

A correlative sparse Lagrange multiplier expression relaxation for polynomial optimization

Zheng Qu* Xindong Tang†

Abstract

In this paper, we consider polynomial optimization with correlative sparsity. For such problems, one may apply the correlative sparse sum of squares (CS-SOS) relaxations to exploit the correlative sparsity, which produces semidefinite programs of smaller sizes, compared with the classical moment-SOS relaxations. The Lagrange multiplier expression (LME) is also a useful tool to construct tight SOS relaxations for polynomial optimization problems, which leads to convergence with a lower relaxation order. However, the correlative sparsity is usually corrupted by the LME based reformulation. We propose a novel parametric LME approach which inherits the original correlative sparsity pattern, that we call correlative sparse LME (CS-LME). The reformulation using CS-LMEs can be solved using the CS-SOS relaxation to obtain sharper lower bound and convergence is guaranteed under mild conditions. Numerical examples are presented to show the efficiency of our new approach.

Keywords— Polynomial optimization, correlative sparsity, Lagrange multiplier expressions, moment-SOS relaxations

MSC Classification— 65K05, 90C22, 90C26

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{R}^n be the n -dimensional Euclidean space, and let $\mathbb{R}[x]$ be the set of all real coefficient polynomials in the variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We consider the polynomial optimization problem

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x) \geq 0, \quad h(x) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

In the above, $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is a polynomial function, and $g \in \mathbb{R}[x]^m$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}[x]^\ell$ are tuples of polynomial functions. In [8], Lasserre introduced a hierarchy of semidefinite programming (SDP) relaxations to provide a sequence of lower bounds for (1.1), which converges to the global optimal value of (1.1), under some compactness assumptions. This approach is known as *the moment-SOS relaxations* and has been intensively explored in the last two decades for global solutions of polynomial optimization problems. For (1.1), Nie introduced the *Lagrange multiplier expressions* (LMEs) [19], whose existence is guaranteed when (1.1) is given by generic polynomial functions. LMEs can be applied to construct the LME reformulation of (1.1) using KKT conditions,

*Department of Mathematics, the University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong. (email: zhengqu@hku.hk)

†Department of Applied Mathematics, the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong. (email: xindong.tang@polyu.edu.hk)

which guarantees the moment relaxation being exact when the relaxation order is big enough, under some classical optimality conditions. However, these approaches are usually computationally expensive. Indeed, even for unconstrained polynomial optimization problems, i.e., $m = l = 0$, the moment relaxation for (1.1) is a semidefinite program of size $\binom{n+d}{n}$, where $d \in \mathbb{N}$ is the relaxation order such that $2d \geq \deg(f)$.

Given the polynomial optimization problem (1.1), let $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ be subsets of $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^s \mathcal{I}_i = [n]$, and let $x^{(i)} = (x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i}$. The (1.1) is said to follow a *correlative sparsity pattern* (csp) $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ if

1. There exists f_1, f_2, \dots, f_s such that every $f_i \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(i)}]$ and $f(x) = f_1(x^{(1)}) + \dots + f_s(x^{(s)})$;
2. There exist partitions $I = (I_1, \dots, I_s)$ and $E = (E_1, \dots, E_s)$ of $[m]$ and $[\ell]$ such that for all $i \in [s]$, we have $g_{j_1} \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(i)}]$ and $h_{j_2} \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(i)}]$ for every $j_1 \in I_i$ and $j_2 \in E_i$.

For convenience, we let $m_i := |I_i|$ and $\ell_i := |E_i|$, and denote

$$g^{(i)} := \{g_j : j \in I_i\}, \quad h^{(i)} := \{h_j : j \in E_i\}.$$

Then, both $g^{(i)}$ and $h^{(i)}$ are subsets of $\mathbb{R}[x^{(i)}]$, and the polynomial optimization (1.1) with csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ can be written in the following way:

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & f_1(x^{(1)}) + f_2(x^{(2)}) + \dots + f_s(x^{(s)}) \\ \text{s.t.} & g^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) \geq 0, \dots, g^{(s)}(x^{(s)}) \geq 0, \\ & h^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) \geq 0, \dots, h^{(s)}(x^{(s)}) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

The moment-SOS relaxation with correlative sparsity is studied in [27], and the convergence result is given in [9]. Recently, Wang *et al.* developed the software TSSOS [13] that implements correlative and term sparse SOS relaxations for polynomial optimization (see also [29, 30]), and it has been used in many applications [14, 28].

In this paper, we mainly consider polynomial optimization problems with a given csp. Note that for any polynomial optimization problem, the trivial csp, i.e., $s = 1$ with $\mathcal{I}_1 = [n]$, always exists. Our primary interests lie in the cases where the $\max_{i \in [s]} |\mathcal{I}_i|$ is small, while n is much bigger than $\max_{i \in [s]} |\mathcal{I}_i|$. For polynomial optimization (1.1) with the given csp, we aim on constructing reformulations similar to LME reformulations introduced in [19], while the correlative sparsity of (1.1) is maintained. Our main contributions are:

- For polynomial optimization with the given csp, we provide a systematic way to construct correlative sparse LMEs (CS-LMEs), which are polynomial functions in x and some additional variables.
- Based on CS-LMEs, we proposed correlative sparse reformulations using Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality conditions. We show that under some general conditions, the reformulation inherits the csp and the running intersection property (RIP) from the original polynomial optimization, and their optimal values are identical.
- We show that for a given relaxation order, correlative sparse SOS (CS-SOS) relaxations always provides a tighter lower bound for the optimal value of the polynomial optimization when the CS-LME reformulation is applied. Asymptotic convergence of our approach is proved under general assumptions. Numerical experiments are given to show the superiority of our CS-LME approach.

This paper is organized as follows. Some preliminaries for polynomial optimization and Lagrange multiplier expressions are given in Section 2. In Section 3, CS-LMEs are studied and reformulations based on CS-LMEs are proposed. Section 4 studies the CS-SOS relaxations for solving CS-LME relaxations. Numerical experiments are presented in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notations and definitions

For a positive integer r , denote $[r] := \{1, \dots, r\}$. Let \mathbf{I}_r be the r -by- r identity matrix, \mathcal{S}^r be the cone of r -by- r symmetric matrices, and \mathcal{S}_+^r be the cone of r -by- r positive semidefinite symmetric matrices. For any two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, we denote by $A \circ B$ the entry-wise product of A and B , and use $\langle A, B \rangle := \text{tr}(A^\top B)$ to denote the trace inner-product of A and B . Let \mathbb{Z}_2^r ($\mathbb{Z}_2 := \{0, 1\}$) be the set of r -by- r binary matrices. For $B \in \mathcal{S}^r \cap \mathbb{Z}_2^r$, denote $\mathcal{S}^r(B) := \{Q \in \mathcal{S}^r : Q \circ B = Q\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_+^r(B) = \mathcal{S}^r(B) \cap \mathcal{S}_+^r$. Given vectors $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^r$, we denote by $v_{i:j}$ the subvector $(v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_j)^\top$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq r$, and $0 \leq v \perp w \geq 0$ means that $v \geq 0$, $w \geq 0$ and $v^\top w = 0$. When the dimension of the ambiguity space is clear, we use \mathbf{e}_i to denote the vector whose i th entry is 1 while all other entries are zeros, and we denote by $\mathbf{0}$ the all-zero vector.

Throughout the paper, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a tuple of n variables. For each $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we let $|\alpha| := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$, let $\text{supp}(\alpha) := \{i \in [n] : \alpha_i \neq 0\}$, and denote by x^α the power product $\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha_i}$. For $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, denote by $\{f_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ the coefficients of f . The degree of a polynomial f is $\text{deg}(f) := \max\{|\alpha| : f_\alpha \neq 0\}$. Denote by $\nabla f \in \mathbb{R}[x]^n$ the gradient of f . When the csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ is given, we let $\nabla_i f := \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1^{(i)}}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n^{(i)}} \right)^\top \in \mathbb{R}[x]^{n_i}$ for each $i \in [s]$.

Let z be a tuple of variables that represents either x , $x^{(i)}$ or $(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)})$ for some i and for some new variables ν . Denote by $\mathbb{R}[z]$ the ring of polynomials in the variables z with coefficients in \mathbb{R} , and let $\mathbb{R}[z]^{r \times k}$ (resp., $\mathbb{R}[z]^r$) be the set of all $r \times k$ matrices (resp., r -dimensional vectors) whose entries are polynomials in z . Moreover, for the vector of polynomials $q = (q_1, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{R}[z]^r$, $q_{i:j}$ means the subvector $(q_i, q_{i+1}, \dots, q_j)$. Let $p \in \mathbb{R}[z]$ and \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S} be two subsets of $\mathbb{R}[z]$, we define $p \cdot \mathcal{R} := \{p \cdot q : q \in \mathcal{R}\}$ and $\mathcal{R} + \mathcal{S} := \{r + s : r \in \mathcal{R}, s \in \mathcal{S}\}$. A polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[z]$ is a sum of squares (SOS) if there exist $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ such that $f = (\sigma_1)^2 + \dots + (\sigma_t)^2$. Denote by $\Sigma[z]$ the set of SOS polynomials in z . For any integer $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{N}_d^n := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \leq d\}$, $\mathbb{R}[z]_d := \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n} f_\alpha z^\alpha : f_\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$ be the \mathbb{R} -vector space of polynomials of degrees at most d , and $\Sigma[z]_d = \Sigma[z] \cap \mathbb{R}[z]_d$ be the set of SOS polynomials of degrees at most d . Given a tuple $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}[z]$, the *quadratic module* of $\mathbb{R}[z]$ generated by g is the set

$$\text{Qmod}(g) := \Sigma[z] + g_1 \cdot \Sigma[z] + \dots + g_m \cdot \Sigma[z], \quad (2.1)$$

and the $2d$ th truncation of $\text{Qmod}(g)$ is the set

$$\text{Qmod}(g)_{2d} := \Sigma[z]_{2d} + g_1 \cdot \Sigma[z]_{2d - \text{deg}(g_1)} + \dots + g_m \cdot \Sigma[z]_{2d - \text{deg}(g_m)}. \quad (2.2)$$

For a tuple $h = (h_1, \dots, h_\ell) \subseteq \mathbb{R}[z]$, the *ideal* of $\mathbb{R}[z]$ generated by h is the set $\text{Ideal}(h) := h_1 \cdot \mathbb{R}[z] + \dots + h_\ell \cdot \mathbb{R}[z]$, and the $2d$ th truncation of $\text{Ideal}(h)$ is the set $\text{Ideal}(h)_{2d} := h_1 \cdot \mathbb{R}[z]_{2d - \text{deg}(h_1)} + \dots + h_\ell \cdot \mathbb{R}[z]_{2d - \text{deg}(h_\ell)}$. For two polynomial tuples h and g , denote

$$\text{IQ}(h, g) := \text{Ideal}(h) + \text{Qmod}(g), \quad \text{IQ}(h, g)_{2d} := \text{Ideal}(h)_{2d} + \text{Qmod}(g)_{2d}. \quad (2.3)$$

Then, it is clear that every $f \in \text{IQ}(h, g) \subseteq \mathbb{R}[z]$ is nonnegative over the set $\mathcal{K} := \{z : h(z) = 0, g(z) \geq 0\}$. Conversely, when $\text{IQ}(h, g)$ is *archimedean*, i.e., there exists $p \in \text{IQ}(h, g)$ such that $\{z : p(z) \geq 0\}$ is compact (see [10]), all positive polynomials over \mathcal{K} are in $\text{IQ}(h, g)$. This result is referred to as Putinar's Positivstellensatz [26]. Moreover, when $h = 0$ has finitely many real roots, or some general optimality conditions hold, the set of nonnegative polynomials over \mathcal{K} is identical with $\text{IQ}(h, g)_{2d}$ (see [15, 17]).

