset$, Theorem 12 says that $-1 \in Q_u(g)[x] + I_u(h, f - t_j)[x]$. It implies that there exists $v_j \in Q_u(g)[x]$ such that $-1 = v_j$ on W_j . 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 $f = s_1 + v_j s_2$ on W_j . Let $q_j = s_1 + v_j s_2 \in Q_{u+d}(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$.

Since $f \geq 0$ on $S(g)$, it holds that $f = t_i \geq 0$ on W_i , for $i = s + 1, \dots, r$. Now letting q as in (23), we obtain $q \in Q_t(g)[x]$, and hence $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h) = W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r$. \square

The implicit degree bound for the representation without denominators associated with quadratic module in [12, Theorem 1] is stated in the following theorem:

Theorem 15. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 1$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

1. $\|\tilde{g}_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $g_m := \frac{1}{2} - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$;
2. f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $f(C(g))$ is finite.

Set

$$\omega := t(n, d, c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + m + 1), f, g, h_{FJ}). \quad (76)$$

Then there exists $q \in Q_\omega(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and h_{FJ} is defined as in (15).

Proof. Using Lemma 3, we decompose $V(h_{FJ})$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s with s satisfying (25) (since each entry of h_{FJ} has degree at most $d + 1 \geq 2$). Accordingly, [12, Lemma 13] says that f is constant on each Z_i . Thus $f(V(h_{FJ}))$ is finite. Set $r = |f(V(h_{FJ}))|$. Then we get the inequality (26). By using Lemma 14, there exist $q \in Q_\xi(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\xi = t(n, d, r, f, g, h_{FJ})$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. By (26), (75) and (76), $\xi \leq \omega$, and hence $q \in Q_\omega(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. This completes the proof. \square

We apply Theorem 15 for polynomial optimization as follows:

Theorem 16. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 1$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

1. $\|\tilde{g}_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $g_m := \frac{1}{2} - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$;
2. *problem (3) has a global minimizer and $f(C(g))$ is finite.*

Let h_{FJ} be as in (15) and let ω be as in (76). Set

$$r = b(n + m + 1, 2\omega, m + n + 2)/2. \quad (77)$$

Then $\rho_r(f, g, h_{FJ}) = f^$.*

Proof. Note that [12, Lemma 17] implies (45). By assumption, Theorem 15 yields that there exists $q \in Q_\omega(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $f - f^* - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. Applying the sixth statement of Lemma 7, we obtain the conclusion. \square

Remark 3. *The degree bound ω in Theorem 15 is not so interesting and so is the order r in Theorem 16. This is due to the fact the bound ω in Theorem 15 depends on all information of f, g_j . Contrary to this, the degree bound w in Theorem 1 only depends on n , which is the number of variables, m , which is the number of polynomial inequalities g_j , and d , which is upper bound on the degree of f, g_j . We conclude similarly to other representations without denominators involving quadratic modules in [12].*

5.2 The case with denominators

Lemma 15. *Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ and $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}[x]$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

1. $\|\tilde{g}_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $g_m := \frac{1}{2} - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$;
2. f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$;
3. $f(V(h) \setminus A)$ is finite with $h = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

Set $r := |f(V(h) \setminus A)|$ and

$$u := \max_{t \in f(V(h) \setminus A)} w(n, d, g, (h, f - t)). \quad (78)$$

Then there exist $q \in Q_t(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $t = dr + u$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h) \setminus A$.

Denote by $t'(n, d, r, f, g, h)$ the parameter t in Lemma 15. Note that it holds that

$$t'(n, d, r, f, g, h) \leq t'(n, d, r', f, g, h) \text{ if } r \leq r'. \quad (79)$$

Proof. By assumption, we get $f(V(h) \setminus A) = \{t_1, \dots, t_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, where $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. We now handle in much the same way as the proof of Lemma 14 to get $q \in Q_t(g)[x]$, and hence $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h) \setminus A \subset W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r$. \square

The implicit degree bound for the representation with denominator associated with quadratic module in [12, Theorem 9] is stated in the following theorem:

Theorem 17. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 1$. Assume that the following conditions hold:

1. $\|\tilde{g}_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $g_m := \frac{1}{2} - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$;
2. f is non-negative on $S(g)$ with $g := (g_1, \dots, g_m)$.

Set

$$\omega := t'(n, d, 2 \times c(n + m + 1, d + 1, n + m + 1), f, g, h_{FJ}). \quad (80)$$

Then there exists $q \in Q_\omega(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $\lambda_0(f - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$, where $\bar{\lambda} := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ and h_{FJ} is defined as in (15).

Proof. Using Lemma 3, we decompose $V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$ into semi-algebraically path connected components: Z_1, \dots, Z_s with s satisfying (30) (since each entry of h_{FJ} has degree at most $d + 1 \geq 2$). Accordingly, [12, Lemma 24] says that f is constant on each Z_i . Thus $f(V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\})$ is finite. Set $r = |f(V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\})|$. Then we get the inequality (32). By using Lemma 15, there exist $q \in Q_\xi(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $\xi = t'(n, d, r, f, g, h_{FJ})$ such that $f - q$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ}) \setminus \{\lambda_0 = 0\}$. It implies that $\lambda_0(f - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. By (32), (79) and (80), $\xi \leq \omega$, and hence $q \in Q_\omega(g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$. This completes the proof. \square

We apply Theorem 17 for polynomial optimization as follows:

Theorem 18. Let $f, g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{R}_d[x]$ with $d \geq 1$. Let f^* be as in problem (3) with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$. Assume that the following conditions hold:

1. $\|\tilde{g}_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $g_m := \frac{1}{2} - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2$;
2. problem (3) has a global minimizer x^* .