2.2 Moment-SOS relaxation

Consider the polynomial optimization problem (1.1). Denote by \mathcal{K} the feasible set of (1.1), i.e., $\mathcal{K} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(x) = 0, g(x) \geq 0\}$. Then finding the global minimum of (1.1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & f - \gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{d_0}(\mathcal{K}). \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

In the above, d_0 is the degree of f , and $\mathcal{P}_{d_0}(\mathcal{K})$ is the cone of nonnegative polynomials over \mathcal{K} with degrees no greater than d_0 . The dual problem of (2.4) is the truncated moment problem

$$\begin{cases} \min & \langle f, y \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{y}_0 = 1, y \in \mathcal{R}_{d_0}(\mathcal{K}), \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{d_0}(\mathcal{K})$ is the cone of truncated moment sequences supported on \mathcal{K} (see [8, 10, 16]). A computationally tractable relaxation for the pair (2.4-2.5) is called *the moment-SOS relaxation*. Given the relaxation order $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2d \geq \max\{d_0, \deg(g), \deg(h)\}$, the d th ordered SOS relaxation for (2.4) is

$$\begin{cases} \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & f - \gamma \in \text{IQ}(h, g)_{2d}. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

The dual problem for (2.6) is called the d th moment relaxation for (2.5), which is

$$\begin{cases} \min & \langle f, y \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{y}_0 = 1, M_d[y] \succeq 0, \\ & L_h^d[y] = 0, L_g^d[y] \succeq 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_{2d}^n}. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

In the above, y is the truncated moment sequence (tms) of degree $2d$, $M_d[y]$ is the d th ordered moment matrix. Given a polynomial tuple $q = (q_1, \dots, q_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, $L_q^d[y] := \text{diag}(L_{q_1}^d[y], \dots, L_{q_\ell}^d[y])$ is the block diagonal matrix, where every $L_{q_i}^d[y], \dots, L_{q_\ell}^d[y]$ is the d th localizing matrix of q_i generated by y . We refer to [8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18, 4] for more references about polynomial optimization and moment problems. Clearly for any order d , optimal values of both (2.6-2.7) provide lower bounds of f_{\min} . The moment-SOS relaxation (2.6-2.7) are SDP problem. We may rewrite (2.6) as:

$$\mathbf{Q}_d \begin{cases} \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_{j=0}^{m+\ell} \langle Q_j, D_\alpha^j \rangle + \gamma \delta_{0\alpha} = f_\alpha, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_{2d}^n \\ & Q_j \in \mathcal{S}_+^{r_j}, \quad j \in \{0\} \cup [m] \\ & Q_j \in \mathcal{S}^{r_j}, \quad j \in m + [\ell] \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

Here $\delta_{0\alpha} = 1$ if $\alpha = 0$, and $\delta_{0\alpha} = 0$ otherwise. For each $j \in \{0\} \cup [m + \ell]$, $r_j := \binom{n+d-d_j}{d-d_j}$, where $d_j = \lceil \deg(g_j)/2 \rceil$, $D_\alpha^j \in \mathcal{S}^{r_j}$ with rows and columns indexed by $\mathbb{N}_{d-d_j}^n$ and the (β, γ) entry of D_α^j is given by

$$[D_\alpha^j]_{\beta\gamma} = \begin{cases} (g_j)_\eta & \beta + \gamma + \eta = \alpha, \quad j \in \{0\} \cup [m] \\ (h_j)_\eta & \beta + \gamma + \eta = \alpha, \quad j \in m + [\ell] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here $g_0 := 1$ is the constant polynomial. Convergence of the moment-SOS relaxation relies on Putinar's Positivstellensatz [26]. Denote by θ_d the optimal value of \mathbf{Q}_d .

Theorem 2.1 ([8]). *If $\text{IQ}(g, h)$ is archimedean, then $\lim_{d \rightarrow +\infty} \theta_d = f_{\min}$.*

We would like to remark that under some optimality conditions, the moment-SOS relaxations have finite convergence, i.e., $\theta_d = f_{\min}$ for all d that is big enough. We refer to [1, 2, 6, 15, 17] for more related work. The moment-SOS relaxations are implemented in the software `GloptiPoly 3` [5].

2.3 Sparse SOS relaxations

Correlative Sparsity. Consider (1.2) with $\text{csp}(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$. For polynomial tuples $h, g \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(i)}]$, denote by $\text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_i}(h, g)$ the set given by (2.1-2.3) with $z = x^{(i)}$. To exploit the correlative sparsity of problem (1.2), Waki *et. al* [27] considered the following relaxation for problem (1.2):

$$\mathbf{Q}_d^{cs} : \quad \begin{cases} \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & f - \gamma \in \text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_1}(h^{(1)}, g^{(1)})_{2d} + \dots + \text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_s}(h^{(s)}, g^{(s)})_{2d}. \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

Its dual problem is

$$\begin{cases} \min & \langle f, y \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & y_0 = 1, \quad M_d[y^{(i)}] \succeq 0, \quad (i \in [s]) \\ & L_{h^{(i)}}^d[y^{(i)}] = 0, \quad L_{g^{(i)}}^d[y^{(i)}] \succeq 0, \quad (i \in [s]). \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

where $y^{(i)}$ is the subvector of the tms y corresponding with $x^{(i)}$, and $M_d[y^{(i)}]$, $L_{h^{(i)}}^d[y^{(i)}]$ and $L_{g^{(i)}}^d[y^{(i)}]$ are the moment matrix and localizing matrices of polynomial tuples $h^{(i)}$ and $g^{(i)}$ generated by $y^{(i)}$ respectively (see [9, 30]). Similarly, (2.9) also admits an equivalent SDP reformulation:

$$\mathbf{Q}_d^{cs} \quad \begin{cases} \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_{i \in [s]: \text{supp}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{I}_i} \left[\langle Q_0^i, A_\alpha \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{m+\ell} \langle Q_j^i, D_\alpha^{i,j} \rangle \right] + \gamma \delta_{0\alpha} = f_\alpha, \quad \alpha \in \Gamma_d \\ & Q_j^i \in \mathcal{S}_+^{r_{i,j}}, \quad j \in \{0\} \cup [m_i], \quad i \in [s] \\ & Q_j^i \in \mathcal{S}^{r_{i,j}}, \quad j \in m_i + [\ell_i], \quad i \in [s] \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

In the above, $r_{i,j} := \binom{n_i+d-d_{i,j}}{d-d_{i,j}}$ with $n_i = |\mathcal{I}_i|$,

$$d_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \lceil \deg(g_j^i)/2 \rceil & j \in [m_i] \\ \lceil \deg(h_j^i)/2 \rceil & j \in m_i + [\ell_i] \end{cases}, \quad \Gamma_d := \{\alpha : \text{supp}(\alpha) \in \cup_{i=1}^s \mathcal{I}_i, |\alpha| \leq 2d\},$$

and the matrix $D_\alpha^{i,j} \in \mathcal{S}^{r_{i,j}}$ has its rows and columns indexed by $\mathbb{N}_{d-d_{i,j}}^{n_i}$ and

$$[D_\alpha^{i,j}]_{\beta\gamma} = \begin{cases} (g_j^{(i)})_\eta & \beta + \gamma + \eta = \alpha, \quad i \in [s], \quad j \in \{0\} \cup [m_i] \\ (h_j^{(i)})_\eta & \beta + \gamma + \eta = \alpha, \quad i \in [s], \quad j \in m_i + [\ell_i] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We refer to \mathbf{Q}_d^{cs} defined in (2.11) as the CS-SOS relaxation of (1.2) and denote its optimal value by ρ_d .

Definition 2.2. We say that the correlative sparsity pattern $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ satisfies the *running intersection property* (RIP) if for every $i \in [s-1]$, there exists $t \leq i$ such that

$$\mathcal{I}_{i+1} \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \mathcal{I}_j \subseteq \mathcal{I}_t. \quad (2.12)$$

Convergence of the CS-SOS relaxation is derived from the following sparse version of Putinar's Positivstellensatz.

Theorem 2.3 ([9, 7]). *Suppose $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ satisfies the RIP property, and for each $i \in [s]$, $\text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_i}(g^{(i)}, h^{(i)})$ is archimedean. If $f := f_1(x^{(1)}) + \dots + f_s(x^{(s)})$ is positive on the semi-algebraic set $\bigcap_{i=1}^s \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g^{(i)}(x) \geq 0, h^{(i)}(x) = 0\}$, then*

$$f \in \text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_1}(h^{(1)}, g^{(1)}) + \dots + \text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_s}(h^{(s)}, g^{(s)}).$$

Therefore, under the same conditions as Theorem 2.3, we have:

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow +\infty} \rho_d = f_{\min}. \quad (2.13)$$

Correlative and Term Sparsity. To exploit simultaneously the term sparsity and the correlative sparsity, Wang *et al.* [30] proposed to relax further \mathbf{Q}_d^{cs} by considering only block diagonal SDP matrices. The detection of the block diagonal structure is done within each csp block, with extra care taken for the monomials involving overlapping variables. Consider the csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$. Let $l = 1, 2, \dots$ be the level of term sparsity. For relaxation order d and level l , they construct a class of block diagonal binary matrices $\{B_{i,j,d}^{(l)} : i \in [s], j \in \{0\} \cup [m_i + \ell_i]\}$ and consider the following relaxation of (1.2):

$$\mathbf{Q}_{d,l}^{cs-ts} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \max \quad \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in [s]: \text{supp}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{I}_i} \left[\langle Q_0^i, A_\alpha \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{m+\ell} \langle Q_j^i, D_\alpha^{i,j} \rangle \right] + \gamma \delta_{0\alpha} = f_\alpha, \quad \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_d^{(l)} \\ Q_j^i \in \mathcal{S}_+^{r_{i,j}} \left(B_{i,j,d}^{(l)} \right), \quad j \in \{0\} \cup [m_i], \quad i \in [s] \\ Q_j^i \in \mathcal{S}^{r_{i,j}} \left(B_{i,j,d}^{(l)} \right), \quad j \in m_i + [\ell_i], \quad i \in [s] \end{array} \right. \quad (2.14)$$

We refer to [29, 30] for the construction of the binary matrices.

The relaxation $\mathbf{Q}_{d,l}^{cs-ts}$ is referred to as the CS-TSSOS relaxation of (1.2). Denote by $\rho_{d,l}$ the optimal value of $\mathbf{Q}_{d,l}^{cs-ts}$. It was shown in [30] that for each order d , there exists an integer l_d such that

$$\rho_{d,1} \leq \rho_{d,2} \leq \dots \leq \rho_{d,l_d} = \rho_d,$$

and thus the convergence of CS-TSSOS relaxation hierarchy is guaranteed whenever the CS-SOS relaxation hierarchy converges. The CS-TSSOS relaxations are implemented in the software TSSOS [13].

2.4 Optimality conditions and Lagrange multiplier expressions

For the polynomial optimization problem (1.1), the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions can be described by the following polynomial system in $(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+\ell}$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \nabla f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla g_j(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_{m+j} \nabla h_j(x), \\ h(x) = 0, \quad 0 \leq \lambda_{1:m} \perp g(x) \geq 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (2.15)$$

The (x, λ) satisfying (2.15) is called a KKT pair, and the first component x of a KKT pair is called a KKT point. Under some constraint qualification conditions, every minimizer of (1.1), if it exists, must be a KKT point. In this case, minimization of f over the KKT system (2.15) returns the same optimal value and optimal solution as the original problem (1.1). Moreover, conditions guaranteeing the convergence of the full moment-SOS relaxation are more mild for the minimization over the KKT ideal than that for the original problem (1.1). In particular, convergence can still occur even when the semi-algebraic set \mathcal{F} is noncompact [3, 20].

A drawback, however, of working on the KKT system (2.15) rather than on the original feasible region $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the augmentation of the number of variables from n to $n + m + \ell$, which causes significant increase on the computational cost. To deal with this undesired complexity growth, Nie [19] proposed polynomial Lagrange multiplier expressions (LMEs). For the polynomial optimization problem (1.1), let $\hat{m} := m + \ell$, and

let $c := (c_1, \dots, c_{\hat{m}})$ be an enumeration for the constraining pair (g, h) . We denote

$$\mathbf{G}(x) := \begin{bmatrix} \nabla c_1(x) & \nabla c_2(x) & \cdots & \nabla c_{\hat{m}}(x) \\ c_1(x) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & c_2(x) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_{\hat{m}}(x) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{f}(x) := \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x) \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.16)$$

Then, the following equation holds at every KKT pair (x, λ) :

$$\mathbf{G}(x) \cdot \lambda = \mathbf{f}(x). \quad (2.17)$$

If there exists a matrix of polynomials $L \in \mathbb{R}[x]^{\hat{m} \times n}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}[x]^{\hat{m} \times \hat{m}}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} L(x) & D(x) \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}(x) = \mathbf{I}_{\hat{m}}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (2.18)$$

then the Lagrange multipliers λ can be expressed as polynomials in x :

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_{\hat{m}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} p_1(x) \\ \vdots \\ p_{\hat{m}}(x) \end{bmatrix} := L(x) \nabla f(x). \quad (2.19)$$

The polynomial vector $p(x) := (p_1(x), \dots, p_{\hat{m}}(x))$ is called the *Lagrange multiplier expression* (LME). Denote

$$c_{eq}(x) := \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^m p_j(x) \nabla g_j(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} p_{m+j}(x) \nabla h_j(x) \\ h(x) \\ p_{1:m}(x) \circ g(x) \end{bmatrix}, \quad c_{in}(x) := \begin{bmatrix} p_{1:m}(x) \\ g(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a KKT point if and only if x satisfies

$$c_{eq}(x) = 0, \quad c_{in}(x) \geq 0.$$

Based on the LME (2.19), Nie [19] proposed the following reformulation to (1.1):

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & c_{eq} = 0, \quad c_{in} \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

It is clear that, when the minimum of (1.1) is attained at some KKT points, then the optimal values of (1.1) and (2.20) are identical. Indeed, the existence of LMEs guarantees that every minimizer of (1.1), if it exists, must be a KKT point [19, Proposition 5.1], thus solving (1.1) is equivalent to solving the reformulation (2.20). When moment-SOS relaxations are applied, finite convergence is guaranteed under some generic conditions:

Theorem 2.4. [19, Theorem 3.3] *Suppose LMEs exist and (2.20) has a nonempty feasible set. Denote by f^* , θ_k and θ'_k the optimal values for (1.1), the SOS relaxation (2.6) and the moment relaxation (2.7) of (2.20) respectively. Then, we have $f^* = \theta_k = \theta'_k$ holds for all k big enough, if $\text{IQ}(c_{eq}, c_{in})$ is archimedean and the minimum value of (1.1) is attained at a KKT point.*

Recently, LMEs have been widely used in various problems given by polynomial functions, such as bilevel programmings, Nash equilibrium problems, tensor computation, etc. We refer to [21, 22, 23, 24, 25] for applications of LMEs. One wonders when LMEs exist, i.e., there exist matrices $L(x), D(x)$ such that (2.18) holds. We say the constraining tuple $(c_1, \dots, c_{\hat{m}})$ nonsingular if the matrix $\mathbf{G}(x)$ given in (2.16) has full column rank for all $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$. For (1.1), LMEs exist if and only if its constraining tuple is nonsingular [19, Proposition 5.1]. We would like to remark that when polynomials $c_1, \dots, c_{\hat{m}}$ are generic, the nonsingularity condition holds (we say a property holds generically if it holds for all points of inputting data but a set of Lebesgue measure zero). However, there are cases that LMEs do not exist. We refer to [19, 22] for more details.

3 Correlative sparse LMEs and reformulations

In this paper, we consider polynomial optimization problem (1.2) with correlative sparsity $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ satisfying the RIP. For $i \in [s]$, we denote by \mathbf{G}_i the polynomial matrix \mathbf{G} given in (2.16) associated with $c := (g^{(i)}, h^{(i)})$.

As mentioned in Section 2.4, one can reformulate polynomial optimization problems with LMEs, from which the moment-SOS relaxations gives tighter lower bounds for the polynomial optimization. To apply LMEs, the KKT system of (1.2) corresponds to the following semialgebraic set on $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1+\ell_1}, \dots, \lambda^{(s)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_s+\ell_s}$:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla f_1(x) + \dots + \nabla f_s(x) = \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \nabla g_j^{(i)}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \nabla h_j^{(i)}(x) \right), \\ h^{(i)}(x) = 0, \quad i \in [s], \\ 0 \leq \lambda_{1:m_i}^{(i)} \perp g^{(i)}(x) \geq 0, \quad i \in [s]. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

In general, the LMEs associated to (3.1), if exist, do not follow the original csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$, unless $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s$ are pairwise disjoint (i.e., $\mathcal{I}_i \cap \mathcal{I}_j = \emptyset$ for any $i, j \in [s]$). As a result, the LME reformulation (2.20) of problem (1.2) usually does not inherit the csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ from (1.2).

Example 3.1. Let $n = 6$ and $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$. Consider the polynomial optimization problem (1.2) with csp $\{\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2\}$, where $\ell_1 = \ell_2 = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} g_1^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) &= 1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3, & g_2^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) &= x_1, & g_3^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) &= x_2, \\ g_1^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) &= 2 - x_3 - x_4 - x_5 - x_6, & g_2^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) &= x_3, \dots, & g_5^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) &= x_6. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the LMEs are

$$\begin{aligned} p_1^{(1)}(x) &= (x_3 - 2)x^\top \nabla(f_1(x) + f_2(x)) + x_{1:2}^\top (\nabla f_1(x))_{1:2} + x_{4:6}^\top (\nabla f_2(x))_{4:6}, \\ p_1^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{1}{2}((x_3 - 1)x^\top \nabla(f_1(x) + f_2(x)) + x_{1:2}^\top (\nabla f_1(x))_{1:2} + x_{4:6}^\top (\nabla f_2(x))_{4:6}), \\ p_2^{(1)}(x) &= \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1}(x) + p_1^{(1)}(x), & p_3^{(1)}(x) &= \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_2}(x) + p_1^{(1)}(x), \\ p_2^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_3}(x) + p_1^{(1)}(x) + p_1^{(2)}(x), & p_3^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_4}(x) + p_1^{(2)}(x), \\ p_4^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_5}(x) + p_1^{(2)}(x), & p_5^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_6}(x) + p_1^{(2)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The reformulation (2.20) does not inherit the csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2)$. For instance, the complementarity conditions in the KKT system imply that

$$(1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3)p_1^{(1)}(x) = (2 - x_3 - \dots - x_6)p_1^{(2)}(x) = 0,$$

which have all variables involved when $f_1 \in \mathbb{R}[x_{1:3}]$, $f_2 \in \mathbb{R}[x_{3:6}]$ are dense polynomials.

Recall that LMEs exist when the polynomial matrix $\mathbf{G}(x)$ has full column rank for all $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, i.e., the constraining tuple is nonsingular, which holds generically. Nevertheless, it does not necessarily mean that LMEs of (1.2) exist when every $(g^{(i)}, h^{(i)})$ is nonsingular. To see this, consider the csp given in Example 3.1. Suppose

$$g_1^{(1)}(x) = 1 - (x^{(1)})^\top x^{(1)}, \quad g_1^{(2)}(x) = 1 - (x^{(2)})^\top x^{(2)}, \quad \ell_1 = \ell_2 = 0.$$

Then, one may check that both $\mathbf{G}_1(x^{(1)})$ and $\mathbf{G}_2(x^{(2)})$ has full column rank over the complex space. However, when $x = \mathbf{e}_3$, the polynomial matrix $\mathbf{G}(x)$ has two columns while its rank equals 1. We further refer to Example 5.4 and Example 5.6 in Section 5 for such cases.

3.1 Correlative sparse LMEs: two blocks

In the next two subsections, we provide a systematic method to construct LMEs for (1.2) which leverages the correlative sparsity pattern $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$. Hereinafter, we additionally assume that the nonsingularity holds for the constraining pair $(g^{(i)}, h^{(i)})$ within every \mathcal{I}_i . That is:

Assumption 1. For each $i \in [s]$, there exist $L_i \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(i)}]^{(m_i + \ell_i) \times n_i}$ and $D_i \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(i)}]^{(m_i + \ell_i) \times (m_i + \ell_i)}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_i(x^{(i)}) & D_i(x^{(i)}) \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_i(x^{(i)}) = \mathbf{I}_{m_i + \ell_i}. \quad (3.2)$$

As explained in the last subsection, Assumption 1 is a necessary but not sufficient condition of the nonsingularity of the constraining tuple of (1.2).