Let h_{FJ} be as in (15) and let ω be as in (80). Assume that one of the following two conditions holds:

1. the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold for problem (3) at x^* ;
2. there exists a sequence of points $(x^{(t)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(t)})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(S(g) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \cap V(h_{FJ})$ such that $(f(x^{(t)}))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to f^* and $\lambda_0^{(t)} > 0$,

Set

$$r = b(n + m + 1, 2(\omega + 1), m + n + 2)/2. \quad (81)$$

Then $\rho_r(f, g, h_{FJ}, \lambda_0) = f^*$.

Proof. Note that [12, Lemma 17] implies (45). Note that the first condition implies that the Fritz John conditions hold for problem (3) at x^* with multipliers $\bar{\lambda}^*$ such that $\lambda_0^* > 0$, so that $(x^*, \bar{\lambda}^*)$ is a global minimizer for problem (45) with $\lambda_0^* > 0$. The second condition implies that each $(x^{(t)}, \bar{\lambda}^{(t)})$ is a feasible solution for problem (45) such that $(f(x^{(t)}))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to f^* and $\lambda_0^{(t)} > 0$. The third statement of Lemma 8 says that $\rho_k(f, g, h_{FJ}, \lambda_0) \leq f^*$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition, Theorem 17 yields that there exists $q \in Q_\omega(\Pi g)[x, \bar{\lambda}]$ such that $\lambda_0(f - f^* - q)$ vanishes on $V(h_{FJ})$. Applying the final statement of Lemma 8 (by replacing h, θ with h_{FJ}, λ_0), we obtain the conclusion. \square

Remark 4. Although they need the same assumption that the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions hold at some global minimizer, the semidefinite relaxations in Theorem 18 have better complexity than the ones in Theorem 14. It is due to the fact that it does not require an exponential number of matrix variables in each semidefinite relaxation.

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

References

- [1] E. Artin. Über die zerlegung definiter funktionen in quadrate. *Abhandlungen aus dem mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg*, 5(1):100–115, 1927.
- [2] L. Baldi and B. Mourrain. On Moment Approximation and the Effective Putinar’s Positivstellensatz. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.11258*, 2021.
- [3] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [4] M. Coste. An introduction to semialgebraic geometry, 2000.
- [5] 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.
- [6] K. Fang and H. Fawzi. The sum-of-squares hierarchy on the sphere and applications in quantum information theory. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–30, 2020.
- [7] R. M. Freund. Optimality conditions for constrained optimization problems. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology (available at: <http://s3.amazonaws.com/mitsloan-php/wp-faculty/sites/30/2016/12/15031343/Optimality-Conditions>)*, 2016.
- [8] J.-L. Krivine. Anneaux préordonnés. *Journal d’analyse mathématique*, 12(1):307–326, 1964.
- [9] J. B. Lasserre. Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. *SIAM Journal on optimization*, 11(3):796–817, 2001.
- [10] M. Laurent and L. Slot. An effective version of Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz for the hypercube. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.09528*, 2021.
- [11] H. Lombardi, D. Perrucci, and M.-F. Roy. *An elementary recursive bound for effective Positivstellensatz and Hilbert’s 17th problem*, volume 263. American mathematical society, 2020.
- [12] N. H. A. Mai. Exact polynomial optimization strengthened with Fritz John conditions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.04254*, 2022.
- [13] N. H. A. Mai, J.-B. Lasserre, and V. Magron. Positivity certificates and polynomial optimization on non-compact semialgebraic sets. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–43, 2021.
- [14] 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.
- [15] M. Marshall. Representations of non-negative polynomials, degree bounds and applications to optimization. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 61(1):205–221, 2009.
- [16] J. Nie. An exact Jacobian SDP relaxation for polynomial optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 137(1):225–255, 2013.
- [17] J. Nie. Optimality conditions and finite convergence of Lasserre’s hierarchy. *Mathematical programming*, 146(1-2):97–121, 2014.
- [18] J. Nie, J. Demmel, and B. Sturmfels. Minimizing polynomials via sum of squares over the gradient ideal. *Mathematical programming*, 106(3):587–606, 2006.
- [19] J. Nie and M. Schweighofer. On the complexity of Putinar’s Positivstellensatz. *Journal of Complexity*, 23(1):135–150, 2007.

- [20] T. S. Pham and H. H. Vui. *Genericity in polynomial optimization*, volume 3. World Scientific, 2016.
- [21] M. Putinar. Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42(3):969–984, 1993.
- [22] C. Scheiderer. Sums of squares of regular functions on real algebraic varieties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 352(3):1039–1069, 2000.
- [23] C. Scheiderer. Sums of squares on real algebraic curves. *Mathematische zeitschrift*, 245(4):725–760, 2003.
- [24] C. Scheiderer. Sums of squares on real algebraic surfaces. *manuscripta mathematica*, 119(4):395–410, 2006.
- [25] K. Schmüdgen. The K-moment problem for compact semi-algebraic sets. *Mathematische Annalen*, 289(1):203–206, 1991.
- [26] M. Schweighofer. On the complexity of Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz. *Journal of Complexity*, 20(4):529–543, 2004.
- [27] L. Slot. Sum-of-squares hierarchies for polynomial optimization and the Christoffel-Darboux kernel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.04610*, 2021.
- [28] G. Stengle. A Nullstellensatz and a Positivstellensatz in semialgebraic geometry. *Mathematische Annalen*, 207(2):87–97, 1974.