We begin with the case of two blocks, i.e. $s = 2$. For polynomial optimization problem (1.2) with csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2)$, let $\nu := (\nu_k)_{k \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2}$ and

$$F_1(x, \nu) := \nabla_1 f_1 + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2} \nu_k \mathbf{e}_k^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, \quad F_2(x, \nu) := \nabla_2 f_2 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2} \nu_k \mathbf{e}_k^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2},$$

where

$$\mathbf{e}_k^{(i)} := \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (3.3)$$

with j being the enumeration of the label k in \mathcal{I}_i . Then, we have $(x, \lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)})$ is a KKT tuple if and only if there exists ν such that

$$\begin{cases} F_1(x^{(1)}, \nu) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} \lambda_j^{(1)} \nabla_1 g_j^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_1} \lambda_{m_1+j}^{(1)} \nabla_1 h_j^{(1)}(x^{(1)}), \\ F_2(x^{(2)}, \nu) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} \lambda_j^{(2)} \nabla_2 g_j^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_2} \lambda_{m_2+j}^{(2)} \nabla_2 h_j^{(2)}(x^{(2)}), \\ h^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) = 0, \quad h^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) = 0, \\ 0 \leq \lambda_{1:m_1}^{(1)} \perp g^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq \lambda_{1:m_2}^{(2)} \perp g^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

To see this, we note that at any KKT triple $(x, \lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)})$, the system (3.4) holds with

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2} \nu_j \mathbf{e}_j = \nabla f_2(x^{(2)}) - \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} \lambda_j^{(2)} \nabla g_j^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_2} \lambda_{m_2+j}^{(2)} \nabla h_j^{(2)}(x^{(2)}).$$

Conversely, it is clear that $(x, \lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)})$ satisfies (3.1) if (3.4) hold at $(x, \lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \nu)$. Under Assumption 1, if we let

$$p^{(1)} := L_1(x^{(1)})F_1(x^{(1)}, \nu), \quad p^{(2)} := L_2(x^{(2)})F_2(x^{(2)}, \nu),$$

then

$$\lambda^{(1)} = p^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \nu), \quad \lambda^{(2)} = p^{(2)}F_2(x^{(2)}, \nu)$$

for any $(x, \lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \nu)$ satisfying (3.4), by (3.2). The polynomial vectors $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}$ are called *correlative sparse Lagrange multiplier expressions* (CS-LMEs) for $\lambda^{(1)}$ and $\lambda^{(2)}$. Furthermore, we get a similar polynomial reformulation like (2.20) for (1.2), that we consider

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & f_1(x^{(1)}) + f_2(x^{(2)}) \\ \text{s.t.} & F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu) \nabla_i g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} p_{m_i+j}^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu) \nabla_i h_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}), \\ & h^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) = 0, \quad 0 \leq p_{1:m_i}^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu) \perp g^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \geq 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.5)$$

One may check the polynomial optimization problem (3.5) has a correlative sparsity pattern of two blocks:

$$(x^{(1)}, \nu), \quad (x^{(2)}, \nu).$$

Example 3.2. Consider the same constraints given in Example 3.1. For the csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2)$, we have $\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2 = \{3\}$. So for given polynomials $f_1 \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(1)}]$ and $f_2 \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(2)}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(x^{(1)}, \nu) &= \nabla_1 f_1(x^{(1)}) + \nu e_3^{(1)}, & F_2(x^{(2)}, \nu) &= \nabla_2 f_2(x^{(2)}) - \nu e_3^{(2)}; \\ p_1^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \nu) &= (F_1(x^{(1)}, \nu))^\top x^{(1)}, & p_2^{(1)} &= F_{1,1} + p_1^{(1)}, \quad p_3^{(1)} = F_{1,2} + p_1^{(1)}, \\ p_1^{(2)}(x^{(2)}, \nu) &= \frac{1}{2} (F_2(x^{(2)}, \nu))^\top x^{(2)}, & p_i^{(2)} &= F_{2,i-1} + p_1^{(2)}, \quad i = 2, \dots, 5. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Note that when CS-LMEs are given as above, the system

$$F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu) \nabla_i g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}), \quad i = 1, 2$$

reduces to one single equation $F_{1,3}(x^{(1)}, \nu) = 0$. Consequently, the polynomial optimization problem can be reformulated as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & f_1(x^{(1)}) + f_2(x^{(2)}) \\ \text{s.t.} & 1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3 \geq 0, \quad x_1 \geq 0, \quad x_2 \geq 0, \quad F_{1,3}(x^{(1)}, \nu) = 0, \\ & (1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3) \cdot p_1^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \nu) = 0, \quad x_1 \cdot p_2^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \nu) = 0, \quad x_2 \cdot p_3^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \nu) = 0, \\ & p_1^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \nu) \geq 0, \quad p_2^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \nu) \geq 0, \quad p_3^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \nu) \geq 0, \\ & 2 - x_3 - x_4 - x_5 - x_6 \geq 0, \quad x_3 \geq 0, \quad x_4 \geq 0, \quad x_5 \geq 0, \quad x_6 \geq 0, \\ & (2 - x_3 - \dots - x_6) \cdot p_1^{(2)}(x^{(2)}, \nu) = 0, \quad x_3 \cdot p_2^{(2)}(x^{(2)}, \nu) = 0, \dots, \quad x_6 \cdot p_5^{(2)}(x^{(2)}, \nu) = 0, \\ & p_1^{(2)}(x^{(2)}, \nu) \geq 0, \quad p_2^{(2)}(x^{(2)}, \nu) \geq 0, \dots, \quad p_5^{(2)}(x^{(2)}, \nu) \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.7)$$

To summarize, the LME approach proposed by Nie [19] allows to tighten the classical moment-SOS relaxation by incorporating necessary polynomial constraints, provided that certain constraint qualification condition holds. However, usually this approach cannot keep the csp from the original polynomial optimization problem. Moreover, when the nonsingularity condition fails, LMEs do not exist. In contrast, one can try to find CS-LME instead by adding some new variables. In the above, we demonstrate how to find CS-LMEs for the two-block case. In the next subsection, we provide a systematic way to construct CS-LMEs for an arbitrary number of blocks.

3.2 Correlative sparse LME: multi-blocks

We aim on finding CS-LMEs such that:

1. The CS-LME reformulation has the csp $(\hat{\mathcal{I}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{I}}_s)$ such that every $\mathcal{I}_i \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{I}}_i$ and every $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_i$ is not too large;
2. The csp $(\hat{\mathcal{I}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{I}}_s)$ satisfies the RIP property.

To construct LME coherent with the correlative sparsity pattern $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$, we first build a tree with nodes corresponding to the elements in the collection $\{\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s\}$.

Algorithm 1 Tree Construction

Input: $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s$ satisfying the RIP.

- 1: $V = \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $A = \emptyset$.
- 2: **for** $i = 1, \dots, s - 1$ **do**
- 3: **if** $\mathcal{I}_{i+1} \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \mathcal{I}_j \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 4: Find the largest $t \leq i$ such that $\mathcal{I}_{i+1} \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^t \mathcal{I}_j \subseteq \mathcal{I}_t$.
- 5: $A = A \cup \{(i+1, t)\}$.
- 6: **end if**
- 7: **end for**

Output: (V, A)

The output of Algorithm 1 encodes a tree structure on $V = \{1, \dots, s\}$. For each $i \in [s]$, we denote the indices of the children of the node i by

$$\mathcal{D}_i := \{t : (t, i) \in A\}, \quad (3.8)$$

and the index of the parent of the node i by

$$\mathcal{A}_i := \{t : (i, t) \in A\}. \quad (3.9)$$

Note that \mathcal{D}_i and \mathcal{A}_i can be empty set and \mathcal{A}_i contains at most one element for $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$.

For each arc $(i, t) \in A$, let

$$\mathcal{C}_{i,t} := \mathcal{I}_i \cap \mathcal{I}_t$$

be the indices of the variables shared by block i and block t .

We introduce a group of additional variables:

$$\{\nu_{i,t,k} : (i, t) \in A, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\}. \quad (3.10)$$

The vector $\mathbf{e}_k^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is defined similarly as in (3.3) for $i \in [s]$. Let

$$\nu^{(i,t)} := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}} \nu_{i,t,k} \mathbf{e}_k^{(i)}.$$

For each $i \in [s]$, consider the following system on $(x^{(i)}, \lambda^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i + m_i + \ell_i}$ with additional variables $\{\nu_{i,t,k} : (i, t) \in A, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\}$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \nabla_i f_i(x^{(i)}) - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{A}_i} \nu^{(i,t)} + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_i} \nu^{(t,i)} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \nabla_i g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \nabla_i h_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}), \\ h^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) = 0 \\ 0 \leq \lambda_{1:m_i}^{(i)} \perp g^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.11)$$

Proposition 3.3. *Let $x := (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda := (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(s)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+\ell}$. The pair (x, λ) is a KKT pair of (1.2) if and only if there exists a group of additional variables $\{\nu_{i,t,k} : (i, t) \in A, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\}$ such that (3.11) hold for all $i \in [s]$.*

Proof. If there exists (x, λ) and $\{\nu_{i,t,k} : (i, t) \in A, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\}$ such that (3.11) holds for all $i \in [s]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^s \nabla f_i(x^{(i)}) \\ &\stackrel{(3.11)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \nabla g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \nabla h_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{A}_i} \hat{\nu}^{(i,t)} - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_i} \hat{\nu}^{(t,i)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \nabla g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \nabla h_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{t \in \mathcal{A}_i} \hat{\nu}^{(i,t)} - \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_i} \hat{\nu}^{(t,i)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \nabla g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \nabla h_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the above,

$$\hat{\nu}^{(i,t)} := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}} \nu_{i,t,k} \mathbf{e}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Therefore (x, λ) is a KKT pair of (1.2). In the following, we show the other direction.

Let (x, λ) be a KKT pair of (1.2). For each fixed $k \in [n]$, let $\mathcal{P}_k := \{(i, t) \in A : k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_k := \{i : k \in \mathcal{I}_i\}$. Then the subgraph with nodes \mathcal{Q}_k and arcs \mathcal{P}_k is a connected subgraph (subtree) of (V, A) . To see this, suppose that $(\mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$ contains two disconnected trees and let i and j be the roots of the two trees. Without loss of generality, we assume $i < j$. Then

$$k \in \mathcal{I}_j \cap \mathcal{I}_i \subseteq \mathcal{I}_j \cap \bigcup_{t=1}^{j-1} \mathcal{I}_t.$$

Therefore, \mathcal{A}_j is not empty and $k \in \mathcal{I}_t$ for $t \in \mathcal{A}_j$. This contradicts to the fact that j is a root in $(\mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$. Moreover, the connectedness of $(\mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$ allows to deduce the solvability of the following system of linear equations:

$$\sum_{t:(i,t) \in \mathcal{P}_k} \nu_{i,t,k} - \sum_{t:(t,i) \in \mathcal{P}_k} \nu_{t,i,k} = \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \frac{\partial g_j^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \frac{\partial h_j^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \right), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{Q}_k. \quad (3.12)$$

Indeed, this system can be written as

$$Bv = b \quad (3.13)$$

where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Q}_k| \times |\mathcal{P}_k|}$ is the incidence matrix of $(\mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Q}_k|}$ is a vector satisfying $\mathbf{1}^\top b = 0$. Since $(\mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$ is a connected tree, we have $\text{rank}(B) = |\mathcal{P}_k| = |\mathcal{Q}_k| - 1$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top B = 0$. Therefore (3.13) and thus (3.12) is solvable. Since there exist $\{\nu_{i,t,k} : (i, t) \in A, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\}$ such that (3.12) hold for all $k \in [n]$, we have the following equations hold at (x, λ)

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k:i \in \mathcal{Q}_k} \sum_{t:(i,t) \in \mathcal{P}_k} \nu_{i,t,k} \mathbf{e}_k - \sum_{k:i \in \mathcal{Q}_k} \sum_{t:(t,i) \in \mathcal{P}_k} \nu_{t,i,k} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_k} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \mathbf{e}_k - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \frac{\partial g_j^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \frac{\partial h_j^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \right) \mathbf{e}_k, \quad \forall i \in [s]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Note that for any $k \in [n]$ such that $i \notin \mathcal{Q}_k$, we have

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \equiv \frac{\partial g_1^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \equiv \dots \equiv \frac{\partial g_{m_i}^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \equiv \frac{\partial h_1^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \equiv \dots \equiv \frac{\partial h_{\ell_i}^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \equiv 0.$$

Therefore, (3.14) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in [n]} \sum_{t: (i,t) \in \mathcal{P}_k} \nu_{i,t,k} \mathbf{e}_k - \sum_{k \in [n]} \sum_{t: (t,i) \in \mathcal{P}_k} \nu_{t,i,k} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &= \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \mathbf{e}_k - \sum_{k \in [n]} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \frac{\partial g_j^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \frac{\partial h_j^{(i)}}{\partial x_k}(x^{(i)}) \right) \mathbf{e}_k \\ &= \nabla f_i(x^{(i)}) - \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_j^{(i)} \nabla g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \lambda_{m_i+j}^{(i)} \nabla h_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}), \quad \forall i \in [s]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Finally, for each $i \in [s]$,

$$\{(i, t, k) : k \in [n], (i, t) \in \mathcal{P}_k\} = \{(i, t, k) : (i, t) \in A, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\},$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in [n]} \sum_{t: (i,t) \in \mathcal{P}_k} \nu_{i,t,k} \mathbf{e}_k - \sum_{k \in [n]} \sum_{t: (t,i) \in \mathcal{P}_k} \nu_{t,i,k} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &= \sum_{(i,t) \in A} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}} \nu_{i,t,k} \mathbf{e}_k - \sum_{(t,i) \in A} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_{t,i}} \nu_{t,i,k} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{A}_i} \nu^{(i,t)} - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_i} \nu^{(t,i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the first equation in (3.11) is satisfied. \square

For every $i \in [s]$, define

$$\mathcal{J}_i := \{(i, t, k) : t \in \mathcal{A}_i, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\} \cup \{(t, i, k) : i \in \mathcal{D}_i, k \in \mathcal{C}_{t,i}\}, \quad \nu^{(i)} := (\nu_{i,t,k})_{(i,t,k) \in \mathcal{J}_i}.$$

Clearly, the vector $-\sum_{t \in \mathcal{A}_i} \nu^{(i,t)} + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_i} \nu^{(t,i)}$ only depends on the variables indexed by \mathcal{J}_i for each $i \in [s]$. Suppose the constraining tuple $g^{(i)}$ is nonsingular (i.e. Assumption 1 holds), and we let

$$F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) := \nabla_i f_i(x^{(i)}) - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{A}_i} \nu^{(i,t)} + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_i} \nu^{(t,i)}. \quad (3.16)$$

Then (3.11) implies that the i th group of Lagrange multipliers can be expressed by a tuple of polynomials which only depends on variables indexed by \mathcal{I}_i and \mathcal{J}_i , say, $x^{(i)}$ and $\nu^{(i)}$.

Theorem 3.4. *For the polynomial optimization (1.2), let A be the set generated by Algorithm 1, $\mathcal{C}_{i,t} := \mathcal{I}_i \cap \mathcal{I}_t$, $\{\nu_{i,t,k} : (i, t) \in A, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\}$ be the group of additional variables, and let $F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)})$ be given as in (3.16). Then, a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a KKT point of (1.2) if and only if the following system (3.17) holds for each $i \in [s]$:*

$$\begin{cases} F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \nabla_i g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} p_{m_i+j}^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \nabla_i h_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}), \\ 0 \leq p_{1:m_i}^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \perp g^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \geq 0, \quad h^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

where

$$p^{(i)}(x, \nu) := L^{(i)}(x) \cdot F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}). \quad (3.18)$$

Proof. Recall the matrix of polynomials $\mathbf{G}_i(x^{(i)})$ defined in Section 2.4. The system (3.11) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{G}_i(x^{(i)})\lambda^{(i)} = [(F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}))^\top \ 0 \ \dots \ 0]^\top, \\ \lambda_1^{(i)}, \dots, \lambda_{m_i}^{(i)} \geq 0, \ g_1^{(i)}, \dots, g_{m_i}^{(i)} \geq 0, \ h_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_{\ell_i}^{(i)} \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

By Assumption 1, the first equation in (3.19) holds if and only if

$$\lambda^{(i)} = L^{(i)}(x) \cdot F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}).$$

Thus, it remains to replace $\lambda^{(i)}$ with $p^{(i)}(x, \nu)$ in (3.11) and apply Proposition 3.3. \square

Remark. For polynomial optimization (1.2) with general csp $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$, we call (3.18) the CS-LMEs of (1.2). By Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.4, CS-LMEs exist when Assumption 1 is satisfied.

3.3 A CS-LME reformulation

In the following, we denote by $\mathbb{R}[x, \nu]$ the ring of real-valued polynomials in variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{\nu_{i,t,k} : (i, t) \in A, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i,t}\}$. For each $i \in [s]$, denote

$$\phi^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) := \begin{bmatrix} F_i(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) - \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \nabla_i g_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_i} p_{m_i+j}^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \nabla_i h_j^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \\ h^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \\ p_{1:m}^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \circ g^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\psi^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) := \begin{bmatrix} p_{1:m}^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \\ g^{(i)}(x^{(i)}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here, the polynomials $p_j^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}[x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}]$ are CS-LMEs defined in (3.18). Based on Theorem 3.4, we propose the following CS-LME typed reformulation of (1.2):

$$\begin{cases} f_c := \min & f_1(x^{(1)}) + \dots + f_s(x^{(s)}) \\ \text{s.t.} & \psi^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \geq 0, \quad i \in [s] \\ & \phi^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) = 0, \quad i \in [s] \end{cases} \quad (3.20)$$

The previous reformulation (3.5) is a special case of (3.20). If we let

$$\hat{\mathcal{I}}_i := \mathcal{I}_i \cup \mathcal{J}_i,$$

then it is clear that (3.20) has the csp $(\hat{\mathcal{I}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{I}}_s)$, with equality constraints partitioned as (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_s) , and inequality constraints partitioned as (ψ_1, \dots, ψ_s) . Suppose the global minimum f_{\min} of (1.2) is attained at some KKT points, then at least one minimizer of (1.2) is feasible for (3.20), thus $f_{\min} \geq f_c$. Since the feasible set of (3.20) is contained in the feasible set of (1.2), we have $f_{\min} \leq f_c$. So, we may conclude the following from the statement above:

Theorem 3.5. *If the minimum f_{\min} of (1.2) is attained at a KKT point, then the minimal value (1.2) and (3.20) are identical, i.e., $f_{\min} = f_c$.*

Remark. Suppose the minimum value f_{\min} is attainable. If the nonsingularity condition holds for (1.2), then f_{\min} is attained at KKT points, since nonsingularity implies the linear independence constraint qualification conditions (LICQ) hold over \mathbb{C}^n . However, this is not necessarily true if we replace the nonsingularity condition by Assumption 1. This is because Assumption 1 does not guarantee the LICQ to hold at every feasible point. For such cases, f_c may, or may not, equals f_{\min} . Nevertheless, it does not mean the KKT conditions must fail at minimizers of (1.2) if the nonsingularity condition does not hold. Indeed, it may happen that the constraining tuple is singular, but the LICQ hold at a minimizer, thus $f_c = f_{\min}$; see Examples 5.4 and 5.6.

4 Correlative sparse LME based SOS relaxation

We study the correlative sparse SOS relaxations for solving the CS-LME reformulation (3.20). First, we establish the RIP.

Lemma 4.1. *The csp $(\hat{\mathcal{I}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{I}}_s)$ satisfies the RIP in Definition 2.2.*

Proof. To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{i+1} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \mathcal{J}_j &= \{(i+1, t, k) : t \in \mathcal{A}_{i+1}, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i+1, t}\} \cup \{(t, i+1, k) : t \in \mathcal{D}_{i+1}, k \in \mathcal{C}_{t, i+1}\} \\ &\quad \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \left(\{(j, t, k) : t \in \mathcal{A}_j, k \in \mathcal{C}_{j, t}\} \cup \{(t, j, k) : t \in \mathcal{D}_j, k \in \mathcal{C}_{t, j}\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $t \in \mathcal{D}_{i+1}$ implies $t > i+1$ and $t \in \mathcal{A}_j$ implies $t < j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{J}_{i+1} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \mathcal{J}_j \\ &= \{(i+1, t, k) : t \in \mathcal{A}_{i+1}, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i+1, t}\} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \left(\{(j, t, k) : t \in \mathcal{A}_j, k \in \mathcal{C}_{j, t}\} \cup \{(j, t, k) : t \in \mathcal{D}_j, k \in \mathcal{C}_{t, j}\} \right) \\ &\subseteq \{(i+1, t, k) : t \in \mathcal{A}_{i+1}, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i+1, t}\}. \end{aligned}$$

If \mathcal{A}_{i+1} is empty, then both $\mathcal{I}_{i+1} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \mathcal{I}_j$ and $\mathcal{J}_{i+1} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \mathcal{J}_j$ are empty. In this case, $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{i+1} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \hat{\mathcal{I}}_j$ is empty. If \mathcal{A}_{i+1} is nonempty, recall that \mathcal{A}_{i+1} contains at most one element and let $\mathcal{A}_{i+1} = \{t\}$ for some $t \in [s]$. Then $i+1 \in \mathcal{D}_t$ and so

$$\mathcal{J}_t = \{(t, i, k) : i \in \mathcal{A}_t, k \in \mathcal{C}_{t, i}\} \cup \{(i, t, k) : i \in \mathcal{D}_t, k \in \mathcal{C}_{i, t}\} \supseteq \{(i+1, t, k) : k \in \mathcal{C}_{i+1, t}\}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{i+1} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \hat{\mathcal{I}}_j = \left\{ \mathcal{I}_{i+1} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \mathcal{I}_j \right\} \cup \left\{ \mathcal{J}_{i+1} \bigcap \bigcup_{j=1}^i \mathcal{J}_j \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_t \cup \mathcal{J}_t = \hat{\mathcal{I}}_t. \quad \square$$

For the polynomial optimization problem (1.2) with csp $(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{I}}_s)$, we consider its d th order correlative sparse SOS relaxation:

$$\begin{cases} \vartheta_d := \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_i f_i - \gamma \in \text{IQ}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_1} \left(\phi^{(1)}, \psi^{(1)} \right)_{2d} + \dots + \text{IQ}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_s} \left(\phi^{(s)}, \psi^{(s)} \right)_{2d}. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Its dual problem is

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_i \langle f_i, y^{(i)} \rangle \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{y}_0 = 1, \quad M_d[y^{(i)}] \succeq 0, \quad i \in [s] \\
& L_{\phi^{(i)}}^d[y^{(i)}] = 0, \quad L_{\psi^{(i)}}^d[y^{(i)}] \succeq 0, \quad i \in [s].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Note that for each $i \in [s]$, $h^{(i)}$ is contained in $\phi^{(i)}$, $g^{(i)}$ is contained in $\psi^{(i)}$, and every $\mathcal{I}_i \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{I}}_i$. It follows that

$$\text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_1}(h^{(1)}, g^{(1)}) + \cdots + \text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_s}(h^{(s)}, g^{(s)}) \subseteq \text{IQ}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_1}(\phi^{(1)}, \psi^{(1)})_{2d} + \cdots + \text{IQ}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_s}(\phi^{(s)}, \psi^{(s)})_{2d}.$$

Therefore, (4.1) is a tighter relaxation than (2.9). In particular, we have

$$\vartheta_d \geq \rho_d, \quad \forall d \geq d_0. \tag{4.3}$$

Theorem 4.2. *Assume that:*

1. *at least one minimizer of (1.2) is a KKT point, and*
2. *$(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ satisfies the RIP property, and*
3. *for each $i \in [s]$, $\text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_i}(h^{(i)}, g^{(i)})$ is archimedean.*

Then

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow +\infty} \vartheta_d = f_{\min}. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. By the definition of CS-SOS relaxation, we have

$$\vartheta_d \leq f_c, \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The first condition, together with Theorem 3.4, implies that $f_c = f_{\min}$. Then we have $\vartheta_d \leq f_{\min}$, and the convergence follows directly by (2.13) and (4.3). \square

Remark. Note that in Theorem 4.2, if we substitute the condition that $\text{IQ}_{\mathcal{I}_i}(h^{(i)}, g^{(i)})$ is archimedean by the archimedeaness of $\text{IQ}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_i}(\phi^{(i)}, \psi^{(i)})$, then the conclusion still holds. However, $\text{IQ}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_i}(\phi^{(i)}, \psi^{(i)})$ is not archimedean in general.

One wonders how will the proposed CS-LME approach differs from solving the LME reformulation by moment-SOS relaxations. Consider the polynomial optimization problem in Examples 3.1 and 3.2. Suppose the $f_1(x^{(1)})$ and $f_2(x^{(2)})$ are dense polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x^{(1)}]$ and $\mathbb{R}[x^{(2)}]$ respectively. For this problem, its CS-LME reformulation is given in (3.7). If we apply the CS-SOS relaxations (4.1-4.2) to (3.7) with correlative sparsity blocks $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_1 = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \nu)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_2 = (x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, \nu)$, the maximal size of the SDP matrices in the relaxations of order d is

$$O\left(\binom{5+d}{d}\right).$$

When the original LMEs are applied, the reformulation does not have correlative sparsity if f_1 and f_2 are dense polynomials (see Example 3.1). In this case, the maximal size of the SDP matrices in the d th order moment-SOS relaxation will be

$$O\left(\binom{6+d}{d}\right).$$

We would like to remark that when $d = 3$, the three binomial coefficients are 56 and 84 respectively. In practical computation, there exist significant differences in the efficiency of these two approaches, as shown by Example 5.1. Moreover, the difference will become large when s is large, or when $\max_{(i,t)} |\mathcal{C}_{i,t}| \ll \min_i |\mathcal{I}_i|$, as shown in the following example.

Example 4.3. Let $N > k$ be two positive integers. Consider the following sparsity pattern:

$$\mathcal{I}_i = \{(N - k)(i - 1) + 1, \dots, (N - k)(i - 1) + N\}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, s. \quad (4.5)$$

When $N = 3$ and $k = 2$, it corresponds to the csp of the Broyden tridiagonal function [9, Example 3.4]. The tree (V, A) associated to the sparsity pattern (4.5) is given by

$$A = \{(i, i - 1) : i = 2, \dots, s\}.$$

For each arc $(i, i - 1) \in A$, the set of joint indices is:

$$\mathcal{C}_{i,i-1} = \mathcal{I}_i \cap \mathcal{I}_{i-1} = \{(N - k)(i - 1) + 1, \dots, (N - k)(i - 2) + N\}.$$

Note that $|\mathcal{I}_i| = N$ and $|\mathcal{C}_{i,i-1}| = k$ for each $i \in [s]$. The additional variables are:

$$\bigcup_{i=2}^s \bigcup_{j=1}^k \{\nu_{i,i-1,(N-k)(i-1)+j}\}. \quad (4.6)$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{(1)} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \nu_{2,1,N-k+j} \mathbf{e}_{N-k+j}^{(1)}, \\ \nu^{(i)} &= - \sum_{j=1}^k \nu_{i,i-1,(N-k)(i-1)+j} \mathbf{e}_{(N-k)(i-1)+j}^{(i)} + \sum_{j=1}^k \nu_{i+1,i,(N-k)i+j} \mathbf{e}_{(N-k)i+j}^{(i)}, \quad \forall i = \{2, \dots, s-1\}, \\ \nu^{(s)} &= - \sum_{j=1}^k \nu_{s,s-1,(N-k)(s-1)+j} \mathbf{e}_{(N-k)(s-1)+j}^{(s)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the sparsity pattern (4.5), the maximal clique size in the CS-LME reformulation is

$$N + 2k.$$

In contrast, when original LMEs exist, the maximal clique size in the original LME reformulation (2.20) is at least

$$(N - k) \left\lfloor \frac{N - 1}{N - k} \right\rfloor + N.$$

Consequently, for the sparsity pattern (4.5), it is expected that the CS-LME reformulation has superior performance than the LME reformulation when $N \gg k$. Recall that N is the size of the blocks while k is the number of the overlapping variables between two successive blocks. Thus N/k can be seen as a measure of the partial separability of the problem. The larger N/k is, the more separable the problem is, hence the CS-LME approach is more efficient. See Example 5.5 for an unconstrained case with $N = 15$, $k = 2$ and $s = 10$.

5 Numerical experiments

In this section, we present numerical experiments that apply CS-LMEs to solve polynomial optimization problems with a given csp. We directly call the software TSSOS¹ [29, 30] to solve the CS-TSSOS relaxation of the CS-LME reformulation (3.20). As recalled in Section 2.3, the convergence of CS-TSSOS is guaranteed when

¹<https://github.com/wangjie212/TSSOS>

the CS-SOS relaxation is convergent. The software `Mosek` is applied to solve the SDPs. The computation is implemented in an Dell x1 Yoga laptop, with an Intel[®] Core(TM) i7-1185G7 CPU at 3.00GHz×4 cores and 16GB of RAM, in the Windows 11 operating system.

For all polynomial optimization problems in this section, we compare the performance of several approaches. First, we solve the problem directly by CS-TSSOS with options `TS=block` and `TS=MD` respectively (see [29] for more details). Then, we solve the reformulation (2.20)) using the original LMEs introduced in [19], if it exists. Note that when original LMEs are applied, correlative sparsity for the reformulation is usually corrupted. Last, we solve the CS-LME reformulation (3.20). For both LME reformulation (2.20) and CS-LME reformulation (3.20), the CS-TSSOS is called with the option `TS=MD`.

Example 5.1. Consider the constraints given in Examples 3.1. Let

$$f_1(x^{(1)}) = x_1x_2x_3 - x_1^2 - x_2^2, \quad f_2(x^{(2)}) = x_4^3 + x_5^3 + x_6^3 + x_3x_{4:6}^\top x_{4:6} + x_4x_5 + x_6.$$

For this problem, CS-LMEs are given by (3.6), and the CS-LMEs reformulation is (3.7). One may check that the global minimum for this polynomial optimization is -1 .

Numerical results for solving this problem are presented in Table 1. In the table, ‘d’ means the relaxation order, ‘l’ represents the term sparsity level. The columns ‘no LME+block’ and ‘no LME+MD’ are numerical results of applying CS-TSSOS directly to the polynomial optimization problem with `TS=block` and `TS=MD` respectively, the column ‘LME’ corresponds to solving the LME reformulation, and the column ‘CS-LME’ represents the relaxation results of the CS-LME reformulation. The ‘LB’ means the lower bound obtained by solving the semidefinite relaxation, and ‘time’ is the time consumption in seconds for computing this lower bound. When a superscript * is marked, it means the lower bound was computed with the highest level of term sparsity within the current relaxation order.

From the table, one can see that when there was no LMEs exploited, CS-TSSOS could not get a lower bound with high accuracy (say, less than 10^{-6}), while the original LME approach took around 1.53 seconds to get the lower bound $-1 - 1 \cdot 10^{-7}$. In contrast, the CS-LME approach obtained a lower bound whose error was $9 \cdot 10^{-8}$ in 0.03 second.

d	l	no LME+block		no LME+MD		LME		CS-LME	
		LB	time	LB	time	LB	time	LB	time
2	1	-1.0001	0.03s	-1.0034	0.02s	not defined		$-1 + 9 \cdot 10^{-8}$	0.03s
2	2	* -1.0001	0.02s	-1.0027	0.02s	not defined		$-1 + 7 \cdot 10^{-8}$	0.06s
2	3			* -1.0001	0.04s	not defined		$-1 + 1 \cdot 10^{-8}$	0.06s
3	1	$-1 - 1 \cdot 10^{-5}$	0.08s	-1.0008	0.04s	$-1 - 1 \cdot 10^{-7}$	1.53s	$-1 + 2 \cdot 10^{-8}$	0.16s
3	2	* $-1 - 1 \cdot 10^{-5}$	0.08s	-1.0008	0.03s				
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮				
5	2	* $-1 - 4 \cdot 10^{-6}$	2.79s	$-1 - 7 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.19s				

Table 1: Numerical results for Example 5.1

For all remaining examples in this section, symbols and notation in tables are similarly defined as in Table 1, and we shall not repeat explaining them, for neatness of this paper. Besides, we say a relaxation ‘fail to solve’ when we cannot get a sensible optimal value for it. This may happen when the SDP is unbounded.

Example 5.2. Let $s = 2$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_2 = \{4, 5, 6, 7\}.$$

Consider the polynomial optimization problem (1.2) with $\text{csp} \{\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x^{(1)}) &= x_1^4 x_2^2 + x_2^4 x_3^2 + x_3^4 x_1^2 - 3(x_1 x_2 x_3)^2 + x_2^2 + x_4^2(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2), \\ f_2(x^{(2)}) &= x_5 x_6(10 - x_7) + x_4^2(x_5 + 2x_6 + 3x_7); \\ g_1^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) &= x_1 - x_2 x_3, \quad g_2^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) = -x_2 + x_3^2, \\ g_1^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) &= 1 - x_5 - x_6 - x_7, \quad g_2^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) = x_5, \quad g_3^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) = x_6, \quad g_4^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) = x_7. \end{aligned}$$

One may check that the global minimum for this polynomial optimization is 0. For this problem, let

$$F_1 = \nabla_1 f_1 + \nu_{2,1,4} \mathbf{e}_4, \quad F_2 = \nabla_2 f_2 + \nu_{2,1,4} \mathbf{e}_1,$$

then the CS-LMEs are

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1^{(1)} &= F_{1,1}, \quad \lambda_2^{(1)} = [-x_3, -1, 0, 0] \cdot F_1, \\ \lambda_1^{(2)} &= x_{5,7}^\top F_{2,2,4}, \quad \lambda_2^{(2)} = F_{2,2} + \lambda_1^{(2)}, \quad \lambda_3^{(2)} = F_{2,3} + \lambda_1^{(2)}, \quad \lambda_4^{(2)} = F_{2,4} + \lambda_1^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

The numerical results for solving this problem are presented in Table 2. From the table, one can see that when there was no LMEs exploited, CS-TSSOS could not get a lower bound with high accuracy (say, less than 10^{-6}) within 271.95 seconds, while the original LME approach took around 84.13 seconds to get the lower bound $-2 \cdot 10^{-7}$. In contrast, the CS-LME approach obtained a lower bound whose error was $-9 \cdot 10^{-8}$ in 18.54 seconds.

d	l	no LME+block		no LME+MD		LME		CS-LME	
		LB	time	LB	time	LB	time	LB	time
3	1	fail to solve		fail to solve		not defined		not defined	
3	2	* $< -10^8$	0.18s	fail to solve		not defined		not defined	
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
3	5	⋮		*fail to solve		not defined		not defined	
4	1	$< -10^7$	0.47s	fail to solve		-1519.49	4.95s	-645.71	0.77s
4	2	* $< -10^5$	0.59s	$< -10^6$	0.45s	-35.36	5.28s	-23.62	0.94s
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
5	2	* -196.20	2.99s	$< -10^5$	1.44s	$-2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	84.13s	-0.0324	5.42s
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
6	1	-50.92	9.77	-102.78	5.59s			$-9 \cdot 10^{-8}$	18.54s
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮			⋮	⋮
8	2	* -0.0001	271.95s	-0.0079	75.64s			⋮	⋮
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮			⋮	⋮
8	5	⋮		* -0.0002	322.68s			⋮	⋮

Table 2: Numerical results for Example 5.2

Example 5.3. Let $s = 3$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_2 = \{4, 5, 6\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_3 = \{4, 7, 8\}.$$

Denote $x_0 := 1$. Consider the polynomial optimization problem (1.2) with $\text{csp}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, \mathcal{I}_3)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x^{(1)}) &= (x^{(1)})^\top x^{(1)} + \sum_{i=0}^4 \prod_{j \neq i} (x_i - x_j), \\ f_2(x^{(2)}) &= (x_5 - x_4 x_6)^2, \quad f_3(x^{(3)}) = (x_4 x_7 x_8 + x_7 + x_8) x_8; \\ g_1^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) &= x_1^2 - 1, \quad g_2^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) = x_2^2 - 1, \quad g_3^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) = x_3^2 - 1, \quad g_4^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) = x_4^2 - 1, \\ h_1^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) &= x_4 - x_5^2 - x_6^2, \quad g_1^{(3)}(x^{(3)}) = x_7, \quad g_2^{(3)}(x^{(3)}) = x_8. \end{aligned}$$

For this problem, the minimum is 4; see [19]. Let

$$F_1 = \nabla_1 f_1 + \nu_{2,1,4} \mathbf{e}_4, \quad F_2 = \nabla_2 f_2 - \nu_{2,1,4} \mathbf{e}_1 + \nu_{3,2,4} \mathbf{e}_1, \quad F_3 = \nabla_3 f_3 + \nu_{3,2,4} \mathbf{e}_1,$$

then the CS-LMEs are

$$\lambda_1^1 = \frac{F_{1,1} x_1}{2}, \quad \lambda_2^1 = \frac{F_{1,2} x_2}{2}, \quad \lambda_3^1 = \frac{F_{1,3} x_3}{2}, \quad \lambda_4^1 = \frac{F_{1,4} x_4}{2}, \quad \lambda_1^2 = F_{2,1}, \quad \lambda_1^3 = F_{3,1}, \quad \lambda_2^3 = F_{3,2}.$$

The numerical results for solving this problem are presented in Table 3. From the table, one can see that when there was no LMEs exploited, CS-TSSOS could not get a lower bound with high accuracy (say, less than 10^{-6}) within 12.13 seconds, while the original LME approach took around 26.59 seconds to get the approximated minimum $4 + 10^{-7}$. In contrast, the CS-LME approach obtained an approximated minimum whose error was $7 \cdot 10^{-7}$ in 1.63 second.

d	1	no LME+block		no LME+MD		LME		CS-LME	
		LB	time	LB	time	LB	time	LB	time
2	1	fail to solve		fail to solve		not defined		not defined	
3	1	-2141.15	0.16s	$< -10^6$	0.13s	1.6190	1.46s	1.1253	0.58s
3	2	* -1268.18	0.17s	$< -10^5$	0.11s	2.3463	2.34s	0.8704	0.35s
3	3			-2815.02	0.16s	3.6639	22.78s	3.6658	1.11s
3	4			* -2742.71	0.14s	3.5889	50.76s	3.6815	1.39s
⋮	⋮					⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
3	7					*3.5485	44.41s	*3.6815	1.45s
4	1	-3.1081	0.71s	-467.41	0.29s	$4 + 1 \cdot 10^{-7}$	26.59s	3.9979	2.13s
4	2	-1.6203	0.75s	-1375.42	0.30s			$4 + 7 \cdot 10^{-7}$	1.63s
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮				
6	2	* $4 - 4 \cdot 10^{-5}$	12.13s	3.5879	0.94s				
6	7			* $4 - 3 \cdot 10^{-5}$	16.97s				

Table 3: Numerical results for Example 5.3

Example 5.4. Let $s = 5$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &= \{x_1, \dots, x_4, x_{17}, x_{18}, x_{19}\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_2 = \{x_5, \dots, x_8, x_{18}, x_{19}, x_{20}\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_3 = \{x_9, x_{10}, x_{18}, x_{19}, x_{20}\}, \\ \mathcal{I}_4 &= \{x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{17}, x_{18}\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_5 = \{x_{13}, \dots, x_{16}, x_{17}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the polynomial optimization problem (1.2) with $\text{csp}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, \dots, \mathcal{I}_5)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x^{(1)}) &= (x_1 - x_{17})^2 + (x_2 - x_{18})^2 + (x_3 - x_{19})^2 + x_4^2 x_{17}, \\ f_2(x^{(2)}) &= x_{18}^2 + x_{19}^2 + x_{20}^2 - x_5(x_6 + x_7 + x_8), \\ f_3(x^{(3)}) &= x_9 x_{10} (20 - x_{18} - x_{19} - x_{20}), \quad f_4(x^{(4)}) = (x_{11} - x_{17})^2 + (x_{12} + x_{18} - 1)^2, \\ f_5(x^{(5)}) &= (x_{17} - x_{13} + x_{14})^2 + x_{15} x_{16}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
g_i^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) &= 1 - x_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 4; \quad g_i^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) = 1 - x_{12+i}, \quad i = 5, 6, 7; \quad g_i^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) = x_{i-7} - 1, \quad i = 8, \dots, 11; \\
g_1^{(2)} &= 3 - 2 \sum_{j=5}^7 x_j - \sum_{j=18}^{20} x_j - x_8, \\
g_2^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) &= x_5, \dots, g_5^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) = x_8, g_6^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) = x_{18}, g_7^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) = x_{19}, g_8^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) = x_{20}; \\
g_1^{(3)}(x^{(3)}) &= 1 - x_9 - x_{10} - \sum_{j=18}^{20} x_j, \quad g_2^{(3)}(x^{(3)}) = x_9, \quad g_3^{(3)}(x^{(3)}) = x_{10}; \\
g_1^{(4)}(x^{(4)}) &= 1 - x_{11}^2 - x_{12}^2 - x_{17}^2 - x_{18}^2; \quad g_1^{(5)}(x^{(5)}) = x_{13}, \quad g_2^{(5)}(x^{(5)}) = x_{14}, \dots, g_5^{(5)}(x^{(5)}) = x_{17}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, one may check that the minimum for $f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_5$ over the set given by the tuple $(g^{(1)}, g^{(2)}, \dots, g^{(5)})$ equals $-\frac{9}{8}$. For this problem, the set of edges is $A = \{(2, 1), (3, 2), (4, 1), (5, 4)\}$. The additional variables are

$$\nu_{2,1,18}, \nu_{2,1,19}, \nu_{3,2,18}, \nu_{3,2,19}, \nu_{3,2,20}, \nu_{4,1,17}, \nu_{4,1,18}, \nu_{5,4,17}.$$

If we let F_i be given as in (3.16), then CS-LMEs are

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{1:4}^{(1)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \cdot F_{1,1:4} \circ (\mathbf{1} + x_{1:4}), \quad \lambda_{5:7}^{(1)} = -F_{1,5:7}, \quad \lambda_{8:11}^{(1)} = F_{1,1:4} + \lambda_{1:4}^{(1)}; \\
\lambda_1^{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{3} F_2^\top x^{(2)}, \quad \lambda_{2:4}^{(2)} = 2\lambda_1^{(2)} + F_{2,1:3}, \quad \lambda_{5:8}^{(2)} = 2\lambda_1^{(2)} + F_{2,4:7}; \\
\lambda_1^{(3)} &= -F_3^\top x^{(3)}, \quad \lambda_{2:3}^{(3)} = \lambda_1^{(3)} + F_{3,1:2}; \quad \lambda^{(4)} = -\frac{1}{2} F_4^\top x^{(4)}; \quad \lambda^{(5)} = F_5.
\end{aligned}$$

We would like to remark that the tuple $(g^{(1)}, g^{(2)}, \dots, g^{(5)})$ is singular, so original LMEs do not exist.

The numerical results for solving this problem are presented in Table 4. From the table, one can see that when there was no LMEs exploited, CS-TSSOS could not get a lower bound with high accuracy (say, less than 10^{-6}) within 7697.33 seconds. In contrast, the CS-LME approach obtained an approximated minimum whose error was 10^{-7} in 53.73 seconds.

d	l	no LME+block		no LME+MD		CS-LME	
		LB	time	LB	time	LB	time
2	1	fail to solve		* < -10^6	0.28s	-10.6981	1.32s
2	2	* < -10^6	0.37			-1.4335	1.50s
⋮	⋮					⋮	⋮
2	5					* - 1.2667	10.05s
3	1	-2.7297	3.59s	-1296.38	0.71s	$-1.125 - 4 \cdot 10^{-7}$	60.41s
3	2	*fail to solve		-1278.05	0.76s	$-1.125 - 1 \cdot 10^{-7}$	53.73s
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮		
5	2	* - 1.1319	16663.91s	-10.4781	252.95s		
5	3			-1.2112	7697.33s		

Table 4: Numerical results for Example 5.4

Example 5.5. Consider the correlative sparsity pattern given in Example 4.3. Let $s = 10$, $N = 15$, and $k = 2$. For each $i \in [10]$, let

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i(x) &= (x_1^{(i)})^2 + \dots + (x_5^{(i)})^2 - 4 \left((x_1^{(i)} x_2^{(i)})^2 + \dots + (x_4^{(i)} x_5^{(i)})^2 + (x_5^{(i)} x_1^{(i)})^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \left(x_1^{(i)} + \dots + x_5^{(i)} - (x_{6:10}^{(i)})^\top x_{11:15}^{(i)} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the unconstrained polynomial optimization problem

$$\min_x f_1(x^{(1)}) + \cdots + f_{10}(x^{(10)}). \quad (5.1)$$

For unconstrained problems, the system

$$\phi^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) = 0, \quad \psi^{(i)}(x^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)}) \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [10]$$

reduces to

$$F_1(x^{(1)}, \nu^{(1)}) = F_2(x^{(2)}, \nu^{(2)}) = \cdots = F_{10}(x^{(10)}, \nu^{(10)}) = 0,$$

where every F_i is given in (3.16) with additional variables given in (4.6). Thus, the CS-LME typed reformulation (3.20) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f_1(x^{(1)}) + \cdots + f_{10}(x^{(10)}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & F_1(x^{(1)}, \nu^{(1)}) = F_2(x^{(2)}, \nu^{(2)}) = \cdots = F_{10}(x^{(10)}, \nu^{(10)}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Similarly, the original LME reformulation (3.20) for (5.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f_1(x^{(1)}) + \cdots + f_{10}(x^{(10)}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \nabla(f_1 + f_2 + \cdots + f_{10})(x) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

The numerical results for solving this problem are presented in Table 5. From the table, one can see that when there was no LMEs exploited, CS-TSSOS could not get a lower bound with high accuracy (say, less than 10^{-6}), while the original LME approach took around 270.40 seconds to get the approximated minimum $6 \cdot 10^{-11}$. In contrast, the CS-LME approach obtained an approximated minimum whose error was $7 \cdot 10^{-10}$ in 20.48 seconds.

d	1	no LME+block		no LME+MD		LME		CS-LME	
		LB	time	LB	time	LB	time	LB	time
2	1	*fail to solve		*fail to solve		fail to solve		fail to solve	
2	2	*fail to solve		*fail to solve		*fail to solve		*fail to solve	
3	1	$* < -10^8$	78.43s	$* < -10^8$	7.26s	$6 \cdot 10^{-11}$	270.40s	$7 \cdot 10^{-10}$	20.48s
4	1	*out of memory		$* < -10^6$	487.31s				
5	1	*out of memory		*out of memory					

Table 5: Numerical results for Example 5.5

Example 5.6. In this example, we present numerical results by varying the number of blocks s . For each $i \in [s]$, let $\mathcal{I}_i := \{9i - 8, 9i - 7, \dots, 9i + 1\}$. Consider the following optimization problem

$$\begin{cases} \min_x & f_1(x^{(1)}) + f_2(x^{(2)}) + \cdots + f_s(x^{(s)}) \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1^{(1)} \geq 0, x_1^{(i)} + x_2^{(i)} + \cdots + x_{10}^{(i)} \leq 1, x_{2:10}^{(i)} \geq 0, \quad i \in [s] \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

In the above,

$$f_i(x^{(i)}) = x_1^{(i)} x_2^{(i)} + x_3^{(i)} x_4^{(i)} + x_5^{(i)} x_6^{(i)} + \left((x_7^{(i)})^3 + (x_8^{(i)})^3 + (x_9^{(i)})^3 + x_7^{(i)} x_8^{(i)} x_9^{(i)} \right) x_{10}^{(i)}, \quad i \in [s].$$

It is clear that (5.4) has $\text{csp}(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_s)$ with the minimum being 0. For each $i \in [s-1]$, we have the additional variable $\nu_{i+1, i, 9i+1}$. Let F_i be given in (3.16), then CS-LMEs are

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1^{(1)} &= -F_1^\top x^{(1)}, & \lambda_{2:11}^{(1)} &= F_1 + \lambda_1^{(1)}; \\ \lambda_1^{(i)} &= -F_i^\top x^{(i)}, & \lambda_{2:10}^{(i)} &= F_{i,2:10} + \lambda_1^{(i)}, \quad (i = 2, \dots, s). \end{aligned}$$

The numerical results for solving this problem with $s = 2, \dots, 7$ are presented in Table 6. In the table, ‘s’ represents the quantity s in (5.4), and all other symbols and notations are similarly defined as in Table 1 (see Example 5.1). When $s = 2$, one can see that without CS-LME, CS-TSSOS could not get a lower bound with medium accuracy within 10^4 seconds. In contrast, the CS-LME approach obtained an approximated minimum whose error was $5 \cdot 10^{-9}$ in 1192.89 seconds. Moreover, when $s = 3, \dots, 7$, we do not present numerical results with relaxation order $d = 3$ since we cannot get lower bounds that are close to 0. Also, results of approaches without CS-LMEs are not presented for $s \geq 3$ and $d = 4$, because close lower bounds cannot be computed by these approaches within a reasonable time consumption.

s	d	l	no LME+block		no LME+MD		CS-LME	
			LB	time	LB	time	LB	time
2	3	1	-0.0735	71.54s	-5369.40	2.88s	-3.6067	16.85s
	3	2	* -0.0230	196.25s	-624.22	4.25s	-0.0680	35.02s
	3	3			-0.0238	78.46s	-0.0091	353.71s
	3	4			* -0.0230	216.41s	-0.0071	834.23s
	4	1	-0.0205	11366.94s	-23.77	682.21	$-5 \cdot 10^{-9}$	1192.89s
	4	2			-0.0104	71235.47	-	-
3	4	1					$-7 \cdot 10^{-8}$	1965.19s
4	4	1					$-2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	2432.45s
5	4	1					$-3 \cdot 10^{-7}$	2868.47s
6	4	1					$-3 \cdot 10^{-7}$	4136.36s
7	4	1					$-3 \cdot 10^{-7}$	4567.80s

Table 6: Numerical results for Example 5.6

6 Conclusions and discussions

In this paper, we consider correlative sparse polynomial optimization problems. We introduce CS-LMEs to construct CS-LME reformulations for polynomial optimization problems. Under some general assumptions, we show that correlative SOS relaxations can get tighter lower bounds when solving the CS-LME reformulation instead of the original optimization problem. Moreover, asymptotic convergence is guaranteed if the sequel of CS-SOS relaxations for the original polynomial optimization is convergent. Numerical examples are presented to show the superiority of our new approach.

For the future work, one wonders if the CS-SOS relaxation has finite convergence for solving CS-LME reformulations. Indeed, finite convergence for the original LME reformulation in [19] is guaranteed under generic assumptions. As demonstrated in Section 5, the CS-LME approach usually finds an exact lower bound (up to a numerical error) for polynomial optimization problems with a low relaxation order. However, it is still open that if the finite convergence is guaranteed theoretically or not. Moreover, when the correlative sparse

polynomial optimization (1.2) is given by generic polynomials, its KKT ideal is zero dimensional, thus the real variety given by equality constraints in (3.20) is a finite set. For the classical moment-SOS relaxations, finite convergence is theoretically guaranteed when equality constraints of the polynomial optimization gives a zero dimensional real variety, as shown in [15]. So, it is interesting to ask whether the analogous is true for CS-SOS relaxations or not.

At last, we would like to remark that LMEs have broad applications in many polynomial defined problems. Therefore, a natural question that follows is how to apply CS-LMEs to these applications. For example, when a saddle point problem is given by polynomials with correlative sparsity, can we apply CS-LMEs to construct polynomial optimization reformulation similar to the one in [25] for finding saddle points?

References

- [1] D. CIFUENTES, C. HARRIS, AND B. STURMFELS, *The geometry of SDP-exactness in quadratic optimization*, Mathematical programming, 182 (2020), pp. 399–428.
- [2] E. DE KLERK AND M. LAURENT, *On the Lasserre hierarchy of semidefinite programming relaxations of convex polynomial optimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 21 (2011), pp. 824–832.
- [3] 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 (2007), pp. 189–200.
- [4] D. HENRION AND J.-B. LASSERRE, *Detecting global optimality and extracting solutions in GloptiPoly*, in Positive polynomials in control, Springer, 2005, pp. 293–310.
- [5] D. HENRION, J.-B. LASSERRE, AND J. LÖFBERG, *GloptiPoly 3: moments, optimization and semidefinite programming*, Optimization Methods & Software, 24 (2009), pp. 761–779.
- [6] Z. HUA AND Z. QU, *On the exactness of Lasserre’s relaxation for polynomial optimization with equality constraints*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.13766, (2021).
- [7] M. KOJIMA AND M. MURAMATSU, *A note on sparse SOS and SDP relaxations for polynomial optimization problems over symmetric cones*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 42 (2009), pp. 31–41.
- [8] J. B. LASSERRE, *Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 11 (2001), pp. 796–817.
- [9] ———, *Convergent SDP-relaxations in polynomial optimization with sparsity*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 17 (2006), pp. 822–843.
- [10] J. B. LASSERRE, *An introduction to polynomial and semi-algebraic optimization*, vol. 52, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [11] J. B. LASSERRE, *The moment-SOS hierarchy*, in Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians: Rio de Janeiro 2018, World Scientific, 2018, pp. 3773–3794.
- [12] M. LAURENT, *Sums of squares, moment matrices and optimization over polynomials*, in Emerging applications of algebraic geometry, Springer, 2009, pp. 157–270.

- [13] V. MAGRON AND J. WANG, *TSSOS: a Julia library to exploit sparsity for large-scale polynomial optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00915, (2021).
- [14] M. NEWTON AND A. PAPACHRISTODOULOU, *Sparse polynomial optimisation for neural network verification*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.02241, (2022).
- [15] J. NIE, *Polynomial optimization with real varieties*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 23 (2013), pp. 1634–1646.
- [16] ———, *The \mathcal{A} truncated K -moment problem*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 14 (2014), pp. 1243–1276.
- [17] ———, *Optimality conditions and finite convergence of Lasserre’s hierarchy*, Mathematical Programming, 146 (2014), pp. 97–121.
- [18] ———, *Linear optimization with cones of moments and nonnegative polynomials*, Mathematical Programming, 153 (2015), pp. 247–274.
- [19] ———, *Tight relaxations for polynomial optimization and Lagrange multiplier expressions*, Mathematical Programming, 178 (2019), pp. 1–37.
- [20] J. NIE, J. DEMMEL, AND B. STURMFELS, *Minimizing polynomials via sum of squares over the gradient ideal*, Mathematical Programming, 106 (2006), pp. 587–606.
- [21] J. NIE AND X. TANG, *Nash equilibrium problems of polynomials*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09490, (2020).
- [22] ———, *Convex generalized Nash equilibrium problems and polynomial optimization*, Mathematical Programming, (2021).
- [23] J. NIE, L. WANG, J. J. YE, AND S. ZHONG, *A Lagrange multiplier expression method for bilevel polynomial optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 31 (2021), pp. 2368–2395.
- [24] J. NIE, Z. YANG, AND X. ZHANG, *A complete semidefinite algorithm for detecting copositive matrices and tensors*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 28 (2018), pp. 2902–2921.
- [25] J. NIE, Z. YANG, AND G. ZHOU, *The saddle point problem of polynomials*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, (2021), pp. 1–37.
- [26] M. PUTINAR, *Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets*, Indiana University Mathematics Journal, 42 (1993), pp. 969–984.
- [27] H. WAKI, S. KIM, M. KOJIMA, AND M. MURAMATSU, *Sums of squares and semidefinite program relaxations for polynomial optimization problems with structured sparsity*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 17 (2006), pp. 218–242.
- [28] J. WANG AND V. MAGRON, *Certifying global optimality of ac-opf solutions via the CS-TSSOS hierarchy*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.10005, (2021).
- [29] J. WANG, V. MAGRON, AND J.-B. LASSERRE, *TSSOS: A Moment-SOS hierarchy that exploits term sparsity*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 31 (2021), pp. 30–58.
- [30] J. WANG, V. MAGRON, J. B. LASSERRE, AND N. H. A. MAI, *CS-TSSOS: Correlative and term sparsity for large-scale polynomial optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.02828, (2020).